

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA  
ARCHÆOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY

---

ACCESSION NO. 66590

CALL No. Sa 8 K | Jay | K.H.

D.G.A. 79

दोसाणा ओरिधमनक्रिया  
काली १०९ वी.  
जवाहर नगर, दिल्ली-११०००७





JAYADEVA AND GĪTA-GŌVINDA: A STUDY

**Other books by the same Authors**

Understanding Western Music

Teaching of Music

Readings in Music & Dance

Readings in Indian Music

Compositions of Haridasas

Indian Music: A perspective

Measurement & Evaluation in Music

An Index of Songs in South Indian Music

Composers of South Indian Music

**By Gowri Kuppuswamy**

Pallaki Seva Prabandha-A Musical Opera

# JAYADEVA AND GĪTAGŌVINDA: A STUDY

*Edited by*

GOWRI KUPPUSWAMY

Reader in Vocal Music, University of Mysore

AND

M. HARIHARAN, M.A., M.Mus., M.Ed.

Research Scholar, University of Mysore

66590



Sa 8K

Jay / K.H.

COLLEGE BOOK HOUSE

M. G. ROAD :: TRIVANDRUM-695 001

66590  
प्रवाप्ति संख्या..... दिनांक 21.11.80  
निर्देश संख्या... Sa8K/ Jay/K.H.  
नई दिल्ली  
केन्द्रीय प्रज्ञातत्व पुस्तकालय

## CONTENTS

Preface		vi
1. A New Light on Poet Jayadeva	—K. N. Mahapatra	1
2. Orissa, The Home Land of Jayadeva	—Dr. B. Rath	20
3. Jayadeva : His Identity	—Siddheswar Hota	25
4. Jayadeva	—R. P. N. Sinha	38
5. Jayadeva : The Lyric-Poet	—Rajasree	42
6. Jayadeva : His Life	—Swami Shivananda	49
7. Jayadeva : The Poet and Mystic	—M. Mukherji	57
8. The First Imitation of Gitagovinda	—Dr. B. Rath	71
9. Three more Imitations of the Gitagovinda	—V. W. Karambelkar	76
10. The Gitagovinda and its Imitations	—Dr. B. Rath	84
11. Two Commentaries on the Gita-Govinda	—Dr. S. N. Sarma	98
12. A newly discovered Ms. of Gitagovinda	—M. R. Majumdar	106
13. Radha-Krishna cult in Gitagovinda	—Gowri Kuppaswamy & M. Hariharan	120
14. The Gitagovinda-Padagana in Bengal	—Swami Prajnanananda	126
15. The use of Poetic Imagery in Gitagovinda	—John B. Alphonso	133
16. Lyric Metres in Gitagovinda	—A. D. Mukherji	148
17. Abhinava Gitagovinda	—K. N. Mahapatra	158
18. Abhinava Gitagovinda	—E. P. Radhakrishnan	172
19. Radha, the Consort of Krishna's Vernal Passion	—Barbara S. Miller	177

Recd. from Chaukhamba Orientalia, Delhi, vide Bill No. COD/189221/80  
 Dated 13/11/80 price Rs. 60.00/-

## P R E F A C E

From the first century A.D. love poetry in Sanskrit was marked by ardent sensuality and zest for Nature. As the lover contemplated his beloved, he was moved by certain qualities—her gentle tenderness, girlish passion, kind solicitude, eager devotion. He was stirred by the thought that she desired him and would brave all for his love. At the same time various objects drawn from Nature also provided him with standards of beauty. Such responses to Nature determined how love itself should be described. So intimate a blending of love and Nature in one intermingling delight characterised Sanskrit love poetry for many centuries.

During the early centuries of the Christian era, Krishna had been vaguely identified with the second member of the Hindu Trinity, Vishnu. In the sixth century, however, two works viz., the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* related his story and this was repeated in greater detail in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* of the ninth century. In the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* Krishna appears in two distinct and even contradictory roles—as the lover of the cowgirls and as a feudal Prince. The first role characterises his youth and the second his adulthood. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the former manifestation became dominant, his role of lover was stressed, the names of his favourite Radha was frankly proclaimed and Krishna's love-making was interpreted as a symbol of the soul's union with God. To love Krishna, and by implication, Vishnu, was to achieve salvation and thus there arose a cult—the cult of Vaishṇavism—in which the romance of Krishna with his favourite Rādhā was exalted as a means of spiritual release. Such thoughts and inspirations prevailed particularly wide in Bengal during the 11th-12th centuries. It is there, towards the end of the 12th century, that the poet Jayadēva made his great contribution to Sanskrit love poetry, the *Gita Govinda* or Song of Krishna.

In this poem, Jayadēva has intricately blended love, Nature and the Seasons. He takes the Sanskrit tradition of courtly love poetry and applies it to Rādhā and Krishna. There is the same refined sensuality with its response to feminine charm as also the customary analysis of moods and situations. However, Rādhā and Krishna behave just as ordinary lovers; they delight in each

other's beauty; and they experience a whole range of ardent emotions. In *GitaGovinda* Krishṇa is a nāyaka, a lover, but because he is also God or Viṣṇu, sensual love and passion are regarded as life at its most sublime. Praise of love-making becomes praise of Krishṇa. Such sentiments in his verses were regarded by Jayadēva from two points of view. They were expressions, in poetry of delight in love; but they were also praises of Krishṇa, which, through sheer poetic intensity and verbal power, could win from the author eternal merit. Without Jayadēva's own poetic mastery, the subject, Krishṇa would at best be mediocre; Yet without that subject, the poetry itself could not have existed. Throughout the poem Jayadēva's devotion to Krishṇa, delight in love, awareness of Nature and belief in poetry are equally strong.

Jayadēva's poem quickly achieved renown in every nook and corner of India and from the early thirteenth century became a leading model for all poets who were enthralled by Krishṇa as God and lover. It was the influence of his work that earned for the poets Vidyāpati and Bilvamaṅgaḷa, who immediately followed him (13 and 14th centuries) the titles of 'new Jayadēva' and 'Abhinava Jayadēva' respectively. These poets as well as late poets of the 15th and 16th centuries like Chāṇḍīdās, Mīrabai, Kēśav Dās, Gōvīnddās, Bihārī Lāl, Kālī Dās and Vallabhāchārya and his four-inspired disciples—Kriṣṇa Dās, Sūr Dās, Parmāṇand Dās and Kumbhan Dās, went even one step further in as much as they roved freely over the many phases of the love play of Krishṇa and Rādhā, subjecting every incident to delighted analysis.

One of the most popular of all the legends on Hindu mythology has been that of Lord Krishṇa and his pranks and sports as a lover form a familiar part of traditional Hindu lore. It is but fitting that Jayadēva has chosen Krishṇa's love play with Rādhā as the central theme for his musical opera. The present volume is an attempt to bring under a single cover varied and detailed aspects of Jayadēva and *GitaGovinda*.

We are indebted to the following authors for their kind permission to publish their articles in the present volume: M/s. K. N. Mahapatra, *a new light on Jayadeva*; Dr. B. Rath, *Orissa* :



*the Homeland of Jayadeva, the first imitation of Gitagovinda and Gitagovinda and its imitations*; Siddhesvar Hota, *Jayadeva: his identity*; B. P. N. Sinha, *Jayadeva*; Rajasree, *Jayadeva: the lyric poet*; Svami Sivananda, *Jayadeva: his life*; M. Mukherji, *Jayadeva: poet and Mystic*; W. Karambelkar, *The first imitation of Gitagovinda*; Dr. S. N. Sarma, *Two commentaries of Gitagovinda*; Prof. M. R. Majumdar, *A newly discovered manuscript of Gitagovinda*; Dr. Svami Prajnanananda, *Gitagovinda padagana in Bengal*; J. B. Alphonso, *Poetic imagery in Gitagovinda*; A. D. Mukherji, *Lyric meters in Gitagovinda*; K. N. Mahapatra, *Abhinava Gitagovinda*; E. P. Radhakrishnan, *Abhinava Gitagovinda* and Barbara S. Miller, *Radha: The consort of Krishna's passion*.

We also owe our thanks to the Editors of *Orissa Historical Journal*, Bhubanesvar; *Mysore Orientalist*, Mysore; *Bhavan's Journal*, Bombay; *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, Bangalore; *Divine Life*, Calcutta; *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta; *Visvesvaranand Indological Journal*, Hoshiarpur; *Indian Historical quarterly*, Calcutta; *Journal of the Music Academy*, Madras; *Journal of the Bombay University (Arts)* Bombay; *Literary Half-yearly*, Mysore; *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Calcutta; *Poona Orientalist*, Poona; and *Journal of American Oriental Society*, Connecticut, U.S.A. for their kind permission to reproduce the articles published in their journals.

We are grateful to Sri M. Easwaran, College Book House, Trivandrum for readily taking up the publication of this book. Our thanks are due to Sri G. H. Rama Rao, Mysore Printing & Publishing House, Mysore for getting the book printed in time. We also wish to record our appreciation of the help rendered by Sri K. Muralidhar Rao, Artist and Dancer, Mysore, in respect of the excellent cover design.

Gowri Kuppaswamy  
M. Hariharan



66590

## A New Light on Poet Jayadeva

Gitagōvinda by Jayadeva is one of the most important works in Sanskrit literature. It has got the largest number of imitations and commentaries written by scholars of different parts of India, which testify to its immense popularity and wide circulation in this country. But the question of the birth place of Jayadeva is still a matter of controversy among scholars. So an humble attempt is made here to find out its solution.

On the strength of a stanza in the first Sarga of the G. G.<sup>1</sup> quoted below many scholars have asserted that the five poets mentioned in it belonged to Bengal and adorned the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena e.g.,

*Vācaḥ Pallavayatyumāpatidharaḥ sandarbha śuddhigirām  
Janūte Jayadēva, ēva śaraṇaḥ śādhyō durahadruḥ  
Śrngārōttara satpramēya racanai rācārya gōvaidhanaḥ  
Spardyōkōpi naviśrutaḥ śruti-dharō dhōyī kavikshmāpatiḥ*

In the above stanza, Jayadeva only gives his own estimate about himself and four other poets who might at best be taken to be his elder contemporaries. But this verse does not imply directly or indirectly that all the five poets mentioned in it belonged to Bengal and adorned the same court. It is only an example of poetic tradition followed by many other poets of India as shown below.

Ravikīrti, the author of the famous Aihole Inscription of Pulakesi II respectfully mentions the names of Kālidāsa and Bhāravī in the 57th stanza of the Prasasti<sup>2</sup>.

*Ravijayatām ravikīrtiḥ kāvētāsrita Kālidāsa bhāravī kirtiḥ*

This cannot be interpreted as Ravikīrti belonged to the same territory where the two great poets Kālidāsa and Bhāravī flourished.

Rājaśekhara, a well-known court poet of Kings Mahēndrapāla and Mahipāla of Kanauj has compared himself with Vālmīki, Bhartṛhari, Menṭha, and Bhavabhūti in a verse of his Bāla Rāmayaṇa which is quoted below ;

*Babhūva valmīkabhavaḥ kavi purā  
Tataḥ prapēde bhuvi sacrubhēṇḍatām  
stithaḥ punaryō bhavabhūti rekhayā  
sa variatē samprati rājaśēkharah<sup>3</sup>*

Similarly Kavirāja Suri, a court poet of Kāmadēva II (1182-87) of the Kādamba royal family of Jayantīpura or Vanavāsī compares himself in one of the introductory verses of his *rātrava pāṇḍaviya Mahākāvya* with Subandhu and Bāṇabhaṭṭa e.g.

*Srīmad ramāyaṇagangām bharātam sāgaro mahān  
tatsaṁyōjana karmaṇaḥ kavirajaḥ Bhagtrathaḥ  
Subandhu bāṇabhaṭṭasca kavirāja iti trayah  
Vaktōti mārgampuṇāḥ cha urthō-vidyatēnavā.<sup>4</sup>*

In the like manner Gōvardhana Āchārya has given a long list of poets in some introductory and concluding stanzas of his work Āryāsaptasatī' which have been quoted and discussed in my article published before<sup>5</sup>. More examples need not be given to clarify the significance of this stanza of the G. G. where the poetic tradition has only been followed.

Let us now examine if any of the five poets mentioned in this stanza belonged to Bengal and adorned the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena. It has been convincingly proved in my article that Āchārya Govardhana, spoken respectfully by Jayadeva had no connection with the court of King Lakshmaṇa Sena and his family was flourishing in the Puri district of Orissa under the patronage of local chieftains and Gaṅga sovereigns. What to speak of Lakshmaṇa Sena, nowhere in the G. G. is there any definite or veiled reference to the effect that its author had adorned the court or received the patronage of any king. On the other hand the saintly poet has taken pride in calling himself: *Padmāvati Carāṇa Cāraṇa Cakravartī* e.g., a renowned master or great expert who could ably direct the dance of his beloved wife Padmāvati (to the tune of the songs which he used to sing joyfully inspired by deep devotion to his favourite god Kṛṣṇa.)

The earliest reference about this poet so far known is found in Prathvirajārāso written in old Hindi by Chand Bardai, who is generally assigned to the 13th century. In this work he is pictured not as a court poet but as a great devotee e.g.,

*Jayadēva artham Kavikavirāyaṁ  
Jinai Kēvalam Kirati gōvinda gāyaṁ*

G. G. was only a hymn to Govinda, which was solely meant to be sung before the god of his devotion and was not written to gain the good will and favour of any royal patron. So its author cannot be associated with Lakshmaṇa Sena or any other king on the strength of any internal evidence furnished by G.G.

As regards the other three poets of this stanza, it may be said that there is epigraphic evidence to prove that Umāpati Dhara was a court poet of the Sena royal family of Bengal. In the last but one verse of the Deopara inscription of Vijayasēna, it is said that this Prāsasti was written by Umāpati Dhara, who may be identified with the poet of the same name mentioned in the G.G. e.g.,

*Nirṇiktasēna kulabhūpati mauktikānā  
magranthīla grathana pakshmala sūtravalliḥ  
Eshākavēḥ padapadārthavicāra Śuddha  
buddērumāpatidharasya kritiḥ prāsastiḥ<sup>6</sup>*

The date of the inscription can be fixed with some amount of certainty as it mentions the defeat of Rāghava Dēva, the Gaṅga king of Orissa (1156-1170 A.D.). in a verse so it cannot be earlier than 1156 A.D. Vijaya Sena died in 1158 A.D.<sup>7</sup> so it was composed some time between 1166 to 1158 A.D. Four verses from this inscription (Nos. 7, 23, 24 and 30) are found quoted in S.K.M. of Sridhara Dāsa<sup>8</sup>. Merutuṅga Āchārya in his prabandha Chintāmaṇi states that Umāpatidhara lived in the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena. This seems possible in view of the fact that the interval between the reigns of Vijaya Sena and Lakshmaṇa Sena was only 21 years (1158-1172 A.D.) "Again verse 2 of the Madhainagar copper plates of Lakshmaṇa Sena almost exactly corresponds to a verse ascribed to Umāpatidhara in the S K M. It is therefore not unlikely that the poet lived not only in the court of Vijaya Sena, but in that of his son and grandson."<sup>9</sup>

No work of poet Śaraṇa mentioned by Jayadeva has yet been discovered. In a verse of Śaraṇa (quoted in the S.K.M. he is found) eulogising a Sena king whose name is not mentioned e.g., 'sēvābhīryadi sēnavamśatilakā dāsādanīyaśriyaḥ.' In another verse quoted in the same work in which while deprecating the rulers of Gauḍa Kalinga, Chedī, Mlēcchha, Kāmarūpa, Kāsī and Magadha, he does not give a clear idea about his patron. So there is no direct and definite evidence to connect Śaraṇa with the court of Lakshmaṇa Sēna. But this much can be said on the strength of the verse referred to above that he was patronised by some Sena king of Bengal.

As regards Dhoyī, there is definite evidence to prove that he was patronised by king Lakshmaṇa Sena, in whose honour he wrote his 'Pavanadūtam'<sup>10</sup> which is evident from verse 2 of the work, which runs as follows :—

*Drishṭvā dēvam bhuvanaviṣayē Lakshmaṇam kshaṇipālam  
Vātā sadyaḥ kusuma dhanushaḥ saṁvidhēyīvabhūva*

In verse 28 of the same work he speaks of the kings of the Sēna dynasty e.g.,

*Tasmin sēnānvayanṛipatīnām dēvarājyābhishiktō  
dēvaḥ sākshāt vasati kamalā kēlikārō surārīḥ*

The verse 101 of the same work informs us that the poet Dhōyika was honoured by the king of Gauḍa e.g.,

*Dantivyūhaṁ kanakalatikāṁ cāmaram haimadaṇḍam  
Yogoḍēndrādalahata kavikshmaḥrutāṁ cakravartī  
Śrīdhōyikaḥ sakalarasika Prīti hētōrmanasvī  
Kāvyaṁ sārasyatāmiva (satana) mantramētījjagāda*

On the strength of the verses quoted above from *Pavanadūtam* Dhōyī can definitely be ascertained as a court poet of Lakshmaṇa Sēna. Poet Umāpatidhara cannot be taken as such on the indirect evidence furnished by a verse of the Madhunagar copper-plate grant of Lakshmaṇa Sēna, which has been assigned to him in S.K.M. Śaraṇa was patronised by a Sēna king, whose name he does not mention. Govardhana as stated before, belonged to Orissa and was not associated with the court of the Sēna kings of Bengal. There is no direct or indirect evidence, on the basis of

which Jayadeva can be called a court poet of Lakshmaṇa Sēna. So the conclusion that all the five poet mentioned in a verse of G. G. quoted before belonged to Bengal and were living in the court of Lakshmaṇa Sēna is not supported by facts and cannot be proved convincingly.

Some scholars cite another verse given below to establish the connection of Jayadeva with king Lakshmaṇa Sēna e. g.

*Gōvardhanasca Śaranō Jayadeva Umāpatih  
Kavirūjaścaratrāṇi rāmitau Lakshmaṇasyaca*

It is said that Śrī Rūpa and Śrī Sanatana Gosvamis saw this verse inscribed on the gate of king Lakshmaṇa Sena's Assembly Hall in Navadvipa.<sup>11</sup> This verse is a spurious one like the famous traditional verse quoted below describing the nine gems of the court of Vikramāditya ;

*Dhanyantari kshapaṇa kāmaraśimha śaṅkuḥ  
Vēṭālabhaṭṭa ghaṭṭakarpāra kālidasah  
Khyātō varāhamihirō Nripateḥ sabhāyām  
Ratrāṇi vaiyara rucirnava vikrasya*

Let us examine the authenticity of this traditional verse. There is no contemporary epigraphic or literary evidence to prove that Nadiya was ever the capital of either Lakshmaṇa Sēna or his forefathers and successors. Regarding the capital of the Sena kings it is written thus :

“It is a note-worthy fact that the two known grants of Vijaya Sena and Vallāla Sēna and all the five grants of Lakshmaṇa Sēna dated within the first six years of his reign were issued from the royal camp at Vikramapura. It was again in this city that the chief queen of Vijaya Sena performed the elaborate ‘Tulāpurusha Mahādāna’.

“It is to be noted, however that the two later grants of Lakshmaṇa Sēna, and those of his successors, are issued, not from Vikramapura, but respectively from Dhāryagrama and Phalgugrama, none of which can be identified”<sup>12</sup>

Similarly in no Sanskrit work written during the Sena period Nadiya is mentioned as the capital of Lakshmaṇa Sena. In ‘Pāvanadūtam’ of Dhoyi, Vijayapura on the Ganges is referred to

as the capital of Lakshmaṇa Sena. Its identification with Nadia may only be presumed but cannot be definitely proved.

Only in 'Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri' written in 1260 after about 60 years of the death of Lakshmaṇa Sena Nadia is described as his seat of Government e.g. "Rāi Lakshmaniah whose seat of government was the city of Nudiah and who was a very great "Rae and had been on the throne for a period of eighty years"<sup>13</sup>.

The account given in 'Nasiri' is not reliable, as it is based on heresay testimony. It narrates fanciful stories about the birth of Lakshmaṇa Sena (p. 555) and invasion of Nadia (p. 557) *It gives a reign of 80 years to this king which is disproved by contemporary epigraphic records. Supposing this account is accepted as true, its version regarding the destruction of Nadia should also be accepted e.g.*

"After Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar possessed himself of that territory (Rāe Lakshmaniah's) *he left the city of Nadia in desolation* (p. 550). In the foot note of the same page it is further written "Muhammad-i-Bakhtiyar destroyed Nudiah and leaving it in desolation passed onwards". So it can be said without any fear of contradiction that no trace of the palace of Lakshmaṇa Sena destroyed by the Muslim army could exist up to the time of Sanātana Gosvāmī. So the theory of seeing this so-called inscription on the gate of his palace is simply imaginary and is not based on any historical truth. The story of the discovery of the so-called inscription describing the connection of five poets with Śrīdhāra Namadvīpa originated and was circulated in the post-Chaitanya period, when Nadia came to prominence due to the great reformer Śrī Chaitanya in that holy place.

Another point which is generally advocated by the supporters of the Bengal origin of Jayadeva is the identification of 'Kenduvilva' mentioned in the G. G. with the village Kenduli on the bank of the river Ajaya in the district of Birbhum in Bengal. Jayadeva has called himself a moon born from the ocean of Kenduvilva in the 3rd canto of his G. G. e.g.,

*Varṇati jayadevakēṇa harēridam pravaṇēna*

*Kenduvilva samudra sambhava, rōhiṇīramaṇēṇa*

But Kenduvilva mentioned with pride by Śrī Jayadeva as his birth place can more convincingly be identified with the Kenduli

śāsana in the Balipatna P.S. of the Puri district standing between the rivers Prācī and the Kuśābhadrā. It was a very big village in the past but at present it is divided into three adjoining villages namely Kenduli śāsana (Brahmana village) Kenduli Deuli (seat of temples) and Kenduli patna (vide sheet No. 73 H/16 one inch map).

The Kenduli area has got antiquities which can safely be assigned to the 8th century A.D. if not earlier. In the outskirts of this village still stand three small dilapidated brick temples of the Bhauma period (c 650-850 A.D.) In two of them are still worshipped two four-armed goddesses carved in chlorite stone who are popularly called Ambikā and Jāgesvarī. Each of the two figures has got a seven hooded serpent over her head. One of them holds a full blown lotus and a lotus bud in her two hands while the two other hands are broken.

She cannot be identified with goddess 'Manasā' as she does not hold *Amrutabhāṇḍa* in her lower two hands. Not far from this stands the image of Viṣṇu holding Cakra, Śankha, Padma and Gadā in his four hands. There is another broken temple for Siva Linga which is called Mukteśvara. On the path to these monuments are found two Yūpa stambas (sacrificial posts) which are traditionally said to have been used by Śrī Jayadeva. The present presiding deity of the village is Śrī Nṛsimha, which is said to have been established by a Gaṅga king. While re-excavating the tank near the Nṛsimha temple some years ago a set of copper plate grants of the Gaṅga king Narasimha IV (1407-1435) was discovered in a stone box under ground<sup>14</sup>. It was sent to the Mahanta of Trimali Matha at Puri as the area then formed a part of his estate. But the stone box containing this set is still to be seen in the local Tahasildar's office.

Not far from this village is the famous Trivenī-Sangama (the confluence of the rivers Prācī, Kusābhadrā and Dhanus) where a big festival is held every year on the day of Amāvāsyā of the lunar month of Māgha, which is called Trivenī Amāvāsyā. According to tradition Śrī Jayadeva used to take his bath every day and worshipped the deity of Mādhava called Trivenī-Mādhava. The antiquity of the Trivenī festival can be pushed atleast to the 13th century if not earlier, as it is a long-standing



custom in this area that people who go the Chandrabhāgā festival held near the famous Sun temple at Konarka on the Māgha Śukla Saptamī must have taken their bath in the Trivenī on the Amāvāsyā day. The worship of god Viṣṇu performed daily with deep devotion and reverence in a large number of temples which were raising their heads with all their splendour and magnificence in and around this Kenduvilva śāṣana before the days of Śrī Jayadeva must have made a deep impression on the mind of this thoughtful and saintly poet, which slowly but imperceptibly shaped his career as a great devotee of God Kṛṣṇa.

It may not be out of place to mention here that in the compound of the Śobhaneśvara temple of the Nilai Śāṣana on the bank of the Prāchī, which is not far from the Kenduli Śāṣana, one can see a dozen big Viṣṇu images carved in chlorite, which have been brought to the ground by the iconoclastic Muslim army in the 17th and the 18th centuries. There is perhaps no other area in India where so many fine Viṣṇu images of the pre-Gaṅga period (circa 900–1100) can be seen as are to be found in the important villages of the Prāchī valley. The village Kenduli of the district of Birbhum completely lacks this archaeological background and devotional environment of pre-Jayadeva days, which contributed a lot in moulding the career of this saintly poet. It has got no antiquities worth mentioning, which can be assigned to the pre-Chaitanya period.

One most important thing which deserves mention here is the lack of any mention of the Kenduli village of Birbhum as the birth place of Śrī Jayadeva in the biographies of Śrī Chaitanya. Had it been considered a sacred place before the days of Śrī Chaitanya, on this account, he who was a greatest admirer of the G.G. of Jayadeva must have paid a visit to this place at least once during his life time. But the contemporary Vaiṣṇava literature is silent about the matter.

So it is evident that attempts were made to connect Kenduli of Birbhum district with Kenduvilva of the G. G. when this work was regarded as a holy book by the orthodox Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal in the post-Chaitanya period. The so-called Jayadeva

temple of this place was built by the mother of Kirti Chandra. Mahārājā of Vardhaman in Saka year 1605 or 1683 A.D.<sup>15</sup>,

Similarly there developed a tradition in Bihar indicating the birth place of Jayadeva in Tirhut. About it Colebrooke wrote "Jayadeva is by the Maithilas said to be their countrymen. In Tirhut, a town on the Belar river near Jenjhārpur, bears the name of Kendoli, supposed to be the same as Kenduli, Kilva sic vilva is a family of Maithili Brahmanas".

About this tradition late M. M. Chakravarti makes the following remark "Beyond the similarity of name, nothing else has been found to support it"<sup>16</sup> The same remark of Mr. Chakravarti may appropriately be made about the Kenduli village of Birbhum district. So the identification of the Kenduli Śāsana of the Puri district having a large number of antiquities of the pre-Gaṅga period in and around it, with Kenduvilva of the Gitagovinda stands on a stronger foundation than with the Kenduli village of Birbhum.

This identification is supported by literary evidence furnished by works written in different parts of India. In 'Sampradāya Pradīpa' written by Gada Dvivedī (1553-54 A.D.)<sup>17</sup> it is stated that the saint Jayadeva belonged to Utkala. Mahipati of Maharastra in his 'Bhaktavijaya' speaks of Jayadeva belonging to a village named Tinduvilva near the sacred city of Jagannātha. Navaji of Gwalior in his 'Bhakamālā in Hindi assigns Jayadeva to Utkala.<sup>18</sup> Chandra Dutta of Mithila in this Bhakaneālā in Sanskrit does not claim Jayadeva for his own land but mentions definitely that Jayadeva belonged to a Brahmin village named Vinduvila near the Jagannātha Puri e.g.,<sup>19</sup>

*Jagannāthapurīpraṇte dēśēvai cōktalābhidhe*  
*Vinduvilva itikhyāto grāmō brāhmaṇasaṅkulaḥ* 2  
*tatrōktale dviḥ jāto jayadēva iti srutaḥ*  
*vidyābhyāsarataḥ śāntaḥ purushōttama pūjakaḥ* 3

\* \* \* \*

*Tadāranyāti bhaktayāve palyāsaha haribhajan* 53  
*gāyanuve gītagōvindam tōthayāmāsa kēśavam*  
*nirmāya gītagōvindam pustakam purushōttamai* 54  
*nivēśa krīttakṛityobhūjadēvō mahāmanāḥ* 65

Against this literary evidence furnished by the above works, the account of Jayadeva written in the Bengali 'Jayadeva Charita' by Banamali Dasa is adduced to prove the Bengal origin of this poet. But this work published by the Bangiya Sāhitya Parishad on the authority of a single manuscript only 'cannot be regarded as very authentic, which indicates that this work had no circulation in Bengal itself, which accounts for the non-availability of a second copy of this work.

Secondly in the *Sarvāṅga Sundarī Tika* the earliest commentary on the G. G. so far available, a copy of which is preserved in our Museum (No. L/129) there is no mention of the fact that the poets returned to in the famous verse *Vachah Pallava Yati...* belonged to the court of Lakshmana Sena. On the grounds stated above, it may be concluded that Jayadeva belonged to Utkala.

The *Daśāvatār Stuti* (hymn to the ten incarnations of god Vishṇu) found in the first canto of the G. G. is very significant as it furnishes a clue to locate the birth place of Jayadeva. Regarding this the learned writer Dr. P. C. Bagchi, made the following remark "Vaishṇavism in Bengal probably made a contribution to the systematisation of the theory of Avatara."<sup>20</sup> The same remark can be applied with greater force and stronger evidence to the Vaishṇavism of Orissa: because two of the earliest representations as depicted by Śrī Jayadeva are found carved in two Vishṇu images worshipped in the village Saintala of the Bolangir Patna district of Orissa. These two images were built either by Mahāśivagupta Vālārjuna, or by his son Mahābhavagupta Janamejaya, the first Somavamśī emperor of Orissa. The village Saintala stands near Murasima-Kataka, a capital of Janamejaya which finds mention in his two Patna C. P. grants and also in the Kalivana grant<sup>21</sup>. These two unique Vishṇu images of Saintala which furnishes definite Archaeological evidence regarding the development of *Daśāvatāra* may tentatively be assigned to the last part of the eighth century. They were first brought to the notice of the scholars by my friend late lamented P. C. Ratha of Balangir<sup>22</sup> from whose description of the two images, extracts are quoted below:

"In the pedestal of each image are found Garuḍa to the right, some worshippers in the middle and sage Nārada to the left,

Over the worshippers are carved the figures of fish and tortoise representing *Matsyāvatār* and *Kūrmāvatār*. On the right and left sides of the pedestal stand respectively Lakshmī holding a lotus flower and Sarasvatī playing on a musical instrument. On the right hand side pilaster of the toraṇa are carved from bottom to top the figures of Varāha, Narasirṇha, Vāmana and Paraśurāma (broken) and on the left hand side pilaster are found from top to bottom the images of Rāma, Balarāma, Buddha and Kalkī. On the lintel over the two pilasters is depicted *Samudra mandhana*, the churning of the ocean with the Gods on one side and the demons on the other. The chief object worship was a two-armed figure of Viṣṇu (broken) standing on the pedestal described above. The representation of the ten incarnations carved round these two images completely tallies with their description given in the famous *Daśāvatāra Stuti* of the G. G.

Two handed figures of Viṣṇu are very rare and old. The image of Vishnu which was worshipped in the famous Lakshmana temple of Srīpur on the Mahanadi in the Raipur district of M.P. is also two-handed like the Sainthala figures<sup>23</sup>. The figures of Avatāras are found carved on the door-jamos of this temple<sup>24</sup>, which was built by Mahāśivagupta Vālārjuna, father of Janamejaya. In a palace called 'Tīrtha Matha' situated in the Ersama P. S. of the Cuttack district there was an ancient temple containing very beautiful images of the ten incarnations of Vishnu, of which the figures of Rāma, Paraśurāma and Balarāma are still preserved, while others are perhaps buried in a mound nearby. These can be assigned to the 7th century A.D. The images of ten incarnations were set in a temple of Kakatpur in the Puri district (Circa 9th century) which was completely destroyed by the Muslims. Some of these recovered from the debris have been placed in the compound wall of the reconstructed Someśvara temple. The ten incarnation of Viṣṇu are found carved on the lintel over the Lion's gate of Jagannātha temple of Puri which is unanimously admitted to have been constructed by Cholaganga Deva between 1112-1147 A.D. But here we find Jagannātha in place of the 9th incarnation as Jagannātha is regarded as the manifestation of the Buddha. The ten incarnations were carved on the outer surface of the walls of the Jagannātha temple. There is a Matha called

‘Daśāvatāra Maṭha’ near the Gundichā temple of Puri, where the ten incarnations are worshipped. Śrī Kūrma and Siphāchalam temples built before the days of Jayadeva are dedicated to Kūrma and Narasimha.

With these archaeological evidences it can safely be ascertained that the theory of Daśāvatāra had gained much popularity in Orissa atleast from the eighth century A.D. So neither Jayadeva nor Vaishnavism in Bengal had anything to contribute to the systematisation of the theory of Avatāra, which was systematised somewhere in North India prior to the days of Vālārjuna, as proved before and was followed by the sculptors of Orissa in the subsequent centuries. Due to their immense popularity Jayadeva in his famous hymn to *Jagadīśahari* or *Jagannāth* of Puri tried to establish that the ten incarnations were only the different manifestations of Supreme Lord Kṛṣṇa who was the *Dasākṛiti kṛit* or the very creator or progenitor of the ten incarnations known to the people. This appealing hymn of Śrī Jayadeva contributed a lot to establish the supremacy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the realm of religion in those days.

As regards the worship of Rādhā Dr. Bagchi remarks elsewhere “Rādhā was probably a Bengali innovation made shortly before the time of Jayadeva and represented only a Vaishavite phase of growing Śāktism”<sup>25</sup> But this conclusion is also not tenable as will be shown below.

There was vigorous revival of Vaishnavism in South India in the twelfth century due to the preachings of Śrī Rāmānuja, Śrī Viṣṇusvāmī, Śrī Nimbārka and Śrī Madhvāchārya. All of whom made Puri the center of their activities and established Maths there for propagation of their respective religious faiths. Śrī Rāmānuja and his disciple founded the Rāmānuja Koṭṭa and Emāraṁṭha respectively at Puri. There are three Maths at Puri established by Viṣṇu Svāmī and his followers, of which the Viṣṇusvāmī Matha near the Mārkaṇḍeya tank is worth mentioning. Following the example of these two great teachers Śrī Nimbārka and his disciples founded five Maths at Puri of which the Rādhāvallava Matha standing just to the east of the Lion’s gate of the Jagannātha temple is note-worthy. A lot of information is obtained from contemporary epigraphic records regarding

the activities in Orissa of Śrī Mādhvāchārya and his famous disciple Narahari Tīrtha.

Of the above four great reformers of Viṣṇavism, Śrī Nimbārka alone proclaimed Rādhā as the Śakti (female energy) of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his spouse in divine sport. The school of Nimbārka gave great prominence to the worship of Rādhā along with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Śrī Jayadeva, a devout Vaiṣṇava from his youth who remained at Puri was greatly influenced by the Nimbārka school either by coming in personal contact with its founder or by intimate association with his disciples who established Maṭhas at Puri in the last quarter of the twelfth century. Exaltation of Rādhā, which is a distinct feature of the Nimbārka school inspired Jayadeva to develop his erotic mysticism. In that age there flourished another saintly poet named Vilvamaṅgala or Lilāsuka in the Andhra country, who like Jayadeva also exalted Rādhā in his devotional lyric called Kṛṣṇa Kaṇāmṛutam. It is difficult to trace at the present state of our knowledge the influence of the kaṇāmṛutam on the G.G. or vice versa. But it seems quite probable that both the saintly poets derived their inspiration from the same source, which was no other than the teachings of the Nimbārka school both in Andhra and Orissa, which were closely tied together culturally under the rule of the imperial Gaṅgas which began in 1112 A.D.

So the theory that Rādhā was probably a Bengali innovation made shortly before the time of Jayadeva is not substantiated by facts stated above. On the contrary, the credit of this innovation goes to Nimbārka, who first gave Rādhā prominence in thought and worship.

Jayadeva is claimed as an Orissan poet because the earliest commentaries on his G.G. were written by two poets of Orissa, its first imitation so far known was made in Orissa. It has been stated before that poet Udayana Āchārya of Orissa, who was a close friend and admirer of the author of the G.G. wrote the first commentary on it called *bhāvavibhāvinī*. The second commentary on the G.G. called *sarvāṅgasuṇḍari* was written by Kavirāja Nārāyaṇa Dāsa, of the famous Kapijnala family of Orissa, who was a court poet of the Gaṅga King Narasiṃha II

(1279–1307 A.D.) also called Kavi Narasimha. Through the efforts of Kavirāja Nārāyaṇa Dāsa, the recitation of the G.G. was introduced in the Jagannātha temple at Puri by his patron, which has formed an important part of the daily Sevā of the deity since those days. The recitation of the G.G. daily in the temple of Jagannātha enhanced its prestige and helped its rapid circulation outside Orissa by scholars who got the chance of listening to its melodious songs, while paying their respect to Lord Jagannātha at the time of their pilgrimage to Puri.

The first imitation of the G.G. so far discovered is the 'Abhinava Gitagovinda' the authorship of which is attributed to the famous Gajapati Purushottama Deva of Cuttack (1466–1497) though its real author was Kavichandrarāya Divākara Miśra. Purushottama Deva introduced the recitation of his 'Abhinava Gitagovinda' in the temple of Jagannātha. But according to tradition this innovation of the king was disliked by Lord Jagannātha at whose behest only 12 verses of his work, interpolated into the G.G. of Jayadeva began to be sung before the deity. Even this interpolation was objected to by the devotees of the Lord. So Pratāparudra Deva, son and successor of Gajapati Purushottama Deva proclaimed by an inscription in 1599 A.D. that only the G. G. by Sri Jayadeva would be recited before the Lord. This inscription placed on an entrance of the Jagannātha temple has been edited and published by M.M. Chakravarti.<sup>26</sup>

The second imitation of G.G. is perhaps the 'Jagannātha vattabha Nāṭata' by Rāya Rāmānanda Paṭṭṇaik, the Onya governor of Rāja Mahendra, under Gajapati Pratāparudra Deva. This was composed some time between 1497 to 1509 A.D. before the coming of Śrī Chaitanya to Puri.

Thus the earliest commentaries on and imitations of the G.G. were written in Orissa, which leads one to the conclusion that the G.G. was written in Orissa and not well-known in Bengal before the days of Śrī Chaitanya, who popularised it there.

The tremendous influence and immense popularity of the G.G. in Orissa not only served as a source of inspiration to her scholars to write the first commentaries on and imitation of it, but also brought remarkable change in Orissan iconography.

Before the days of Jayadeva worship of the four-handed figures of god Vishṇu was very popular and held in high esteem by the people. But the wide circulation of the G.G. in Orissa which was recognised as a holy book and daily recited in the Jagannātha temple, steadily but imperceptibly influenced the minds of her people and inspired them with devotion for Śrī Kṛṣṇa whose glory it sings. But Śrī Rādhā could not be defied in that age either singly or in the company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as her worship was not sanctioned by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa which had gained popularity in Orissa before the days of Śrī Jayadeva; nor recognised by the Smṛti writers of Orissa who were moulding the religious life of the people in those days with the support and patronage of the kings. The cumulative effects of these trends of religious thought of that age was that Jagannātha was regarded as another form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa<sup>77</sup> and the worship of only Gopījanaballava Śrī Kṛṣṇa and not Rādhāballava Śrī Kṛṣṇa got the royal sanction. So images of Gopīnāth (Kṛṣṇa) standing in the Tribhang pose, playing on flute *vaṁśidhārī* surrounded by Gopīs Gōpastṛiparī vēśhṭita and tending cattle Gōdhana Cāraṇa began to be built in this age. A large number of Gopīnātha images of this type, which began to be carved from the 13th century are found in different parts of Orissa. Of these the following which can be assigned to this period are mentioned below:—

(a) The Gopīnātha image discovered from Dharmasala P.S. of the Cuttack district with an inscription of the 13th century on its pedestal, which as now preserved in the Orissa State Museum.

(b) Three Gopīnāth images in the villages of Alārpur, Hirāpur and Sarakanā which were built during the reign of Narasimha II (1278-1307). The Alārpur image is now being worshipped in a temple at Baliana.

(c) The famous Gopīnātha image of Remuṇā Kaṭaka (present Remuna in Balasore district) made during the reign of Narasimha II.

(d) The Gopīnātha image in the temple of Someśvarapur built during this period (Circa 1264-1300 A.D.).

(e) The Gopīnāth image in the broken temple at Bāgeśvarapur near Pipli most probably built by Bhanu I (1264-1278).



Other Gopīnātha images found in other parts of Orissa need not be described here. Since that age it became a custom in Orissa to build a temple for Gopīnātha (Kṛṣṇa) in each Śāsana or Brahmaṇa village found by the king and his officers.

It may be pointed out here that this development of Hindu iconography which was effected by recognition of Jagannātha as Kṛṣṇa in the post-Jayadeva period is clearly noticed in Orissa ; whereas this is conspicuous by its absence in Bengal and Bihar. "While thousands of images of different varieties of the four-handed Viṣṇu belonging to the eleventh and twelfth centuries have been discovered in different parts of the provinces of Bengal and Bihar" not a single Kṛṣṇa image belonging to the post-Jayadeva and pre-Chaitanya period has been discovered in these two provinces. The conclusion made on this matter by late R. D. Banerjee, who is regarded as an authority on Indian Archaeology is quoted here :

"Not only do we find a very great scarcity of combined images of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā in the Eastern school, but no image of Kṛṣṇa by himself earlier than the fifteenth century has been discovered any where in Bengal or Bihar. The popularity of the Rādhā Kṛṣṇa cult in north eastern provinces of India appears to date from the advent of the great reformer Chaitanya"<sup>28</sup>.

The Gītagovinda influenced the entire Sanskrit literature of India as a whole, which is clearly proved by the large number of imitations of this work made by poets of different parts of India. But the influence of the G.G. was the greatest in Orissa where the number of its imitation made by her poets was greater than that made in any other region of India, as is shown below :—

1. Abhinava gītagovinda by Gajapati Puruṣhottama Deva (C. 1470 A.D.)
2. Jagannātha vallabha nāṭaka by Rāya Rāmānanda Paṭṭṇaik (C. 1500 A.D.) (Nos. 1 and 2 are the earliest imitations of the G. G. so far known)
3. Piyūshalaharī nāṭika } by Jayadeva Āchārya
4. Vaiṣṇavāmṛita nāṭaka } son of Kaviḍimḍima (C. 1520)
5. Gōpagōvindam } Author not known,
6. Muḍita mādham by Satañjīva Miśra (C. 1620 A.D.)

7. Mukundavilāsa by Yatīndra Raghunātha Puri (C. 1620 A.D.)
8. Śivalilāmrita kāvya } by poet Nityaānanda
9. Śrīkṛṣṇalīlāmrita mahākāvya } (C. 1690 A. D.)
10. Naraharī charita by Rāmachandra Khadgarāya (C. 1730 A. D.)
11. Rādhāvilāsa mahākāvya by Harekṛṣṇa Kavirāja (C. 1750 A. D.)
12. Samruddhamādhava nāṭaka by Kavibhūṣaṇa Govinda (C. 1750 A. D.)
13. Brajayuva vilāsa } by Kavichandra Kamalalochana
14. Gīṭa mukunda } Khadarāya (C. 1780-1800).
15. Saṅgīta chintāmaṇiḥ }

Purushottama Bhaṭṭa of the 15th century, author of Chchanda-gōvinda most probably belonged to Orissa. This work is especially quoted in treatises on music written in Orissa.

Some imitations of the G. G. were no doubt made in Bengal in the post-Chaitanya period, but not before the days of Śrī Chaitanya, as was the case in Orissa, from which it may be concluded that the G. G. was made well-known in Bengal by the master.

Almost all the *rāgas*<sup>29</sup> used in the G. G. were used by early Oriya poets while composing their verses. The number of '*rāgas*' used in Oriya poetry began to increase in course of time, the number reaching its maximum in the time of Upendrabhaṅja (1680-1720 A. D.). Many beautiful Kāvyaas like the '*Rahasya-maṇjari*' of Devadurlaya Dāsa, the '*Rasakallola*' of Dinakṛṣṇa, the '*Mathurā Maṅgala*' of Bhaktacharaṇa, and the '*Bidagdha Chintāmaṇi*' of Abhimanyu Sāmantasimphāra, and the '*Kisora Chandranānachampū*' of Kavisūrya Vajadeba Ratha and many others were written under the influence of the G. G. Translations in old Oriya verses of the G. G. is more than a dozen in number of which that by Dharaṇīdhara is the best. Illustrated manuscripts of the G. G. are found in every '*Bhāgabataghara*' and in the houses of rich and the Pandits in Orissa.

But in the old Bengali literature, the use of the '*rāgas*' of the G. G. are scarcely met with. There was practically no distinct age of the Kāvyaas in old Bengali literature. Music in Orissa was

tremendously influenced by the G. G. which was not the case in Bengal.

On the grounds stated above, Jayadeva author of the G. G. may be regarded as a poet of Orissa, and not Bengal, where religion, art and iconography, literature and music were not affected by the all-pervading influence of the G. G. in the pre-Chaitanya age, as was the case in Orissa. So I appeal to the scholars to examine the tenability of the theory of the Bengal origin of Śrī Jayadeva, which is being persistently advocated in the light of the facts stated above.

K. N. MAHAPATRA

1. The Gitagovinda is abbreviated as G. G.
2. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VI p. 1.
3. *History of Sanskrit poetics* by Dr. P. V. Kane—p. 908
4. Quoted from the manuscript in the Orissa State Museum
5. *O. H. R. Journal*, Vol. VII No. I p. 40-46.
6. 'Inscriptions of Bangal', Vol. III, p. 49.
7. 'History of Bengal' published by the Dacca University p. 111.
8. 'Sanskrit literature in Bengal' J. & P.A.S. Bengal Vol II No. 5, 1905. p. 100.
9. *Saduktikarṇāmrita* is abbreviated as S.K.M.
9. Inscriptions of Bengal Vol. III p. 107.
10. Published by M.M. Chakravarti, J.A.S. Vol. IV. 8. 1905 pp. 41 to 71.
11. Birbhum Vivarana e.g., śrī rūpaśrī sanātāna śrīdhāma navadvīpe Lakshmaṇasenara sabhāgrahadvāre nimnōkta ślōkaṭi ankita dekhiyā-chilena.
12. 'History of Bengal' published by the Dacca University p. 251
13. 'Tabakat-i-Nasāri' translated by Raverty p-554
14. Re-edited and published by my colleague S.S.N. Rajaguru in *O.H.R. Journal* Vol. V.
15. Birbhum District Gazetteer, p. 119.
16. J.A.S. Bengal Vol. II New series 1906. p. 163.
17. History of Dharmasatra literature Vol. I pp. 660 by Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane
18. J.K.H.R. Society Vol. I pp. 243 and 246.
19. Baktamala Printed and Published by the Venkatesvara Press, Bombay Sarga 39.
20. History of Bengal, published by the Dacca University p. 408

21. (a) Edited by Fleet. E. I. Vol. III pp. 341-344  
 (b) Edited by G. M. Laskar; J. A. S. B. 1905 Vol. I pp. 12-13  
 (c) Edited by D. C. Sirkar and P. C. Ratha. I H Q Vol. XX p. 245
22. J. K. H. R. Society, Vol. II, Nos. 2 & 3, pp 124-125
23. See plate XVII of A. S. of India, Vol. XVII by Cunningham
24. A. S. of India Vol. XVII, p. 28
25. 'History of Bengal'. Published by the Dacca University p. 404.
26. J. A. S. Bengal Vol LXII, 1893. p. 96.
27. See Inscription of Chandrika Devi in the Ananta Vasudeva temple of Bhubaneswar, dated 1278 in which Sri Krshna is substituted for Jagannath e.g., E. I. Vol. XIII, p. 150.  
 (a) *krishṇēna trishāāvati* (V. 6)  
 (b) *Tattīrthamaṇḍanarayāsyā tīrē aganavanīghanē*  
*Srikṛishṇa śrī valavāsavasite nandanāyitre* (V. 13)  
 (c) *Mukuṭādyeralankāraih saktyā bhaktyā mudānvitā*  
*Balakṛishṇau subhadrāśca śreyase sāvabhūshayata* (V. 23)
28. Eastern Indian school of Medieval Sculptures by R. D. Banerjee.
29. (1) *Mālava rāga* (p. 10, 96) (2) *Gujjari rāga* (p. 18, 55, 80, 104, 123)  
 (3) *Vasanta rāga* (pp. 24, 100, 139) (4) *Karṇāṭaka rāga* (p. 64)  
 (5) *Rāmakeri* (pp. 30, 167) (6) *Deśivarāḍi* (pp. 77, 110, 128)  
 (7) *Gōṇḍakri* (p. 89) (8) *Varāḍīrāga* (pp. 146, 150)  
 (9) *Bhairavī rāga* (p. 116) (10) *Pibhāsā rāga* (p. 158)  
 GG of the Nirnayasagara Press Edition, 1937.

## Orissa, The Home Land of Jayadeva

The *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva is a unique work in the History of Sanskrit Literature. The poem describes the amorous dalliances of Rādhakṛṣṇa with the excellent ideational subtleties and superb stylistic elegance which have become a perennial source of inspiration and joy to the thinkers and litterateurs alike. Owing to its immense popularity it has claimed more than fifty commentaries and given rise to more than hundred and twentyfive imitations. Though it has been accepted as a *vade-mecum* in the field of creative choral compositions and religious pursuits in India for the last eight centuries, yet, from the historical standpoint, the important question relating to the home land of Jayadeva has not been settled so far. An attempt therefore, has been made herein to offer a solution to the problem.

A few scholars<sup>1</sup> are of opinion that the poet belonged to the court of a king Lakshmaṇa Sena of Bengal and that he was born in the village Kenduli situated on the bank of the river 'Ajaya' in the District of Birbhum. In support of this conclusion they have advanced a number of arguments which invite immediate attention of the scholars and demand a serious and thorough examination.

It is generally argued that Jayadeva in his G.G. refers<sup>2</sup> to himself along with the poets like Umāpatidhara, Śaraṇa, Ācārya Govardhana and Dhoyī. As these four poets belonged to the court of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, very likely, he also adorned the royal court and was a contemporary of these poets. But this supposition is not borne out by facts. As excepting the case of Dhoyī<sup>3</sup>, no historical data are available to prove that the other three poets belonged to the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena. The theory gives rise to a problem of chronology which is to be solved by the historical rise analysis of the date of Lakshmaṇa Sena and his relation with the poets.

On the basis of *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*<sup>4</sup> of Śrīdhara Dāsa, the period of reign of Lakshmaṇa Sena is approximately fixed as 1184-1205 A.D.<sup>5</sup> The poet Umāpatidhara is known to be the writer of Deopara record of king Vijaya Sena (1125-60 A.D.) So the possibility of his association with the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena, the grandson of Vijaya Sena is doubtful. Also the date of the composition of the G.G. (1150 A.D.). as accepted almost certainly, does not tally with the time of Lakshmaṇa Sena<sup>6</sup>. The poet Śaraṇa makes a vague reference to a "Senakula Tilaka" in one of his stray verses<sup>7</sup> preserved in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛtam*. The name of this king is not known. Moreover the authorship of the different verses is ascribed to Śaraṇa Deva, Śaraṇa Datta and Cirantana Śaraṇa, who are not probably identical. Ācārya Govardhana has been established<sup>8</sup> as a man of Niāli Śāsana in the District of Puri. It is known from a commentary that his mention of a "Senakula tilaka Bhūpati" in his *Āryāsaptasati* refers to Pravara Sena, the author of *Setubandha Kāvyaṃ*. Again it is noteworthy that not a single stanza from *Āryāsaptasati* is preserved in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛtam*. Thus the poets Umāpati, Śaraṇa and Govardhana have nowhere mentioned the name of Lakshmaṇa Sena, as has been done explicitly by Śrīdhara Dāsa,<sup>9</sup> Dhoyi<sup>10</sup> and Halāyudha<sup>11</sup> in their respective works.

Moreover some scholars<sup>12</sup> expressed their doubts about the very genuineness of the verse<sup>13</sup> in question in the G. G. The contents of the verse amount to mocking at the illustrious poets which appears to be somewhat improper on the part of a poet and devotee like Jayadeva. Even Rāṇākumbha in his *Rasikapriya* commentary expresses his grave doubts over the authorship of this particular verse.

Further, nowhere in the G. G. do we find any direct or indirect reference to king Lakshmaṇa Sena or any other king. On the other hand, we come across two references in the G. G. that it was written for the propitiation of Lord Jagannātha<sup>14</sup> only.

Again the verse under reference gives only the poet's own estimate of himself and four other poets. But it does not imply directly or indirectly that the five poets were contemporaries and were associated with the same court. Besides it is also wellknown to the student of Sanskrit Literature that it was a

traditional practice<sup>15</sup> with Sanskrit poets to compare the merits of one's own work with the same of the others. Thus due to the paucity of plausible and authentic evidences, it will be historically unsound to arrive at a definite conclusion that the five poets referred to in the verse were contemporaneous to one another and adorned the same royal court.

In order to prove Jayadeva's association with the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena, the following traditional verse is often cited, where Jayadeva along with the above four poets has been enlisted as the Jewel of the court of Lakshmaṇa Sena i.e. "Govardhanaśca Śaraṇo Jayadeva umāpatiḥ Kavirājaśca ratnāni samitau laksmaṇasya ca".

This verse is alleged to have been noticed<sup>16</sup> for the first time by Rūpa and Sanātana Goswāmin, at Navadvīpa three hundred years after Lakshmaṇa Sena and the report of which came to us after four hundred years. As the verse lacks the authenticity of any kind, it has been accepted by the scholars as a spurious one or hearsay.<sup>17</sup> Hence it need not be discussed here at length.

Another interesting point is that Jayadeva unequivocally declares his belonging to 'Kindubilva'.<sup>18</sup> All the commentaries of the G. G. have accepted 'Kindubilva' as the birth place of Jayadeva. The location and the identification of the village 'Kindubilva' has become a matter of long-standing controversy among scholars. A host of critics have tried to identify the 'Kindubilva' with the Kenduli village situated on the bank of the Ajaya river in the Birbhum District of Bengal, while the Orissan scholars assay to locate the place Kindubila near the Pratāparudrapur Śāsana between the rivers Prāci and Kuśabhadrā and try to identify the same with the Kenduli Śāsana in the District of Puri.

The advocates of the Bengal origin of the poet, refer to a Bengali book entitled "Jayadeva Carita" by one Banamāli Dāsa which presents strange accounts about Jayadeva. According to it when the father of Padmāvati arrived at the village Kinduvilva of Birbhum with his daughter in search of the God-ordained groom Jayadeva, the villagers told him that they know nothing about Jayadeva or his parentage ; but, however, they had seen a lunatic named Jayadeva in the village. The very fact that the

co-villagers did know nothing about great poet and his parentage demolishes the theory advocated on that basis.

The authenticity of the said 'Jayadeva Carita' is challenged<sup>19</sup> by scholars. This work has been published by Bangīya Sāhitya Parisad, Culcutta, from a single manuscript of the work in 1803 A. D. Nothing is known about the original manuscript nor has a second manuscript of this work been discovered anywhere in Bengal.<sup>20</sup>

DR. BANMALI RATH

\* This paper has been read, discussed and accepted in the International Sanskrit Conference, New Delhi, 1972, held under the joint auspices of the Government of India and the UNESCO.

1. (i) Bangalira itihasa—Dr. Nihara Ranjan Rāy.  
(ii) History of Bengal, Dacca University.  
(iii) Macdonell's History of Sanskrit literature.
2. vācaḥ pallavayatyumāpatidharaḥ sandarbhaśuddhiṁ girāṁ  
jānīte jayadeva eva śaraṇaḥ ślāghyodurūha dṛteḥ  
śṅgārottarasat prameya recanairācārya govardhana  
spardhi ko'pi navīśrutaḥ śrutidharo dhoyi kavi kṣmāpatih
3. Dhoyi in his Pavanadūtā refers to 'Lakṣmaṇaṁ Kṣaunṛpālaṁ'  
J.A.S. 1905 pp. 41-71.
4. The Sadukti Karnāmṛta was compiled in śaka year 1127—"Sake saptavimśatyadhika śatopeta daśaśate" i.e. in 1205 A.D. in the 21st regnal year of king Lakṣmaṇa Sena—Srimallakṣmaṇa Sena Kṣitipasya tasyaika-vimśabde". This indicates that King Lakṣmaṇa Sena was ruling from 1184 to 1205 A.D.
5. Inscription of Bengal Vol. III—p. 49.
6. Souvenir on Jayadeva pp. 13-18. Ed. by Dr. N. K. Sahu Jayadeva Sanskritika Pariṣad, Orissa Bhabaneswar, 1968.
7. "Sevābhīryadi senavamśa tilakādāsādaniya śriyaḥ".
8. Vide Orissa Historical Research Journal Vol. VII April, '58.  
and "Govardhanācārya & Udayanācārya" by K. N. Mahapatra.
9. "Sa śri Lakṣmaṇasena eka nṛpatirmuktaīca jivannabhūt"—sadukti karṇāmṛtaṁ.
10. "Dṛṣṭvā devaṁ bhuvanavijaye lakṣmaṇaṁ kṣaunṛpālaṁ" (v. 2)—Pavanadūtāṁ.
11. "Vijaya rasikamate laksmana kṣaunibhartuḥ"—Brāhmaṇa Sarvasvam
12. Dr. N. K. Sahu in his article published in "Souvenir on Jayadeva"
- p. 10. Vide also Introduction to Piyūṣalahari, ed. by K. Kar p. 292.
13. G. G. Verse No. 4—Vācaḥ pallavayatyumāpatidharaḥ etc,



14. "Prityai śripuruṣottamasya racitaṁ Srigitagovindakaṁ". It is quoted from a M. S. which is copied in the 1st regnal year of Virakeśari Deva.

Vide also G. G. the last verse "Vyāpārāḥ puruṣottamasya dadatu spitāmmudāṁ sampadaṁ"

15. Vide Aihole inscriptiou of Pulakesi II by Ravikirti;

Rājaśekhara's bālarāmāyaṇa, History of Sanskrit Poetics—P. V. Kane, p. 203 and so on.

16. Virambhūm vivaraṇa e.g. "Sri rūpa Sri sanātana śridhāma navadvipe Lakṣmaṇa sener sabhā gṛhadvāre nimnokta ślokati ankit dekhiyā chilen"

17. O.H.R.J. Vol. VII. Oct. '58 & Jan. '59 Nos. 3 & 4 p. 195-96.

18. G. G. 3rd canto—"Varṇitaṁ Jayadevakena hareridaṁ pravaṇena Kinduvilva samudra sambhava rohiṇiramaṇena."

19. The Souvenir of Jayadeva pp. 22-41—Vide the article by K. N. Mahapatra.

20. Virabhūm vivarana—Sri H. K. Mukhopadhyay 1323 Sal P. 201.

"Kon ādarśa puthi haite iha grantha nakaha karāhaya' tāhā jānājāya nāi/E grantha anya kothāo pāoyā jāya nāin /".

## Jayadeva : His Indentity

Jayadeva is one of the most celebrated and popular poets in Sanskrit. His soul—stirring compositions have inspired many mystics and devotees.

It is widely held that Jayadeva was born at Kendubilva (Kenduli) on the bank of the river Ajaya in the Birbhum district of Bengal, that he was the son of Bhojadeva and Vambadevi, and that he was the court-poet of Lakshmana Sena, the Vaidya king of Bengal<sup>1</sup>. But Mr. R. C. Majumdar and Mr. Jagabandhu Singh differ from this view of Bengali Historians and scholars and savants like Sir William Jones, Mr. Edwin Arnold, Mr. Peterson and maintain that tradition has preserved a verse to be a part of an inscription according to which Jayadeva was with Gobardhan, Sarana, Umapati, and Kaviraj, attached to the court of one Lakshmana Sena."<sup>2</sup> Mr. R. C. Majumdar adds. "Each and every event of Jayadeva's life as depicted by Navaji, Chakradatta Mahipati and Ramdas of Orissa in their life story of Jayadeva was so to say, interwoven with Lord Jagannath and the Emperor of Orissa. The events can not be ignored as legends as claimed by some writers." Mr. Jagabandhu Singh, a prominent pleader of Orissa, remarks "Jayadeva is a poet of Orissa and was born at Kendubilva remarks, (Kenduli) in the Puri district and an Oriya Brahmin."<sup>3</sup>

In the face of these two divergent views, one asks : Is Jayadeva a court-poet of Lakshmana Sena, the Vaidya king of Bengal or of the Utkal Kings ?

Madala Panji (Palm leaf records), the Orissan Chronicle, provides concrete records of Lord Jagannath and Ekajata-Kamadeva who was a Vaishnava and reigned from 1144 to 1150 A.D.<sup>4</sup> and never took his daily food without hearing musical notes of Gita-govinda<sup>5</sup>. King Ekajata Kamadeva became a favourite disciple of Jayadeva and built temples to encourage the Vaishnava cult in his own kingdom particularly at Madhupur Patana situated in the Chudangasahi of Puri city. He is more connected with many

valuable gifts to Vaishnavas, as this fact is revealed from the copper-plate grants discovered at Puri and Kendupatana.<sup>6</sup> These facts clearly bear testimony to the popularity of Jayadeva both as a poet and as a religious guru of King Kandaewa (1144-1150).

Moreover the work "*Abhinavagitagovinda*" of Rajaraja II (115-1154 A. D.) alias Purusottama Deva, also known as Madan Mohan, it is believed, was introduced by Purushtama Deva in place of Jayadeva's *Gitagovinda* because Jayadeva has in his *Daśāvatārastōtra*<sup>7</sup> regarded Buddha as an incarnation of Vishnu. Balarama, Achyutananda Pratapa and other literary giants invoked Lord Jagannath as a Buddha as the notion was extremely popular among the followers and supporters of Vajrayana School of Orissan Vaishnavism. Jayadeva was disliked by the Brahmins and other Saivites of the period for regarding Buddha as an *avatār* of Hari; so *Abhinavagitagovinda* was sung in the Jagannath temple out of dire necessity to satisfy some sections of the people of Orissa; but such an acton wounded the inner sentiments of Vaishnavas of the time and there was agitation against this innovation with a demand for reciting Jayadeva's *Gitagovinda* before the Lord Jagannath. This struggle ended with compromise effected by the Lord Jagannath between the king and the poet. Later, however, *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva was re-introduced in the temple as before. Ramadasa in his *Dardhyatabhakti Rasāmṛta*, the *Nirnayasagara* edition of *Gitagovinda* and Chandradutta in his *Bhaktamala* have narrated these facts. As a result of the divine compromise between the two devotees of the Lord Jagannath, each chapter of *Gitagovinda* consists of a beautiful verse of the *Abhinavagitagovinda* of the king Purushottama and this fact is again supported by Kavicharita in Marathi and *Alankarasekhara* of Keshava Misra of the 16th Century A.D.

From these direct evidences it is to be concluded that the Utkal king, Purushottama Deva, was distinctly mentioned in the *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva, who by the time has obtained high esteem as a court-poet of Ekajata Kamadeva.<sup>8</sup> The salient features of poetic excellences of *Gitagovinda* which has created an epoch of the Bhakti cult have been enacted also in the characters and inscriptions garnted by Kavi Narasingha,

Kapilendra and Prataparudra Deva<sup>9</sup>. Besides this the inscription on the leftside reveals the record of accepting Jayadeva's Gita-govinda sung daily before the Lord Jagannath as a routine work after His Badasinharabesa<sup>10</sup> : and this practice is still observed in the Jagannath temple.

The idea of attributing Jayadeva to the court of Lakshmana Sena, the Vaidya king of Bangal, by Bengali scholars and historians is quite spurious on the ground that the Sakti religion was more powerful during his reign. People of his country were very much fond of Tantrism and as a result they observed the Agama cult and took Panchmakaras which later on gradually influenced the Vaisnavism of Bengal. To enable them the degenerated societies, Halayudha, the royal and learned Pandit in the court of the king Lakshmana Sena, wrote 'Matsya Sukta'. If Jayadeva were in the court of Lakshmana Sena, it would have been quite possible to mention such a learned scholar Halayudha, who influenced greatly the mass of Bengal; but on the other hand neither Halayudha nor Jayadeva had mentioned names of each other, though Jayadeva narrated much about Acharya Govardhana, a Brahmin of Utkal.

Gitagovinda exerted a great influence both in form and matter on Roy Ramanada of the 15th and 16 century A.D. as can be found in his Jagannathaballava Natakam; on Banamali of the 15th century A.D., as seen in his Krishnalilamruta in Sanskrit (unpublished); on Jatindra Raghunath of Puri in the 17th Century A.D., as in his Mukundabilasa in Sanskrit (unpublished); on Dharanidhara Dasa and Sadananda Kavisurya of the 17th century A.D., as seen in their Gitagovindas in Oriya. The Gita Govinda of Uddhaba Das of the 16th century A.D., and the works of other Oriya poets also, have been influenced by Jayadeva. Debadurlabha Das of the 16th century A.D., in his Rahasya-manjari and Dinakrusna Das of the 17th and the 18th century A.D., in his Amrutasagara and Pindika Srichandana of the 17th century A.D., in his Vasantarasa have greatly adopted the subject-matter, the manner of narration and even the sweet and sonorous language of Jayadeva's Gitagovinda.

Sisusankara's Ushabhilasa (1555 A.D.), is quite identical with Jayadeva's Gitagovinda and displays the enchanting scenery, the

ornamental expressson, overflowing music and amorous love of Radha and Krshna with a slight difference in name of the hero and heroine as well as the mode of expression and sweet language. Usha, the daughter of Banasura, and Aniruddha, the grandson of Sri Krshna, fell in love with each other. The vernal beauty is conducive to love and the melody, raga and tala of the songs are quite in keeping with the entertaining mood of the lover.

The ideas in Ushabilasha, Ch. III, 14-20 bear a close resemblance to Gitagovinda Ch. I. 3-32. Anirudha repented very much for his illicit amorous connection and sought pardon of Usha, and the same method of satisfying Radha is accepted and narrated picturesquely in the Gitagovinda of Jayadeva.

Both Gitagovinda and Ushabhilasha are love lyrics in praise of Lord Sri Krshna. Love as narrated is divine but purely sensible with the estrangement of lovers and their final reconciliation. Compare Ushabhilasha Ch. VII. 5, 15-16, 41-45 and Gitagovinda Ch. X. 3-4 for justification.

The ennobling influence and overwhelming popularity of Jayadeva's Gitagovinda in every nook and corner of Utkal even from the beginning of the 16th Century A.D. onward is thus clear. Clearly it must have taken at least 150 to 200 years to achieve such a level of popularity.

This conclusion is further testified by various palmleaf Mss. found in different parts of Orissa along with the Bhagabatagadis in the houses. Bhamadeva Mishra wrote a short commentary in Sanskrit with an attractive and true translation of original texts with various readings of *Gitagovinda*. So far as I know another anonymous prose translation also exists. Numerous Oriya poets<sup>11</sup> have made successful renderings of the same volume into Oriya language and referred to him too in their original works. People of Utkal were much familiar with Jayadeva like Jagannatha, the author of Bhagavata; but none in Bengal seems to be acquainted with him. Birabhumvivarana has<sup>12</sup> rightly remarked, "We have come across some works written on Jayadeva by Bengali writers but none of them have given any reference to any event before the time of Chaitanya." Jayadevacaritam of Banamalidasa, written in Bengali and published by the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad is

supposed to have been composed in the 17th Century A.D. The publication was made only out of one manuscript as no other Mss. of the same could be found in any place of Bengal. It does not mention at all the life-history of Jayadeva—not even the most interesting events which occurred in relation to either the Lord Jagannath or the Gajapati Emperor of Orissa. A ludicrous account of Jayadeva's marriage with Padmavati contained in Bemalai shows how it is unacquainted even with significant events in his life.

Viswanath Kaviraja (1190 A.D. 1250 B.D.) the Sandhivigrahika in the royal court of Raja Narasingha Deva, has quoted a *śloka* from Jayadeva's Gitagovinda and discussed the poetic qualities in his Sahitya Darpana. This clearly certifies that Jayadeva was prior to him and a man of Orissa, because Viswanath had adorned the court of Raja Narasingha Deva whose predecessors had devoted themselves to cultural and architectural pursuits.

Scholars of the East and the West like Sir W. Jones, Mr. Edwin Arnold, Mr. Lassen and others have based their conclusions on the nativity of Jayadeva mainly on a *śloka*.<sup>13</sup>

The verse is most probably a traditional one like that of "Dhanvantarīkhsapanakamarasinghaśankubetabhaṭṭaghaṭakar para kālīdasa, Khyāto varahamihiro nrupateh sabhayam ratnani bai bararuchinnababikrasya". No historical element is blended with these two verses; as contradictory evidences are apparent either from inscriptions or other historical and literary records.

When Lakshmana Sena, the last Vaidya and Hindu king of Bengal, was attacked and defeated by the Muslims of Delhi, he took shelter in the royal court of Anangabhim Deva (1154-1181) and through his courtsey and that of his successor Rajaraja Deva (1181-1216 A.D.), Lakshmana Sena remained in that court with his kingly status and spent the later part of his life as a devotee of Lord Jagannath at Srikshetra (Puri).

Anangabhim Deva had a number of learned scholars, illustrious poets, leading historians and social reformers in his court. He was hailed the Vikramaditya of Orissa. It was at his court that Lakshmana Sena came in contact with the poet Jayadeva for a of sixteen years and admired the poet's talents. With the royal period aid from Anangabhimadeva, Jayadeva spent a few years of

his life on the banks of the river Ganges included at that time in the expanded Gang Empire. The brief narration of Chandradutta rather is more favourable to the account of Jayadeva's overwhelming popularity which travelled far and wide of the greater Orissa then known. So the verse "Vacham pallavayatyuma māpatidhara", etc., Gitagovinda, sloka. 4 proves, as if Umapati, Govardhana and Dhoyi were the court poets of either the Utkal King or the king Lakshman Sena, who spent his later life as a guest in the court of the Utkal king. The other possibility might be inferred that Umapati, Govardhana and Dhoyi were the native poets of Utkal and received royal honour during their life time from the Utkal King due to brilliancy of thought, evergreenness of muse and nectar-flowing expressions. But the latter one is more definite and conclusive; because Govardhana was contemporary of Jayadeva and court poet of Raja Raja II. His Āryasaptaśati and Govardhan Sataka furnish us a definite and reasonable information that Govardhana is a man of Puri (Srihsetra) and achieved poetic talents being patronised by Rajaraja II. He has mentioned Udayana Acharya<sup>15</sup> and Balabhadra of whom the former is his favourite disciple; and both are the inhabitants of Srihsetra (Puri). Further proof assigns Govardhana as the court-poet of the Gajapati of Utkal; as he is clearly mentioned while he uttered some praiseworthy words to Lakshmana Sena to accord the decency of honour to a guest. Moreover no Acharya Brahmin is seen anywhere except Utkal; and therefore there is no reasonable background and historical certainty to conclude without a least thinking that Govardhana was the court-poet of Lakshmana Sena, the Vaidya King of Bengal. This is more strengthened when we know certainly that Acharya Govardhana is the son of Acharya Nilambara, a permanent inhabitant of Utkal. Like Acharya Govardhana, I am also definite about other two poets that they are natives of Utkal. Hence the sloka No. 4 as interpreted by scholars is quite absurd and unconvincing.

Sanatana Goswami (1) has nowhere spoken about anything of the poet's works except only his name. This greater inconsistency provides an adequate scope to understand that these statements attributing to or associating with the name of Sanatana Goswami are spurious, which is again supported by the earliest commentator

Maharana Kumbha of the 15th Century A.D., (as his commentary runs, "Idanim kabih kabigananayam pareirapi kabibhiraham pariganita iti swaprasansartham *kshepakamapi tatkrutham* slokam swagranthasya kurbannaha.")

The popularity of Jayadeva in Utkal is definitely proved for a period of not less than 200 years ; and as a result valuable pieces of lyrics and popular verses were composed by various authors irrespective of caste and creed on the model of Gitagovinda ; and a consolidated list of authors as available from the different records is given below.

1. Gitagauripatti by Bhanudatta. 2. Krishnagita by Bhanudatta. 3. Krishnagita by Somanatha. 4. Gitārāghava by Hari-sankara. 5. Gitaraghaba by Prabhakara. 6. Gitārāghava by Ramakavi. 7. Gitagiriśa by Rama. 8. Sangitamadhava by Govinda Das. 9. Gitavitaranga by Abhinava Charukriti. 10. Gitagangādhara by Kalyaṇa. 11. Gitagangādhara by Rajasekhara. 12. Gītagaṅgādhara by Chandrasekhara Saraswathi. 13. Śivagitimālīka by Chandasikhamani. 14. Rāmōdhāraṇagitakavya and Śivashṭapadi by Venkatappa Naik of Mysore. 15. Gitaśataka by Sundara Acharya. 16. Sangita-Raghunandana by Viswanatha. 17. Sangita-sundara by Sadasiva Dikshita. 18. Mukunda Vilasa by Viswanatha. 19. Sankarisangita by Jayanarayana, etc. Besides original productions, there were a number of commentaries on Gitagovinda. Udayana Acharya, Krishnadasa, Gopala, Narayana Dasa, Bhavacharya, Ramaratna, Ramadatta, Rupadeva, Vitthala, Yibeswara, Salinath, Hrudayabharana, Tirumat Ray, Srikantha Mishra, etc., are some of the commentators.

The view that Jayadeva hailed from Bengal is made to hinge on two *ślokas* ; and it has already been shown that this is untenable because one of them refers to him as a court-poet of Utkal Kings of the Ganga Dynasty. In further support of this it may be said that in the Nirnayasaagara edition (2) of Gitagovinda the definite name of the native village of Jayadeva is described as Kindubilva ; as it originated from the great ocean. Mr. Mangalesh Ramakrishna Telang and Vasudeva Lakshman Sastri the Joint Editor of this edition have provided another reading as Tindubilva (1) of Kindubilva. The same edition again describes, "Jayati padmāvatiramana Jayadevakavivarativani tamatisatam" which



explains that Padmavati is the wife of Jayadeva. It is interesting to note that Kenduliśasana in the district of Puri has a village named Kenduli in Birbhum district and which holds Jayadeva in great esteem, on the river Prachi and near the Bay of Bengal. In and near about Kenduli there are many antiquated and historically prominent temples including those of Vileswapur, Vasudevanarayana and others, and this is the most suitable place by its artistic and religious environments for a human being to be properly qualified so as to become a life-long true devotee of Vishnu. So there is no justification to bring a far-fetched idea about the birth place of the poet Jayadeva in a remote village of Bengal.

Padmavati is the wife of Jayadeva and a daughter of a Dravidian Brahmin of Andhra. In the past Dravidians had marriage alliance with the Brahmins of Utkal but not with Bengalis. This is still prevalent among the Brahmins of Utkal. Bhaktamala of Chandradutta describes Jayadeva's parentage as enumerated below:

*"Jagannāthapūriprānte dēśakhaibotkalābhidhe,  
Vindubilva iti khyāto grāmo Brāhmaṇaśankulaḥ.  
Tatrōtkāle aste dyijo Jayadēva iti śrutah,  
Vidyābhyāsārataḥ śāntaḥ puruṣōttamapūjakaḥ.  
Atha tatraiva biprōnyo debasarmeti viśrutah.  
Anapatyo bahuba san Jagannāthamupāgataḥ".*

There is a Brahmin village near Jagannath Puri in Utkal. In that village lived Jayadeva, a practiser of Sanskrit learning and a devotee of the Lord Jagannath. Devasarma worshipped Him, as he had no issue. Lord Jagannath was satisfied with Devasarma and granted a son who is no other than Jayadeva. Bindubilva is a corrupted form of Kendubilva as 'K' is pronounced as "B" which is very common with the Mithila people due to dialectical variations.

In view of the above arguments 'Jayadeva' is undoubtedly an inhabitant of Kendubilva of Puri district and a royal court-poet of Ekajata Kamadeva of Utkal.

Further, many scholars have wrongly estimated that Jayadeva took his theme for Gitagovinda from the Bhagavata Purana and

Vasantarasa described in Gitagovinda is purely done by the meetings of Sri Krishna and Gopi just after the death of Dantavakra. Rāsa-Lila as described in Gitagovinda is not connected with the autumn as in Bhagavata Purana ; but interlined with the vernal season of Brahmavaivarta Purana, as described below ;

*"Rasōstabam mahātramyam sarbēśam harshabardhanam ;  
Pūrṇachandrōdaye naktam basante rasamaṇḍalē.*

*Brahmavāivārta Purāṇa. Ch. XIV.*

*Ekādaśriharivaktam bāṇam brundabāṇam yayau.  
Subhēśuklatrayōdashyam puracandrōdaye madhu ;  
Yudhikāmadhabikuṇḍamalatiṇṇapuspabāyuna.*

*Vasitam kalauadena madhupānam manōharam. Ibid Ch. XX.*

The above references show clearly Jayadeva's Rāsa-Lila lasted for three nights instead of five nights of the Sataras as described in the Bhagavata Purana. Many Oriya writers appreciated this theme and as a result we see that all of them have followed the same custom even after Jayadeva. Rasakalpadruma of Jagannath Misra has many of these verses of Piyushalahari.

Navaji of Gwalior has spoken of Utkal as Jayadeva's birth country. Mahipati of Maharashtra in his Vaktavijaya describes Jayadeva as an incarnation of Vyasa belonging to a village 'Tindubilva' near the sacred city of the Lord Jagannath. Gada in his Kuladipika speaks of Jayadeva as a devotee and a man of Utkal. The tradition still runs in Assam that Jayadeva is a native of Utkal.

Gitagovinda is a lyrical drama with celestial songs in praise of love of Lord Sri Krishna and Radha. It consists of 12 cantos and 24 Ashtapadis. The whole work is viewed from four aspects, viz., literary, devotional, musical and mystical. The mystic element is exhibited in the beginning and at the end of the book, and the middle is full of expositions of all the four elements, Radha is not a woman of ordinary type, but symbolises unending love for Krishna in the world. The whole story is a gradual development of a holy soul who sees only a path of glory for everlasting peace and the most desired salvation.<sup>20</sup>

Padmavati, wife of Jayadeva, danced with her husband in accompaniment to his tunes. It is as if Jayadeva and his wife

Padmavati took the role of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā; and exhibited the sentiment of love with an allegorical explanation of divine philosophy and each one in the world is longing for union with the divine. The melody is of southern variety. The various ragas assigned to different Aṣṭapadis have got marked similarity with the musical tunes of Southern India.

Thus Gitagovinda marks the transitional period between pure lyric and pure drama and occupies the first place in the domain of the lyrical literature in the world. It has no dialogue in the strict sense of the word, and only there are three characters who were engaged in a kind of lyrical monologue of which one of the other two acts as an auditor and some times even no auditor at all.

The most striking fact is that, "the sexual ideas<sup>21</sup>, apparent in the verses have received in the hands of Indian commentators, an allegorical explanation of divine philosophy, as the longing and union of the supreme and the individual souls."

*Piūyshalahari* is a one act drama and called Gōṣṭhirūpaka. It is recently discovered and definitely considered a work of Jayadeva the author of Gitagovinda. It is played by a party of his own in the temple of the Lord Jagannath and this possibly may be a Vaisnavagoṣṭhi, the example of which is followed by the Orissan Vaisnavas of Achyutananda school which performs the Nitya-rasalīla of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the chief cowherdess, Rādhā. It describes the vernal sport of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with his beloved Gopīs with Rādhā as queen-head of love. Fourteen words are enlightened with the divine lustre of the words of Jayadeva as a monumental work of Piyushalahari and the moon, as well as the hardest stone of the world may be melted. The stage manager of Piyushalahari says :

"*Sūtradhara-Asyadṛabikartumimau samarthau chaturdaśānā-  
mapi piṣṭakānām,*

*Aham bachobhīrjayadevanāmakarachchatabhi schatusāra-  
dhama. 8."*

Like Gitagovinda it displays the unknowable form and the pervading nature of Mūrārī whose flute gives the highest perfection of the flow of nectar to the animal and natural kingdom. All

are enjoying the pleasure abode of Nilachala and the antagonistic animals even have renounced their ferocity not through fear of chastisement but the power of supreme and formless love. This blue brilliance has enraptured both Jayadeva and his wife to such a degree of perfection and bliss that they have totally forgotten the rules and regulations of social life and are attracted to stage the drama of Rasa-festival even at the cost of vehement criticism from their opponents. Kalidasa saw his poetical creation with the delight of the eye, the delight of the ear and the entire satisfaction of imagination and taste ; but Jayadeva, as revealed in *Piyushalahari*, is more famous for his philosophical dialogue than anything in this world. This dialogue has been enriched with beautiful flowers of emotion and sensuous ideality. The end of the play is marked with the religious intent, the manifestation of the fruitful penance and purity as symbolised in the Lord of the universe, in His guise of wooden image.

*Piyushalahari* is an introduction of Rasalila of Sri Krishna with Radha. It is a drama of high category and quite fitting for theatrical performances and every letter of which is a feast to the ear like the few frequent utterances of a lovely-faced lady. The spiritual instruction is blended with an object of love for the celebration of an annual festival of Sri Krishna, and the drama provides materials to remove and remodel the lines of Mr Macdonell<sup>22</sup> uttered in connection with Gitagovinda ; as he has said, "Gitagovinda marks the transitional stage between pure lyric and pure drama—a lyrical drama, which though dating from the 12th Century A.D. is the earlier literary specimen of a primitive type of play that still survives in Bengal and must have preceded the regular dramas". This conclusion is now untenable and baseless ; as from the internal and external evidences, it assures us that Gitagovinda deals with the last stage of sportive and encircling dance (*Rāsālila*) and *Piyushalahari* is an introduction to Gitagovinda. These two works originated at the Nilachaladhama (*Śrīkṣhetra*) and its justification, I have mentioned only to remind, is given by these lines, "O the audience assembled through divine grace in the temple of the great Lord, who has the form of Garuda emblemmed on his banner ; and who is to the devotees like the moon to the Cakora birds and who is like the crest-jewel

Nilachala, the blue mount. The opera party of Jayadeva, a jewel among the learned scholars, is ready to perform theatrical performances. Their dance swift like lightning in its graceful movements is capable of delighting the hearts. The graceful movement is as pleasant and limpid as the lustre of the moon. They are pleasing to the sight as the quick glances of ladies whose eyes resemble those of antelopes.”

Rāmagitagovida, Rādhakṛshnavilasa and Alankāraśataka are also attributed to Jayadeva and these works deserve the careful attention of research scholars.

From the above materials it must be concluded that Jayadeva is a poet of high merit in the courts of Ekajata Kamadeva, Puruṣottama Deva and Anangabhima Deva, the Gajapati Kings of Utkal as the royal poet, and a native of Kendubilva, near Sri Kshetra in the Puri District. Like Kalidas he was a poet of unsurpassed excellence.

By SIDDHESWAR HOTA

- 1 Dr. M. K. Chariar's History of Classical Sanskrit Literature. p. 337.
- 2 Govardhanaścha śarano jayadeva umāpatih, Kabirājascha ratnani-sambitau lakshmansaya. cha :-Birabhumā Bibarana and Bachapallabayaty-umāpatiharah sandarbhasudhigiram, etc. :Gitagovinda.
- 3 Prachina Utkal of Jagabandhu Singh. p. 58.
- 4 Eraja bada Vaishav ācharana kale-Madalapanji (Published).
- 5 Records from Madala Panji. (Unpublished).
- 6 R. D. Banerjee's History of Orissa, p. 254.
- 7 Jayadeva's Dasavatarastotram. Gitagovinda 11, 9.
- 8 Prachina Gadyapadyadarsa ed. by Mr. A. B. Mahanty.
- 9 Vaisnavism in Orissa pp. 42. 43.
- 10 Prachina Utkal by Jagabandhu Sin Singh.
- 11 Gitagovinda by Dharanidhara Das of the 17th Century A.D.
  - (a) Rasabaridhi by Brundabana Das of the 15th Century A. D.
  - (b) Gitagovinda by Uddhaba Das of the 16th Century A.D.
  - (c) Gitagovinda by Trilochana Das of the 17th Century A.D.
  - (d) Gitagovinda by Sadananda Kavisurya of the 17th Century A.D.
- 12 Birabhum Bibarana :—pp. 210 (Foot-note).
- 13 Gitagovinda Sl. 4
- 14 (a) Madala Panji.
  - (b) History of Utkal by Krupasindhu Mishra, pp. 110.
  - (c) History of Utkal by Pyarimohan Acharya. pp. 74-75.
  - (d) Prachina Utkal by Jagabandhu Singh.

15 Megheswar and Sobhaneswar Inscriptions of Bhubaneshwar./4 anka, etc.

16 Aneke balen sripada sanātanagōswami] naki navadvipa nrubasabhādvāre nimnokta slokata khodita dekhiyachhilen. "Gobardhanascha, etc."—Introduction to Kavi Jayadeva and Sri Gitagovinda by H. K. Mukherjee and Srirupasantana sridhamanabadwipa Lakshmanasener sabhagruhadware nimnokta slokata ankita dekhiya chhilen-Gobardhanascha, etc. Vide p. 196, Birbhum Vivarana.

17 See page of this paper (Foot Note—1) and Sloka, No. 4 from the Gitagovinda of Nirnayasagara Edition.

18 Barnitam Jayadevakena hareridam prabanena.

Kindubilwa samudrasambhabarohiniramanena, Hari hari...io. Gitagovinda. pp. 58.

19 Ibid Gitagovinda. pp. 58. "Tindubilva" Kendubilva iti pathou.

20 Gitagovinda, Ch. XII, 29.

21 C. R. Srinivasa Iyengar

22 Mr. Macdonell :—History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 344.

## Jayadeva

A Most characteristic feature of mystic experiences is that they are universal. In all ages and all times there have been saints testifying to the truth of mystic relationship between the human soul and Divinity. The human soul's yearning for God or the Supreme Being provides the basis for this relationship of love. The intensity of emotion roused by unfathomable devotional urge transcends all carnal desires as the common people understand it. The thirst of the soul for union with the object of devotion is limitless, so that this yearning alone seems real and all else fades out of the ken of the devotees' consciousness.

It is this irresistible yearning and sublime bliss of the mystic union which made the Gopis of Vrindavan break all barriers, mental and social, in their pursuit of Lord Krishna. The love of the Gopis, Radha being principal among them, for Krishna has presented for the people of this country for ages a practical ideal of devotion and divine attachment. This has been the theme of a large number of literary works in our literature. *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva is acknowledgedly one of the best among them. By virtue of the excellence of its poetry, its mystic and its devotional fervour, *Gitagovinda* has had a profound effect on our Bhakti literature and thought.

Such is the fascination which every word of that great devotional lyric, *Gitagovinda* has for human ears. Sir Edwin Arnold called it the 'song of songs' and there is no denying that in sweetness, poetic beauty, expressiveness, choice of words and in fact all that goes to make a great lyric, *Gitagovinda* is unsurpassed. Few poetical compositions have ever acquired such an abiding place in the hearts of men as this poem of medieval India. For centuries, the temples of this country and the courts of kings have hummed its melodious music. It has fascinated even foreigners, which is evident from the various translations made of it in verse by the poets of European languages in Latin, English, German and French.

It constituted a landmark in the art of the composition of devotional lyrics in this country and had tremendous impact on the imagination of devotional poets; amongst those who trod the footprints of Jayadeva, its author, we recall the names of Vidyapati and Chandidas, poets of great eminence in the world of devotional poetry. *Gitagovinda* was to them the fountain-source of the Krishnabhakti cult.

Poet Jayadeva was born in a small village of Bengal, called, Kindu Bilva, which falls now in the district of Birbhum. The year of his birth is not known. It is, however, commonly supposed that he was born some time in the eleventh century A.D., when the Sena dynasty ruled in Bengal and Khilji King sat on the throne of Delhi. The name of his father was Bhojadeva and that of his mother, Ramadevi. Both died when he was very young. He married Padmavati, whose hand was offered to him under a tree in Puri by her father, a man of deep devotional bent, under a direction from Lord Jagannath, given to him in a vision. Padmavati, too, was a woman of a high religious temperament. The union proved to be very happy and the wife was a source of inspiration to the poet.

Shortly after, he undertook a tour of Vrindavan (where Lord Krishna spent the early years of his life) and neighbouring places. It is said that when he visited Jaipur, he was wounded by some dacoits. Returning home, he stayed at the court of the then King of Bengal. Jayadeva's wife predeceased him. Legend has it that on one occasion when he was away, the wife of the King whose court he adorned, jokingly told Padmavati that Jayadeva was dead. So deep was Padmavati's sorrow, it is said, that she fell down dead. Jayadeva, when he heard of it, could not bear the terrible shock, and he left for his village, where he spent the rest of his life in loneliness.

Jayadeva wrote his immortal lyric when he was in Puri. It acquired great fame even during his life-time and was sung all over India, but more especially in the South, where even today it maintains its ancient popularity. George Keyt has rightly said that 'as a love poem *Gitagovinda* stands unrivalled in Indian literature.' The mystic love of Radha and Krishna has been described here in wordly imagery, for there is no other way in



which it could be described. But the poet has, by his cryptic remarks, left no doubt as to the spiritual content of it ; in fact it is the yearning of the human soul to mingle with the Divine that is described in a metaphorical manner. It is—

*The desire of the moth for the star,  
Of the night for the morrow,  
The devotion to something afar  
From the sphere of our sorrow'.*

that is the basis of all *gopi* love. That is how the deep pangs of separation which the *gopis* experienced become understandable. The fact that the cowherd Krishna was not even eight years of age when the love-drama was enacted in Vrindavan, with which his name is so closely associated, is sufficient to cast aside all doubts of there being anything carnal about it. Of all men and women in Vrindavan, it was only the *gopis* who were permitted to participate in it ; them alone the love of Krishna, who was an incarnation of the Supreme Spirit, drove to infatuation.

Of all the incarnations of God, it is Krishna alone who is the repository of all sweetness and has the quality of attracting others towards him, as the very name Krishna indicates, (*Karshayati* Krishna :—(Krishna is one who attracts) in an unbounded measure. It was natural, therefore, that the milkmaids of Vraj felt so strongly drawn towards him. And so did Mīra in a later age.

An intense desire to possess and mingle is the truest characteristic of love, and this is love which a devotee feels for the object of his devotion. Naturally, therefore, to love God, as a woman loves her beloved is considered the highest form of worship. The attitude was designated by several names in Hindu devotionai philosophy—*dāmpatyabhāya*, *Kāntābhāya*, *gopibhāya*, *mādhuryabhāya*, *parkiyabhāya* etc., all of which in the ultimate analysis mean the sweet feeling which a woman has for the object of her love. The highest personification of it is Radha. Such was the intensity of Radha's love for Krishna that both have become inseparable in the sense that we cannot conceive of Radha without Krishna or of Krishna without Radha. In fact, Radha, according to Hindu conception, is the embodiment

of *Prakriti* (negative energy) and Krishna of *Purusha* (positive energy) and both together go to make the whole. The one cannot exist without the other.

The *Gitagovinda* has only three characters in it—Radha, Krishna and a lady-messenger or attendant of Radha's. The subject-matter of the book is the pangs of love in separation. The *dutika* plays a very important role in it, for after carrying the messages of the one to the other, not once or twice but repeatedly, she is able, ultimately, to bring the lovers together. She is like the *guru* who is responsible for uniting the human soul with the Divine.

The singing of the yearning of the soul for God and of God for the human soul, and depicting this longing in symbol of Radha and Krishna, the immortal poet of the *Gitagovinda* has been a pathfinder for other poets to follow. His originality is to be measured by the success of his endeavour. In its lyrical purity, in the intensity of its emotion and drama, in mellifluousness of diction and in richness of imagery. *Gitagovinda* remains unsurpassed to the present day.

The *Gitagovinda* inspired not only the poets but painters as well. Sitting amidst the Himalayan ranges, far away from the place where Jayadeva sang his celestial songs, the painters in the valleys of Jammu and Kangra depicted with their brush what poet Jayadeva had done with such exquisite finesse in words in his lyrical compositions. Apart from the fact that they are an example of a very high order of painting, they present before us a very vivid picture of the Radha-Krishna love-drama and are undoubtedly a rich heritage of ours.

The contribution of the *Gitagovinda* towards the development of Indian drama—especially in Bengal—was also considerable. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee in his introduction to *Indian Drama* says: 'In Eastern India, for example, we come across a kind of drama with elementary dialogues of two or more actors accompanied by songs, which seems to have made its appearance first in Bengal and Northern Bihar (Mithila) and then to have spread all over Eastern India—Assam and Orissa as well as Nepal. This was a new type, the germs of which are perhaps to be seen in the *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva.'

By R. P. N. SINHA

## Sri Jayadeva: The Lyric Poet

“So long as Sanskrit language lives, Jayadeva’s name shall flourish. In the temple of Love, his name is written in Divine letters for all time. He was a great singer and poet ; but above all, a saint whose devotion for Sri Radhakrishna and whose renunciation shed indelible lustre on the canvas of time and spread a fragrance which even lures the Lord to play the Bhramar on the elegant bouquet offered by Sri Jayadeva in the form of the great song. “Gīta Gōvinda”, wrote Sri Bankey Behari in his book; “Minstrels of God” (Vol. I) giving a thumb-nail sketch of Sri Jayadeva, the greatest of Lyric poets in all Indian literature and indeed the last great name in Sanskrit poetry since the twelfth century. It may be very rightly said that Jayadeva was the founder of the BHAKTI movement which grew in strength and spread rapidly in the 15th and 16th centuries defying the aggressive sectarianism and intense bigotry of the preachers and followers of various religions and faiths.

It may be even said that this Bhakti movement opened a fresh field of melodic expression. And it was Jayadeva who first preached the message of faithfulness, devotion and surrender of the will to the Lord through his immortal classic “Gīta Gōvinda” and thus initiated a new, but pleasant approach to God which forms the quintessence of Gīta Gōvinda, lightly hailed as the “INDIAN SONG OF SONGS” by Sir Edwin Arnold who has translated it into English. It is at once a great poem, a gripping lyric drama and a heart entrancing Opera—all rolled into rapturous music. And like the ‘Song of songs’ in the old testament, it is a mystical allegory.

Bhakti or Devotion to God is something unique. It has never grown old and even in, the worst days of heresy, Bhakti survived as a cult. Particularly in Karnataka, Bhakti movement progressed very well through the preachings and practice of its devout

champions. Sri Harekrishna Mukhopadhyaya refers to this in his work on "Jayadeva and Gita Govinda" where he says "Uthpannā Draviḍe Bhaktiḥ Vriddhiḥ Karnāṭke gathā". There is a very fine and vivid description in Skanda Purana. There it is mentioned that a girl aged about sixteen is sitting by the side of two old men of seventy five years each who are about to breathe their last. Narada appears on the scene and asks the girl as to who she is and who the two old men are to which the girl replies that she is the mother and that the two old men are children. Narada is astonished and requests her to explain what she means. She tells him that she is Bhakti and the two old men represent Jñāna and Vairagya. Narada immediately understands the significance and retires from the scene thoughtfully...This is a very lucid illustration of the fact that Bhakti is eternal whereas Jñāna and Vairagya are ephemeral. It is this Bhakti that forms the gist of Vaishnavagīta which inspired Jayadeva to sing his luscious songs on Radha-Krishna. The impact of Vaishnavigītha could be easily and clearly seen in Tagore's "Gitanjali".

Jayadeva lived sometime in the eleventh century. He was born in Kinduvilva, a village in Bengal. His father was one Bhoja Deva and his mother's name was Rama Devi. Jayadeva was one of the poets of King Lakshmanasena, ruler of Bengal which fact is corroborated by an inscription on a stone pillar at the entrance hall of the king's court. The inscription gives the names of Umadatihara, Govardhana, Śarana, Dhoyi and Jayadeva as the five gems of poets who adorned his court. A detailed account of the life of Jayadeva is given in Cantos 30 to 41 of Chandradatta's 'Bhaktimala'. The existence of two more Jayadevas should not be mixed up with the author of Gita Govinda. One of them wrote that brilliant Sanskrit drama "Prasanna Raghava". His father's name has been given as Mahadeva and mother's as Sumitra. The other Jayadeva was the author of "Sringara Mādhaviya Champu". Nothing is known about his parents.

The names of Jayasree and Padmavati occur at three places in Gita Govinda. The important part played by Padmavati who was also called as Jayasree, in the life of Jayadeva deserves to be mentioned here. It is no exaggeration to say that any account covering the life and work of Jayadeva would be incomplete if

it fails to mention the name of Padmavati and her important contribution. Her marriage with Jayadeva makes interesting reading. One Devasarma, a resident of Kinduvilva, was blessed with a daughter as if in answer to his prayer to God. Devasarma had offered to give his child to god in case he was blessed with one. He did keep his word. He took his daughter Padmavati to the temple, left her in the Sanctum Sanctorum and returned home. In the night he had a vision of God who commanded him to give Padmavati in marriage to His ardent devotee, Jayadeva. Accordingly, Devasarma took Padmavati to Jayadeva's abode and requested him to marry her. Jayadeva was hesitant whereupon Devasarma returned home leaving Padmavati behind. Later Jayadeva took Padmavati to Devasarma and married her according to Hindu rites.

Padmavati was known for captivating beauty and sterling qualities. One Gopala Pandit who wrote a commentary called 'DEEPIKA' on Jayadeva's Gita Govinda in the 16th century, describes Padmavati in the following stanza :—

*"Padmāyatyatisundar matura jātyādhikā Padmini  
gāndharvoditagitavādyakishalā vignāna pārangama  
sringāraikaparāyanā rasakatā bhāvaika nishthāsati  
sādhvyāchārapatīvrātātiyimalā pntyrmanoharini."*

Jayadeva himself pays a tribute to her in his opening poem in Gita Govinda where he calls himself as "*Padmavati charaṇa chāraṇa chakrayarti*" and again in Canto 11, Prabhandha 21, describes his poetic circle as

*"Vihita Padmavati sukha samājē  
kuru Murāre, maṅgalasatāni  
bhanati Jayadeva Kavirājarāje."*

Of course, Kumbha Rana of Mewar who wrote his famous 'RASIKAPRIYA' commentary on Gitagovinda gives a different interpretation. He refers to Padmavati as Lakshmi (Padmam kare yasyāha sa Padmavati) and mentions Jayadeva as an expert in making obeisance to Her feet. Sankaramisra, the author of that celebrated commentary, 'RASAMANJARI,' explains the unique compositions of Jayadeva delightfully who in turn also became an expert dancer.

*“Padmāyati nāma Jayadevapatni tasyascharanayoh  
yascharanam sanchāranam nartanamitiyāvatena  
Chakrayarti Natasāryabhauma”—ityarthaḥ.*

Pujari Goswami who wrote the commentary ‘BALABODHINI’ explains that Padmavati was none other than Radha and Jayadeva as Krishna revelled in dancing with her. Of all these, the explanation given by Sankaramisra seems to be plausible. Even Kumbharana who avers that good men do not even mention the names of their wives, holds that the case of great men is a exception to this rule. He supports his opinion by quoting instances such as Lord Krishna dancing before Satyabhama and Lord Siva, yogiraja as he is called, showing Parvati as a part of his own body and concludes that there is nothing wrong with Jayadeva, who in a fit of ecstasy, starts dancing along with Padmavati.

Padmavati’s highest and noblest virtue was her unfailing loyalty and devotion to Jayadeva. This was put to a severe test by King Lakshmanasena, Jayadeva’s patron and friend, who sent false news to Padmavati that Jayadeva was dead as a result of some accident. Padmavati dropped down dead on hearing the shocking news. The king and Jayadeva arrived at the place. On seeing the heartrending calamity, the king was seized with remorse and repentence. Jayadeva consoled him and sang.

“Vadasiyadi kinchidapi dantaruchi kaumudi haratidara timiramatiphoram” which brought back Padmavati to life.

Two incidents touching the greatness of Jayadeva and Gita Govinda may be cited here. Once when a gardner’s daughter was singing.

*“Ratisukhasāre gatamabhisāre madhanamanohars yesham  
nakurunitambini gamanavilambanamanusaratam hridayesam  
dhirasamīre yamunātīre vasati yane vanamali  
gopipīnapayodharamardana chanchalākārayushālee.”*

and plucking vegetables in the garden, the sweet and enchanting melody of the lines made Lord Jagannath (Of Puri) leave the temple and follow the gardner’s daughter into the garden. Only

when the song was completed did He return to the temple, His fine pītambaram having been torn during His ecstatic march through the field of thorns. Since then at the instruction of the Lord given to the Raja of Puri in his dream, even to this day this song is sung in the night before the Lord retires to bed.

The other incident relates to the line which the Lord Himself is said to have composed as Jayadeva was writing the line “*Vadasiyadi kinchidapi*”, he wrote “*Smaragarala khaṇḍanan mama sirasi maṇḍana*” and stopped at that as he thought that the lotus feet of Radha rested on the head of the Lord. He left it at that and went to river Ganga to take his oil bath. During his absence, the Lord appeared in the guise of Jayadeva with the oil dripping from His head, took the manuscript from Padmavati wrote “*Dehi pada pallayamudaram*” and disappeared. On returning from the river, Jayadeva sat down to complete the verse from where he had left off. But to his surprise he found that it had been completed in exactly the same manner he wanted. Also he noticed one or two drops of oil on the manuscript. Not being able to contain his curiosity, he asked Padmavati as to what had happened during his absence. Padmavati told him everything. Jayadeva’s joy knew no bounds and told her that she was more fortunate than himself for having been blessed with the darshan of the Lord.

Jayadeva’s Gita Govinda is full of eroticism. It could not be otherwise as it portrays the cream and the most secret rasa of Sri Radhakrishna’s love and sings of the Ras Lila and the Divine acts before and after the dalliance scene. This eroticism is intended for the noblest of the Souls who are spiritualists par excellence and to whom there is no such thing as body consciousness. With a view to prevent its being dragged into the mire and misused by the common worldly minded sensual beings, Jayadeva administers a warning at the beginning itself through the following lines :

“*Yadi Harismarāṇe sarasam manoyadi vilāsa kalāsu  
kutūhalam  
madhura kōmala kānta padāvalīm śrunu tadā Jayadeva  
Saraswatīm*”

which means "If your heart is steeped in contemplation and softened by the remembrance of Hari and you are possessed by the insatiable desire to hear of His supreme and transcendental deeds and of the pure Rasa Lila which He enjoyed with His devotees the Vrajavanithas as the Gopis of Vraja are called—then with faith and purity of body, mind and heart, hear this poem of Jayadeva."

The spiritual appeal and the efficacy of the Divine song, Gita Govinda written in twelve cantos are indeed great. That Lord Krishna Himself appears whenever and wherever it is sung is a positive proof of the Lyrical excellence of this magnificent work. Professor Berridale Keith wrote that "Jayadeva's work is a masterpiece and it surpasses in its completeness of effect, any other Indian poem, It has all the perfection of the miniature word-pictures which are so common in Sanskrit poetry with the beauty which arises from magnitude and arrangement". Chaitanya cherished Gita Govinda as the very breath of his life and would not pass a day without hearing its recital. Though the theme is drawn from the Bhagavata and Garga Samhita, the stamp, the two great works on Vaishnavism, the stamp of personal experience has given an individuality of its own and made it an immortal classic. The spiritual life of Jayadeva would be incomplete if he has not drunk deep the nectarean drops from out of the perennial spring of Divine Love, the Gita Govinda. The medium of expression through which he depicts the DIVINE LOVE has made Gita Govinda "*Sringara swarupa*" whereas the DIVINE SONG or the BHAGAVADGEETA is "*Vedanta swarupa*". Eminent scholars have written elaborate commentaries in Sanskrit discussing the various stage of Love through which the devotee has to pass in his pursuit of the path and to whom the love of Radhakrishna presents itself as the BEAU IDEAL.

To Jayadeva belongs the credit of being the earliest composer of the Indian Opera, though it was during Narayana Tirtha's period that the Opera reached the highest watermark of perfection. Gita Govinda is a magnificent Opera. Its popularity extends to over eight centuries. The songs are unique for the rich flavour and sweetness which capture the imagination of



rasikas and devotees alike. In addition to initiating the Bhakti ideal, Jayadeva's Gita Govinda has for its special feature the very happy and choice assemblage of words to suit the RAGA MADHURYA which is significant. He has assigned to each song its definite raga and tala, though unfortunately, the precise notation has not been given or preserved. The songs are not sung in their original ragas so much so the originals are lost to us. Even Kumbharana gives only the notes which he says were adopted in his time (about 1433-1468 A.D.). In the North, the songs are sung in different tunes at different places whereas in South India they have come to be known as "ASHTAPADIS". This may be largely due to the popularity given them by the South Indian pilgrims, musicians and devotees who might have sung them in pure Carnatic ragas. However, it is said that the songs of Gita Govinda were set to South Indian music by one Ramudu Bhagavata of Tirumalarajapatnam, a musician whose patron was the pontiff of Kamakotipeetam.

It is possible that some echoes of the original melodies of Jayadeva may still be preserved in the Hindustani DRUPADS (heroic ballads), KHYALS, GHAZALS and REKATAHS (love songs of Moghul derivation) DADRAS and MUKTAS (serenades of Hindu origin), the TAPPAH (hummed by the camel drivers of Rajasthan and Punjab), the TARANA (song without words), (and the SOHLA the marriage strain), the STUTI (eulogistic chants) and ZIKRI (hymns of morality). It is well worth an exhaustive professional study for the benefit of posterity.

By RAJASREE

## Jayadeva: His life

Jayadeva was the son of Narayana Sastriar, a very pious Brahmin. His mother's name was Kamalabai. She was also pious and devoted. Though Narayana Sastriar had no desire for wealth, property and children, his wife had a secret desire for a son. She did not reveal this to her husband. She constantly prayed to the Lord that she might be blessed with a beautiful and virtuous male child. She was ashamed to be regarded by the world as a barren woman.

One night Narayana Sastriar dreamt that the Lord appeared and told him that his wife's prayer would be fulfilled and that he would soon have an illustrious son. Sastriar woke up and reported to his wife his happy dream. He asked her if she made any prayer to God for the boon of a child. She admitted that she did pray. Narayana Sastriar felt extremely grieved that all their *Tapas* and devotion became useless on account of their selfish motive. He became angry with his wife and said, "Foolish woman, you ought not to have prayed for a son. You ought to have prayed for the eternal bliss of the Atman. You have ruined yourself and me also." He did not speak to his wife from that moment. She appealed to her husband for pardon but to no purpose. They both fasted even for a day or two.

A holy pious Brahmin entered their house and enquired into the cause of their grief and reconciled them both. He said that it was the will of the Lord that they should be blessed with a virtuous son and that the child would become a great and reputed saint. Narayana Sastriar felt that the Lord himself appeared in the form of the Brahmin.

A few months after a male child was born to Kamalabai. That was Jayadeva.

Jayadeva was highly devoted to God even in his boyhood. He studied all the sacred scriptures. He had an orthodox type of education.

After some years Narayana Sastriar entered the forest along with his wife to lead the life of Vanaprastha.

There was one Brahmin in Jagannath Puri by name Deva Sharma. He was a great Bhakta of Lord Jagannath; but for many years he had no child. One day he prayed to Lord, "O Lord! If I beget children through Thy grace, I shall surely dedicate the first among them to Thee. This is my sincere, heart-felt prayer. O Dear Lord! Kindly grant my wish." So praying he returned to his house.

Then in due course of time, a daughter was born to the devout Brahmin Deva Sharma and afterwards many good and brilliant sons. Taking the daughter with him, one day he came to Lord Jagannath with his wife by his side and said, "O Lord! By Thy grace my desire has been fulfilled. According to my promise I dedicate this first child Padmavati to Thee. Kindly accept her." Then he narrated all the previous story to the 'Pujakas' (worshippers) and went back to his house. That night, the Lord appeared in his dream and told Deva Sharma, "Deva Sharma, I am highly pleased with you. I have accepted your child. But give your daughter to Sri Jayadeva, because he is my dear devotee." The same dream, the worshippers also had.

Jayadeva was then living outside the village boundary in a leafy-hut. He was meditating upon Lord Jagannath and his face showed clearly that he was extremely happy in spite of his material poverty. Deva Sharma came to Jayadeva and prostrating himself before him said, "By the command of Lord Jagannath I have brought my daughter Padmavati to you. Kindly accept her." Jayadeva denied saying that he was very poor and he was not a fit person to accept her. Despite all effort Jayadeva did not accept the girl. Deva Sharma brought the worshipper of the temple to verify his statement. Then making the girl stand nearby, Deva Sharma said, "O my dear daughter, from to-day he is your husband. You have to worship him daily. A woman merged in the service of her husband attains undying happiness." Thus saying he returned to his house.

The girl stood for a long time near Jayadeva. Jayadeva said to the girl, "Your parents have gone away leaving you here. How are you going to live in this dreadful forest?" Padmavati replied,

"O my Lord ! What are you saying ? My father has given me to you now. I am not alone here, because you are always with me." Hearing these words of Padmavati, Jayadeva thought, "She is speaking the truth. Surely it will be a sin to abandon her. Hence I shall have to go to her parents' house and marry her duly performing ritualistic ceremonies." Thus resolving, Jayadeva asked Padmavati to follow him to her parent's house for marriage according to Brahmanical rites. Padmavati said, "My father has ordered me to obey your commands implicitly. Therefore this is a great blessing to me to act as per your wish." So saying she was ready by his side. Thereupon Jayadeva married Padmavati. They led an ideal life. He fed the poor and gave presents to Brahmins. He would never eat without at least one guest. Despite their poverty they lived very happily. Even though they were very poor, their hearts were filled with pure love and devotion. They were respected by all.

Jayadeva wrote his grand immortal poem *Gita Govinda* which celebrates the glorious divine love of Radha and Krishna. All the people of the little village Bilvagam recited the Ashtakas. The poems were sung before the Lord Jagannath during the annual festival. People were struck with their splendid music and poetry and praised them highly. The fame of Jayadeva reached far and wide.

When Jaya Deva was composing *Gita Govinda* he could not find a suitable word in the middle of his composition. He kept the manuscripts in the room and went for a bath. Lord Krishna himself took up the form of Jayadeva and asked Padmavati, "My dear, give me those manuscripts." Padmavati gave the Lord the manuscripts. She took the Lord for her husband. Lord Krishna wrote the couplet in his own handwriting. Again he went hurriedly for his bath in the river.

After a short while Jayadeva came to his house after his bath. He took up the manuscripts to jot down the poem which he composed. To his great amazement he found the couplet there written by somebody. He said to his wife, "O Padmavati ! Who has written this poem ? It is exceedingly beautiful. I could not write like this." Padmavati said, "You yourself came suddenly, wrote the poem and at once returned for bath." Jayadeva was



66590

struck with awe and wonder. Lord Jagannath appeared in his dream and said, "O Jayadeva, I myself wrote the couplet." Jayadeva woke up and rejoiced heartily. When the king of the country heard the glory and fame of *Gita Govinda*, he became jealous of Jayadeva. As he was a poet himself, he too wrote another *Gita Govinda*,

Once the king came to the temple of Jagannatha. Jayadeva was then dancing and singing his own *Gita Govinda*. The king said, "Why do you not sing my *Gita Govinda*?" Jayadeva said, "The Lord is not so much pleased with your work as he is with my *Gita Govinda*. Let us test this now."

The king ordered both his work and Jayadeva's work to be placed before the Lord. The king prayed to the Lord, "Please keep that which is better and dearer to you on the top." All came outside and bolted the door. After a short time all came in side. The king opened the door first. He saw Jayadeva's book kept over his own book. The king was very much afflicted at heart. He gave up food and water. He had a dream. The Lord of Jagannath appeared in the dream and said, "Why do you grieve unnecessarily? There is no scripture dearer to me than the '*Gita Govinda*'. I am pleased with your composition also. But accept Jayadeva's *Gita Govinda* as superior to your book. Propagate Jayadeva's *Gita Govinda* all over the land." The king woke up and regained strength. He became a great devotee of Jayadeva. He himself studied by heart Jayadeva's *Gita Govinda*. He propagated the work of Jayadeva all throughout the land.

One woman was singing beautifully the *Geeta Govind* in the forests when she was collecting fruits for sale. Lord Jagannath was very much pleased with her singing. He began to wander in the forest to hear her recitation. The Lord's garment was torn to pieces while He was running all over the forest as it was caught in the thorny bushes of the forest. In the early morning the priest of the temple and the king saw the *Pitambara* of the Lord all in rags. They were not able to find out the reason for the torn condition of the cloth. They prayed to the Lord to make them know the reason. The Lord appeared in their dreams and said, "One woman was singing *Gita Govinda* in a

forest. I ran in the forest to hear her song. When I ran the Pitambara was torn to pieces by the thorns."

The king and the priest praised both Jayadeva and the woman who was selling fruits. The king brought the woman to his state and gave her immense wealth. She sang daily the *Gita Goyinda* in the presence of the king.

The Lord becomes a slave of His devotees. He will do anything for the sake of His devotees.

Once Jaya Deva's father-in-law came to see him and stayed with him for some days. He took Padmavati for a short stay with her mother. A rich merchant named Bhagawan Das a native of neighbouring village came to Bilvagam and requested Jayadeva to come to his house as a guest. Jayadeva consented and accompanied the merchant. He stayed in the house of the merchant for some days. The merchant sent Jayadeva to Bilvagam in his own carriage loaded with many rich presents. There was a small forest between the two villages. A band of robbers came and attacked Jayadeva. Jayadeva gave them all the things. But the robbers suspected from the readiness with which he gave away all the things that he might report to the police and get them punished. Therefore they cut off his hands and feet and threw him into a waterless well. Jayadeva bore all sufferings patiently. He prayed to the Lord that the robbers may be pardoned. He gave himself up to the care of God. He was fully conscious that God did everything for his good. He never made any complaint to God. He thought that a very great sin had been purged out. He had perfect belief that what happened was not an act of the robbers but the bidding of God Himself for his own good. This is the Bhava or mental attitude of all real devotees. They always welcome suffering, trial and adversity.

The King of that province who had been out for hunting came to the same well where Jayadeva was lying helpless, to see if there was water in it to quench his thirst. He did not find any water in the well, but he saw a mangled human body. At once he ordered his servants to lift up the body. As soon as the king came to know that the man was Jayadeva of great reputation, he requested to accept him as his disciple. The king adored

Jayadeva as his Guru. Jayadeva was installed as the chief Guru of the state and was carried in a palanquin for a grand procession in the town with music, etc.

The saintly nature of Jayadeva, his piety, wide knowledge and spiritual attainments, his resignation to the will of God—all these made a very deep impression on the mind of the king. One day the king approached the Guru and wanted to be initiated into Sanyasa.

Jayadeva said, "O king! Sanyasa is not external renunciation. Real renunciation is of the mind. Renunciation of desires and egoism constitutes real renunciation. Be a king outwardly but internally be a mental Sanyasin."

When Padmavati heard the news that her husband was in the palace of the king, she went there and was much afflicted at her heart when she looked at the mangled form of her husband. She prayed to the Lord, "Will not the Lord Jagannath, the All-merciful restore to my husband his hands and feet". The Lord granted her prayer. Jayadeva regained his hands and feet by the touch of his wife Padmavati. They lived together happily under the patronage of the king. The king regarded Padmavati as Goddess Lakshmi. He ordered it to be proclaimed in his country and its neighbourhood that devotees of all creeds would be sumptuously entertained and given rich presents.

The robbers who offended Jayadeva heard of the king's hospitality and charity, dressed themselves as pious men and appeared before Jayadeva. They saw Jayadeva and recognised him. Jayadeva also knew who they were. Fearing punishment they stealthily left the palace. Jayadeva sent men to pursue them and bring them back. The royal servants brought them back. Jayadeva bowed to them and directed the king to prostrate himself at the feet of robbers, garland them and treat them with great respect. They were removed to a palatial residence and entertained as if they were members of the royal family. The robbers were not happy. They were every moment expecting a sentence for execution. Therefore one day they informed that they wanted to return to their native place. Jayadeva told the king in a great joy and in an unblemished manner "On the way there is a great forest. To help these poor

scholars, please send some of your soldiers. There are great robbers in the forest." The king presented them nice, good garments and immense wealth and sent five soldiers to accompany the robbers. All of them sat near a tree on the way for taking rest. The soldiers said to the robbers (who were in disguise as scholars), after a long talk on some point, "Please, tell us who you are? In what way you are connected with Jayadeva? See, how he helped you! He asked the king himself to give you enough comforts."

The robbers smiled and told the soldiers, "Yes, now hear the reason for all this. We were sitting somewhere near the residence of the king of Karnata for the sake of Bhiksha. There came this poet Jayadeva searching for wealth. There this greedy contemptible poet stole some money from one man's house. That rich man brought this poet to the court of the king. 'O king, this person is not a real poet. He is a thief. He lives by theft only. Now he has stolen wealth from my house. I have got him tied by my servants and now brought him to your Highness.' The king ordered one of his servants to take him out of the country and kill him. The servant dragged this poet and took him far out of the vicinity of the country. There we saw this poet and requested the king's servant to cut off his hands and feet instead of putting him to death. Thus advised, the servant cut off the poet's feet and hands and showed to the king. This is the story, O soldiers! Therefore this Brahmin is worshipping us, because we saved him from the king's command."

When the robbers were speaking thus, there was a terrible sound up above the sky. There was a tremendous thunder and it fell horribly on the heads of those robbers and they perished at once. The servants lost their consciousness and stood like stones for sometime, but regained consciousness after a while; wondered at the dreadful scene, and returned to the palace. The king was in Jayadeva's room, the soldiers went there with the wealth given to the robbers and narrated the entire story relating to Jayadeva as said by the robbers and the scene which they witnessed after it.

Hearing this Jayadeva, the kind-hearted poet cried, "Ha, ha!" He sobbed very much, striking his crippled portions to



the ground in great distress. At once the hands and feet of Jayadeva became alright, Jayadeva had his normal limbs as before (This is another version). All were wonderstruck to witness this surprising event! Hearing the death of those barbarous people, Jayadeva felt very much at heart. The king questioned Jayadeva as to what the real matter was? He again prostrated himself to Jayadeva and beseeched him to tell him the secret underlying all these incidents. Then Jayadeva related to the king all that had happened from the beginning to the end of his connection with the robbers. The king was very much pleased on knowing this marvellous story. The king praised Jayadeva and said, "O Jayadeva! You are the only really fortunate man in this world. At least I have seen and heard in this world of a wonderful man who treats his friends and enemies alike."

Jayadeva took a vow that he would take bath in the Ganges till the end of his life. He became old. One day he fell down in an unconscious state while returning from the Ganges after his bath. After sometime he regained consciousness. The king offered a palanquin to Jayadeva, Jayadeva totally declined to accept it. Next day the Ganges herself appeared in the well in the house of Jayadeva, with lotuses on account of the force of *Tapascharya* and devotion of Jayadeva.

Such was the glorious life of Jayadeva, the greatest devotee of Lord Krishna, who was humble, simple and unostentatious, who always found joy and happiness in meditation on Lord Krishna, who was perfect and who was an embodiment of forgiveness. He understood the secret of renunciation. He knew that renunciation was mental with all senses completely restrained. His life is an example to show to the world that God-realisation can be had in any state of one's own life.

By SWAMI SHIVANANDA

## Jayadeva : The Poet and Mystic

Contemporary opinion seems to be in favour of the view that the Gītagovinda as a work of art has a significance not very consistent with what is clearly its religious appeal. Apparently viewed the work, though recognised as a master-piece of Sanskrit literature, jars on modern taste by its vehement eroticism,—however much one would transmute it into the love divine. But as a matter of fact, if we are not forgetful of our traditions, the work which ravished the heart of Śrī Gaurāṅgādeva, the purest of mortals,—the work which has poured and is still pouring the balm of Gilead on the lacerated hearts of pious souls cannot be simply brushed aside by such an exoteric standard. Indeed like the famous Song of Songs of Solomon, which, as reconstructed in the form of a drama by Monsieur Renan, is almost unsurpassed in the whole range of mystical literature in the West, the Gītagovinda has a unique standard of its own as being the maturest product of one who combined in his wonderful genius the truest poet and the supreme mystic. It will be our endeavour in this paper to deal with the Gītagovinda not only as a work of art, but as a representative work of mysticism, and to point out in this connection the relation between art and religion. We shall also try to bring out a justification of the fact so apparent in all mystical writings, *viz.*, the vehemence of sensuous appeal, and lastly we shall point out the differences from such standard Vaiṣṇava literature as the Bhāgavata and the Harivaṃśa, which Jayadeva has introduced in order to emphasize the mystical note.

Now to do at least a partial justice to the claims of the Gītagovinda as a work of art, we must dive down into the first principles to consider for ourselves what it is that we mean by art and, incidentally, a work of art. In this we shall try the path indicated by one of the greatest of modern philosophers, Benedetto Croce, in his remarkable work, "The History of Aesthetics."

After distinguishing between intuitive and logical knowledge, Croce characterises the former as being that which is obtained through imagination, of individual things (and not of their relations) and finally as being productive of images. So that the distinction between reality and non-reality is extraneous, secondary to the true nature of intuition, where all is real, nothing is real. Again, intuitive knowledge is expressive knowledge. To intuit is to express; and nothing else (nothing more but nothing less) than to express.

The true critical attitude with regard to a work of art is to ask if it be expressive and what it expresses, whether it speaks or stammers or is altogether silent and not to ask if it obey the law of an epic or a tragedy, of historical painting or landscape. For in aesthetic analysis it is impossible to separate subjective from objective, lyric from epic and the image of feeling from that of things.

The true artist, in fact, finds himself big with his theme, he knows not how; he feels the moment of birth drawing near, but he cannot will it or not will it. Thus, while making a verbal pretence of agreeing or yielding a feigned obedience, artists have, however, really always disregarded the so-called laws of artistic and literary kinds. Every true work of art has violated some established kind and upset the ideas of the critics, who have thus been obliged to broaden kinds, until finally even the broadened kind has proved too narrow owing to the appearance of new works of art. Every true work of art is a standard by itself.

Art, then, is independent both of science and of the useful or the moral. There should be no fear lest frivolous or cold art should thus be justified, since what is truly frivolous or cold is so because it has not been raised to expression, or in other words, frivolity and frigidity come always from the form of the aesthetic treatment, from failure to grasp a content, not from the material qualities of the content itself.

But this attitude should not be misunderstood. It is not scientifically incorrect to talk of tragedies, comedies, dramas, romances, pictures of everyday life, battle-pieces, landscapes, poems, versicles, lyrics and the like, and to draw attention to

certain groups of works in general and approximately to which, for one reason or another, it is desired to draw attention. But here from aesthetes that we were, we have changed into logicians; from contemplators of expression into reasoners.

Lastly, it follows as a corollary to what we have said above that all translations are impossible in so far as they pretend to effect the remoulding of one expression into another. And one great characteristic of a true work of art is the fact of its being non-translatable.

Now religion or dharma as we better understand it, dharma—the substance, the self-ness of things and of men,—is the inherent or intuitive expression of practical aspirations and ideals. It is not something that is forced upon us from the outside, neither a sort of acquired habit; but it is something that is immanent in our constitution as human beings; we cannot have it or not have it, according to our sweet will. Every man as such is more or less religious-minded. It is this religious-mindedness that guides us in our conduct and circumstances and largely accounts for the difference in conduct in men even under the same circumstances. One man in affluent circumstances gives away everything for the mitigation of human suffering; another, under as much affluence becomes the more stingy to get his bank-amounts doubled and trebled. This religious sense is never extinct; and it must not be confused with the so-called morality. But if we take morality to be fundamentally the expression of humanity as a whole through the individual, it merges into dharma as we have conceived it. Every true poet and artist possesses either consciously or unconsciously this religious sense in a high degree. The birth-pangs of creation that they feel cannot but arouse in them the highest religious feeling like the pain of child-birth of the mother.

Especially so was the case with the poets and artists of India, and medieval Europe. As sister Nivedita in her searchingly synthetic essay very beautifully puts it: "There was a mood when we held in our hands an old book, an old picture, an old jewel, or even things as a padlock, a piece of brass-work, or a fragment of embroidery. It was a mood of leisure and simplicity to which the work in hand at the moment was the whole

aim of life. The craftsman was concentrated upon his labour. The whole of Dharma lay in the beauty he was bringing forth. His craft was for the moment or for that moment in the existence of humanity that we call a man's life—his religion." It is of this religion as a feeling and not merely as knowledge that we shall speak.

This religiousness is purely individualistic. And if it starts from the Divine nature, rather than from man and his surroundings, if it does not develop in an ethical reference, it transcends into mysticism, where the dominant note as St. Augustine sounds it, is—"I believe, therefore do I speak. Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation. Speak it out that I may hear thee. Behold, the ears of my heart are before thee. O Lord, open them and say unto my soul, I am thy Salvation. O Lord, to whom being and living are not several things, because both to be and to live in the highest degree is of thy very essence. Whatsoever I speak, or write, or read, or number, let all serve thee, O God, Thou Light of my soul, Thou Bread of the eternal mouth of my soul, and Thou Firmest Knot, marrying my soul and the bosom of my thoughts together." Mysticism thus maintains the possibility of direct intercourse with this Being of Beings—intercourse by a species of ecstatic transfusion or identification, in which the individual becomes in very truth "partaker of the divine nature." God ceases to be an object to him and becomes experience; and what may be called the symbolism of religious feeling remains not simply a speculation but comes to be literally or metaphysically true as an endeavour after the realization of an ineffable union. And "it is a marked characteristic," as Evelyn Underhill in their effort to convey to us the nature of this communion with the Super-Sensuous are inevitable drawn to employ some form of sensuous imagery; .....and their fearless employment of homely and physical symbols—often startling and even revolting to the unaccustomed taste—is in direct proportion to the exaltation of their spiritual life." With the mystics the mind is as it were the sixth sense (*sarvēndriya guṇābhāsam sarvēndriya vīvarjitam*)—as we have it) and they alone can speak of hearing with the eye, seeing with the ear and so on, which will sound to us extremely absurd and paradoxical. But does not our talk of

light and colour sound as absurd to a man born-blind? "Between Nature and ourselves—more, between ourselves and our consciousness—hangs a veil, a veil dense and opaque for normal men, but then almost transparent, for the artist, the poet and the mystic."

To those who still have the incongruity between art and religion lurking in their minds the following words of a recent writer, Mr. W. G. Raffe may commend themselves: "Every human need is ended by the satisfaction of union with the object desired. Religion is the process of the attainment of the final satisfaction and religious teaching in every land is the story of the attainment of union. Consequently the symbols of art, which is inspired from the same supernal force, have union as their main subject. All art is the teaching of religion, and the very form of religion itself is created as a work of art by a supreme artist. Each body of teaching is made for its own time and place, addressed to its own people, but all taken from the same origin. But each in its own way stresses the act of union and each uses as symbols the facts of the lower world, and even lower models of union, as types of the higher."

This general and somewhat abstract outline is drawn, as is apparent, with an eye to the subject in hand, *viz.*, the *Gītagovinda* is the only work, as far we know, by Jayadeva. It is a whole lifetime's fruition under the mid-dewed touch of religion; an ardent mind has burst forth into songs, a mind that has always lost itself in identification with its lover even as *Rādhā* is described as having been. Nothing tells so strongly clearly in a piece of work as its motive. And what, one wonders, is the motive of the *Gītagovinda*, so diligent a piece of work? Its motive is to reveal the joy of self-expression of the mystic, and in every rippling dance of the music of his songs we feel the heart-beats of the poet within our heart of hearts and every page of the work is like a petal of his heart unfolded. This song-offering has been his only life-long worship to his lover, the Eternal Flute-player. The work has been his life of life, his religion and it has the supreme honour of creating or at least foreshadowing a religion that was to have its day some centuries later.

It now only remains to fill in this outline. The first thing, as

we have stated above, would be to ask what the Gitagovinda tries to express and that with what success. This can be done in no better way than by taking a synopsis of the whole work, by going through every canto of the work, in an appreciative and critical manner. But this is much more than what our space will permit and we shall have to rest content with only a rapid and helpful analysis.

In the first place, there is the *Mēghaibhēṇṭura* śloka over the significance of which a great deal of controversial breath has been expended. But obviously with the reading of the stanza over again after we have finished the work once, we have our first vague idea confirmed that it expresses and embodies within itself the meaning of the whole book. Kṛṣṇa asks Rādhā to get for him a shelter and what more fitting shelter can Rādhā give than her own heart when their perfect union is effected in the twelfth canto; it is thus that a man finds himself bound within the life of a householder in the love of his own beloved.<sup>1</sup> The stanza has thus a twofold significance. It gives the meaning of the whole work in a nutshell as well as introduces us into the religious atmosphere of the poem. Then follows in three stanzas an account of the poet himself as also of his contemporaries and the class of readers for whom the work is meant. Now the line *Yadi Harisamaruṇē Sarasamanī Yadi vilāsa kalāśu Kutūhalam* with its apparently contradictory tone at once reveals the mystic, who like Kabir, does not see with approval prescriptions of dry mortifications for spiritual uplift and well-being, and who, conscious of the divinity of all things, delights in arts as a means of service at the feet of his God and Beloved. Then comes very appropriately the first song singing the glory of God, as Bhagavan with superhuman faculties and not as the supreme soul, running closely paralled in thought with the verse of the Gītā. But after an intervention of one śloka we come to the second song which in general harps on the deeds of the Kṛṣṇa-incarnation alone—and we may add, of the Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa as distinguished from the Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, in which the main note is that he comes not only for the deliverance of mankind but also to realise himself infinitely through his activities. As Dr. S. N. Das Gupta puts it: "The episodes of

Kṛṣṇa's life are often conceived to happen on a non-physical plane, where both Kṛṣṇa and his partners are thought to play their parts of love and friendship in non-physical bodies. Thus, they are not regarded as particular events that took place at specific points of time in the life of a particular man, Kṛṣṇa. They are interpreted as the eternal, timeless, spaceless play of God with His own associates and his energies, with whom He eternally realises Himself in love and friendship."

The mystico-philosophical significance that the above excerpt sees into the Kṛṣṇa episodes has been in another way stated in the Gopala-tapanī Upanishad, which may be conveniently taken notice of at this place. The Gopāla-tāpanī is a curious mixture of Upaniṣadic thought with Tāntric rituals and observances. Be this as it may, it adopts the Upanishadic view that Gopala Kṛṣṇa is nothing but the Paramātmā (Supreme soul) and Gopis his Māyāśakti (the manifestations of power) that through nāma and Rupa conceals from the Jīvātman (the individual Soul) his true identity which consists in the realisation of tatvamasi (Thou art That). The play of Kṛṣṇa with Rādhā, the chief of the Gopi is the eternal play of māyōpahitābrahma or better Eswara in his desire for self-realisation and the ever-flowing cosmos dances in the music of eternal Om—music that finds its echo in the devout heart of the *bhakta*, whose mind is the holy Vrindāvan and whose ecstatic tears the flow of the sacred Kālindi. This may be true so far as it goes, but it smacks too much of abstract philosophy to be in the spirit of a mystic with a keen and profound poetic temperament. As a poet-mystic Jayadeva had no contempt for the physical, which he has taken as the vehicle of his mystic communication. For his mystic vision all aspects of the world possessed equal authority and really the first love of a maiden for a youth is the intensest and purest kind of love that the earth has to offer. And his soul as a maiden felt the same yearning for Kṛṣṇa, the most Divine Youth, which his Rādhā has exhibited. Again, he as a *bhakta* has every claim to the love of Kṛṣṇa, who himself is shown to pine for the love of Rādhā, that is to say, for the love of the *bhakta*, the most triumphant utterance in this connection being what is placed in the mouth of Kṛṣṇa — *Smaragralaghaṇḍanānī Sirasi maṇḍanamdēhi pada-*



*Pallavamudaram*. What soul in the highest devotional mood has not been weary of the delay of His approach, in a fit of divine jealousy thinking Him to be tarrying with others more fortunate than himself! This conception very easily explains how it was possible for Kṛṣṇa to be dallying with so many maidens at the same moment, and as such he remains the lover of every soul that yearns. The *Apākatanāyakatya* explanation will not do, for the sloka of the *Bhagavad gita Yada Yadācarati Srēṣṭastatīa-devētarō janaḥ Sa yat Pramāṇam Kurute lokastadanuṣartate* stands as a real and formidable barrier. Nor the philosophical explanation based on the Upaniṣadic text, meaning that the *paramātmā* stands as a mere spectator without feeling anything the worse for any kind of enjoyment, for nothing can touch it, while it is the individual soul, the *Jīvātma*, that reaps the fruits of its own enjoyments. This really takes its stand on absolute monism, for the *Paramātmā* being *Ekabhavāhītōyam* holding the whole universe within its bosom, whom will it enjoy or seek. But the mystic conception of God is essentially dualistic, if not pantheistic. *Bhakta* is as much necessary for *Bhagavān* as the latter is necessary for the former.

It is very significant that Jayadeva omits from his poem the episode of *Veṇuṣādana* or blowing the lute prior to the *Rasalīla* scene, nor is there the suggestion of the *gopī*'s having left their husbands and relations and other household duties of the time, drawn away by its music; although there is always the mention of singing the lute as associated with Kṛṣṇa. The episode of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata* is omitted and omitted on purpose. Jayadeva seems not to be a supporter of the cult of *Parakīyārati* which was held up as the highest type of love in later Vaiṣṇavism, as evinced, for example, in many places of *Chaitanya Charitamrutā*. Jayadeva did not concern himself with this episode, because Jayadeva took the whole Kṛṣṇa legend in his own way, which wears altogether a different outlook. His own treatment bears this out, as will be shown presently. What we mean by our mystical interpretation may be clear if we remember the very deep-toned, familiar song of Rabindranath *Mēye pāse* and many others. But we must not forget that in spite of their almost similar mystical outlook there is a vital distinction

between Rabindranath and Jayadeva as Rabindranath, like his favourite Kāvīr, escapes the excessive emotionalism, the tendency to an exclusively anthropomorphic devotion, which results from an unrestricted cult of divine personality, especially under an incarnational form, while Jayadeva accepts such an incarnational form, and goes frequently to emotional raptures, more particularly in his songs and it is this anthropomorphic devotion that accounts for the portrayal of the character of Kṛṣṇa as we have it in his work.

But we were on our way to an analytical orientation of the poem and we have far strayed away from our path. After the *Yadi Harisamarāṇe śloka*, we have again a benedictory stanza which indicates that the main Rasa in this work is the Sambhōga Sringāra. Now this second song more than the first supplies us with the other incidents of Kṛṣṇa's life, incidents which place him in the light of Satya and Śiva ; and it prepares us for his Ananda and Sundara side and points out unmistakably the fact that Kṛṣṇa to be depicted here, will be on a line with the words of the śruti *rasōaish*.

Then begins the first Canto proper with an introductory stanza, which reveals the whole situation at a glance. Rādhā has been in the fruitless search for Kṛṣṇa, who is sporting with other gopis, but the pangs of separation of Rādhā are because before that, she has been, she thinks, the sole recipient of his love (so we gather from many places later on), which is now turned to others leaving her unceremoniously behind. Now Rādhā is addressed by her maid in song, which describes in the most exquisitely idyllic poetry and with an almost colour-laden brush, the sporting scene, which is quite in the vein of Śrīmad Bhāgavata, Harivaṃśa and Viṣṇu purāṇa. This is familiarly known as Rāsālīla, which Jayadeva describes in one place as Rāsōllāsa and in another as Rasōllasa.

In this Canto as in others, it is remarkable that first there are one or two introductory stanzas, giving the whole outline of the scene, followed by songs, and then there are ślokas again, which are a clear and rather conscious (so invariable the links are) repetition of the ideas of the songs. This phenomenon has proved a veritable enigma for critics and, more than anything

else, has given food to the suspicion which has found expression in many bold and sweeping conjectures as to their authorship. This shows that we have neglected the significance of hints like *Srijayadēyabhaṇitamidam adhiḥkaṁ yadimanasā naṭanīyam* showing at once that the songs are there because they may more easily be retained, or rather may be given a congenial place, in their memory by men of kindred feeling or *Rasikajana* as they are frequently called. It is this practical religious consideration that has made him compose the songs; but to satisfy the taste of his orthodox critics, he had to render those thoughts in ślokas also. But this should not imply that the songs can be taken out of the book without consideration for the ślokas. For, the ślokas, many of them, are essential to the thorough understanding of the songs in their proper situations. The songs and the ślokas are complementary to one another and it is wonderful how artistically they are interwoven. The whole first canto ought to prove a thing of constant study by the discerning critics. The latest pronouncement of Dr. Keith in this respect, viz., that "in inserting such songs, he doubtless foresaw the use that would be made of them both in the temples and at festivals", does not sound plausible. And in the case of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa though not so directly of *Dutis* another explanation of the song element may be offered and it is this that, as we have in the Bhāgavata upagāyan and *giyamanah* both Kṛṣṇa as Anukūla Nāyaka and Rādhā as Pragalbhā Nāyika have been traditionally endowed with highest proficiency in dancing and music and the hoary antiquity of this tradition may be seen in the fact that mention is made of the Halliśa dance in Bhāsa's drama, the Balacarita.

There is another very significant aspect of the first Canto. The second song begins with deeds of Kṛṣṇa which are enumerated in Śrīmad Bhāgavatā and Harivaṁśa. Now scientifically speaking and aesthetically—a distinction noted very clearly above—if fulfils very accurately one great epic condition, viz., that the hero must be of a dhīrōdatta type and his exploits must be taken from some well-known source. The 'rasa' consideration offers another reason why the incidents are treated more like edisodes than as dramatic action. Throughout, the Sringara Rasa is presented to an ecstasy and the whole situation of

Sambhōga is described with all artistic details, and with the perfect self-possession. This is strictly forbidden in any Sanskrit drama and so the songs ought not to be taken as so many dramatic monologues. Thus the epic form is very well justified.

Now let us pursue the thread of the narrative further. The second Canto begins with the song of Rādhā. After the song there occurs this significant śloka ;—

*Gaṇayati guṇagrāmam bhāmam strabhādapi nēhate  
vahati ca paritōsham dōsham vimuñcati dūratah  
yuvatiśhu valatrishṇē krishṇe yihārīṇi mām vinā  
punarapi manī vāmam kāmam karōti karōmi kim*

This is verily the *guṇamahātmāsakti*, the first of the ten *Daśabhāvas* mentioned in the *Nāradaśakti sūtra*. Of these ten, we have *Rūpāsakti*, *Pūjāsakti* (*haririti haririti japati sakāmam* etc.) *kāntāsakti* *Ātmaniyēdanāsakti*, *tanmayāsakti* and *paramayīrahāsakti*, these *Daśabhāvas* manifested here. We have spoken before of the *Gopāta tāpanaiḥ Upanishad* and how mystical attitude is distinct from philosophical attitude.

Now in the *Gopālatāpano* we have an account of the *tīrthas* with which evidently the *manayatha mahātīrtha* is contrasted, an account of the *Mantras* (to which *Ālāpa mantrāvali* is presented as a contrast), and the *Amrutatva* referred to there is contrasted with this *Parōranbhāmratatva*. Indeed Jayadeva, as here, fearlessly and freely associates terms of high religious significance with love terms. It may be noticed in passing, that from the artistic point of view, the poet shows a thorough familiarity with the canons of *Natyasastra* and *Kāmasūtra* as the various parallels quoted in the commentaries tend to testify.

Then comes another song of Rādhā as *utkaṇḍhītā nāyikā* addressed to the *sakhī*. As we find later on, the whole situation, as the poet leads us into, is like this :—Rādhā discovers Kṛṣṇa one spring morning engaged in revels with the cow-herdresses since the night before, when he secretly departed for them leaving Rādhā behind. Then Kṛṣṇa suddenly remembers Rādhā (this *Rādhāmādhaya Hridayē* bears quite a different meaning in the *Gītāgovinda* from the *Baghavata* where these very same words

occur and mean, placing Rādhā on his breast), Kṛṣṇa sees also how Rādhā has angrily departed and he feels penitent. Then there are mutual *viraha* utterances, which occupy the whole day and with the fall of evening the spring-time is gone and then looms large the rainy season atmosphere and the *sakhi* of Rādhā advises her to *Abhisār*, which Rādhā in her love-born condition cannot do to the finish. So the Sixth Canto ends with the evening thickening all around—and the Seventh Canto begins with the moonlight diffused through the sky. There in a bower Rādhā spends the long dreary night saying, 'He cometh not, he cometh not' and the Eighth Canto opens with the morning. Then throughout the whole day there goes on the *Abhisār* of Kṛṣṇa, who reaches his lady-love in the Tenth Canto after the day is over. The Eleventh Canto opens with the song of a *sakhi* of Rādhā in the fall of evening. Then in the night the long-wished-for union comes about. Thus the incidents of the whole poem occupy two consecutive days and nights. This detailed time-analysis is not without its benefit. The treatment of the natural atmosphere is striking. We see this spring-time beauty smiling in the morning flowers and singing in the hum of bees, holding its sway over the whole day, being suddenly replaced with the fall of evening by the rainy clouds and showers. This is not a mere poetic device, but a common experience in Bengal, especially in that part of Bengal of which the poet is said to have been an inhabitant. This is a valuable piece of internal evidence confirming that he was a native of Bengal, and not of Orissa, as some suppose.

On the other hand, this time-analysis discloses how different the whole arrangement is from the *Bhāgavata*, the *Hariyaṃsa* etc. For the sake of evidence let us enumerate these differences here. Thus :—

1. *Bhāgavata*—*śaratkāthāśriyaḥ*  
*Gitagovinda*—*vasanta*.
2. *Bhāgavata*—One night, that is extended by *yogamāya*.  
*Gitagovinda*—it is two days and nights.
3. *Bhāgavata*—it is *Pūrṇimāranjani* though *Ghōrarūpa* because of dense forests, etc.  
*Gitagovinda*—it is *Varshā Abhisāraḥ*;

4. *Bhagavata*—*Krishna* is *Śiṣu* or *Kiśōra* and through *Yoga-māya* he is transformed into a never-fading blooming youth ;

*GitaGovinda*—he is naturally shown as a youth.

The first cause of such differences has been indicated above, viz., Jayadeva's mystical outlook. They also speak eloquently of the large and lofty artistic sense of the poet. They show how rigidly he keeps to the best tradition of the classics. It is also very significant that he totally omits the *Yōgamāya* element of the *Bhagavata* and in its stead shows us *Kṛṣṇa* as the eternal youth. In this respect his precedent is followed by all later poets like *Caṇḍidāsa* and *Vidyāpati*. This has considerably heightened the effect of the poems, the power to grip the mind with the sense of an absolute truth, which shows the amplitude and intensity of realisation as also the perfection of art.

The essay is already long. But it will be abrupt to close it without some mention of its artistic beauty. We quote from Dr. Keith, "If to be untranslatable is a proof of the attainment of the highest poetry, Jayadeva has certainly claim to that rank. The poem has all the perfection of the miniature word-pictures which are so common in Sanskrit poetry with the beauty which arises, as Aristotle asserts, from magnitude and arrangement." Let us take some instance. His similes are *Kālidāsa*ian in point of beauty and appropriateness—they are pictures in miniature :—

"*Urabhi murārerūpahitahari ghana iya taralayaḷāke  
taḍḍitiya pūṭe rativiparūṭe rājasi sukritāvipāke*"

*Tyajati no pāṇitalēna kopōlam  
Bālaśaśinamiva sāyasaḷōlam*"

"*Viśeṣhāmanurañjaṇēna janayannānandamindīvara-  
vēṇīśyamalakōmalai rūpanayanāṅgairanaṅgōtsvam  
syachchandam brajasundarībhirabhitah pratyaṅgamālingitah  
Sringārah sakhi mūrtimānamiva madhau mugdhau hariḥ  
kriḍati*"

We have said before, "Every true work of art has violated some established kind," and the whole Sanskrit literature affords no better example than the *GitaGovinda*, unique in conception,

unique in itself. And what shall we say of his songs? They flow out and shape themselves so spontaneously and with so careless an ease, into so many pictures, with light and shade, colour and smell, sounds and sensations, so sensuous and yet not sensual, so intense and yet not fatiguing, that we feel saturated with the music of his verse, which rings sweet and unknown sensations into our ears. And with legitimate pride, born of intense self-consciousness, he says ;—

*“Yadgāndharyakalāsu kausālamānuyānam ca yad vaiṣṇavam  
Yachśrīṅgārayivēkatasvaracanākāvyēshu līlāyitam  
tat saryē jayadēvapaṇḍitakaveḥ kṛtishṣaikatānāmnaḥ  
sānandāḥ pariśōdhayantu mitiyah śrīgītagōyindataḥ”*

To all this we say. Amen. His poem, like the immortal Song of Songs, will be an unfailing source of joy and inspiration to kindred spirits, and Jayadeva will always live in their hearts, as he wished to live.

By M. MUKHERJI

1. Compare the Commentary. *RASIKAPRIBA*

## The First Imitation of Gitagovinda

Jayadeva, the famous lyric poet of Orissa,<sup>1</sup> has given in his *Gītagovinda* (G.G.), a charming picture of the amorous dalliances of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa which have become a perennial source of inspiration, elation and joy to thinkers, litterateurs, devotees and poets of the world, all over, since the last few centuries. The sweetness of the diction, the musical beauty of the lyrics, the softness of the word-pictures, and above all, the artistic expression of the universal human feelings, expressed in the *Gitagovinda* have a captivating effect on its readers, irrespective of caste, creed and colour. As a result, the popularity of this work has never been affected by the bulk of literature in Sanskrit as well as in the regional languages which has subsequently appeared in the field. In appreciation of these qualities of the *Gītagovinda*, a host of writers of India, highly inspired by its external artistic beauty and its internal universal appeal, have attempted, at different times, to compose poems in imitation of that masterpiece. Especially, the scholars from all parts of India in general and the poets of Orissa in particular, being born and brought up in that glorious tradition<sup>2</sup> of Sanskrit culture, have composed in Sanskrit more than one hundred and thirty imitative works of the *Gītagovinda*, giving vent to their poetic ingenuity and erotico-devotional ecstasy.

Apart from a few works of this type available in print, such imitative works continue to be discovered in manuscripts and a number of them must also have been lost in course of time. But many interesting stray verses and fragmentary songs and, in some cases, the names, only of such *gītakāvyas* have been preserved in the later commentaries, rhetorical works, anthologies and works on musicology.

In the present paper observations will be restricted to the



first imitation of the Gitagovinda. We learn from different records<sup>3</sup> available today that a king of Orissa,<sup>4</sup> being jealous of poet Jayadeva, since his Gītagōvinda earned nation-wide reputation as a poem par excellence and as it was introduced into the liturgy of the Jagannātha temple, composed a poem like Gitagovinda and tried to usher it into the liturgy of Jagannātha in place of the G.G. But according to a traditional story, Lord Jagannātha did not like this attempt and prohibited the work of the king from being recited in the temple. As a result, the king was very much pained at heart and offered himself before the feet of Lord Jagannātha for his propitiation and for the acceptance of his work in the daily liturgy of the temple. The Lord was satisfied with the sincerity of the devoted king and ordained in a dream that few verses of the work of the king might be incorporated in the G.G. being recited daily in the temple.<sup>5</sup>

The *Bhaktavijaya* of Mahipati, a work written in the Marāṭhī language, states that 24 verses from the work of a King of Orissa have been included in the famous G.G. Rāmadāsa, an Oriyā poet of the 18th century A.D., describes in his *Dārḍhyatābhakti*,<sup>6</sup> that only 12 stanzas of the king were included in the G.G. Again, we find in the Sanskrit commentary entitled *Sarvāṅgasundarī* on the G.G. by Nārāyaṇadāsa, who was contemporary of Narasiṃha Deva II (1278–1308 A.D.) of the Ganga dynasty of Orissa, left 18 verses<sup>8</sup> of the G.G. uncommented. Further, M.M. Śaṅkara Miśra (16th century) in his *Rasamañjarī*,<sup>9</sup>—a Sanskrit commentary on the G.G., comments upon only two verses out of the 18 verses cited above. Rāṇā Kumbhakarna (1460–68 A.D.) in his commentary *Rasikapriyā* on the G.G. comments upon all the 18 spurious verses. Dharaṇīdhara Miśra,<sup>10</sup> the first translator of the G.G. into Oriyā, translates 15 verses out of the 18; he translates also two new verses which are not found in Rāṇā Kumbha's commentary. Thus it is proved that only 20 verses (18+2=20) have been interpolated into the G.G. of Jayadeva after the *Sarvāṅgasundarī* commentary was written by Nārāyaṇadāsa the great-great grand-father of the famous rhetorician Viśvanātha Kavirāja.<sup>11</sup> Though the exact verses and their number cannot be ascertained at present, yet these twenty

verses have been accepted as spurious. Only the discovery of the unknown imitative work will solve the problem in this respect.

According to the work *Prācīna Utkala* (The Ancient Orissa) of the historian Jagavandhu Sing, Purushottamadeva of the Ganga dynasty had attempted to introduce his own *Gītagovinda* into the daily rituals of the Jagannātha temple. Though we do not come across the name Purushottamadeva in the panel of king of the Ganga dynasty, yet this Purushottamadeva can be identified with Bhānudeva II (1309–28 A.D.) who was popularly known as Purushottamadeva.<sup>12</sup> Viśvanātha Kavirjāa; who was the minister for foreign and home affairs in the court of Bhānudeva IV, records an eulogy of Purushottamadeva in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa*;

*ananyasādhāraṇadhiḥ dhṛtākḥilayasundharaḥ |*  
*rājate ko'pi jagati sa rajā Putuṣottamaḥ<sup>13</sup> ||*

This verse is applicable to King Bhānudeva II alias Purushottama of the Ganga dynasty of Orissa and it refers to his extraordinary scholarship and erudition. The epithets<sup>14</sup> which denote the rare accomplishments of the king are epigraphically recorded.<sup>15</sup> The last verse<sup>16</sup> of the *Rasikapriyā* commentary written by Kumbhakarṇa of Mewar, who died in 1468 A.D., speaks of a king Purushottama, who, at any rate, cannot be identified with the author of the *Abhinavagītāgovinda*, who wrote his work after 1468 A.D. Therefore the king Purushottama may be identified with the Ganga King Bhānudeva II (1309–28 A.D.) who ruled his kingdom in the name of God Purushottama with whom he was perhaps confused.<sup>17</sup>

Thus we can safely conclude that there was a work written in imitation of the *Gītagovinda* to the credit of Purushottamadeva alias Bhanudeva II who was most probably tempted to replace the famous *Gītagovinda* by his own composition in order to show that his poetic ingenuity and erudition was at par with that of the poet Jayadeva. Further this conclusion is corroborated not only by the non-availability of the listed spurious verses in the *Abhinava-Gītagovinda* of Gajapati Purushottamadeva, but also by the suggestive reference to the name of Purushottama alias Bhanudeva II in the last verse of the unknown imitative work which has been interpolated into the *Gītagovinda* as its

colophon<sup>18</sup>. But a definite conclusion can be drawn in this matter, only when a Ms. of this work by Purushottamadeva the Ganga king of Orissa is discovered.

By DR. BANMALI RATH

1. The histories of Sanskrit literature have described Jayadeva as belonging to Bengal. But recent researches on the subject have substantially established with a series of plausible grounds and authentic historical data that the poet belonged to Orissa. Vide in this connection :

(i) The Souvenir on Sri Jayadeva edited by Dr. N. K. Sahu, The Jayadeva Sanskritika Parishad, Orissa, Bhubaneswar, 1968.

(ii) A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts of Orissa, Vol II. Preface, ed. by K.N. Mahapatra, pp. xxxv-lvi. Orissa Sahitya Akademi, Bhubaneswar.

2. Vide the paper of the present writer: 'A family of poet-cum-rhetoricians in Orissa'. Jhankar, February 1958, Vol. IX No. 12, pp. 1084-90.

3. Maheśwar inscription of svapneśvaradeva ed. by N. N. Basu. J.A.S., Bengal Vol. LXVI 1897 pp. 12-24.

4. Sobhanesvara inscription of Sri Vaidyanātha, ed. by Sudhākara Pattanāyak, J.B.O.R.S., Vol. XVII, 1931, pp. 119-35.

5. Vide O.H.R.J., Vol. VII, No. I, pp. 40-46, "Govardhanācārya and Udayanācārya" by N. N. Mahapatra.

6. Vide Darḍhyatā bhakti of Rāmadāsa :

"Dvādaśa śarga parimāṇa / Jayadevara grantha jāṇa /  
bārasargara ādye tāra / rahiba bāra śloka tora /  
rājā hoiṇa ethe toṣa / gamilā āpaṇā uāsa" /

7. A Ms. of this commentary is preserved in the Ms. Library of the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar.

8. G.G., verse nos. 12, 13, 18, 26, 33, 40, 44, 54, 56, 57, 60, 68, 78, 79, 80, 85, 87, 93.

9. Vide the G.G. with *Rasikapriyā* and *Rasamañjarī* commentaries, published by N. S. Press, Bombay.

10. Dharanīdhara Miśra's Oriya translation of the G.G. is preserved in the O.S.M., Bhubaneswar.

11. Vide "A family of poet-cum-rhetoricians in Orissa" by the present writer, Jhankara. Vol. IX, Nos. 12 March, 1958.

12. Vide South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. VI, Nos. 714 and 938.

13. Vide Sāhityarpaṇa, 4th chapter p. 305, ed. Dr. S. Sing.

14. "Govinda-padāravinda-rajassāndrikṛtānanda", "Viśvarūpa-Srīpati bhaktiyuta", "Vāgdevatābhūṣaṇa", "Pāṇḍityamaṇḍitaḥ", "Mahākavi maṇḍalasevitaḥ".

15. Vide "The Panjabi Matha copper plate Inscription of Bhanudeva II No. 3 of Sakābda 1234", ed. by S. N. Rajguru U.B.P. Inscriptions of Orissa, Vol. II.

16. Nirnayasagar Press edn. of the G.G., p. 172. The commentary upon the verse "Vyāpārāḥ Purushottamasya dadātu sphītam mudam sampadam" of the text of the G.G. contains a veiled reference to a king Purushottama ruling prior to him. Further, Kumbhakarṇa also refers to a work written by a king—"Prabandhah prthivībhartrā prabandhaḥ prītaye hareḥ" (p.75)

17. Vide O.H.R.J., Vol. IX, 1960, Nos. 3 & 4. *Abhinavagītagovinda* by K. N. Mahapatra.

18. Gitagovinda Canto XII last line of the last verse : Vyāpārāḥ Purushottamasya dadātu.sphītam mudam sampadam.

Here Purushottama is a word of double entendre which means Lord Jagannatha and the king Purushottama, the author of the work.

## Three more Imitations of the Gitagovinda

Very few Sanskrit literary works enjoy the fame similar to that of the *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva. It is, perhaps, the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa that may vie with it in that respect to some extent but the comparison is unfair. The *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva is appreciated by people for reasons other than literary and for literary reasons as well. This work has more than forty commentaries from different parts of India ; it has evoked inspiration in poets for its imitation ; and a number of such imitations which are more than two dozens, is recorded ; it is profusely quoted in later works and the Anthologies do not forget to mention Jayadeva. Such celebrity is enjoyed by the author of *Gitagovinda* for the novel form which he chose for his poem and set a new ideal before others to follow. In spite of the hesitation shown by some scholars<sup>1</sup> we are required to accept that Jayadeva "practically created a new genre." When once the new form was invented and the workmanship of *Gitagovinda* was appreciated everywhere, others came readily to follow its lead. Being a great religious work, a great poem on "Devotion to Viṣṇu", it represented a devotional tendency of the Medieval India. The particular form and tune of the Padāvalīs caught the imagination of people and became a convenient vehicle of expressing the surging devotion. It is for these reasons that the *Gitagovinda* had never the dearth of imitations.

It is true that the literary imitations of the *Gitagovinda*—"the literary counterfeits" never became the current coins of poetry ;<sup>2</sup> that their late and borrowed imagination attained but a limited popularity ; that as poetry they could never stand equal to the famous *Gitagovinda* ; still as followers of the devotional tendency idealized by Jayadeva, as sparks of the light enkindled by the author of the *Gitagovinda*, we should note with satisfaction as many imitations as may come across our way.

Jayadeva's *Gītāgovinda*, 'as the fountain-source of Bengal Vaishṇavism—the Caitanya School of Bhakti, takes up the theme of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. The imitations on the other hand adhere to the form but change the theme according to the particular inclination of the mind of the poet. Thus, there are some which have Rāma and Sītā or Hara and Pārvatī as their themes, while there are certain others that retain the old ideal one. *Gītārāghava* (by Prabhākara, Rāmakavi, and Hariśaṅkara) and *Saṅgītarāghava* (by Cinnasommabhūpāla) or *Saṅgītarāghunandana* (by Viśvanātha) have apparently Rāma as the centre of devotion; *Gītāgaṅgādhara* (by Kalyāṇa, Rājasekhara, Candrasekhara Sarasvatī, and Nanjarāja); *Gītāgīrīśa* (by Rāmabhadra), *Gītāgaurīśa* or *Gītāgauripati* (by Bhānudatta) or the works like *Gītamahānata*, *Gītadigaṃbara* (by Vamśamaṇi); *Gītaśaṅkara* (by Bhīṣmamiśra, Anantanārāyaṇa and Hīra) appear to have been devoted to Hara. *Gītāgopīpati* (Kṛṣṇa-dutta), *Gītāmādhava* (Revārāma), (also by Prabodhānanda Sarasvatī), *Gītāgopāla* (Caturbhūja), *Saṅgītā-dāmodara*, *Saṅgītanārāyaṇa*, *Saṅgītamakaranda*, *Gītasundara* etc. have it seems, Kṛṣṇa or Viṣṇu as their central theme. *Gītāgaṇapati* looks like a solitary exception to the above three popular themes. All these are found mentioned in different Mss. catalogues.

There are three more: two of them—*Saṅgītacintāmaṇi* and *Gītāmukunda* are simply mentioned by R. B. Hiralal as belonging to the collection of the Bhonsle Rājā Family of Nagpur,<sup>5</sup> and the third—the *Saṅgītarāghava* by Gaṅgādhara does not seem to have been recorded at all. Aufrecht also mentions *Saṅgītacintāmaṇi* by Kamalalocana<sup>6</sup> and the *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature* by Krisnamachariar also refers to a *Saṅgītacintāmaṇi* but it is included in the works on music.

But the *Saṅgītacintāmaṇi* by Kamalalocana from Bhonsle Rājā's collection,<sup>7</sup> the same mentioned by R. B. Hiralal and Krishnamachariar, is a work not on Saṅgīta but is an imitation of the *Gītāgovinda*. This will be clear from the closing verses of the work:—

*Yadyadyandāvanabhuyi navam bhaktabhāvānusārāt  
Rādhākṛishṇaviha yiharataḥ spashṭamērāśṭakālō (?)*

*Tattatsaryam hridi rasavidāmēya var्यarti nityam  
prēmaśrēṇīcaraṇa saraṇassōstusandēha kridyaḥ* 3

*Saṅgitacintāmaṇināmni kāvyē  
prināti hīnaprabhavēpi bhavyaḥ  
Siddhē budhānām madhumakṣhikābhi—  
Mārdhyīrase buddirudēti sādhyi* 4

*Yaḥ krishṇakhangaṛyōbhūdgōvindakavi bhūshaṇāt  
Tannandanaḥ prabandhasyakartā kamalalōcanaḥ* 5

It is observed that the author takes up the sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in the Vṛndāvana as his theme and classifies these sports specified by the hours of the day—as *Nisāntalīla* (f. 2<sup>b</sup>), *Prātārīlīla* (f. 3<sup>a</sup>) *Pūrvāhyalīla* (f. 3<sup>b</sup>), *Aparāhyalīla* (f. 5<sup>b</sup>), *Sāyāhṇalīla* (f. 6<sup>a</sup>), *Pradōshalīla* (f. 7<sup>a</sup>) and *Naktalīla* (f. 8<sup>a</sup>). All these *līlās* or sports are described in the form of songs or *Padāvalis* in the same tunes as *Gurjari* (f. 1<sup>a</sup>), *Ramakali* (f. 2<sup>b</sup>)...*Ragas* (f. 4<sup>b</sup>) *Kambodhi* (f. 6<sup>a</sup>) *Dhanāśrī* (f. 6<sup>b</sup>) etc. ; the language too is modelled on the lines of the original. Also as in the *Gitagovinda* the beginning is set up with a background, after every song some verses explanatory of the situation are added. But the work obviously lacks the melody, the diction, the rhythm and the emotional expression of the original.

The poet Kamalalocana who himself admits his *Saṅgitacintāmaṇi* as a 'low-born' work *Hinaprabhava* was avowedly a follower of the Caitanya School of devotion. He pays his homage to Caitanya in the second verse of his *Cintāmaṇi* and makes mystic reference to some 'Gāndharvī'. But his adherence to the Caitanya Sampradāya is more explicit in his *Gītamukunda* wherein he offers salutations to Gauracandra and Caitanyacandra. The last verse of the 'Cintāmaṇi' tells us that Kamalalocana was the son of Kṛṣṇa Khadgarāya and the grandson of Govinda Kavibhūṣaṇa. This same verse also appears in the *Gītamukunda* (f. 47<sup>a</sup>). The poet Kamalalocana was, with a greater probability, a Bengali Brahman brought over to Nagpur by Bhonsle Rājā from Bengal in one of his campaigns in that province. This conjecture may justify the presence of the works of Kamalalocana in Nagpur only and not elsewhere in India. This solitary lamp of Caitanya

Bhakti burning in such a far off place from Bengal leads us to such a conjecture. Hence we may tentatively place our poet in the middle of the 18th century, or earlier.

"*Gītamukunda*"<sup>9</sup> also called as *Gītāmṛta*<sup>10</sup> by Kamalalocana is another work written in exact imitation of the *Gītagovinda*. This work is more ambitious than the *Śaṅgītacintāmaṇi*. Though the poet keeps up his modesty in this work also—

*Kkaciṅguṇaḥ sāhasamityayētya  
satyam pravartē harikīrtikāvyē  
Ālōcyā śōcyasya mamōdyam yad  
Hāsyam satām syātparamaḥ sa lābhaḥ. 6*

he calls his *Gītamukunda* a Mahākāvya. In the introductory verses of the Kāvya, the poet unmistakably shows his devotion to Viṣṇu Kṛṣṇa of the Caitanya School by offering salutations to Gauracandra (vs. 1), Caitanyacandra (vs. 2), Vakreśvara Guru (vs. 3), Rādhā (vs. 4), and the musical notes of the Divine Flute (vs. 5).

This Kāvya contains 14 cantos or sargas :

1. *Śaṅgatamangalaḥ* (f. 3<sup>a</sup>), 2. *Vṛndāvananandaḥ* (f. 6<sup>a</sup>),
3. *Darśanaharshaḥ* (f. 11<sup>a</sup>), 4. *Sāṃjātakūñjōtsavaḥ* (f. 13<sup>b</sup>),
5. *Sānandakiśōradymadyaḥ* (f. 16<sup>b</sup>), 6. *Candrōdayānandaḥ* (f. 19<sup>a</sup>),
7. *Sōjjāgaranāgaraḥ* (f. 21<sup>b</sup>), 8. *Vipralabdharādhaḥ* (f. 25<sup>a</sup>),
9. *Sātaṅgapankajākshaḥ* (f. 28<sup>a</sup>), 10. *Bādhitamādhavaḥ* (f. 31<sup>a</sup>),
11. *Nirmāṇabhāvaḥ* (f. 33<sup>b</sup>), 12. *Kiśōrayihāramanōharaḥ* (f. 36<sup>b</sup>),
13. *Lalitamīlanalilaḥ* (f. 39<sup>a</sup>), 14. *Mangalānaṅgakhēlanaḥ* (f. 42<sup>b</sup>),

After the fourteenth canto, the poet again takes up his favourite theme of describing the love sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa specified by the hours of the day such as *Niśāntakālakēli* (f. 43<sup>a</sup>) *Prataḥkālakēli* (f. 43<sup>b</sup>) etc... Throughout the poem either in the cantos or in the Lilās, the number of Padāvalīs varies but every time it is above three. In each canto and in every Padāvalī imitation of *Gītagovinda* is obvious, and as we read through the work we become almost familiar with some such regularly occurring phrase as.—

*Kayibhūṣaṇasutasambhayaḥ*.....  
or *Kayibhūṣaṇasutanandanabhaṇitam*.....



or *Kamalayilōcanaviracita*.....

or *Kamalanayanadharanīsutabhaṇitam*.....

As in the original, the melody and tune i. e. the Rāga and the Tāla of every song are mentioned in the beginning of every Padāvali.—Gurjara, Vasanta, Asāvarī, Rāmakarī. Gadakarī Dhanāsīrī, Mālavya, Desī, Varādī etc., are some of the names of the Rāgas employed by Kamalalocana in his *Gītamukunda*. A specimen of the poetry of this poet may not be out of place here :—

*Sung in Gurjari raga*

*Mastakavilasadakhaṇḍasīkhaṇḍakamaṇḍalamandītakēśam*

*Madanaśatārbudagarvadalanakaraviracitanāṭavarayēśam*

*Rādhē! bhaja vrajarājakumāram varamuralīkaramurutara-  
hāram.<sup>1</sup>*

*Gaṇḍitakañcaviḷōcanamañjulaḡatijitakhañjanapuñjam*

*Sitakarasundarahasitamāñjulagatijitakhañjanapuñjam*

*Sitakarasarasundarahasitamadhurarasadadhadhigatakuñjam* 2

*kaladhantāmala lēlita mlakāvalika valita bhāyam*

gandālasitamanikunḍamaṇḍalamīṅgitarāṅgaviśālam 3

... (f. 6<sup>ab</sup>)

Such songs are placed in the mouths of three interlocutors—Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā and Viśākhā, the last serving as a female companion of the heroine. Thus here also the actors are same, the settings and situations are similar, the process—estrangement, sorrow, longing, jealousy, intercession, propitiation and union—is also the same. Perhaps, the *Gītamukunda* of Kamalālocana, like the *Gītāgovinda* of Jayadeva was composed to illustrate the rules of the refined theology of the *Rasaśāstra* of *Rupagoṣvāmin*.

We now proceed to the third imitation of the *Gītāgovinda* from Nagpur. Though the *Saṅgītarāghava*<sup>11</sup> by Gaṅgādhara is not from the collection of Bhonsle Rājās of Nagpur yet it was written for a Bhonsle Rājā. This *Saṅgītarāghava* was composed in Śaka 1736—

*Shadāṣṭasaptāikāmite śāliyaḥśakēmale*

*Gaṅgādharah kaviscake grantha saṅgati rāghavam*

(Post-colophon)

It is one among the eighteen works of the versatile but unknown Gaṅgādhara Kavi of Nagpur. His works have recently been traced for the Nagpur University Manuscripts Department.

In the title of the work we have a covert reference to the Raghūjī III of Nagpur and the work was composed when Jānoji Bhonsle came to the throne, in A.D. 1853 after Raghūjī III. As a matter of fact *Sanḡitarāghava* was composed at the expressed desire of the young King Jānoji—

*Śrībhōsalakulamaṇinā jñānanripēṇārthitaḥ prabhuprītyai  
Saṅgatirāghavam kavigaṅgādhara uccakāra sammuditaḥ*

(F. 24<sup>a</sup>)

and to him it is dedicated for we have at the end of each canto *Śrībhōsalakulābhinayōttamamaṇiśrīkshānākhyanripōdyōcita* ..... and lastly the poet expresses a benediction for long life of the king and his patron—

*Bhōsalakulajalanidhitaḥ samudita iha kīrtikiraṇayindamidam  
Vistārāyansamantāt jñēnanripēnduḥ śarachatam jīyāt 3*

(f 2<sup>a</sup>)

This means that the poet Gaṅgādhara who was a contemporary of Raghūjī III, was a person advanced in years at the accession of Jānoji and wrote this work to entertain the new young king Abhinavottamamaṇi. From other works of the poet we know that Gaṅgādhara was the son of Viṭhala and Rukmini, the author of 18 works,<sup>12</sup> who flourished in Nagpur from about A.D. 1800 to 1865.

The *Sanḡitarāghava* aspires to abridge the story of *Rāmāyaṇa* within the limits of six cantos.<sup>13</sup> Having praised Rāma in verses 1 and 2 the King Jñāna the poet at once begins the theme. At the conclusion of every canto we have ;—

*Śrī bhōsalakuiābhinavōttamamaṇiśrī jñūnākhyanripōdyōcita  
Śrīrukmaṇipatisūrisrunugaṅgādharaḥ kavikṛitau Śrī saṅḡitarāghavā-  
khye granthe pramuditarāghavō nāma prathamāḥ sargaḥ. Bāla-  
kaṇḍīyakathānakamidam*

The poet calls his Padāvalīs as Ashṭapadis which are formally introduced by a verse or two and are in usual Mālava and other

Rāgas. Here is a typical copy of Jayadeva's style from the *Saṅgītarāghaya*.

*Rāghaya Drutamanujaśarīra jaya jaya rāma here*  
*Tanayasuvamśakrite dhritayānavatāram*  
*Vihitapayitracaritramudāram 1.*  
*Ravikulatōyanidhau dhritavānasi dēham*  
*Daśarathabhūpajanim tvamadāham 2.*  
*Kuvalayaduḥkhaḥatau śrutisaṅkhyāśarīram*  
*Kalayasi kōmalasadguṇadhīram 3.*  
*Ramayasi viśyamidam svaguṇairguṇasindhō*  
*Patitajanādbhutasundarayandho 4*  
*Daśamukhabhukhyamahō syaśarairhṛityāmstyam*  
*Danujakulam prathayannijatatvam 5*

By V. W. KARAMBELKAR

1. Keith, *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 123.

2. Dr. S. K. De, *A History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, vol. I, p. 396.

3. In the Introduction to the Edition of the *Saṅgītagangādhara* by Nājarāja, Belgum 1936, the editor writes :—

“The present work, now brought to light, is the only lyric written in imitation of *Gitagovinda*, of which therefore, it bids to be a rival.” How curious?

4. Bombay Edition, 1891.

5. *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS in C.P. Nos. 6150-51—Saṅgītacintāmaṇi* and No. 1353—*Gitamukunda*.

6. *Cat.*, Pt. I. p. 685.

7. *Saṅgītacintāmaṇi* size 11"×6"; folio 8; complete without date. This and other works of the Rājā's collection are now likely to be brought over to the Nagpur University MSS. Department.

8. The work begins with—

*Niśānte śrī vrindāvanabhuvilosadvallīśayanē*  
*Sayānam gandharvyāviratayā (?) nandanayanam*  
*Tayā vrindādēśādvaidhurapaḍam gōkulavidhum*  
*Vidhuvānaścañcum śukapati rupāślōkayadidam. 3*

9. Size 12"×6"; folio 47; date not given, no commentary. Script—Nāgarī, handwriting bold and legible.

10. Iti Sri kamalalōcana kavi Candra viracitam gitamrutam sampūrṇam

11. *Nagpur University MSS.*, Acc. No. 1956. Size 8"×4"; folio 24 paper blue.

12. Eighteen works of Gaṅgādhara :

1. *Aparādhakṣhamāpanastōtra*, 2. *Ānandalahari ṭīka*
3. *Karpūraniṭikā ṭīka* 4. *Kālanirṇaya* 5. *Gaṇeśalīlākāvya*
6. *Gaṅgāshṭapadi* 7. *Gurutatvavicāra* 8. *Citramahājūshā*
9. *Jaiminī aśvamēdha* 10. *Prasannamādhavakāvya*
11. *Bhāminīvilāsaṭippaṇi* 12. *Ratikutūhala*, 13. *Rasakallōla*
14. *Rāmapramōdakāvya* 15. *Vilāsaguchchakāvya*,
16. *Vṛttacandrika* 17. *Saṅgītarāghava*, 18. *Harilīlamṛitakāvyaḥ*.

13. Cantos are :

1. *Pramuditārāghava* (f. 7<sup>a</sup>) *Bālakāṇḍa*
2. *Pravāsirāghava* (f. 10<sup>b</sup>) *Ayōdhayākāṇḍa*
3. *Virahirāghava* (f. 13<sup>a</sup>) *Araṇyakāṇḍa*
4. *Udyuktarāghava* (f. 17<sup>a</sup>) *Kishkindhakaṇḍa*
5. *Udyuktarāghava* (f. 20<sup>b</sup>) *Sundarakāṇḍa*
6. *Sānandarāghava* (f. 24<sup>a</sup>) *Yuddhakāṇḍa*

# The Gitagovinda and its Imitations

The *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva is a unique work in the History of Sanskrit Literature. The poem describes the amorous dalliances of Rādhā Kṛṣṇa with the excellant ideational subtleties and superb stylistic elegance which have made it a perenial source of inspiration and joy to the thinkers, literateurs, devotees and poets all alike. Practically it has been accepted as a *vade-mecum* in the field of creative coral compositions and religious pursuits in India for the last eight centuries. The sweetness of diction, the musical beauty of lyrics, the softness of word-pictures and, above all, the artistic expression of the universal human feelings, depicted in the *Gitagovinda* have a captivating effect on its readers, irrespective of caste, creed and colour. As a result the popularity of this work has never been affected by the bulk of subsequent Krishnaite literature in Sanskrit as well as in the regional languages. In appreciation of these qualities of the *Gitagovinda*, a host of Indian writers, highly inspired by its universal appeal, have attempted at different times, to compose poems in imitation of this masterpiece. The scholars from all parts of India in general and the poets of Orissa<sup>1</sup> in particular being born and brought up in that glorious tradition<sup>2</sup> of Sanskrit culture, have composed, in Sanskrit, more than one hundred and thirty imitative works giving vent to their poetic ingenuity and erotic-devotional ecstasy.

Apart from a few works of this type available in print, a bulk of such imitative works, continue to be discovered in manuscripts though a number of them must also have been lost in course of time. There are many interesting stray verses and fragmentary songs and, in some cases, the names only of such *Gītakāvyas* have been preserved in the later commentaries, rhetorical works, anthologies and works on musicology. For our discussion, here, we have taken into consideration the whole bulk of imitative works of the *Gitagovinda* to have a thorough survey of the field

and to present a critical estimate of these works, which either have been published or preserved in different oriental Manuscript Libraries or described in different catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts prepared by Indological Institutions in India and abroad. The limited space here does not permit us to go into details of the individual imitative works which have been discussed at length elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> A list of such works has been appended to this paper for ready reference.

Much has been said and discussed elsewhere on the literary beauty and devotional inflatus of the *Gitagovinda* and its imitations; but two vital points regarding their form and sentiment need clarification which would solve the problems posed by the accepted canons of literary judgement in India.

(i) *Literary form of the Gitakāvya and the tradition :*

The literary style of the *Gitagovinda* and its imitations which is a mixed feature of traditional verses and newly improvised songs, has been introduced for the first time<sup>4</sup> by the celebrated poet Jayadeva. But, about the form of the *Gitagovinda*, there is diversity of opinion amongst scholars. Lassen has classed it as a lyric drama, Jones as a melo-drama and Von Schroeder as a refined folk-play or yatra.<sup>5</sup> But the poets of these Gitakāvya have termed their works as *Mahākāvya*<sup>6</sup>; though they do not conform to the conventional pattern of the *Mahākāvya*.

The divergent views of the Scholars are in no way helpful for an exact assessment of the subject. It will not be out of place, here, to trace the history of this new development in the field of Sanskrit *Mahākāvya*s. In the whole field of Sanskrit literature, we have a few standard *Mahākāvya*s complete in all respects in comparison with shorter kāvyas called '*Khaṇḍa Kāvya*'. The art of writing *Mahākāvya*s in its proper sense, was fully and assiduously cultivated by the vaunted court poets, patronised by the cultured kings of the past. By the 9th century A.D., with the rare exceptions of the works of the versatile scholars like Śrīharsha and Rājaśekhara, the production of the *Mahākāvya*s and dramas of unnecessary verbosity and bombast, artificial ornateness etc., has been petered out, perhaps, due to the severe

stricture<sup>7</sup> passed by the great critics like *Ānandavardhana* and others. As a result of this, hundreds of shorter *kāvya*s less ambitious in verbal tropes and rigidity in texture, came into being. The more formal compliance with the formalities advocated by earlier theorists, were gradually disapproved by the writers as well as readers. The later poeticists like *Vidyādhara* and *Viśvanātha*<sup>8</sup> came to the rescue of these shorter creations and practically a place of honour was given to them. So the tradition of writing *Mahākāvya*s continued without a break, but the popular *Kāvya*s complied with the definitions of *Mahākāvya*s in their own way.

*Kshemendra* (11th century) and the early medieval poets like *Dāmodaragupta* and *Kavirāj* introduced a new style for the short *kāvya*s. Poets as well as readers attached much importance to the *Yamaka Kāvya*s and *Śleṣa-Kāvya*s<sup>9</sup>. Thus the *kāvya*s of the day tried to exhibit the power of displaying the poets mastery in wordy problems and pedantry in *śabdāṅkārā*s. Less talented poets began to write hundreds of *kāvya*s by mere elaboration of the episodes, taken from the great Epics and *Purāṇa*s. Some have used this form in writing mere summaries whereas a band of poets utilised this to write biographies and historical *kāvya*s. All these writings, though designated as *mahākāvya*s, were far away from the compactness, rigidity in texture, artificial ornateness and the pedantic bombast of the earlier classical ones, yet all these later varieties of works were called *Mahākāvya*s as in a general sense. *Jayadeva*, the author of the *Gītagovinda* and a host of other writers of *Gītakāvya*s also used this form of *Sargabandha* and inaugurated a new genre. *Jayadeva* could keep up the standard and even exceeded the early masters of classical epics in enriching the external texture of the *kāvya*. But, often he lags behind so far the inner essence is concerned. Of the type of *kāvya*s under the name of *Mahākāvya* discussed above, a few exceptions are always there. Though the counterfeits of the *Gitagovinda* have declared themselves as *Mahākāvya*s, yet with equal footing they can match neither with the older classics nor with *Gītagovinda* in certain respects. Nevertheless they have their own brilliant features which can never be underestimated.

(ii) *The main sentiment of the Gītakāvya and the canonical deliberations.*

It is well known that the poets of the Gītakāvya (termed as Mahākāvya) also intended their works to be appreciated by the readers from the stand point of purely literary work.<sup>10</sup> Now to go deep into it, it should be made clear that the early and later poeticists have framed the rules<sup>21</sup> for the guidance of the poets to study and to create standard Mahakavyas in the field. Atleast a few of the most important features of the technicalities became imperative and binding on the medieval writers of this literary type. Amongst the notable features, prescribed by the critics in the canons of literary judgement, specially the recipes for the plot (vastu), the hero (netā) and the sentiment (Rasa), dominant and accessory, were invariably adhered to by the poets.

It is stated that the poet must be aware of the fact that all his descriptive and narrative analysis of the plot, the creative ingenuity, poetic device and the ideational subtlety which are generally employed to beautify the theme, should be made subordinate to the supersensuous transcendental delectation of the poem. *Ānandavardhana*, the master critic, prescribes that *Rasatātparya*<sup>12</sup> quite distinct from *vastutātparya*, should be main aim of the Mahākāvya and proper emphasis should be laid thereon, which has been accepted, elaborated and sincerely adumbrated by the host of later theorists of the *Dhvani* school.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps, critics like *Ānandavardhana* and *Abhinavagupta*, prescribed this restriction, keeping the whole early medieval literary works in view, which marked a great diversion from suggestive beauty and were striving to be mere narrative ones, dilating upon much hackneyed purāṇic themes. Especially the Kāvya, dealing with the *kṛṣṇā* legened, advanced too much in this respect without caring for the recipes of the canons of poetic judgement or the views of the master critics in the field. The problem in the description of love between *Kṛṣṇa* and the *Gopīs* in the manner of the well known puranic *Rāsālīla*, whether to be accepted as proper or improper, legal or illegal.<sup>14</sup> If it is legal, then there is no problem. It goes without saying that the work dealing with such a highly erotic legal theme will be accepted as



a standard work suggestive of *śṅgāra* Rasa in consonance with the accepted maxims. If it is construed as illegal<sup>15</sup> according to the code of Indian life, the work dealing with such an episode should be regarded as suggestive of *śṅgāra rasābhāsa*; and thereby the principle of maintaining the *Rasatātparya* which is the criterion of a standard work is shattered. As a result of which a great bulk of our literature would be branded as second-rate creations.

It is a noteworthy fact that property in thought and expression has played a great role in the analysis of human sentiments and feelings in literature. In the ancient literature of India we find that much importance has been attached to and much emphasis laid on the idealism and proper conduct of life. The Indian critics, who have been born and brought up in such traditions, had to declare their measured deliberations in connection with poetic judgement as to what is a decent decorous and agreeable picture in the ideational treatment of a sentimental theme. But on the otherhand it is quite natural on the part of a man to have lapses and incongruity in his action, thinking and feeling; and literature being a true picture of the human life is also to record all these. In the context of such deliberations the critic had to pass his remark as to what should and what should not be recorded in literature. When it is admitted and realised on all hands that only by suggestion of sentiment and feeling the ultimate goal of poetry is achieved, it was a main job of the critic to treat the sentiment and feeling from the standpoint of propriety (*Aucitya*) in relation with the standard code of conduct as sanctioned by the sacred lore and popular usage. Thus we find much controversial deliberations on the subject under the name of *Rasa* and *Rasābhāsa*<sup>16</sup> in Indian poetics.

So according to the Indian poeticists in general the love between a man and woman, who is not a wedded wife, is improper and the suggestion of impropriety in love is called *śṅgārarasābhāsa*.<sup>17</sup>

From the standpoint of this poetic judgement all the *kāvyas*, dealing with the love episode between *Kṛṣṇa* and *Gopis* turn into *kāvyas*, suggestive of *Rasābhāsa*. Practically most of the poets in their *Gītakavyas* deal with the *Rāsālīlā*, the puranic love episode

between *Kṛṣṇa* and *Gopīs*. *Kṛṣṇa* is depicted here as a paramour<sup>18</sup> and the *Gopīs* as others' house wives in the manner of other *kāvya*s of the same theme. *Viśvānatha Kavirāja*, the later poeticist unlike others, though counts it as *Rasābhāsa*, finds no difference between *Rasa* and *Rasābhāsa*, in delectation, and regards it on a par with *Rasa*<sup>19</sup>. *Viśvanatha* in his masterly work '*Sāhityadarpaṇa*' deals with the poetic sentiment exhaustively and declares with cogent arguments that *Rasa* is the only criterion in judging a work as a piece of literature. According to him a creative work quite suggestive of beautiful experiences of human feelings, irrespective of social propriety or impropriety can be accepted as a first rate literature on the basis of sound *Rasa* theory. This has been established by him with hair-splitting analysis of the subject. Thus the Sanskrit *Gītakāvya*s, dealing with the amorous dalliances of *Rādhākṛṣṇa* are regarded as the best type of works even if there is a sense of impropriety according to the code and conduct of Indian social life. A later theorist, while dilating on propriety (*Auchitya*) of the hero, makes a significant concession in the case of Lord *Kṛṣṇa*<sup>20</sup>, Who according to him cannot be judged by the ordinary principle of *Rasa* theory. Later on, the famous *Goswāmīns*, the masters of *Rasa śāstra* of Bengal vaishnavism, developed the theories of their own to appreciate devotional *Vaiṣṇava* works. Practically in that spirit the readers will have to appreciate the works under reference. It should be borne in mind that the movement of *Bhakti* in medieval India created such an impetus and environment that life and thought were bound to assume newer significance. The aim of the poets was to glorify the deeds<sup>21</sup> of *Kṛṣṇa* and attain emancipation thereby. Moreover, their attempts were aimed at sublimating the activities of *Kṛṣṇa*, the supreme Being<sup>22</sup> who descended on earth to impart godly grace through the manifestation of His *Līlā*<sup>23</sup>. It may be pointed out here that the poet *Jayadeva* and a host of his followers were aware of all these view-points and framed their works accordingly where the critic meets neither with the rigid sectarian doctrinalism nor the stereotyped ways of mere formal complaisance with the conventionalities of *kāvya* making. As it was expected of *Jayadeva* and other poets who had proper training and balanced grounding

in *Kāvya* and puranic literature which contributed substantially to their skilful literary productions.

From a careful perusal of the bulk of the *Gītakāvyas* referred to in the appendix, it can be generally remarked that though most of them, have their stylistic elegance and sentimental subtleties, yet they cannot be estimated on a par with the superb *Gītagovinda*. Though all the works have been written in imitation of the G.G., they vary in the choice of themes. While most of the works have been written in praise of *Rādhā-kṛṣṇa-līlā* after the manner of the G.G., yet some of them depict the *Siva-līlā*, *Rāma-līlā*, *Gaṇapati-līlā*, *Kātyāyana-līlā*, *Vishṇu-līlā* and so on. All these works are of devotional character and they present different aspects of the *līlā* with a back-ground of highly sensuous charm. At times the erotico-religious compisclians of the devotis poets are considered to be the products of spontaneous inspiration, while some of them appear to be mere meretricious display of artificial and erudite fancy. Nevertheless in the treatment of their highly lucious and erotico-devotional theme the poets have invested their mystic poems with the whole gamut of erotic motif, imagery and expression alongwith the exquisite verbal melody and pictorial fancy which have substantially contributed towards their popularity in the field. In spite of the applause they receive for their vivid exuberance of erotic fancy and emotional inflatus in the depiction of the much hackneyed romantic theme where the emotional and rhetorical contrivances have been sufficiently displayed, one would scarcely come across a genuine poetic talent of an independent and original character in these imitative *gītakāvyas*.

But in the history of devotional literature in Sanskrit these *gītakāvyas* are, to some extent, responsible in bringing out a new development. Perhaps for the first time the advent of the *Gītagovinda* created a new genre and a forceful impetus for the creation of religious poems, essentially devotional and emotionally religious<sup>4</sup> based on transfigured sex-passion. The blending of eroticism in the speculative religious thought sufficiently enlivened the medieval religious movement of Bhakti and its literature. The poets of the *Gītagāvyas* following the foot-print of the celebrated poet *Jayadeva*, lifted one of the most

powerful impulses of human mind into a means of glorious exaltation. In the field of religion and literature it attracted the masses through its emotional and aesthetic appeal against the high intellectuality of dry dogmas and doctrines. Thus the new application of the apparatus and inventory of *Rasanispatti* alongwith the technicalities of the *Kāmaśāstra* in the making of the religio-literary Gitakavyas became novel intimated and inspiring; as a result of which the erotic sensibility in its devotional ecstasy often rose above the rhetorical formalities that provided the scope for the depiction of intimate personal feeling with the touch of empirical investigations of the gifted poets. But on the other hand one must agree that a few poets of this age carried the erotic sentiment to such a lamentable extreme that the descriptions of dubious acts and jests, which are frank expressions of physical passion, undoubtedly appear unpalatable to the cultured mind. However esoteric the sense may be, they are presented as literal facts, of which sex and sex alone supplies the incentive.

In spite of this solecism the poems bear the stamp of poetic merits that are responsible in savouring the suavity of the romantic subject and sentiment. The passion in these poems is genuine. The pictures possess delicacy of feeling and gracefulness of poetic touch. The reality and richness of the emotion often attained the appreciable standard. But the works being fashioded after the standard pattern of the G.G, have become too much alike, the subjects lack variety and strikingness of inventive thought; the treatment is somewhat similar and the style and diction employ more or less the same series of decorative devices and conceits; yet it cannot be gainsaid that we often find in them a rare and pleasing charm, the succulent possibilities of a highly erotic subject, the lucious exuberance of picture-squeness and mellifluousness, produced by the harmonious adjustment of sound and sense through the employment of befitting method, manner, form and diction, are often remarkable and convincing. Though the *Gītakāvyas* alongwith their mighty sex-impulse have been viewed from different stand-points of human values, yet it is accepted on all hands that undoubtedly is was a positive literary gain of immense importance which

could successfully inspire the people for their religious and literary pursuits for the last few centuries.

By DR. BANMALI RATH

1. "Contribution of Orissa to Gitakavya literature" by Dr. B. Rath Proceedings of the International Sanskrit Conference Vol. I part. I 1975. pp. 2882-400.

2. "A family of poet-cum rhetoricians in Orissa" by Dr. B. Rath, Jhankar. February 1958 Vol. IX No. 12 pp. 1084-90.

3. The VIIIth chapter of the book—

"A study on the Srikṛṣṇalīlāmṛtaṁ" by the present writer.

4. (i) Aspect of Sanskrit Literature—Dr. S. K. De. 1950 p. 138.

(ii) Indian Lyrics—A. R. Dasgupta 1962 pp. 21-24.

5. A new History of Sanskrit Literature. P. 413 Sri Kṛṣṇa Chaitanya.

6. The colophons at the end of the Gitagovinda, Srikṛṣṇalīlāmṛtaṁ by Nityānanda and Mukundavilāsa by Jatindra Raghuttama Tirtha etc. Mss.—preserved in the O. S. M. Bhubaneswar.

7. Dhvanyāloka II. 19-20 and vṛtti thereon 'Vivakṣhā tatparatvena—' etc. and III. 14 and vṛtti—'dṛśyanteca kavayo alamkāraṇi vandhanaikarasā anapekṣhitarasā parabandhesu'.

8. Sāhityadarpaṇa, Ch. VI. 328.

9. 'The Vṛndāvana yamaka and author' S. P. Bhattacharya V. R. Society Bulletin 1931.

10. SKLM. The last verse No. 181.

"Cetaś cet kavitaṁ sudhā jalaṇidhābāplāva māśansati".

The manuscript of the Srikṛṣṇalīlāmṛtaṁ is preserved in the manuscript Library of the Orissa State museum, Bhubaneswar.

11. Kāvya-darśa. I. 18-19 Dhvanyāloka III. 10-14

Sāhityadarpaṇa Ch. VI. 315-324.

12. Dhvanyāloka III. 7 and vṛtti thereon, "Sargabandhetu rasatātpa-  
yaṇa yathārasamaucityam anyathātu kāmācāraḥ"

13. Kāvya mīmāṃsa, PP. 44-45

Kāvyaṇuśaṇa VIII.

Kāvya-darśa I. 16-17

14. The illegality of love is referred to here is parakīyā prīti (The love between man and woman wedded to another person). In Rāsālīlā we find this type of love as the main theme of the Kṛṣṇite kāvyas.

15. This question of legality or illegality of love has been raised in the śrīmadbhāgavatam itself, vide śrīmadbhāgavatā 10.33. 27-29.

16. Vide Kāvya-prakāśa ed. by Jhallakikar P. 121

Sūtra 49 and vṛtti thereon. "Tadābhāṣāḥ anaucitya pravartitāḥ".

17. Vide Sāhityadarpaṇa Ch. III. 262-263. and the example thereon.  
 "anaucitya prabrttatve ābhāso rasa bhāvayoḥ"  
 "Upanāyaka samsthāyām..."  
 Example: "Rāterupanāyakanīṣṭhasya yathā  
 "Svāmī mugdhataro vanam ghanamidam  
 vālāham ekākinī  
 tapme sundara munch kṛṣṇe"
18. Vide SKLM verse Nos. 85, 92, 95.  
 Song No. 17 "Upapatiratininditatāpada..."  
 No. 24 "pati suta bāndhavam apahāya..."
19. Sāhityadarpaṇa III. 259  
 "Rasabhāvau tadābhāsau bhābasyapreśamodayu"  
 Sāntih śabalatāceti sarvepi Rasāh"
20. Vide the Introduction of Hari Caritam ed. S. P. Bhattacharya P. 5  
 F. N. No. 25  
 The pre-chaitenya Alakāra writer Sudeva Mīśra in his Rasavilāsa—  
 "neṣṭā yadanginirase kabibhiḥ parodhastad  
 gokulāmbuja dṛśām kulamāntaṇa  
 Āśamāyā rasavidhera Vatāritānām  
 Kamsāriṇā rasikamaṇḍalaśekharaṇa
21. SKLM. verse Nos. 1-9. Gopāl līlā 1.5
22. Vide Śrīmadbhāgavatam. 10.33. 30-40  
 The point has been discussed here at length.
23. SKLM verse No. 179.

## APPENDIX

### Alphabetical Index of the imitations of the Gitagovinda

Name of the work	Name of the Author	A.D.
1. Abhinava Gitagovinda	Purushottamdeva	1480
2. Anandalatika natika	Ramakrshna	
3. Usabhikasa	Narayana Misra	
4. Kasigita	Candradatta	
5. Krshnagiti	Somanatha	16th Cent
6. Krshnavijaya		
7. Krshnagiti	Manadeva	1652
8. Krshnavilasa	Kaviratna Narayana Misra	1644
9. Krshnalila tarangini	Bellamkonda Ramaryana	
	Sastri	1875

Sl. No.	Name of the work	Name of the Author	Date A.D.
10.	Krshnalila tarangini	Ramasayaka Kavi	
11.	Gangavamsanucarita campu	Vasudeva Rath	
12.	Gitagaurisa (gitagauripati)	Bhanudatta	1320
13.	Gitamukunda	Kamalalocana Khadgaraya	1790
14.	Gitagirisa	Ramabhatta	1513
15.	Gitasamkara	Bhisma Misra	
16.	Gitatamkara	Hira	
17.	Gitagopipati	Krsnadatta	1646
18.	Gitaraghava	Harisankara	
19.	Gitapitavasana	Syamarama kavi	
20.	Gitasitaballabham	Sitikantha	
21.	Gitavali	Rupagosvamin	1470-1554
22.	Gopala Champu	Jivagosvamin	1511-1566
23.	Gitadigambar	Hamsamani	1655
24.	Gitagopala	Caturbhuj	
25.	Gitasankariyam	Jayanarayana Ghosal	
26.	Gitagangadhara	Kalyana	
27.	Gitaraghava	Prabhakara	1674
28.	Gitagaurivara (Gitagauri)	Tirumalla	
29.	Gitabhagavatam	Rayadurga nripati	
30.	Gitavitaraga	Abhinava Carukirti	
31.	Gitagangadhara	Raja Sekhara	
32.	Gitaganghadhara	Candra Sekhara	
33.	Gitapradipa	Jagadhara	
34.	Gitavali (Bhagavata gitavali)		
35.	Gitasitapati	Acyutaraya modaka	
36.	Gitavitaraga (astapadi)		
37.	Gitagangadhara	Gangadhara	
38.	Gitagirisa	Sriharsha	
39.	Gitagirisa (Sivashtapadi)	Mahakavi Ramabhatta	
40.	Gitaraghava Kavyam	Ramakavi	

Sl. No.	Name of the work	Name of the Author	A.D.
41.	Gitasankara	Anantanarayana	
42.	Gitasundara		
	(Sangitasundara)	Sadasiva	
43.	Gitagopala	Caturbhujā	
44.	Gitadamodara	Sambhurama	
45.	Gitamadhava	Rebarama	
46.	Gitarasa	Lakshmana Somayati	
47.	Gitamahesvara	—do—	
48.	Gitasataka	Sundaracarya	
49.	Gitagauripati	Sankara Misra	
50.	Gitamakaranda	—do—	
51.	Gitagaurisa	Ramabhadra	
52.	Gitamahanta	Vamsamani	
53.	Gitagovindastaka	—	
54.	Gopagovinda	—	1625
55.	Gopalakeli candrika	Ramakrshna	
56.	Candika Carita candrika	Krsnadatta	1646
57.	Carugita Kavya	Nanjaraja	
58.	Citrayajna natika	Ramakrshna	
59.	Chandomakhanta	Purushottamabhabhatta	1550
60.	Jagannathavallabhanataka	Rayaramananda	1500
61.	Janakigita	Hariharacarya	
62.	Tripurasundaristuti kavya	Kalidasa	1751
63.	Darukavanavilasa	Ratnaradhya	17th Cent.
64.	Nanjarajadasamollasa		
	Campu	Nilakantha	
65.	Nandighoshavijaya natika	Ramakrshna	
66.	Nanjaraja Campu	Srinivasacarya	
67.	Patavilasa (Sahaji vilasa)	Dhundivysa	
68.	Brajayuva vilasa	Kamalalocana	
		Khadgaraya	1790
69.	Bhagavatagitavalli		
70.	Bhonsale vamasavali		
	campu	Naidhruva kasyapa	
71.	Madhavagitasudah	Raghava apakhandekar	
72.	Mudita Madhava	Satanjiva Misra	1650



Sl. No.	Name of the work	Name of the Author	A.D.
73.	Mukundavilasa mahakavya	Yatindra Raghuttama- tirtha 1667	
74.	Mukundananda	Kasipati	
75.	Ramagitagovinda	Jayadeva	
76.	Ramodaharanagitakavya	Venkatapa nayaka	
77.	Ramagitakavyam	Vrttamani Srinivasacarya	
78.	Ramagita	Krshnabhata	
79.	Ramodaharanagiti kavyam	Narayana Swami	
80.	Rasavihara	Madhava	
81.	Raghava Pravandam	—	
82.	Ramacandrodaya	Purushottama Misra	
83.	Ramabhyudaya	Purushottama Misra	
84.	Ramakatha Sudodaya	Saiva Srinivasa Suri	
85.	Raghashtapadi		
86.	Rukminiparinaya	Narayana Misra	
87.	Rukminyashtapadi		
88.	Vahuvalisvami Asthapadi		
89.	Valabhadra vijaya	Narayana Misra	
90.	Valaramayana	Purushottama Misra	
91.	Vishnupavali		
92.	Viraviruda	Candradatta	
93.	Vairagya cintamani	Manavikrama Kaviraja	
94.	Sarabhoji rajacarita	Anantanarayana	
95.	Sankara vihara	Narayana Misra	
96.	Sankari Sangitam (Gitasankariyam)	Jayanarayana Ghosal	
97.	Sankarigiti		
98.	Santasudharasa	Muni vinayavijaya	
99.	Sivalilamrta mahakavyam	Nityananda	1700
100.	Sivamohini vilasa	Bhaskara	
101.	Sivashtapadi	Venkatapa nayak	
102.	Sivagiti Malika	Candrasekharananda Sarasvati	
103.	Sivagitimalika	Candasikhamuni	
104.	Sivagita	Rama	

Sl. No.	Name of the Work	Name of the Author	A.D.
105.	Sivashtapadi		
106.	Sivashtapadi	Ratnaguru	
107.	Srikrśnalilahṛta	Nityananda	1700
108.	Srikrśnalila tarangini	Narayana Misra	1675
109.	Sri Kṛśnalilamṛtam	Iśwarapuri	
100.	Sri Kṛśnastava	Dinavandhu Misra	
101.	Sri Ramastapadi		
	vivarana	Upanisad Brahmendra	
112.	Sṛngara rasa mandana	Vitthallesvara	1550
113.	Samrddha madhva		
	nataka	Govinda Samantaraya	1594
114.	Sangita Cintamani	Kamalalocana Khadgaray	1790
115.	Sangita raghunandana	Gangadhara	1864
116.	Sangita raghunandana	Priyadasa	1832
117.	Sangita Gangadhara	Nanjaraja	1705
118.	Sangita Madhava	Probodhananda Sarasvati	
119.	Sangita Madhva	Govinda Daia	1537
120.	Sangitaraghava	Cinnabommabhupala	
121.	Sangita Sundara	Sadasiva	
122.	Sahaji vilasa (Patavilasa)	Dhundi vyasa	
123.	Sahaji Rajashtapadi	Sri Srinniyasa	
124.	Sangita Govinda	Madhusudana	
125.	Harismṛtisudhankura	Raghunandana	
126.	Kṣhanadagita Cintamani	Visvanatha cacravarti	1664
127.	An unknown work of king puruṣhottama		
	(Bhanudeva. II)		1328
128.	An unknown work of Kṛśnadasa		1570
129.	An unknown work of Raja Raghunathaharicandan		1620
130.	An unknown work of Govinda Dasa		1577
131.	An unknown work of Radhamohana Thakur		1698
132.	An unknown work of Harihara		18th Cent

## Two commentaries on the Gita-Govinda

The *Gita-govinda* by Jayadeva has not only been famous in India for its melody, but also attained celebrity amongst the western scholars. It has been commented upon by several medieval scholars of different parts of India. In the editorial notes appended to the *History of Sanskrit Literature*, vol. I, Dr. S. N. Dasgupta has enumerated thirty commentaries so far discovered.<sup>1</sup> Sri M. Krishnamachariar in his *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, has recorded thirtytwo commentaries many of which have been included in the list given by Dr. Dasgupta<sup>2</sup>. The number of commentaries so far recovered undoubtedly testify to the wide popularity enjoyed by *Gita-govinda* during the last few hundred years.<sup>3</sup> Recently two more commentaries have been recovered in Assam. A brief account of these commentaries has been given below.

The commentary which is the more exhaustive of the two and which appears to have gained more popularity, is known as *Saravati*.<sup>4</sup> The commentator Maharaja Sri *Sukladhvaja* is an important figure in the history of Assam. He was the younger of the two celebrated sons of king Visva Simha (1510-1540) the founder of the Koch kingdom which comprised the whole of Western Assam and parts of North Bengal. Visva Simha was succeeded by Malladeva *alias* Narayana (1540—1585), a great patron of art and literature. The learned commentator was the young brother of Naranarayana and served as the Prime Minister and Commander-in-chief of the royal army. In him the qualities of a victorious general and a scholar were admirably combined. He led a victorious campaign against the neighbouring kingdoms, but ultimately found his Waterloo in the battle against the Nawab of Bengal. This happened about 1563 A.D. Sukladhvaja remained a prisoner for a year and after his release he sided with the Mughal army under Akbar the Great against the Nawab of

Bengal and thus avenged his previous defeat. He died about 1580 A.D.<sup>5</sup> The commentary was probably written within 1540-1550. In the commentary he introduces himself as Maharaja; this indicates that he undertook the task of writing the commentary when he came to power as the *defacto* king of the state being the right-hand man and Commander-in-chief of the *de jure* king Naranarayana who ascended the throne in 1540 A.D. The lower limit of the work may approximately be fixed in or about 1560 which marked the beginning of the series of military campaigns which probably afforded little opportunity for scholarly pursuits.

The Sukladhvaja wrote this commentary and not any of his court poets can be inferred from two external evidences. One is furnished by the Assamese translation of *Gita-govinda* by Ramasarasvati in the 16th century of the Christian era. Here Ramasarasvati refers to *Saravati* by Sukladhvaja in the following way :

“I have rendered the *Gita-govinda* by Jayadeva into Assamese verse; Maharaja Sukladhvaja also wrote a commentary. If you cannot follow my rendering, please consult the commentary.<sup>6</sup>”

The other evidence is furnished by a manuscript copy of Jagadhara's commentary *Saradipika*.<sup>7</sup> The introductory and concluding verses of this copy of Jagadhara's commentary are composed by one Ratnakara Kandali. The opening lines of the manuscript have been quoted below :

Opening lines ;

*Śrīśukladēvabhūpālayacasā likhati sphuṭam  
saṭikagūtagōvindam Śrīratnākarakandalī  
karakalitabhujāṅgō mastavinyastagaṅgo  
vihitanāṭanaraṅgo- dattadaityēsābhaṅgaḥ  
Cīravigaladanaṅgaḥ tyaktasaṅgo aṅganāṅgo  
bhavatu mama vibhūtye śambhurunmattagaṅgaḥ*

From the above lines it is clear that Ratnakara Kandali transcribed *Gita-govinda* and *Saradipika* at the behest of Sukladhvaja. Probably the copy of the commentary by Jagaddhara that belonged to Sukladhvaja was in a worn-out condition, and therefore, Ratnakara Kandali was asked to make a fresh copy

it.<sup>8</sup> The words *likhati sphutam* otherwise carry no meaning when we read it together with the succeeding lines where the authorship has been clearly ascribed to Jagaddhara. Ratnakara Kandali not only copied the manuscript but also added a few lines of his own to the beginning and the end of the commentary.

The influence of the commentary *Saradipika* on the work of Sukladhvaja is considerable and Jagaddhara's views have been cited at several places of his commentary. The fact that Sukladhvaja possessed a copy *Gita-Govinda* with Jagaddhara's commentary and that he asked a scholar to make a transcript of it proves his deep interest in *Gita-govinda*; and that indirectly establishes his claim to the authorship of *Saravati*.

The *Saravati* begins with a salutation to Krishna. The introductory lines are quoted below :

*kastūrīmakarīruca kucaṭate nētreñjanānām śrīyam kaṭhē  
śyāma sarōjadāmasushamāmāsyē dvirēphadyutim  
śrīṅgarāṅkuravibhramanca hridayē vāmabhruvam tanvaṭī  
rāsōllāsa bharōddhara madhuripōḥ kānticcaṭū pātu vāḥ  
vyhākhyānam vividham nidhāya hridaye prakhyātasamkyā-  
vatām sāram tasya vivicya sajjanasabhāsaṁbhāshāshanair-  
bhūyasah*

*vispashṭam jayadēvasatkavigirām guḍhāśyōdbhāshiṇim ṭikām  
sārāvatiṁimām vitanute sukladhvaṇō bhūpatiḥ*

Concluding lines : *vaśyaśrījayadēvapaṇḍitakavērvāṇīnavīnān-  
ganā na prāyāni (prāyēṇa ?) nivēśitum prabhavati śrīyam  
svayam (svīyam hiyā ?) kiñcana*

*Śrīśukladhvavajabhārati rasavati tasyā vayasyā tatah  
tatparyani*

*gaṇānalasatipadam(?) jānita vidyadjanāḥ*

*Sadvaṇīm jayadēvapaṇḍitakavērvāṇīm nigūḍhāśayam nānā-  
lankritibhūshitāmgūṇavatīm hridyancamānām parām*

*...kshitipālamaulimukūṭaprasliṣṭa pādadyutēḥ śrīśukladhva-  
jabhūbhujō vijayatāmākālpamēshā kritiḥ*

One of the noticeable features of the commentary is the description of *ragas* in their deified or personified forms. These *raga-dhyanas* agree in detail with those described in *raga-māla*

texts and depicted in the medieval paintings. A few of such *raga-dhyana* have been quoted below :

The commentator has probably taken these descriptions of *ragas* from *Sara-dipika* which also contains similar portrayal of different melodies employed by Jayadeva in *Gita-govinda*.

*Saravati* quotes profusely from various texts and cites various authorities. A list of works quoted and authorities cited are noted below :

*svarṇaprabhā bhāṣvarabhushaṇā ca nīlam nicōlam vapushā*  
*vahanti*  
*kāntē padōpāntamadhistitēpi manōnnata rāmakiri pradishṭā*  
*śyāmā sukēśī priyavādinī ca saṁlēpitā lōhitacandanēna*  
*pi:astragadhyāsitakēśapāśā prōktā kavindraiḥ kila bhairavīyam*  
*vinōdayanti dayitam sukēśi sukaṇkaṇā cāmaracālanēna*  
*skandhē dadhānā surapushpaguchcham varāṅganēya kathitā*  
*baḍārī(?)*

The commentator has probably taken these descriptions of *ragas* from *Sara-dipika* which also contains similar portrayal of different melodies employed by Jayadeva in *Gita-govinda*.

*Saravati* quotes profusely from various texts and cites various authorities. A list of work quoted and authorities cited are noted below :

- (a) Lexicons and word-books : *Amarakosa*, *Vṛddha-Amara*, *Sasvata*, *Viśya*, *Dharanī*, *Medinī*, *Haravali*, and *Ratnakosa*.
- (b) Kavyas : *Malatī-madhava*, *Sringara-tilaka*, *Mudra-rakshasa*, *Karpura-manjarī*, *Bhagavata-puranā*, and *Kusumanjali*.
- (c) Poetics : *Natya-sastra*, *Bhava-lata*, *Kavyadarsā*, *Sahitya-darpana*, *Sarasvatī-kanthabharana*.
- (d) Erotics : *Kama-sutra*, *Kama-tantra*, *Bharata*, *Rasika-sarvasva*, *Nagara-suryasya*.
- (e) Commentaries : *Sara-dipika*, *Pitamundiya*, the commentary on *Gita-govinda* by *Bhagiratha*.

The commentary gives definitions of different types of *nayakas* and *nayikas*, and their moods, attitudes and feelings at different

erotic stages of the mind. There are a number of verses dealing with topics which should really come under *Kama-sastra* (erotics), but these verses have been ascribed to Bharata. In the extant *Natyasastra* of Bharata, such verses are not to be found. Verses dealing with topics like sexual union, orgasme '(yuti lakshanam)' methods of copulation etc. have been quoted at different places of the work and they are ascribed to Bharata

A few of such verses ascribed to Bharata are quoted here ;

*Suratāntalakṣṇam* : angasyēdaḥ slathatvaṁ ca kēśavastrādi-  
samvritiḥ  
jāte cyutimukhe nāryā virāgēchchā ca  
gamyate

*Cyutilakṣṇam* : mūrchanā militam cakshuśachyuti-  
kālasya-lakṣṇam  
tataḥ svajaghanākṣhlēśhah śūtkārō vītal-  
añjaya  
humkāraḥ svāsvatam (?) nāryāḥ cyuti-  
sānnidhyakōrakah

*Krauñcabandha-*

*lakṣṇam* : hastau pascāt samānīya padasthānē śira-  
stathā  
striyāḥ pādaḥ hridisthānē kraunchabandh-  
aḥ prakīrtitah

*Purushāyita-*

*śrīngāram* : nūpuranīśyanau jātau śrūyate rasanādh-  
vaniḥ  
mūṭhakānte ratiśrānte kāmīnīpurushān-  
yite

*Grāmyabandha-*

*lakṣṇam* : Uttānitāyāḥ surate yaduru āśīnakāntōru-  
gatau bhavētām  
Grāmyam tadā syāt kaṭitā yadāśya bahir-  
bhavētankila nāgarākhyam

*Sringara lakshannai* : (1) *jaghanakalita kāntaḥ*

*śrōṇīrapyōpaviṣṭāt vajrati yadiha  
nārā muktakēśattariya karajavada-  
nahridyam cuṃbanamcāvidhitsu  
kalayati jaghanōpaslēshamēnam  
munīndrah*

(2) *Adharadaśanajihvāpānamārabhya  
kuryāt*

*nayanayadanaguhyē cēti jihvāprasārē  
grahaṇamatha vidadhyāt vastrakēśa-  
stanādeḥ  
kucayugabhagadēśē mardana  
cōruyugme*

(3) *Āslēshacumbananasvakshatatāḍanāni  
samardanam prahasitam khalu  
vikshitāni*

*jihvappravēśarasanāgrasamanta (?)  
nābhikshōbha vacam vadati...nītijñah*

(4) *Angētha talpētha sukhōpaviṣṭām  
gāṭham patiḥ śliṣhyati sā ca  
kāntam*

*anyōnyagātrē viśativa rāgāt dyaṇḍyam  
tadā kshirajalābhidānam*

The verses quoted above and topics dealt therein are beyond the scope of the *Natya-sastra* by Bharata. These verses are obviously gleaned from some works falsely ascribed to Bharata. Another work frequently quoted to illustrate mental or emotional states of lovers is *Bhava-lata*.

The commentary frequently refers to two older commentaries on *Gita-govinda* : one is, as has been already referred to, the *Sara-dipika* by Jagaddhara the celebrated commentator on *Malati-madhava*, *Veni-samhara* and *Vasavadatta*. The other is an unnamed commentary by Bhagiratha,<sup>9</sup> probably the famous commentator of *Kavyadarsa*, *Naishadha*, *Sisupala-vadha*, *Meghaduta* and *Kratarjuniya*. Bhagiratha as a commentator of *Gita-govinda* is little known, and amongst the thirty and odd



commentators so far known his name is not found. From his Kiratarjuniya commentary we learn that Bhagiratha belonged to Pitamundiya family; hence the reference to Pitamundi is to Bhagiratha's commentary on the Gita-govinda.

The commentary has accepted the traditional view that Jayadeva was a court poet of King Lakshmana Sena of Gauda.<sup>10</sup>

The second commentary recently recovered in Assam is *Sandarbhā-dīpikā* by one *Dhritidasa*.<sup>11</sup> The manuscript records Saka 1725 as the date of its completion.<sup>12</sup> The date probably refers to the time of the completion of the manuscript copy, for, immediately after the date, the name of the copyist Dharmaraja Sarma is mentioned. Nothing is definitely known of the commentator Dhritidasa Sarma but he appears to be an Assamese from the fact that he gives equivalents of a few Sanskrit proper names.

The commentary begins with a salutation verse in praise of the Goddess of Speech.

The following works have been frequently quoted by Dhritidasa in his commentary :

Lexicons :—*Medini*, *Viśva*, *Amara*, *Pada-sagara*.

Kavyas :—*Sisupala-vadhā*, *Udbhata-sagara* (anthology).

Poetics :—*Kavyadarsa*, *Bharata*, *Alankara-samgraha*

Erotics :—*Kamasutra*, *Rati-sagara*, *Rati-rahasya*, *Rati-ratna*, *Sringara-prakasa*, *Nagara-Sarvasya*, *Rasika-sarvasya* and *Bharata*.<sup>13</sup>

The common features between *sarayati* and *Sandarbhā-dīpikā* are :—(i) Both the commentaries have quoted Bharata not only as the celebrated writer of the *Natya-sastra* but also as one of the authoritative writers on erotics. (ii) Both have quoted from musical treatises the *dhyānas* of different *ragas* employed by Jayadeva.

One special feature of Dhritidasa's commentary is that it quotes several works on erotics. Passages from *Nagara-sarvasya*, *Rasika-sarvasya* and *Sringara-Prakasa* are more numerous.

By DR. S. N. SARMA

1. S. N. Dasagupta & S. K. De : *History of Sanskrit Literature*, vol. I., p. 666.

2. M. Krishnamachariar : *A History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 342.

3. (A complete account of the *Gita-govinda*, its commentaries and imitations is under Preparation by Dr. V. Raghavan and will soon be published—Ed.)

4. Manuscript copies of this commentary have been preserved in the libraries of the Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Gauhati, and the Kamarup Sanskrit Sanjivani Sabha, Nalbari (Assam). The writer is in possession of a third copy.

(According to a list of Mss. in private possession in Assam available in the New Catalogue office, Madras University, there is a Ms. of this Commentary with Gopinath Sarmopadhyaya, Kaniha, Assam.—Ed.)

5. K. L. Barooa : *Early History of Kamarupa*, Pp. 292-302.

6. *Ramasarasvati* : *Gita-govinda* (Assamese version) Verse No. 5. (See also Descriptive Catalogue of Assamese Mss., H. C. Gosvami, Calcutta University, 1920, Pp. 77-8. Ed.)

7. Ms. No. 70, Department of Historical & Antiquarian Studies, Gauhati.

8. The manuscript of *Sara-dipika*, preserved in the Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Gauhati, was copied in the year 1704 (1626 Saka) by one Kamala Pathaka. probably copied it from the original transcription of Ratnakara Kandali who flourished in the 16th century.

9. The following lines of the commentary (on 12.12 of the *Gita-govinda*) may be noted.

*bhagīraṭvādyalikhitatvāt granthasandarbhoviruddhatvāt pakṣhēpatvāch-  
cha upēkṣhitāḥ*

10. Commenting on 1.4 of the *Gita-govinda*, the author of *Saravati* writes :

*lakṣmaṇasēnasabhāsadām svarūpakathanēna nijōtkarshapratipādanēna  
svakāvnomahātmyam sūcayati*

11. Ms. No. 64, Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Gauhati. (There is a ms. of this commentary in the Dacca University Library, No. 4435.—Ed.)

12. *śākē śrīhoimavatyaḥ padakamalayuga śaṭpadōbhūya śāstra (?)  
vaiśākhē bāṇabāhuśikhiriśaśiyute śubhrapakṣhē caturthyām*

13. Most of these works have been referred to by M. Krishnamachariar in his *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 885-896.

## A newly discovered Ms. of Gitagovinda

In spite of the synthetic and cultural unity, every province of India has from the remotest times, developed and possessed an art tradition of her own as having expression to the spirit of the particular race which inhabits that province. It is the synthesis of these separate and diverse art-traditions substituting in different parts of India and each possessing a distinct individuality that constitutes the common mosaic of Indian art, which was produced not merely to give expression to the artist's own feelings or emotions, but in response to a definite demand in the social and religious life of the people on one hand, while on the other it was a spontaneous expression of the life of the people themselves and was an inseparable part of that of life. There was thus no duality between life and art.

The relation between Art and Religion is a matter of eternal interest. The whole of Indian life is so based on theocratic ideals that it is not surprising that art should also be so. India is spiritualistic, and its spirituality is the underlying cause of its art-culture. As to please the Gods the Indian people developed their Music, so to illuminate the attributes of their divinities they had recourse to painting and Sculpture. And to enshrine their metallic and lithic images they eventually developed their Architecture, Sculpture, Architecture and Painting all the three are thus inter-related and they grow up side by side. The architects built stupas, viharas and temples, while, the sculptors found their motives in the legends of Buddha, Mahavira, Krishna and Rama and the stories associated with their life and religion. Art in India has, thus, always been a hand maid of religion.

Although nearly all Indian art is religious it is a mistake to suppose that style was dependent on creed. 'Style' is more conveniently considered as a function of time and place, varying accordingly to the date and locality of the work. There is no such

thing for example, as a Jaina style of architecture or painting. The Stupas of the Jainas are indistinguishable in form from those of the Buddhists, and a Jaina curvilinear steeple is identical in outline with that of a Brahmanical temple.

Pictorial art in Western India, principally of Gujarat is thus, the style of a geographical area and of a particular creed, either Jain or Hindu, or Rajput as it is styled between 16th and 19th centuries. The technique and style of the miniature-painting in Mss. of Jaina canonical works ranging from 12th century upto the 16th is identical with those of the Brahmanical and secular Mss. that have come to light. The same thing holds good even in the later Hindu miniatures that come under that influence of the Mughal style.

The great cycle of classic Sanskrit literature and Sastriya plastic art had passed their zenith before the end of the 9th century. The vernaculars of various provinces began to develop from the secondary Prakritis about the 10th or 11th century. This development was not merely an accidental change, but a movement of constructive evolution under the great spiritual impulse of the Puranic renaissance—the emergence of the ultimate phases of Indian religion in the cults of Siva, Sakti and Vishnu, in their loving manifestations.

And the beginning of the 16th century was a time of great religious, social and literary upheaval for it witnessed the careers not only of Chitanya, Vallabha, the founder of the popular cult of emotional Vaishnavism—Tukarama, the spiritual preceptor of the Great Sivaji, but also of Nanak, the founder of the virile congregation of the Sikhs.

Under the influence of the gradually developing phases of popular Vaishnavism in Gujarat, the cult of Siva and Sakti was greatly modified, and it resulted in the Right-hand worship of the Mother Goddess with identical Smarta or Vaishnava rites and ceremonies. The central inspiration of Western Indian Pictorial Art—which includes the pure Gujarati or Southern Rajastani miniature—Art dating from the 11th century onwards—up to the end of the 16th century and the well known Rajput art which obtains from 17th century upto the end of the 19th) is mostly

Vaishnava. Vernacular poetry and painting, popular music and celebrations of festivals are the various expressions of this common inspiration.

The cult of loving devotion, with Sri Krishna as the central figure arose about the 10th or the 11th century. It was the way to salvation open to all, irrespective of birth, range or sex, as contrasted with the highway of knowledge accessible only to the few. This medieval resurgence of popular religion and culture has not yet spent its force, and has continued to dominate the art and literature of the country for practically a millennium.

Since the advent of the Mohammedans, the days of Mahakavyas, of epics had gone. There was also then no scope for grandiose sculpture and elaborate fresco-painting, for it was a time of popular resurgence and democratisation of culture. Miniature-painting, was, therefore not an accident—but a logical extension of the culture which was not becoming the property of the masses through the cultivation of the vernaculars—the spoken tongue of the people. It was a decline it was perhaps inevitable, for the standards of early classics in art could not naturally be maintained. Hence the miniature-painting of pre-Mughal days never overcame the disabilities of its plebian origin, and it did not attain its aesthetic possibilities until it came under the sheltering wing of royal patronage.

Hindu painting is essentially an aristocratic folk-art, appealing in all classes alike, static, lyrical and inconceivable, apart from the life it reflects as contrasted to Mughal painting which is academic, dramatic, objective and eclectic. After Akbar, Mughal painting is almost devoid of any poetical background. Hindu painting, on the other hand, illustrates every phase of medieval Sanskrit, Hindi and Rajastani literature, and indeed, its themes cannot be understood without a thorough knowledge of the Indian epics, the Krishna literature, music and erotics. Hindi paintings, thus, more akin to the art of literary compositions—a kind of pictorial interpretation rather than more embellishment of poetic themes.

The development of the Hindi and the Rajasthani literature during the Mughal period is closely and organically connected

with the evolution of Hindi painting as exemplified in the pictures illustrating the various sentiments (*rasa*), the different kinds of heroes (*nāyakas*) and heroines (*nāyikās*), the seasons of the year and the modes of the year and the modes of music. In fact the poets not infrequently furnished the imaginative frame-work which was elaborated by the artists into glowing pictures of concrete images and appropriate atmosphere. It was always the painter who copied and translated the poet's ideas: and it is because of this that the verses of Jayadeva, Bihārī, Keśavadās and Matirām and the episodes of the *Shrimad Bhāgavata* form the principal repertory of Hindu painting. This practice of depending upon the poet for ideas and imagery was fully in consonance with ancient traditions; for the philosopher in this country furnished the intellectual foundation and set the rules, on and within which the artist was free to expand himself.

Hindu painting reached its zenith under the fostering care of royal courts and with its decline the art also languished. In fact, in the history of Hindu painting, there was an early differentiation between patronage-art and the art which exclusively attached itself to temple-building. The former developed into miniature-painting, the earliest remnants of which are found in the Mss. of Jaina canonical works. It was partly secular and partly religious, cultivated as a pastime and an accomplishment at the courts and residences of princes and wealthy merchants. The art of temple work is witnessed in the immortal frescoes of Ajantā and Bāgh, Sigiriā and Sittānvāsal. The Rajput princes and the wealthy middle class in Western India shared with the common people their benefits in the religious ideas—which are real inspirators of Rajput art. The difference, therefore, between Mughal art and Hindu art lies not only in their difference of clientele but also of ideas and outlook.

Technically and stylistically the differences are quite clear. Apart from the illustrations of manuscripts in direct continuation of Persian tradition, Mughal painting is essentially an art of miniature-painting; and when enlarged, becomes an easel picture: Indian Ms. illustrations are, however, in a totally different tradition: Hindu painting enlarged thus becomes a

mural fresco, historically, indeed, it is a reduced wall-painting. This is better illustrated by some specimens from the *Gītagovinda* Ms. under notice in this paper.

Traces of Vaiṣṇavism may be said to be evident in Gujarāt even earlier than the 13th century, as is known from King Śāraṅgadeva's inscription of Saṁvat 1348 (1292 A.D.) which records a continuation of the gift for the worship of and offerings to the feet of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the old temple at Pālaṇpur (N. Gujarāt)\*. The introductory verse of this stone-inscription, which is the last verse of the 1st canto of the *Gītagovinda*, and describes Kṛṣṇa as the essence of the ten *avatāras* establishes the fact with greater certainty. Popularity of Viṣṇu-worship in Gujarāt can be gauged from the unique and rich varieties of Viṣṇu images of Mediæval Indian Sculpture, that are met with in all sizes and in varying aesthetic qualities.\*

The fact that out of the whole text of the lyrical poem, the *dasāvatāras* verse had found its way in a stone-inscription shows how the popularity of the saint-poet of Bengal in the East had reached the farther West province of India-Gujarāt; and it shows, also, how the work had become quasi-sacred on this side of India, which has its famous pilgrim centres of Prabhāsa and Dwārkā intimately connected with the cult of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, incessantly visited by the ever-moving caravans of pilgrims from all parts of India who used to exchange among themselves devotional songs and sweet prayers carried from such avowed centres of Hindu culture. It is also significant that in the earliest known illustrated Mss. of the *Gītagovinda*, only the ten *avatāras* are reproduced in line and colour; the other religio-erotic scenes from the poem being left out for later artists to visualise. The illustrated sets of the *Bālagopālastuti* Mss. by Bilvamangala, the author of *Kṛṣṇa Kaṇāmṛta* in the pure Gujarāti style, may be mentioned here in passing to show the popularity of Kṛṣṇa-cult in Gujarāt early in the 15th century.

A mediæval sculpture with a Kṛṣṇa legend (Bāla Kṛṣṇa standing near the churning vessel) is found on a pillar at the Sun temple of Moḍherā, built in the 11th century. An image of Govardhanadhārī Śrī Kṛṣṇa now at Verāval (Southern

Kāthiāwād) brought from Devapaṭṭan bears an inscription of the installation of the image in Valabhi Saṃvar 927 (V.S. 1302) by a lady of the Āhira caste.

The sculptured pillar (circa 6th century) with two incident—from the life of Bāla Kṛṣṇa—the Nāgadamaṇa and the Govars dhanadhāraṇa—unearthed at Mandor near Jodhpur, in 1905 by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar pushes back the history of the Kṛṣṇa-cult in Western India several centuries earlier.

Coming to later period, a folio from the Mss. of the *Viṣṇubhakticandrodaya* is mentioned in the *Bhavnagar Inscriptions* dated Samvat 1469, evidently prior either to Chaitanya or Vallabha.

Thus the cult of Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa, manifested itself in many channels rather unobserved until the 15th century, when Vaiṣṇavism had evolved into a sect. It was left for Vallabh-āchārya to turn it into a popular religion of the Gujarāṭi Hindus with an aesthetic and practical code of worship. Accordingly, other cults were absorbed in the all-absorbing Vaiṣṇavism of Vallabha.

The *Magnum opus* of Vaiṣṇava Bhakti-Śāstra is *Srīmat Bhāga, vata Purāṇa*, attributed to Vyāsa, the author of Mahābhārata—who had omitted the treatment of Bhakti : and it was to make up that want that he brought out the *Bhāgavata*. While the *Hari-vaṃśa* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* each gives some account of Kṛṣṇa's youth spent among the *gopas* and *gopis* of Vrindāvana and its neighbourhood, they deal with the whole life of Kṛṣṇa : whereas the *Bhāgavata* scarcely refers to his later life, but spends all its strength over his boyhood and youth : hence the hold it has had on some of the Vaiṣṇava sects and communities, and on many of the noble minds of India. *Bhāgavata* has come to be the gospel of popular Vaiṣṇavism and the inexhaustible repertory of Hindu literature and painting. The subject-matter of the *Gitagovinda* is due to the same source.

The *Gitagovinda*—the song celestial in praise of Lord Kṛṣṇa—of Jayadeva (died 1120 A.D.) may be said to be the first as well as the finest poetical expression of that great devotional wave of Vaiṣṇavism, which swept through India and revolutionized the life of the people in the 15th and the 16th centuries. Popular



Vaiṣṇavism sounded the innermost depths of the common consciousness, which under its fecund inspiration, found expression in a variety of ways. It was in a way a revival of popular culture which produced in the domain of Hindi literature lofty and refined melodies and accomplished verses of poets like Sūrdās, Bihārī, Matirām and Keśavadās.

The subject of the *Gitagovinda*—a lyrical drama—is the love of Kṛṣṇa for the beautiful cowherdess Rādhā, the estrangement of their loves and their final reconciliation. There are four aspects in which the *Gitagovinda* is viewed by Indian readers: (i) literary, (ii) devotional, (iii) musical, and (iv) mystical. All these views combined have led to the wide popularity of the poem, all over India. The ten incarnations of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa are of universal acceptance among Hindus: and the popularity of the *Gitagovinda* resting on this view has not suffered in the least in spite of its Śṛṅgāric (erotic) note—the sensualism in full bloom—woven in sweet words of exquisite music. It is the devotional side of the *Gitagovinda* that has found greater appeal in Western India, especially the hymn of the ten incarnations of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. *Jayadeva*, its author, too, is looked upon more as a *bhakta*, rather than a poet as he figures in Nābhāji's Hindi *Bhaktamālā* and in the Gujarāṭi poem *Surata-Saṅgrāma* of Narasimha Mehtā, the poetry of whom is highly reminiscent of *Jayadeva's* work.

The *Gitagovinda*, like the *Kṛṣṇa-Karṇāmṛita* of Bilva Maṅgala (which has several verses in common to *Bālagopālāstuti* mentioned above) is a group of erotico-mystic lyrics of considerable devotional fervour on the romantic theme of Kṛṣṇa. This theme must have been a living reality to the poet as well as to his audience. There has been a great deal of mediæval scholastic interpretation, but no account of theological subtlety can overly, the artistic and human appeal of the poem. In spite of simplicity and directness, the poem possesses all the distinctive features of a deliberate work of art. Its undoubted verbal melody and highly sensuous pictorial, authenticated by a deep sincerity of ecstatic emotion, make it a finished product of great lyric beauty. Devotee yet sensuous, it expresses fervent religious longings in the intimate language of earthly passion, and illustrates finely the use

of love-motif in the service of religion.

The earliest illustrated manuscript of the *Gītagovinda* so far known to us (of course being limited only to miniatures for six of the ten avatāras of Kṛṣṇa, with an introductory one for Śārādā) was published in the *Journal of the University of Bombay, Volume VI, Part VI*, May 1938, under the title "A 15th Century *Gītagovinda* Ms. with Gujarāṭi Paintings," with colour reproductions of the extant miniatures which are in the pure Gujarāṭi style.

A later version of the *Gītagovinda* in paintings, executed at Basholi in the Kashmir State belonging to the first half of the 17th century, contains miniatures which cover each an entire page with the text written on the back; they were exhibited by Śrīyuta Ajit Ghosh at the 2nd Lucknow Art Exhibition in 1926 and one of them was published in *Rupam* No. 37.

N. C. Mehta was the first to publish the pictorial composition of the *Gītagovinda* by Mānaku—a goldsmith by caste, the court-artist of Tehri-Garhwāl a Rajput State in the Himalayas, in Samvat 1887, who, it is recorded, was inspired by a lady of distinction to "compose," as he calls it, his pictorial version of *Jayadeva's* celebrated masterpiece. The whole of the *Gītagovinda* has been composed by Mānaku in scores of paintings, out of which two are reproduced in the "*Studies in Indian Painting*" as Plates 23 and 24 (Chapter V: The Court-Art of Tehri-Garhwāl).

Dr. Stella Kramarisch published the illuminations of a *Gītagovinda* manuscript, about a century old from Bengal, in the *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art*, December 1934, with the text in Bengali characters. The glow of post-Chaitanya painting in Bengal lingers in these miniatures.

The simple yet suggestive miniatures of the manuscript, introduced through this paper, belong to the Early Rājasthāni or Gujarāt style of painting of about the early 16th century. Simplicity in design and in composition suggests an early date for the Ms. as we know from a close study of the Mss. of *Kalpasūtra* and the *Devīmāhātmya* that the illustrations in the narrative art—grow more copious, more complex and more crowded with details as we progress from century to century.

The Ms. was only recently acquired by the Honorary Secretary of the Gujarāt Vernacular Society, Ahmedabad, from a Baroda dealer in antiquities. I am obliged to the Asst. Secretary, Śrīyuta Rasikalāl Parikh, for kindly making it convenient to place the Ms. at my disposal for purposes of study.

It is a tiny manuscript measuring about 4" × 5", amply illuminated on hand-made paper and painted with indigenous colours, directly on the surface of the paper, without priming. The surface of the paper-page is designed on the palm-leaf manuscript page, it being its one-third in this instance.

The Ms. comprising of 34 folios (68 sides) with 35 miniatures is, however, incomplete, the text running up to the end of the eleventh *sarga*, and some portion of the twelfth, leaving us quite ignorant of the exact date and name of the artist of the copyist. However, the introductory remarks contained in the three lines<sup>1</sup> at the bottom of the first folio (in Old Gujarāṭi prose, leaves very little doubt about the location of the Ms., and its style of execution, which must be somewhere in Western India, where the old Western Rājasthāni or early Gujarāṭi language was in vogue.

We are here incidentally reminded of the illuminated *Bhāgavata* manuscript in Jodhpur Fort Library, wherein the legend of the miniatures in the Sanskrit text with *Bhāvārthadīpikā* commentary of Śrīdhara is given in Old Gujarāṭi prose. The Manuscript is dated Samvat 1667; scribe's name is Suraji and the artist's name is Govind<sup>2</sup>.

One of the oldest Rājput paintings of the Kṛṣṇa-līlā theme, published by Dr. A. K. Coomarswamy with a title "Kṛṣṇa Rādhā"<sup>3</sup> shows in style, lyrical theme and the language of the superscription an intermediate relation to the Gujarāṭi paintings of the 15th century. It is introduced as being of the Early Rājput (Rājasthāni) or Gujarāṭi style of the 16th century.

The illuminations of this Gītagovinda Ms. are planned according to one idea, which is carried out with a few variations on some pages. In every case the written text as well as the miniatures occupy almost a square panel: the idea in the text is

illustrated by a miniature on the obverse or the reverse of the folio, without any text.

The variation from this main theme occurs within the first five folios (ten sides) of the *Daśāvatāra Stotra* (Hymn of the ten incarnations) where every stanza from the *Aṣṭapadi* in *Sarga* I is given on the top of the miniature forming as it were the legend of the miniature. The writing of moderate merit with 17 to 18 lines in a page as a rule, is well balanced within the outlines of the panel. The spelling of 'Govinda' as 'Govyand' with similar other words mis-spelt 'Yugadisha' for 'Jagadisha,' 'Ramgyari Ragh' for 'Ramgri,' etc., at the end of each *Sarga* is reminiscent of a similar corrupt script noticed in another 15th century Ms. of *Gitagovinda*, with Gujarāti paintings.<sup>4</sup>

The panels and scenes, on the whole, illustrate the words given either in the front page or the backside of the miniature; they show mood and setting not only of the *Gitagovinda*, but they hold the atmosphere of Vaiṣṇava lyricism. They surround the text and have by far larger share in the illustrations. The text runs on from page to page, while a wide and multifarious setting in the miniatures keeps present the fragrance in which the special scenes and moods are embedded, and in which they may, but need not be shown exactly with the text.

Here, as throughout Indian art, it is the *sthāyi-bhāva* (the thing that stays of the amours of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā) which is made visible form. It is diffused through the paintings; they are the permanent setting for the current of the song, its broadly speaking embankments.

The rectangular space of the illustrations (*ālekyā-sthāna*) on the standard size of the page attempts to depict the sentiment of the text, in the language of line and colour. The creepers and trees brimming with flowers and fruits, river with fish and tortoise, the symmetrical avenue of the trees symbolising the groves of Vṛndāvana create the fusion of sentiment to be delineated. The traditional palm-leaf theme, freed from size and shape of the actual palm-leaf, sets the scheme of lay-out in about four of the miniatures. The painter's response to the song, as a painter, concentrates the pattern into a type of book-illustration quite different from the marginal embellishments of Mughal Mss.

Out of the 35 miniatures in this Ms. enclosed in a square frame, 28 are done in brick-red ground, the remaining seven on faint yellow. The colours used are red, green, blue, pink, rose, pure white and pearly white, the latter being employed to depict jewelled ornaments or floral decorations. Gold is conspicuous by its absence. The flowers and creepers fill in the empty space in the composition of the panel. Landscape without human figures is rare in Indian painting; and in these illustrations it is delineated to heighten the effect of the setting and the mood.

The dress-scheme in female figures is in continuation of the pure Gujarāti style, which is slowly drifting towards the Rājasthāni. The vigour of the bodily movement is emphasised by the movement of the garments. A clean and flowing line nearest to that of the later Kāngrā painting, although more homely, is supported by the manner in which the *Sari* is worn; and it sums up the figure within long flowing lines. As a study of rhythmic motion and spontaneous gesture these miniatures are very interesting.

The weakest point in these illustrations is the figure of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, which is neither elegant, charming nor expressive. Kṛṣṇa, delineated in pictures of Hindu painters, is seldom up to the standard of the intensity of love and devotion with which He was contemplated and adored. "Throughout the entire range of Rajput or Hindu portraiture of the mediæval age there hardly emerges a glorious form of Man or his apotheosis, comparable for instance to the immortal figure of *Avalokiteśvara* holding the blue lotus adorning the walls of the Ajanta caves. On the other hand the feminine creations of Hindu painters leave but little to desired the way of graceful, tender and sweet representations of womanhood."

Of the Mughal tradition there are but faint traces; the profile is reminiscent of it, and the floral patterns are at times replaced by arabesques. Almost invariably the faces are in profile: they stand out clearly against the ground, archaic, thin and in good taste. The figures are arranged, singly or in groups. The groups on the single pages, with never more than four figures at the most, only incidentally illustrate the text. They visualize the

thing that stays, the mood of the song, that is the mood in which the painter visualized the song.

It is evident from the bare outline that has survived the colours, sometimes deplorably worn out—as in many of the miniatures like those of the *Vasanta-Vilāsa* (published by N. C. Mehta in “A Further Essay on Vasanta-Vilāsa” in 1931), and of the *Earliest Devī-māhātmya miniatures* (published by the writer in the “Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art” for 1938)—that it is the outline that establishes all the facts of the narrative.

Though the colouring is strong and brilliant in places, still one feels that it is less essential than the drawing. The compositions, formal and traditionally fixed with abundance of details, are brilliant statements of facts and at times expressive of emotions from the literary composition, and every event is told in the art of symbols. Theme and formula compose an inseparable unity; text and pictures form a continuous relation of the same fact,

In these outline sketches, which share the primitiveness of the art, there are no lights and shades. When colours are used, the pigments are selected not because they conform to the colours of objects, but because they help to make the pattern stand out clearly. These outlines are sharp and distinct. There is no shading or blending of surfaces.

Contrast and easy selection are the dominant motives of the artist. In other words, these painted pages are merely another version of the same story told swiftly and vividly through the medium of line and colour.

Pure bright tints like red, green, blue, pink, rose and pearly white are used in conjunction with a few strokes of the brush. There is no attempt at technical finish or optical illusion. These mediæval paintings are somewhat in the nature of modern posters. The lines and colours are there to emphasize their message through their distinctive medium and with their peculiar vocabulary. In short, the presentation is characteristically linear, as can be seen from the black-and-white reproduction of Plates,

Naturally therefore emphasis is laid on a lucid rendering of the scenes, on the appropriate illustration of the incidents rather than on representing the actual appearances either of the environment or of the human figures. The pictorial rendering is a mere substitute for a verbal rendering generalized and effective in a country of vast spaces and many scripts and languages like India.

These excellent illustrations of Line—which is fundamental and not carefully drawn and redrawn, possess a naive charm and simplicity that finished work often lacks. The human figure of Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā and her attendants, though highly stylized with projecting beak-like nose and long bulging eyes, even though drawn in profile, has all the qualities of a sure and vigorous sketch—a concise statement in a pictorial script. The figure of Kṛṣṇa, however, is very crude as shown with a heavy type of *mukuta*; and in some cases marking of mustaches even for Bāla Kṛṣṇa is, perhaps, due to a convention where ideal manhood is so represented as in the figure of Kāmadeva in the *Ratirahasya* Ms. (vide *Bom. Univ. Journal*, May 1937, Plate I). It should also be admitted that there is a certain sameness of treatment in these illustrations and little variety of subject-matter which is the loves of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā; yet their importance, both from the aesthetic and historical points of view, is nevertheless unquestionable. The treatment of trees and foliage is another point of interest in this Ms.

It can be laid down as a fact that the figures in the Gujarāṭi and the Southern Rājasthāni miniatures are not individualistic but reduced to certain formal types, while the colouring is almost invariably flat. Trees, water, clouds, houses also partake of the same formalism that helps to simplify the content of the picture, and does not make it in any way stilted or artificial.

The pictorial representation is evidently the forerunner of later Rāgamālā series and the Nāyaka-Nāyikābheda group of the Rajput School, because even though it does not display much technical excellence, it is possessed of great vitality, bold cryptic statement, a primitive outlook and a vivid sense of colour.

There appears to be an interrelation between the Southern Rājasthāni School of early Rāgamālās and the Gujarāṭi Ms.

illustration, despite many differences; because the main inspiration both of Gujarāṭi and Rājasthāni miniatures was literary and religious. We are here reminded of the painting "*Kṛṣṇa Expecting Rādhā*" published by Dr. A. K. Coomarswami, and described as a specimen of Southern Rājasthāni, of early 16th century. The Gitagovinda miniatures, introduced through this paper belong, on stylistic grounds to the same or a slightly early period, as further evidenced by the Old Gujarāṭi text of late 15th century, referred to above.

The importance of this find need not be further dwelt upon, as it undoubtedly makes a valuable addition to the materials of Hindu miniature-painting in Gujarāt so far known to us.<sup>5</sup>

In conclusion, I have the pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to the University of Bombay for the substantial help it has been granting towards the cost of conducting this research work and of publishing the results thereof.

By M. R. MAJUMDAR

\*The relevant portion of the inscription is reproduced in my paper on "*A 15th Century Gitagovinda Ms. with Gujarāṭi Paintings*" in the *Bombay University Journal*, May 1938.

\*cf: "*Studies in Varieties of Viṣṇu Images from Gujarāt*" in Dr. Bhagwānlāl Indrajit Commemoration Volume, *Journal of the Gujarāt Research Society*, October 1939, by M. R. Majumdar.

1 cf: Text:

2 For a detailed Note on this illustrated Ms., reader is referred to my paper on "Some Illustrated Mss. of the Gujarāt School of Painting": VII All-India Oriental Conference, Proceedings, pp. 827-835 (1933).

3 Reproduced in colours, in *Rupam*, and in black and white as Plate LXXXII, in the "*History of Indian and Indonesian Art*" by Dr. Coomarswamy (1927).

4 Vide my paper on "*A 15th Century Gitagovinda Ms. with Gujarāṭi Paintings*" in the *Bombay University Journal*, Vol. VI, Part VI, May 1938.

5 A single folio of *Bhāgavata Daśama Skandha* with a miniature in pure Gujarāṭi style (dated *Sahvat* 1690) has just come to light at the exhibition of Vaiṣṇava Temple Art, inaugurated by His Holiness Shri Vrajaratna Lālji Māhārāja, at Badā Mandir, Surat on 24th November 1941. It belongs to the valuable Mss. treasure of his Holiness Shri Vrajabhūṣaṇa Lālji Māhārāja of Kāṅkaroli near Nāthadwārā (Mewād). This find helps to establish the prevalence of the peculiar Gujarāṭi style of miniature painting up to the Second Period of Western India Painting *ie.*, 1650 A.D.



## Radha-Krishna Cult in Gitagovinda

The tradition of verse compositions in Sanskrit remained supreme in India till the 12th century, but even though their output did not diminish thereafter, the Mohemmadan invasion coupled with the increasing prominence of the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian language (vernaculars) reduced to a significant extent the popularity of poetical works in Sanskrit subsequently. That is why Jayadeva—who lived during the later part of the 12th century and early part of the 13th century—has been called the 'last of the Ancients and the first of the Moderns'. Jayadeva was essentially an inspired poet who revelled in the theme of mundane and profane love. It is well to remember that Gitagovinda was written at a time when Kṛishṇa and Rama burst into prominence as the celestial heroes for a new-Hindu revival calculated to resist Muslim dominance. Gitagovinda was looked upon as a religious work and Jayadeva came to be revered as a Vaishnavite devotee who had recieved the special grace of Lord Krishna himself.

The important point is that in the Gitagovinda, Rādhā is depicted as Lord Kṛishṇa's mistress and not consort. Jayadeva portrays Rādhā merely as an ordinary woman whose company Kṛishṇa enjoys for a short while. Her passions are entirely human and nowhere is there the slightest hint that she is divine. The main theme of the Gitagovinda is the estrangement of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa caused by the latter's solicitude for other Gopis, Rādhās' anguish, Kṛishṇa's indifference towards her and lastly the rapture which attends their final reunion<sup>1</sup>. Jayadeva's main object appears to have been to create a beautiful work of lyrical, pictorial and verbal splendour. Because of his emotional temperament, Jayadeva evidently chose an erotic theme and found the fascinating story of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa most absorbing.

The source of the Radha cult in Gitagovinda still remains a puzzle and no satisfactory theory has been put forward in this context. A very significant fact is that Rādhā is not mentioned in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, *Mahābhārata*, *Hariyaṃśa Purāṇa*, *Vishṇudharmōttara Purāṇa* and *Brihatdharma Purāṇa* in spite of the fact that all of them deal with the Rasakrida of Kṛishṇa with the Gopis<sup>2</sup>. The name Rādhā, is derived from the Sanskrit verb root 'Rādh' meaning pleasing or conciliatory. Rādhā therefore denotes one who pleases. Even though Rādhā is not mentioned by name in the *Bhāgavata*, there is a story therein where mention is made of a particular Gopi who is Kṛishṇa's special favourite and keeps his company exclusively so much so that the rest of the Gopis surmise that she must have worshipped Kṛishṇa with particular devotion in her previous birth. However, Jagganatha Dasa in his Oriya translation of Sridharasvami's commentary of the *Bhāgavata* refers to this Gopi as Vrindavati, which shows the identity of the favourite Gopi of *Bhāgavata* with Rādhā was not known.

Sri J. C. Roy, the formulator of the Astrlogical theory connecting the Rādhā-Kṛishṇa myth, identifies Rādhā with Vaiśāka (Libra) *nakshatra* on the authenticity of a verse in the *Atharva veda*<sup>1</sup>. According to this theory, Kṛishṇa is Sūrya (sun) surrounded in the firmament by Gopis who symbolise the stars.

Rādhā plays a prominent role in the *Brahmayāivarta Purāṇa*<sup>4</sup> wherein Kṛishṇa is described as a young boy and Rādhā as a much older woman in much the same way as represented by Jayadeva in his Gitagovinda. According to this Puranic work, the Gods went to Lord Narayana and begged him to destroy the demon Kamsa. Lord Nārāyaṇa gave them two hairs from his body one of which was born as Krishna and the other as Balarāma. They went to Lakshmi and entreated her to be born as Radha so as to enable Kṛishṇa to have a companion<sup>5</sup>.

The Vaishnavites usually regard Gitagovinda as a literary sequel to the *Bhagavata* and during the interval between the composition of the two epics, there have been quite a large number of references to the love of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa. The name of Rādhā has been associated with that of Krishna from

ancient times and the earliest poet to make such a reference was Hala, the author of *Gatha Saptasati*<sup>6</sup>, who flourished in the 2nd century A. D. Another early reference to Rādhā is found in three inscriptions of Vakpati-Munja, a Paramara king of Malwa<sup>7</sup>. An author, with a similar name Vakpati, in his *Gauḍavaḥo* written during the middle of the 8th century mentions, Rādhā in a solitary verse which describes the marks made on Kṛishṇa's chest by Rādhā<sup>8</sup>. The Kashmiri poet Anandavardhana (9th century A.D.) mentions Rādhā in his *Dhyānaślōka* and refers to her as the creeper grove on the Kālinadi river<sup>9</sup>. In the *Vēṇīsamhara* of Bhatta Narayana, we find a reference to Rādhā as the beloved of the enemy of Kamsa. Hemachandra, the author of *Kumārāpālacharita*, mentions Rādhā in two verses<sup>10</sup>.

It is interesting to note that both immediately before Jayadeva's time and immediately thereafter, there are instances where the love play of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa is portrayed in an exalted divined plane, in contrast to Jayadeva's treatment of the theme. Thus the sect founded by Nimbārka (12th century) in the Telugu country worshipped Rādhā as Kṛishṇa's eternal consort who lives for ever with him in the Gōlōka, far above the other worlds. Nimbārka's followers believed that like her Lord Rādhā too became incarnate in Brindāvan as his wedded spouse. To Nimbārka, Krishna was more than a mere incarnation of Viṣṇu. He was the eternal Brahman from whom spring Rādhā and numerous other Gopas and Gopis who sport with him in the Gōlōka. Similarly in the Rādhā-Kṛishṇa hymns of Chāṇḍīdāsa (14th century) in the Bengali language of the romance of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa attains a divine lyrical quality. Thus one finds that the conception of the Rādhā Kṛishṇa cult by Nimbārka as well as Chāṇḍīdāsa vastly differs from the eroticism depicted by Jayadeva in the Gitagovinda.

The *Sāduktikarṇāmrita*<sup>11</sup> of Sridharadasa (early 13th century) contains in addition to 13 verses of Jayadeva including 5 from the Gitagovinda, another verse attributed to Abhinanda which describes the dalliance of Kṛishṇa and Rādhā in a solitary grove on the banks of the river Yamuna. After Chāṇḍīdāsa, the next important poet who dwelt on the Rādhā-Kṛishṇa cult was

Vidyāpati who flourished in the middle of the 15th century in Bengal. Vidyāpati became famous for his *Charyapadas* which contain an excellent description not only of Rādhās' adolescent youth but also her ecstatic encounters with Kṛishṇa. In other parts of India also, the Rādhā-Kṛishṇa cult became highly developed. Mirabai, the Queen of Rajasthan, wrote and sang her immortal Mira Bhajans on Rādhā and Krishna. She was followed by Surdas who distinguished himself by linking the thirtysix different modes—the Ragas and Raginis of North Indian Music—with love poetry of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa. Bilva-mangala, the poet from Kerala, wrote the *Bālagōpōlastuti* based on the Rādhakṛishṇa cult which made him famous as the 'Jayadeva of the South'.

Within a hundred years of the appearance of the Gitagovinda, Jayadeva's fame had spread to every nook and corner of the country. At least a hundred and fifteen post-Jayadeva poets have paid him tribute by extensively imitating his style. A verse from the Gitagovinda finds place as a benedictory invocation in an inscription in Gujarat during the reign of Śāraṅgadēva (1292 AD).<sup>12</sup> More than fifty commentaries on the Gitagovinda have been listed by Dr. Mukherji<sup>13</sup>. One of the earliest of these commentaries is by Rāṇa Kumbha of Mewar (1433-68 AD) entitled *Rasikapriya* which is quite an exhaustive work. According to an Oriyan Inscription in the famous Jagannath Temple at Puri<sup>14</sup> (believed to be dated 1499 A.D.) only the songs and poems from the Gitagovinda are to be sung exclusively by the Dēvadasis and other singers of that Temple by the orders of Gajapati Prataparudradeva (the original inscription is reproduced)<sup>15</sup>.

Jayadeva is generally believed to belong to the Kenduli village in the Birbhum district of West Bengal. His memory has been kept afresh for nearly eight hundred years through the Annual fair in that village on the banks of the Ajay river. However K. N. Mahapatra<sup>16</sup> has adduced extensive evidence to show that Jayadeva as well as a number of his contemporaries flourished in Orissa. According to his version the, Kenduli Bilva of Jayadeva is identical with a village known as Kenduli in Puri District. However, irrespective of Jayadeva's place of origin, Gitagovinda

is a work which has profusely and extensively influenced North Indian literature in general and Bengali literature in particular.

Gitagovinda represents Kṛṣṇa as the seasonal God of Spring, characterised by extreme sweetness which is conducive to his love play with Radha. It is in this manner that the erotic theme (*Śṛṅgāra rasa*) is brought out by Jayadeva. Throughout Gitagovinda, Radha plays the role of the classical heroine (*Nāyaki*)<sup>17</sup> in several forms with Kṛṣṇa. It is therefore no wonder that the heroine of Jayadeva has become the model for the later Bengali and Hindi authors and the legend that it was Jayadeva who invented Radha still persists.

By GOWRI KUPPUSWAMY & M. HARIHARAN

#### NOTES

1. W. G. Archer, *The Loves of Krishna*, 1957, London p. 76
2. For a fuller account of Rāsakṛīḍa as found in various Puranas, refer Tadapatrikar's article vide-*Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* Vol. X. p. 269.
3. Ch. XIX. 7. 3 (c-d) Ed. by W. D. Whitney and R. Roth, 1856, Berlin p. 356.
4. *Brahmavaivarta Pūraṇa, Kṛṣṇa-Janma Khaṇḍa*, Anandasrama Series No. 102 Ed. by V. G. Apte, 1935, Poona. Vol. II pp. 433-911.
5. *Śrīkṛṣṇa kīrtana* p. 202.
6. I. v. 89; II vv. 12 & 14
7. *Indian Antiquary* Vol. VI p. 50 & *Epigraphia India* vol. XXIII p. 108, 111 (The dates of the three inscriptions being 974, 982 & 986 AD)
8. *Gauḍavaḥo: A historical poem in Prakrit*. Ed. by S. P. Pandit, Bombay Sanskrit Series No. 34. 1887 p. 7.
9. *Dhanyālōka*. Ed. by P. Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, Kavyamala Series no. 125. Nirnayasagara Press, 1891.
10. *Kumārāpālacharita* of Hemachandra (1936) Appendix p. 621 v. 2 & p. 622 v. 5.
11. *Sāduktikarṇāmirita* of Sridharadasa. Ed. by Prof. S. C. Banerji 1965. The verses are: 1.4.4; 1.50.3; 1.59.4; 1.60.5; 1.85.5; 2.37.4; 2.72.4; 2.77.5; 2.132.4; 2.137.5; 2.170.5; 3.5.4; 3.9.4; 3.9.5; 3.10.4; 3.11.5; 3.15.5; 3.19.5; 3.20.5; 3.23.5; 3.29.5; 3.34.3; 3.34.4; 3.34.5; 3.38.3; 3.39.4; 3.40.5; 3.52.5; 5.16.4; 5.18.2.
12. *Indian Antiquary* Vol. XLI p. 20 with a slight variation.
13. Pandit Hare Krishna Mukhopadhyaya in his *Kavi Jayadeva O Śrī Gīta-Govinda*, Calcutta, 1965, 4th edition.

14. Cf. Manmohan Chakravarti in *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. LXII 1893 pp. 96-7.

15. Left side of the temple (3' —3" x 1' —3" —Lines 10)

Vīra śrī gajapti gauḍeśvara navakōṭīkarṇāṭa kalavaragesara  
viravara Śrīpratāparudradēva. 1

Mahārājānkura samasta 8 Aṅka śrāhi kakaḍā su 10 Budhvāre  
Avadharita Ārdhvagā pramāṇē vaḍa. 2

Thākuraṅka gītagōvinda thākura bhōgavēle e nāta hōiva samjha-  
dhupa sarilā thāru. 3

Vaḍa siṅgāra pariyante e nāta hōiva vaḍa thākuraṅka samparadā  
kapileśvara thākuraṅka vandhā. 4

Nāchaṇimāna purushā samparadā tēlaṅgi samparadā emāne  
savihēm vaḍa Thākuraṅga gītagō— 5

vinda jam (jham?) Ānagīta na sikhive Ānagīta na gāyive Āna nāta  
hōyi paramēśvarāṅga chchāmure na. 6

Hava ye nāta vitarake vayishṇama gāyapa chārījana achchanti  
yēmāne Gītagōvinda gītahi sō gāyive. 7

Bhānka thāru Aśikshitamāne ēkaśvarare śūṇi gītagōvinda gīta-  
himse. 8

Sikhive ānagīta na śikhive ēhā. 9

Je parīkshā ānagīta nāta karāyile jāñi se jagannāthanka drōha  
karayi. 10.

16. cf. Article no. 1 in this book.

17. Virahōtkanṭhita, Abhisārika, Viprālabdha, Kanḍita svādhinābharta-  
rika etc. Each of these is mentioned by Jayadeva.

## The Gitagovinda-Padagana in Bengal

The *Padāyali-kīrtan* of Bengal is a classical type of *nibaddha-karaṇa-prabandha-gāna* of the *Sūḍa*-class. It is possessed of *dhātu*, *aṅga*, *tāla*, *rāga*; and different emotional contents. It is devotional-cum-spiritual in nature. It has a tradition and a special feature of its own. Its *sāhitya* in sweet *vrajabūli-bhāṣā* as well as the method of improvisation or *gāyaki* are unique ones.

I proceed herewith to prove briefly that the *Gitagovinda-padagana* of Jayadeva really forms the background of evolution of the *Padāyali-kīrtan* of Bengal. But before I proceed, I would like to say that the word '*kīrtan*' is a general term that conveys the idea of a devotional song or devotional songs, sung in eulogy of a god, a deity, or a superman, and for that reason it is also called the *Yaśogāna* or *Kīrtigāthā-gāna*. The dictionary meaning of the term, *kīrtan* is *kīrti*—*kṛita* + *kthin* in relation to *khyātiḥ* or *yaśaḥ* i.e., reputation. The *Vācaspatyābhīdhāna* states: "khyātibhede amaraḥ/khyātibhedaśca dhārmikatvādi-praśastadharmavatvena nānā-deśīya-kathana-jñāna-viśayatā / kīrtiśca jīvato mṛtasya vetyatra viśeṣo nāsti/\* \* tatra dānādīprabhavā khyātiḥ kīrtiḥ śauryādīprabhavā khyātiryāsa iti kecid yaśaḥkīrt-yorbhedamāhuḥ." Manu has also said in his *Saṁhitā*: "prajñāṁ yaśaśca brahmavarcasameva ca". So it is clear that the term '*kīrtan*' is a song in praise of conception or knowledge, or quality, or power or glory, of a god or a superman. In the *Bhāgavatam*, *kīrtan* or *kīrtigāna* has been used for a song in praise of divinity and greatness of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the 15th-16th century A.D., Śrī Chaitanya and his followers used this song for signifying the divine sportive play or *līla* as well as greatness or *maḥimā* of the all-powerful Creator. In the *Pañcarātra-saṁhitās* and *Purāṇas*, the word *kīrtan* has been used for singing a song in praise of Vāsudeva or Viṣṇu and his different emanations. As for example,

in the *Bhāgavatam*, it has been mentioned: “randhrāḥ veṇo-radharasudhayā pūrayan gopavṇdairvṇdāranyaṃ svapada-ramaṇaṃ pīāviśad gītakīrtiḥ.” The term *gītakīrtiḥ* has been defined as “gītā kīrtiḥ yaśaḥ yasya sa Śrī-Kṛṣṇaḥ”, i.e. *kīrtan* means a kind of song (*gāna*), sung in praise of divine sportive plays of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and it is sung by a band of singers in a raised voice: “gāyanta uccairamumeva saṁhatāḥ” (X. 30. 4). In all parts of India, *Kīrtan* is sung in praise of Śrī Kṛṣṇa or Viṣṇu-Bhagavān by the band of singers, and it is recognised as the devotional *bhajan*. In Bengal, it evolved first in the form of the *Nāma-kīrtan* and was introduced by Śrī Chaitanya himself; and then in the form of *Rāsa* or *Līlā-kīrtan* and was introduced by Narottamādās in a Vaiṣṇava festival at Khetari, in the mode of classical *dhrupada* in *vilambita-laya*.

Regarding *kīrtan*, one of the Vaiṣṇava savants, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa has said in the *Haribhaktivilāsa* (XI. 239): “kalau saṁkīrtya keśavaṃ” or “kalau taddharikīrtanāt.” Sanātana Goṣwāmī has also said: “saṁkīrtanaṃ nāmoccāraṇaṃ gītaṃ stutiśca nāma-mayī.” That is, *kīrtan* is sung in raised voice with the name of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa has prescribed this type of *kīrtan*, as it is a combination of *nṛīta*, *gīta* and *vādyā*. He has said that this type of *kīrtan* is meant for the Vaiṣṇavas i.e. for the devotees of Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa. In South India, the devotional *kīrtan* was prevalent among the mediaeval Saint-singers, viz., the Nāyanmārs and Ālwārs of Tamil land, and it was then introduced by their successors in Karṇāṭaka, Mahārāṣṭra, Gujarāt and other places.

Sometimes it is believed that *Padāvali-kīrtan* evolved from the *Nāma-kīrtan*. But that is not correct, as from a close study of both *Padāvali-kīrtan* and the *Gītagovinda-padagāna* it is known that *Padāvali-kīrtan* evolved with the essential materials of the *Gītagovinda-padagāna*, which also evolved after the ideal *Caryā* and *Vajra gānas* of the Vajrayāna and Sahajayāna Buddhists in the 12th century A.D. It is also known from the comparative study of both the *gānas*, *Gītagovinda* and *Padāvali-kīrtan* that both the *gānas* were composed as the means of worship or *upāsanā* in twofold ways, and they were known as *aśvarya* in the *vidhimārga* and *mādhurya* in the form of *rasāsvadana* or realization



of different divine aesthetic sentiments. The author of the *Gita-govinda* has made Śrī Kṛṣṇa the centre of the themes of all songs, and has recognised him as the embodiment of prime-sentiment, *śṛṅgāra*. Similar conception is also found in the *Padāvali-kīrtan*. Besides, it is evident that both Jayadeva the later mystic Vaiṣṇava composers (Mahājanas) have adopted *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-tattva* as the central theme of their *padas* and *padāvalis* and from this adoption, the different *pālāgānas* like *māna*, *dāna*, *kaṇḍitā*, *māthura*, *rāsa*, *naukāvilāsa* etc., were composed in the *Padāvali-kīrtan*. It is generally believed that *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-tattva*, associated with *bhaktitattva*, evolved from the Bengal Vaiṣṇavism that was introduced by Sri Chaitanya. But that is not correct, as the *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa* cult was prevalent even before Jayadeva and Chaitanya. Well has it been said by Dr. S. K. De in his *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bangal* (1942): "Long before Chaitanya, the melodious *Padāvalis* of Jayadeva in Sanskrit (?) and the songs of *Chāṇḍīdāsa* in Bengali had also popularised the *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa* cult with their largest of Vaiṣṇava devotional sentiments. Even if Chaitanya's religious personality started a new movement or gave a new interpretation to an old faith, his affiliation to the whole trend of Vaiṣṇava tradition of the past cannot be doubted, and its influence on him must have been varied and abundant." Further he has said, "A Chaitanyite Vaiṣṇava would regard the *Gita-govinda* not merely as a poetical composition of great beauty, but as a great religious work, and would explain it in terms of his *Bhakti-rasa-śāstra*. But it must not be forgotten that Jayadeva's poem was composed nearly three hundred years before the appearance of Chaitanya and before the promulgation of the *Rasa-śāstra* of Chaitanyaism." So leaving aside all the controversial discussions, it can safely be taken that the *Padāvali-kīrtan*, which was mainly based on the Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, adopted the main principles of *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-tattva*, together with *rāsatattva* from those, contained in Jayadeva's *Gita-govinda-padagāna*.

The *Padāvali-kīrtan* took a new and novel course during the time of Narottamadās in the 16th century A.D. It has already been said that Narottamadāsa introduced the *garāṇhātī* style of *kīrtan* in slow tempo, in the mode of the classical *dhrupada* of

the North Indian Hindustani music. It is a fact that afterwards different styles of *manoharasahi*, *reṇṇī*, *mandāriṇī jhārkhāṇai* etc. *kīrtanās* evolved with their special tempo and features, but all of them had their central theme, the *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-tattva* as we find it in the *padagānas* of the *Gitagovinda*. From the observation we find that the *Gitagovinda* is divided into twelve chapters (*sargas*) and each chapter is named after each divine aspect of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the hero or Nāyaka of the songs. Similar things also happened in the *pālās* of the *Padāvalī-kīrtan*. The mystic Vaiṣṇava composers have composed different *pālās* or plots of the *kīrtan*, describing the sportive plays of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, and their central themes are Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, the hero and heroine of the plays. And it should be noted that all the *pālās* are saturated with aesthetic sentiments and moods (*rasas* and *bhāvas*). It is quite true that the Vaiṣṇava Ālamkārikas like Rūpa Goswāmī, Kavi Karṇapūra, Pitāmbaradās and others have afterwards elaborately described sixtyfour sentiments in their *Uj्ज्वालaniḥsaṇi* and *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu*, *Alaṃkāra-kaustubha*, *Rasamañjari* etc., in connection with the *Padāvalī-kīrtan*, and thus helped the later composers to divinise the themes of the *Padāvalis*. Not only Pūjārī Goswāmī and Rāṇā Kumbha, but also all the commentators of the *Gitagovinda* have described how Jayadeva has divinised his *padagānas* with aesthetic sentiments and *Nāyaka-Nāyikā-bhāvas* long before Rūpa Goswāmī. Kavi Karṇapura and other later Vaiṣṇava Ālamkārikas described and classified the *rasas* and *bhāvas* in their respective works, for the purpose of their proper uses in the *Padāvalī-kīrtan*. It is also found that like Jayadeva (as it is evident from the *padagānas*), the Vaiṣṇava Goswāmī's have also divided the prime-sentiment, *śṛṅgāra* into *vipralamba* and *sambhoga*. The former has again been divided into *Pūrvārāga*, *māna*, *premevaicitta* and *prayāsa*, and the latter into *saṃkṣipta-sambhoga*, *saṃkīrṇa-sambhoga*, *sampanna-sambhoga* and *saṃpāddhi-sambhoga*. Again the eight sub-sentimental moods like *abhisārikā*, *vāsakaśajjā*, *urkaṇṭhitā*, *vipralabdhā*, *khaṇḍitā*, *kalahāntarītā*, *proṣitabhartṛkā* and *svādhinabhartṛkā* were divided into sixty-four ( $8 \times 8 = 64$ ) sentiments. The manifestations of these sixty-four sentiments are also found in the *padagānas* of the *Gitagovinda*. The eight main sentiments, as described in

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, are quite evident in the *Daśāvatārastotra*, as described by Jayadeva, and those main sentiments are *śṛṅgāra*, *hāsyā*, *karuṇa*, *raudra*, *viṣa*, *bhayānaka*, *bibhatsa*, and *adbhuta*. In the commentary of the *gāna*, "*śṛīta-kamalākuca-maṇḍala*" etc. (No. 2), Pūjārī Goswāmī has stated: "*daśāvatārān kurvate śrī kṛṣṇāya sarvākaraṣaṇānandāya tubhyam namo'stu / daśākṛititvaṃ prakāṣayannāha / mīnarupeṇa / ... śrī kṛṣṇasya sarvanāyaka-śīroratnatā pratipādanāya dhīrodāttatvādi caturvidhanāyaka-guṇa-samanvayena sarvotkarṣāvīrabhāvanam prārthayate śṛītakamaletyādibhiḥ*". It has already been said before that the eight main *rasas* (though afterwards one or two more sentiments like *śānta* and *vatsala* were added) have been used in the *Padāvali-kīrtan* of Bengal. And it should be remembered that the *Nāyaka*, *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* has been conceived as the embodiment of *śṛṅgāra-rasa*.

Regarding the composition of different *pālās* (or plots) of the later *Padāvali-kīrtan*, it can be said that their ideas are contained as germs (*bijākareṇa*) in the *Gitagovindu-padagānas*. I would like to draw the attention of the readers to the following lines of the *Gitagovinda*, which really gave the inspiration for composing different *palāgānas* like *māthura*, *dāna*, *rāsa*, etc. of the latter *padāvali-kīrtan*. The lines are :

- (a) Viharati Haririha sarasa-vasante, etc. (I. 28).
- (b) Vṛndāvana - vipine parisara-parigata-yamunā-jalapūte, etc. (I. 34).
- (c) Rāsarase saha nṛtyaparā Hariṇā yuvatiḥ praśaśamse, etc. (I. 45).
- (d) Vṛndāvana-vipine lalitam vitanotu, etc. (I. 47).
- (e) Rāsollāsābhareṇa vibhramabhṛtāmābhīra - vāmabhruvām, etc. (I. 49).
- (f) Viharati vane rādhā sādharmaṇa-praṇaye harau, etc. (II. 10).
- (g) Yuvatiṣu valattṛṣṇe Kṛṣṇe vihāriṇi māṃ vinā, etc. (II. 19).
- (h) Govindam vraja-sundarīgaṇa-vṛtam, etc. (II. 19).
- (i) Rādhāmādhāya hṛdaye tatyāja vraja-sundarīḥ, etc. (III. 1).

- (j) Dhira-samire yamunā-tire vasati vane vanamāli, etc. (V. 9).
- (k) Hari Hari yāhi Mādhava yāhi Keśava mā vada kaitava-vādaṃ, etc. (VIII. 2).
- (l) Smara-garala-khaṇḍanaṃ mama śirasi maṇḍanaṃ, deh-padapallavamudāraṃ, etc. (X. 9).

In this way it can be shown that different *pālāgānas* of the *padāi valī-kīrtan* were composed by the Mahājana composers with different sportive ideas which are contained in the *padagānas* of the *Gitagovinda*.

Besides them, the twelve spiritual principles or *tattvas* like *yugalarūpa*, *prakāśa* and *vilāsa*, *rasāśvādāna*, *bhājana*, *bhakta* and *bhagavān*, *sādhya*, *sādhana*, *pūrvarāga* and *anurāga*, *abhisāra*, *vāsakasajjā*, *milana* and *Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa* are found common in both the *Gitagovinda-padagāna* and *padāvalī-kīrtan*. Again the expression of divine love (*prema*), which has been conceived in three different ways, *prauḍha*, *madhya* and *manda* in the *Gitagovinda*, has also been adopted in the *Padāvalī-kīrtan*. Some thousands of *padas* were composed by more than three hundred Mahājanas like Chaṇḍidās, Vidyāpati, Guṇarāj Rhāṇ, Rāy Rāmānanda, Murāri Gupta, Govinda Ghose, Vāsudeva Ghose, Rūpa Goswāmī, Basu Rāmānanda, Yadunāthdās, Varṇśidās, Balarāmdās, and others, and it must be admitted that they got inspiration for the composition of those *padas* from those of the *Gitagovinda*. Jayadeva was a pioneer composer of the *padas* in the *śṛṅgāraraśa*, which are divine and world-transcending. The picture of Rādhā, as the divine Nāyikā of Nāyaka, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is beautifully painted by Jayadeva, and it is said that he got the idea of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa from the Vaiṣṇava Bhakti cult which was prevalent during the time of the Vaiṣṇavite Sena kings towards the end of the 12th century A.D. "Some are of opinion," says Dr. S. K. De, "that the advent of the Karṇāṭas in Bengal with the Cedi prince Karṇadeva introduced the *Śrīmadbhāgavata* emotionalism, which had its most probable origin in Southern India; and it is noteworthy that the Sena kings themselves, who were in all probability Vaiṣṇavas, are described in their inscriptions as Karṇāṭa-Kṣatriyas. There can be no doubt, however,

that the first and the most important literary record of pre-Chaitanya Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal is the passionate lyrical poem of Jayadeva, which must have been the source of inspiration of such later Bengali poems as the *Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtana* of Chaṇḍidās (circa end of the 14th century).” To this we would like to add that not only Chaṇḍidās, but also all the later Vaiṣṇava Mahājana composers composed their *padas* or *pada-sāhityas*, being inspired by the composition of the *Gitagovinda*. It is also a fact that the Rādhā-kṛṣṇa legend of the *Gitagovinda* inspired Jiva Goswāmī, while he beautifully described Śrī Rādhā in the *Rādhā-prakaraṇa* of the *Ujjvalanīlamanī*. The female attendants like Sakhī, Gopi and Dūti, which are the sweetest imaginative conceptions of Jayadeva, have also been adopted in the *padas* of the *Padāvalī-kīrtan* by the Mahājana composers.

So, from the close and comparative study of both the *Gitagovinda* and the *padas* of the *Padāvalī-kīrtan*, it can be concluded that the finest *śṛṅgārarasa-kāvya Gitagovinda* supplied living inspiration to the mystic Vaiṣṇava composers to compose the *padas* of the *Padāvalī-kīrtan*, and the *Gitagovinda-padagāna* can be recognised as the background of the *Padāvalī-kīrtan* of Bengal.

By SWAMI PRAJNANANANDA

1. In this connection, Dr. S. K. De has said: “The opening Daśa-vatāra Stotra, as well as the second Jaya-Jaya-Deya-Hare Stotra, presents Kṛṣṇa in his Aīśvarya aspect, not an Avatara, but as the veritable Supreme deity of many incarnations (*daśākṛtīkṛte kṛṣṇāya tubhaṁ namaḥ*), omitting all reference to Rādhā but mentioning Śrī or Lakṣmī. As the poem proceeds, the Dhīrodātta Nāyaka becomes Dhīralalita and all the erotic Madhurya implications of the theme are developed to their fullest extent”—*Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement* (Calcutta, 1942), p. 9.

## The use of Poetic Imagery in Gita Govinda

The two great love songs—the song of songs or the Song of Solomon (Hebrew, ca. 600 B.C.E), and the Gita Govinda or the Song of Govinda by Jayadeva (Sanskrit, ca. 1200 C.E)<sup>1</sup>, have their obvious differences with regard to their date of composition, geographic location, cultural milieu, the fundamental attitude to life and its predominant emotion, Love. The Hebrew Song has fabulous antiquity while the Sanskrit Gita has later day history. The song was compiled from a long period of oral transmission in West Asian natural surroundings of the desert and pastoral life, while the Gita was composed by a court poet in the sub-Himalayan greenery. The precise origin of the Song of Songs and the purpose for which they were sung are shrouded in mystery, though in later ages the poem has been subjected to allegorical and parabolic interpretations, justifying its canonicity within Judaic or Christian tradition. Gita, on the other hand was deliberately composed in expression of Vaishnava Bhakti.

In spite of these obvious differences, the *Song* and the *Gita* could be examined as lyrical poems, pure and simple, and their themes and imagery discussed strictly from a literary stand-point. It is true that these poems gained scriptural sanctity. Nevertheless, great works, be they sacred in a particular tradition or not-so sacred to others outside that tradition, they all have one thing in common, that is, perennial human interest, and as such they deserve to be examined as great works belonging to all the mankind on this earth for example, the *Ramayana* is sacred in the Indian tradition as much as the *Pentateuch* in the Judaic and the Christian traditions. Still they could be examined as epics or works having epic proportions. Lao Tzu's *Tao Teh Ching* or the *Katha Upanishad*, or *The Book of Job*, in spite of their canonical sanctity in Taoist, Hindu, and Judaeo-Christian tradition, could

still be considered as literary masterpieces, in the context of World Literature, having poetic beauty and metaphysical subtlety. It is in this spirit of UNESCO's concept of World Literature as being the collective contribution to multi-foliate human culture that the two outstanding love songs of the world will be discussed in this paper, from the Comparative Literature point of view.<sup>2</sup>

*The Song of Songs* has baffled scholars and theologians alike, who, during the course of centuries, have advanced various theories for its interpretation. These theories, too numerous to be examined in a short paper, are concisely discussed and summarized by H. W. Rowley in his brilliant "Interpretation of *The Song of Songs*"<sup>3</sup>. Rowley's studied conclusion about the poem is:

"In the present century there has been serious advocates of the old Jewish allegorical view, of the Christian allegorical view, of the wedding-cycle theory, of the Adoniz-Tammuz liturgy theory and of the view that we have a collection of amorous poems, whether from a single author or from several. All interpreters agree in recognising the high poetic quality of the Song, and in recognising, too, that its metaphors show a freedom and boldness we should not allow ourselves today. The view I adopt finds in it nothing but that it appears to be, lovers' songs, expressing their delight in one another and the warm emotions of their hearts. All of the other views find in the Song what they bring to it."<sup>4</sup>

Somewhat following in the same spirit, Rabbi Robert Gordis capsuls his life-long study and profound understanding of the poem as follows :

When the *Song of Songs* is studied without preconceived notions, it emerges as a superb lyrical anthology, containing songs of love and nature, of courtship and marriage, emanating from at least five centuries of Hebrew history, from the days of Solomon to the Persian period<sup>5</sup>.

Gordis argues that the *Song of Songs* "contains twenty-eight songs and fragments, which fall into several patterns," often

overlapping which he arranges under basic themes with nine descriptive titles.<sup>6</sup> Besides, in several cases, he feels, some of the verses are only titles, or perhaps first lines of songs "which are no longer extant in their full form," and of which "we lack the music to which they were invariably sung".<sup>7</sup>

Thus, the generally accepted view today about the Song of Solomon is that it is an anthology of lyrics, in eight chapters, telescoped from the oral transmission of a few centuries, and compiled at a later date without reference to the identity of the individual poems. Yet, most often this collection is read as if it were one continuous poem. In such a situation to impose the semblance of a plot on these lyrics would be to subordinate them to an intentional fallacy. Despite this inherent difficulty, attempts have been made to roughly sort out the main elements in the *Song*, as embodying a pastoral drama with a minimum of two or three characters, depending upon the point of view;<sup>8</sup> as portraying various social or religious scenes; as containing monologs, dialogs, descriptions, and dream-sequences; as expressing human emotions on a variety of levels – of longing, flirting, searching, estrangement, re-union, and ecstatic satisfaction.

The main narrative, if it can be called narrative as reconstructed, would be something like the following:<sup>9</sup>

1:2-2:7, a country girl (Shulamite) expresses to the daughters of Jerusalem her longing for her lover, who suddenly appears, and then both engage in loving conversation:

2:8-3:5, the girl reminisces, describing a typical tryst with her lover and a nocturnal episode in which after a long and trying search, she finds her lover;

3:6-5:1, the beloved hails the approach of her lover and he replies with a detailed description of her beauty;

5:2-6:3, Shulamite tells of another trying search, search for her lover, concluding with a description of him, a declaration of union;

6:4-12, the lover describes her beauty once more;

7:1-8:4, at the request of the daughters, the girl remains to have her beauty described by them ending with a customary expression of love and fidelity;



8: 5 – 14, the conclusion, including the famous lines on love (8–7), essentially expressing the mood of the poem.

What is of significance in considering the *Song of Songs* as a literary work is that the entire poem as have it today “deals with concrete situations” with frequent references to “specific localities in the topography of Palestine.”<sup>10</sup> Though this wealth of detail and concrete imagery obviously tends to celebrate human love on various occasions, this should not preclude us, as Rowley maintains, from interpreting the poem allegorically: “We for our profit may rightly find in the images of the *Song*, as in experiences, analogies of things spiritual,” even though they were not written for such purpose and the original authors or compilers had no such ideas in their minds.<sup>11</sup>

The *Gita Govinda* by Jayadeva does not suffer as much under the same scholarly disputation and the need for hypothetical explanations regarding the date, authorship, and purpose of the composition, as does the *Song*. There is evidence that the poem was composed by Jayadeva (son of Sri Bhojadeva and Ramadevi), a poet in the court of King Lakshmansena of Bengal, in the beginning of the 12th century of the Common Era. Avowedly, the poem is a testament of faith of the Vaishnava Bhakti, a spiritual movement of “Loving-Faith” which, along with Saiva Bhakti, was sweeping the whole of the Sub-Himalayan region and was even mellowing the Sun mysticism in South West Asia.

The theme of the poem *Gita Govinda* is the pain of separation and joy of union of lovers. There are only three characters: Krishna, the youthful Yadava prince, unknowingly brought up since his childhood as the son of cowherd, Nanda, and his wife, Yashoda; Krishna's beloved, Radha, a gopi or cowherd girl; her companion, an unnamed gopi, who as a Confidante, acts as a go-between. The identity of Krishna is twice removed from the reality of the cowherd, since he is a prince in disguise, and as Narayana (man-divine), he is regarded as the *avatara* (incarnation) of Vishnu, the preserving energy of the Ultimate. Consequently, Krishna's lila (play as expressed in the poem) assumes manifold perceptions and recognitions. Jayadeva apparently took his theme from the “Rasakrida” sections of the *Bhagavata Purana*,<sup>12</sup>

The poem has a prolog in which the poet praises Sri Vasudeva or Vishnu for suppressing evil and upholding the moral order whenever it is set aside, through his various *avatāras*, including the *avatāra* of Krishna, and the *avatāra* yet to come, that of Kalki or the White Horse. In the following twelve cantos, the author presents a poetic drama or an opera in monologs, containing twenty-one songs of which 11 are sung by the Confidante, six by Radha, two by Krishna, and two by the poet. In the opening few lines of each canto, one of the lover is portrayed in a particular state of tension, and a corresponding natural scene is counterpoised as if in a miniature painting. Then follow the long monologs which are, in fact, songs by one of the characters, giving expression to the emotion experienced by the lover in that state. These songs are set to a particular raga and sung to the accompaniment of a musical instrument, producing a *rasa* (sentiment) of the scene by blending the music, poetry, human emotion with Nature's abundant response invoked through luscious, vivid, sensuous poetic imagery.

Jayadeva's luxuriant poem has confounded many translators and critics. Frazer found "portions of the poem are untranslatable," awhile admitting at the same time that Jayadeva's "artistic reserve" saved the poem from "gross lewdness".<sup>13</sup> Macdonell was somewhat disturbed that "a poem which describes the transport of sensual love with all the exuberance of an Oriental fancy, should have received the allegorical interpretation in a mystical sense".<sup>14</sup> To Weber "love poetry is of the most unbridled and extravagantly sensual".<sup>15</sup> Edwin Arnold apologized for modifying much and omitting completely the last canto from his translation "in order to comply with the canons of Western propriety."<sup>16</sup> George Keyt, on the other hand, in translating the poem with a painter's eye, found in it, "the endowment of the physical side with all the real and enduring qualities of the spirit". He found that the physical aspect is not something distinct from the spiritual, "nor is it on that account a parallel in any sense whatever to the sort of love that is sexual in the manner of the "Ars Amatoria" and other such expressions of "profane love in Europe".<sup>17</sup> While two Indian scholars summarized their understanding of the Vaishnava Bhaktas as follows:

Though the poem has an erotic form particularly to lay readers, to the devotees of Hari (Vishnu), they do not excite any sex passion or idea but fill their minds with the splendour of the divine amour between Radha and Krishna. It is not much an expression of the longing of the human soul symbolized in Radha and God symbozied in Krishna, but to a real Vaishnava it appears as the delineation of the transcendental amours of Radha and Krishna into which the devotee enter through religious sympathy and devotion.<sup>18</sup>

Thus the poet does not have to apologize for what he has expressed nor ; does one escape into an allegorical explanation in order to proclaim the spirituality of the sentiment.

A brief summary of the narrative as presented by Jayadeva will be as follows :

Cantos 1-2. To Radha, estranged from Krishna, maddened with thoughts of love, her Confidante sings two songs, pointing out how hard it is to endure being parted from the lover in Spring ; and pointing out to Radha how Krishna sports with other charming women given to love (I). Through broken pride and jealousy, Radha having gone to the thicket of creepers, wasted in body, sings two songs, recalling how Krishna used ; to frolic with her, and urges her Confidante to make Krishna enjoy her (II).

Cantos 3-6. Abandoning the cowherd girls and searching for Radha, Krishna goes to a bamboo bower in the banks of the Jamna where he sings repenting his neglect of Radha (III). In the next three cantos, the Confidante sings five songs ; two to Krishna, troubled and sad, telling him how Radha wastes away parted from her lover, and how Radha is growing delirious every hour with love's distress and deep sorrow (IV) ; two to Radha, to go to Krishna who with his loving sport will cure her love sickness ; unable to move Radha, the Confidante goes to Krishna again and tells him how Radha cries and moans for him, and urges Krishna to return to Radha (VI).

Cantos 7-9. When the moon lights Brindavan. Radha most wretched in anguish, waiting for her lover to come to her, sings

four songs; first the laments Krishna's delay in coming to her; second, in her doubt she suspects that perhaps Krishna is enjoying with another woman; third, moved by envy and jealousy, she imagines that perhaps Krishna has gone far away to an island or a forest, and is dallying with another woman; finally, she compares her own wretched state with the state of the woman who may be enjoying with Krishna (VII). When the night is almost passed, the Confidante reproachfully sings two songs, one to distraught Krishna (VIII) and another to depressed and wounded Radha (IX) urging each to meet the other at a place of tryst.

Canto 10. Towards the end of the day, while Radha softened in anger, weakened in restraint, awaiting a message, Krishna slyly comes, and sings her a song, imploring her to come to him and be his beloved and enjoy his love.

Cantos 11-12. At night fall, after soothing Radha, Krishna goes to the woods. The Confidante coaxes Radha, dressed and decorated, to follow Krishna to the woods. The confidante leads Radha to the hunt in the woods in which Krishna is lodged and sings, urging Radha to go in and sport with her lover in that beautiful bower. Thus persuaded, Radha enters the abode of Love, and the poet sings a song, describing how Radha beheld Krishna's face, desiring only her and longing for dalliance, and how Radha surrendered (XI). The poet sings another and the final song, describing how Radha relieved of her heavy load of restraint and lover's obstacles, dissolves in ecstasy of the union, till exhausted through the joys of love. After playful sport, Krishna dresses his beloved and decks her with jewellery (XII).

The imagery in the *Song of Songs* and *Gita Govinda* could be examined on two levels, physical and psychological. On the one hand the images used are simple, direct, vivid, and concrete, describing the lover, his beloved, or the scene. On another level, the poetic imagery suggestively recreates the interior landscape of the lovers, connecting their inner states of being with the outward Nature's modes, thus generating in the poem the atmosphere, movement, and action, in the descriptions of Nature's seasons, call to love, and love making. In both cases, the poets

draw from the experiences of their own cultures as well as from the flora and fauna of their respective geographical regions, namely, that of semi-desert pastoral landscape of Palestine, and the tropical rain-fed green forests on the banks of the Ganges.

In addition to the use of the direct imagery, and poets seem basically engaged in revealing, as it were, through the apparatus of a literary form and its embellishments, the essential human condition, swaying through phases of lovers, from attraction, estrangement, tensions, reconciliation, surrender, and ecstasy. For this purpose another set of imagery is woven into the texture of the poems to operate on the psychic level, thus stimulating in our minds an extension of our being beyond the ordinary experiences of life, time and space. These images functioning as a kind of double blinkers—at the same time simple and direct and complex and suggestive—project a double vision about the same situation or experience.

On the physical level, we can see how the poets describe the lovers, and their beloveds, which is fairly obvious. In the *Song of Songs*, the lover is described (5 : 10-16), as being "white and rubby" whose "head is the finest gold" and his "curled locks are black as raven". He has "eyes of doves" while his "lips are as lilies," and his cheeks are as "beds of spices". His arms are "rods of gold" while his body "is a column of ivory overlaid with sapphires," and his legs are "pillars of marble". His countenance is "lordly as the cedars of Lebanon". The portrait is drawn in a few broad strokes. So also Krishna in the *Gita Govinda* is described with minimum of detail. His "body is blue" (I, p. 24) he has "moon-like eyes" (II, p. 20), and "lotus feet" (IX, p. 80). He wears "garments of Yellow," and "lotus garlands, and plays on the flute tunes of love". (I, p. 24).

It is in describing the beloved, however, that the poets employ many aspects of Nature to suggest her physical form and beauty. In the *Song* the Shulamite explains, "I am black, but comely" (1 : 5), for "the sun has looked upon" her for some time (1 : 6). She has "dove's eyes" (4 : 1), but sometimes her "eyes are like fish pools" (7 : 4). Her "hair is as a flock of goats" (4 : 2) while her temples are like "a piece of pomegranate" (4 : 3).

Her "lips are like a thread of scarlet" (4 : 3) and her teeth are "like a flock of sheep that are even shorn" (4 : 2). Her neck "is like a tower of ivory" (7 : 4) while her breasts, "are like twin young roes which feed among the lilies" (4 : 5), or at times like a "cluster of grapes" (7 : 7). Her naval is "like a round goblet which wants not liquor" (7 : 2) and her stature "is like to a palm tree", (7 : 7).

Radha in the *Gita*, on the other hand, has "vine-like body" (II, p. 32) with a "lotus face" (IV, p. 44). She has "deer's eyes" (III, p. 39), while her cheeks "are pale as moon-beams" (IV, p. 43). Her lips "are like a bimba fruit". (III, p. 39). She has "Jar-shaped breasts" (X, p. 84), at times "resembling a pitcher" (IX, p. 79); they are "firmer than fruits of palmyra palm" (IX, p. 79). Her thighs "are like elephant's trunks" (IX, 89), while her "feet surpassing hibiscus flower" (X, p. 84).

Besides these descriptive images, the poets have used other subtler methods of suggesting Nature's purpose in young lovers. That men and women are a part of a larger phenomenon of flowering and fruitfulness in this world, and such a process has seasons, is made very clear.

In the *Song*, the Shulamite expresses herself to be "the rose Sharon and the lily of the valleys" (2 : 1), while Jayadeva describes Radha's limbs as being "tender like flowers in Spring" (I, p. 21). As Nature is in Spring, so are human lovers, tender and blossoming. It is in Spring that Shulamite's lover calls her "to rise up" and "come away" (2 : 11-13):

For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone ;

The flowers appear on the earth ; the time of the singing of  
birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our  
land ;

The fig tree puts forth her green figs, and the vines in blossom  
give forth fragrance.

In the *Gita*, the impact of Spring is contrasting brought out in the absence of the lover. The confidante painfully makes estranged Radha aware of this predicament :

In Spring when tender Malayan Breezes fondle the beautiful  
creepers of clove.

And huts and bowers resound with the mingled sounds of  
bees and kokila birds...

And the Jasmine scent overpowering, awaying with folly  
the mind of even sages...

It is hard to endure being parred in Spring, my friend

(Canto I)

Thus Love is not a peculiar fever of man, but expresses itself in manifold forms of life during Spring—in vegetation, in insects, in birds, in beasts, and in animals. Man being only a part of that vibrating and thrilling universe, is not outside it. His fulfilment and peace apparently rests in being in harmony with this wonderful world of Love, an idea which crystalizes in the imagery of Brindavan's luxurious forest brimming with life on the banks of the Ganges, or in the house of Love referred to in the dialog of lovers in the *Song of Songs*:

Thou art handsome, my beloved, yea sweet

And our couch is green,

The beams of our house are cedars, and our rafters are  
cypress.

(1 : 16-17)

In spite of these general similarities in the use of images in both poems, there is one basic difference. In the *Song*, the poet resorts to vague and veiled imagery to suggest various calls to love, love-making, and ecstasy to love; in the *Gita* such situations are not disguised but directly expressed. Consequently, the imagery in the *Gita* is lusciously sensuous while in the *Song* it is pregnant with sensuous suggestions.

For example, in the *Gita*, estranged Radha, seeking Krishna's return to her, urges her Confidante :

O make him enjoy me, my friend...

I who am shy like a girl on her way to the first of her trysts  
of love...

O make him enjoy me, my friend...

Me who sweated and moistened all over my body with love's  
exertion (II, 31-32).

In the *Song* such a call to love is couched in veiled suggestion in the language of love imagery bordering Freudian overtones :

Let my beloved come into his garden and eat his pleasure fruits (4 : 16)

I brought him into my mother's home and into the chamber of her that conceived me (3 : 4).

Krishna directly coaxes Radha: "O beautiful, give me your pleasure again, I burn with desire", (III, 38). The lover in the *Song* indirectly suggests, "I have come into my garden: I have eaten my honeycomb with the honey," (5 : 1). In the *Gita* the Confidante urges, Radha, as a cure for her love sickness, to return to Krishna who endowed with passion's lovely form... "the swelling breasts of gopi girls crushes ever with his restless hands", (V, 52). In the *Song* such a situation is only suggested in terms of the effects of love-action :

When the king was on his couch

My spikenard gave forth its fragrance (1 : 12)

This escape into indirect suggestive imagery is perhaps conditioned by the attitude to woman in the cultures. In the tradition of *Gita Govinda* where woman is accepted simply as a woman, capable of giving and receiving love, without such relation being subjected to a pre-conceived religious position to the contrary, the type of attitude that could accept a highest divine feminine principle, one does not necessarily have to hide behind some apology for woman for being what she is. She did not cause man's fall, nor is she the root of his trouble. She is simply the root of his being. Physical love is as natural for man and woman, mortal or divine, as to any other living being. The concept of sin in love does not creep in. On the other hand, the very act of love from the Semetic Garden of Eden, is somehow associated with a value judgment not very flattering to the women, and the deity is conceived as an old man without a wife. As a result perhaps, the woman and the act of love are seldom referred to in direct speech. Thus, the woman in the *Song* is referred to as a "palm tree" which the lover proposes to climb (7 : 7-8) : she is a wall, her breasts are towers (8 : 9-10), and the lover is knocking at the door, seeking entrance (5 : 4). She is a hero's chariot, "the midst thereof is paved with love" (3 : 9-10) : "She is a garden enclosed, a spring shut up, a



fountain sealed," and the lover is their cultivator or enjoyer (4: 12). She is a vineyard and the sly foxes roost there too (2: 15). The kind of poetic statement as the 12th canto of *Gita Govinda* which Edwin Arnold found highly improper to translate for the Western audience, is hardly to be found in the *Song of Songs*. Nevertheless, the *Song of Solomon* is perhaps the most Oriental among the books of the Hagiographa and as such it carries the manner of celebrating human love as in the Chinese and Indian tradition, with a fervor approaching the pitch of spirituality.

Because of the operation of the double imagery in the two poems, like the double time in Kalidasa's or in Shakespeares plays, we are at once led to participate in which the Indian critics regard as the "rasa" or flavour, or sentiment of the poem, on a level we ordinarily associate in our daily experiences, and also at the same time are driven vaguely to grasp meaning beyond meaning, from a realm we do not see, yet feel the intimations of immortality close to the skin of our being. In this situation, the physically real is not unreal, nor is it divorced from the Reality Man is not outside Reality, but being a part of it also embodies it Physical love, therefore, is as much real as it true, and in fact, is the real basis for a metaphysical experience of a love beyond the physical, the experssion of the atmīc gravitation to the Brahman of the individual spirit to the Higher Spirit.<sup>19</sup>

In comparing these two poems in the treatment of love and the use of poetic imagery to communicate the basic human emotion, one is confronted with the question: Should the sensuousness of the imagery to express the physical response of human love be subjected to various allegorical or parabolic interpretations to escape later day puritan morality, or could these poems beread, like the Chinese classic *Shih Ching* (The Book of Odes), in the directness of their expressions as the groppings of man towards union and ecstasy, in terms of layers of known experiences and images, percolating to the inner core of their being? In that case, we could join with Rabbi Akiba in declaring that these songs of love, be they in Chinese, Hebrew,

or Sanskrit, are nothing but "Holy of Holies"<sup>20</sup> singing hosanna in the highest to the noblest experiences of man !

During the time when men sought visionary perception of Reality through existential body-apparatus, perhaps those rishis prophets, masters and enlarged souls were able to tune their hyper-sensitive spirits to the wave-length of cosmic communications and to feel in their individual being the vibrations of Brahman the rhythm of the dance of Siva, the voice in the wilderness within, and the measures of Yahwe's calls on the Mount Sinai of the soul. In such a state they were perhaps capable of sub and super conscious apprehensions in conscious states. This three-layered recognition of the excitement and ecstasy of human love, about the affable and the inaffable, known and the unknown, of the higher reality within one's own being and outside, such transformation of Nature in art, conscious into visionary, images into illuminations, like the dissolution of a drop in the ocean, resulting in a non-erotic understanding of a erotically charged sensuous situation, sung to music, is indeed an act of faith, or an act of truth. It is perhaps when the power of the poem does not electrify the reader to capture the full glow and energy of the poem, fusing layers of double imagery into a double vision, that individuals only see the surface meaning, linguistic structure, and literary embellishments, devoid of the *rasa* or flavour that is being created by the ingredients of the poem. Consequently, as Rabbi Gordis suggests we may have to read the *Song of Songs* against its "Oriental background"<sup>21</sup>. If the *Song* expresses the Judaic world-view "which denies any dichotomy between body and soul between matter and spirit (because it recognises the both as the twin aspects of the great miracle called life)"<sup>22</sup> then we may perhaps come to understand the poem and its spirit in the oriental sense, where the cosmic creative energy is conceived, among other possibilities, in the "Purusha Sukta" of the *Rig Veda*<sup>23</sup> and translated in human proportions in the concept of Linga-yoni. In the light of such an Oriental background, the *Song of Songs* and the *Gita Govinda* express man's deepest faith through the logic of poetic imagery.

JOHN B. ALPHONSO

## FOOT-NOTES

1. Following the modern convention I have used BCE for before the Common Era, and CE for Common Era.

\*Paper read at the International Comparative Literature Association VI Congress, Bordeaux, France (Aug. 31—Sept. 5, 1970).

2. Though there are innumerable scholarly studies of the Song and the Gita during their long history, there has hardly been any attempt to examine these from a Comparative Literature point of view. One early attempt to counter-pose the song with similar works was made by H. A. Ouvry. *The Song of Songs*, with notes and illustrations by Satyam Jayati (i.e. H. A. Ouvry). He used the text from the Authorised Version of the Bible and included an abridged paraphrase of Jayadeva's *Gita Govinda* and abstracts from the Arabic *Moallaci* (ca. 500 C.E.) London: William and Norgate, 1867, 87 p. (Copy in the British Museum).

3. H. H. Rowley. "The Interpretation of The Song of Songs." in *The Servant of the Lord and other essays on the Old Testament*, and ed. rev. Oxford: Basil Blackwell and Mott. 1965. ch. 6. pp. 197-245. This chapter embodies material appeared earlier in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Oxford, 1957, 38, 337-363; and the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society London*, 1938) 251-276.

4. Rowley, p. 243.

5. Robert Gordis, *The Song of Songs*, p. x.

6. Gordis, pp. 35-36, viz., Songs dealing with yearning, fulfillment, in praise of the beloved; duets of mutual praise; love in the world of Nature dreams songs; greatness of love; songs of courtship and marriage; love's sorrows and joys.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

8. Rowley, pp. 212-215 and Gordis, pp. 10-13, for summaries of dramatic theories. Of these two are popular: (a) The Song as a drama with two characters (King and Shulamite), and the poem is an expression of love by the two characters. This view lends itself to allegorical interpretation of a divine lover and a human or institutional beloved. (b) The Song as a drama with three characters (King Solomon, Shulamite, and her rustic lover). The King having become enamoured of a country maid takes her to his palace, but he is unable to shake her love in spite of all the royal pomp and comforts. At last, the King lets the country girl to return to her rustic lover and they are re-united. This view has dramatic tension and the poem lends itself to the interpretation of the triumph of true love. Daughters of Jerusalem play the background chorus as in a Greek play.

9. Ronald E. Murphy "Canticle of Canticles", *Encyclopedia of America*, 1959, Vol. V, 534 p.

10. Gordis, p. 8.

11. Rowley, p. 211.

12. *Bhagavata Purana*, Bk. X chs. 29-33 (*Rasakrida*). Also see Radhakamal Mukherjee, *The Lord of Autumn Moons*. Bombay: Asia

Publishing House, 1957, containing trans. with comment and interpretation of chs. 29-33.

13. R. W. Frazer, *A Literary History of India*, London, Fisher Unwin, 1898, p. 343.

14. A. A. Macdonell. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Oxford, 1899, p. 348.

15. A Weber, *The History of Indian Literature*, tr. John Mann and T. Zacharia. London, 1878; reprinted, Chowkamba Series, 1961, p. 210.

16. Edwin Arnold, *Light of Asia and the Indian Song of Songs*. London: Trubner, 1891; reprinted, Bombay: Jaico Publishing, 1949 p. 156.

17. George Keyt, *Gita Govinda*. Bombay: Popular-Kutub, 1949, p. 10.

18. S. N. Dasgupta and S. K. De. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Calcutta; the University, 1962. Vol. I, p. 667.

19. *Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*.

20. Gordis, p. 8.

21. Gordis, p. 40

22. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

23. *Rigveda*, Book X, Hyme 90.

## Lyric Metres in Gitagovinda

The twenty-four lyrical poems included in Jayadeva's *Gita-govinda* are commonly supposed to have been written in Apabhraṃśa metres. Some, including Pischel, have even suggested that they are Sanskritised renderings from Apabhraṃśa originals. This is extremely unlikely; for *Gita-govinda* has an integrity and compactness of style that one cannot associate with a translation, and the vowel-music and consonantal effect which constitute a special charm of the poem could not have been derived from any Apabhraṃśa original. Undoubtedly Jayadeva wrote the poem in Sanskrit and not in Apabhraṃśa. In the recitative portions of the poem he wrote in traditional classical Sanskrit metres; only in the lyrical pieces he appears to have followed a different principle. But it is unlikely that in composing his lyrics Jayadeva should have deliberately imitated Apabhraṃśa metres; the probability is that he was only setting his lyrical poems in Sanskrit to certain musical patterns, as would be evident from the directions at the head of the lyrics.

There are, of course, certain generic features common to Apabhraṃśa metres and the lyrics in *Gita-govinda*; they are moric and they are rimed. There is also considerable similarity in structure between the lyrics in *Gita-govinda* and some of the Apabhraṃśa metres. Yet, in spite of these similarities and resemblances which might be due to causes other than deliberate imitation of Apabhraṃśa metres by Jayadeva, it is questionable whether the poet actually took over his lyric from Apabhraṃśa.

Before we critically examine the rhythmical structure of the lyrics in *Gitagovinda* and compare them with apparently similar compositions in Apabhraṃśa, certain points might be considered at the outset.

How is it that Jayadeva, even granting that he actually took over Apabhraṃśa metres,—did not compose his lyrics in any such standard Apabhraṃśa metres as Gāhā, Dōha, Arilla

(Adilla), Rōla, Caupāti, Cappai etc? Many of them were popular and current in literature long before Jayadeva wrote, they were exploited, among others, not only by the mystics and saints of the Buddhist schools when they composed their verses for the common people<sup>1</sup> but also by some of the Sanskrit dramatists including Kālidāsa.<sup>2</sup> A learned poet of Eastern India like Jayadeva must have been well acquainted with their works at least, if not with the works in Apabhraṃśa of poets of Western India like Pushpadanta<sup>3</sup> (10th Century A.D.) and of poets of Northern India like Joindu<sup>4</sup> and Dhanapāla<sup>5</sup> (both of 10th Century A.D. probably) who used extensively Apabhraṃśa metres like Alillā, Caupati, Doha, Ullāla (including Karpura) etc. Why did not Jayadeva write in these popular meters at all?

Vidyāpati, another learned poet, who also belonged like Jayadeva to Eastern India, distinctly mentions the Apabhraṃśa metres, as Dohā, Raddā, Chapad, Arilla, Pajjhaṭikā, Rolā etc., in which he wrote the poems in his *Kirtilālā*. *Kirtilālā* was written about two centuries later than *Gita-gōvinda* in Avahaṭṭha, a later form of Apabhraṃśa, and its metrical features provide evidence of the continuity of the metrical tradition in Apabhraṃśa. Jayadeva must have been familiar with this tradition. Why did he not then try his hand at writing Dohā(s) and other popular metres like Arilla, if he was taking over his metres from Apabhraṃśa? And if he was doing so, why did he not give any indications thereof? In some of his recitative verses, as in verse XX of Canto II, Jayadeva mentions the particular metre in which the verse was written. Why did he not do so in his lyrical pieces? He did not consider it beneath his dignity as a Sanskrit poet to state that his lyrics were to be sung to certain popular tunes like Gurjari or Desabaḍāri. Why did he not follow the usual practice in medieval poetry and mention the popular metres if he had taken them over? If Śaṅkarācārya could state that his devotional stanzas to Gangā were written in a popular metre<sup>6</sup> (Pajjhaṭikā), why did not Jayadeva follow suit when he wrote his devotional lyrics?

The standard treatises on Sanskrit metrics compiled since Jayadeva wrote his poem, like Kedāra Bhaṭṭa's *Vṛttaratnākara* (c. 14th Century A.D.) with its supplements and Gangādāsa's

*Chandomañjari* (16th Century A.D.) include lists of metrical types adopted into Sanskrit from *Prākṛta* and *Apabhraṃśa* sources. Gangādāsa mentions<sup>7</sup> *Dohaḍikā* the same metre as *Dohā*, and gives his illustration from *Apabhraṃśa*. *Pajjhaṭikā* is mentioned by Gangādāsa and Narayaṇa Bhaṭṭa (16th Century), and the latter gives his illustration from *Prākṛta*. Kedāra Bhaṭṭa's list includes *Khañjā* and *Śikhā*, exactly the same as metres of the same name recognised in the Hindi prosodist Gadādhara's *Chandomañjari*, which differ only slightly from metrical types with the same names in *Prākṛta Piṅgala* and other works on *Apabhraṃśa* prosody. Evidently the names were somewhat loosely<sup>8</sup> applied, but the types recognised and illustrated in *Vṛttaratnākara* must have been taken over from popular modes as the lines consist almost wholly of short syllables rounded off by a solitary longum at the end. Metres in Vedic and classical Sanskrit had always a considerable number of longa among the constituent syllables.<sup>9</sup> But the interesting point to note in this connection is that none of the even latter-day prosodists include in their lists the special types found in *Gita-govinda* or give illustrations from the poem, although *Gita-govinda* must have been very widely known when these prosodists compiled their works. Evidently they thought that Jayadeva's lyrics were musical pieces written to patterns of musical rhythm and there was no need to consider them in any treatise on the metres of Sanskrit poetry.

It may be noted that though Jayadeva's lyric metres are all moric, they are different from the recognised moric metres in Sanskrit, like *Āryā*, *Gīti*, *Vaitāliya* etc., which are also lyrical in character. *Āryā* is the same as *Gāthā* or *Gāhā* in *Prākṛta*. Another lyrical metre, *Chulikā*, constructed on the same principles as *Khañjā* and *Śikhā*, was also an established metre in Sanskrit although, as the very name suggests, it was very probably derived from *Prākṛta* sources.<sup>10</sup> But Jayadeva did not write in any of these metres. The dance-numbers in Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśī* are written in various *Apabhraṃśa* metres, including *Dohā*, *Pādākulaka*, *Gāhu* and other types, but only one of these types, viz., *Pādākulaka*, has a close resemblance to one of the lyric metres used in *Gita-govinda*. But whether this particular metre used in *Gita-govinda* conforms exactly to the prosodic rules

governing the Pādākulaka metre and whether Jayadeva must be supposed to have taken it over from Apabhraṃśa, will be discussed in a later section in this paper.

The lyrical metres in *Gita-govinda* are mostly in riming couplets, both the lines of the couplet being identical in structure and length. Symmetry is the essential principle of structure,

Each line in a couplet consists usually of two sections, co-equal or approximately so, counter-poised against each other, though the last section is often shorter, allowance being made for the slowing down of the tempo towards the close and for the pause at the end of the lines. Sometimes the number of sections is three, the first two being co-equal while the third is longer and effectively balances the whole line. An emphatic caesura marks off one section from another, and sometimes this is emphasised by the use of intra-linear rimes.

This is the principle of metrical structure in New Indo-Aryan languages of Eastern India like Bengali, Assamese, Oriyā etc. In Bengali, for instance, the two most popular metres, *Payār* and *Lāṭhī* (or *Tripadī*), one with a bipartite and the other with a tripartite structure, are based on the same rhythmic principles as the lyric metres in *Gita-govinda*. These principles are different from what regulate the Vedic and Classical Sanskrit metres of the syllabic group. Nor are they exactly the same as the principles of rhythm in standard Apabhraṃśa metres like *Gāhā*, *Dohā*, *Gāhu* etc., although there are certain resemblances between these Apabhraṃśa metres and the lyric metres in *Gita-govinda*. The point will be further elaborated in the following sections.

It may be mentioned here that in studying the structure of the lyrics it is not proposed to consider the *Dhruva* lines constituting the burden of the songs. These lines are not integral parts of the lyrics. They were not chanted by the singer (or, the *Kathaka*) himself; they were meant to be sung in a chorus by the audience in the intervals between the stanzas. They do not usually rime with any of the stanza lines, and the rhythmic flow is often quite different from what we have in the song proper. By way of illustration we might refer to the *Dhruva* lines in lyrics II, VII, IX, XII, XIV etc.,



The most frequent metrical type in *Gita-govinda* is a riming couplet with twenty-eight morae to each line. Of the twenty-four lyrical poems in *Gita-govinda* as many as ten (Nos. III, IV, V, VI, VIII, XI, XVII, XX, XXII, XXIII) are written in this particular metre. It is generally supposed to be constituted with seven feet of four morae each. Although in a typical line like

*Candana | carcita | nilaka | levara | pitaya | sana vana | māli*  
(Song IV)

such analysis holds good, there are lines where such analysis is not possible. For instance, in Song II, there is the line

(i) *madanama | hipati | kanakaduṇḍaruci | keśava | kusuma vi |*  
*kāśe.*

Here the closed syllable *daṇ* is so placed that the line can by no means be resolved into seven feet of four morae each.

Similar instances are provided in the lines

(ii) *bandhujivamadhu | rādhara | -pallava | mullasi |*  
*tasmita | śobham* (Song V)

(iii) *dhūmaketumiva | kimapi ka | rālam* (Song I)

where the long syllables *ji* (in Song V) and *ke* (in Song I) are so placed that the lines in which they occur cannot be resolved into feet of four morae each.

Yet no one could possibly suggest that there was any rhythmic lapse in these lines.

The fact is that the view that each line in the poems referred to is constituted with feet of 4 morae is based on an inaccurate, though plausible, theory. *Jayadeva did not actually follow the foot-and-line principle of prosodic structure; he was following a musical pattern.* Each line in his lyrics is a musical section (*āvarta*) consisting of a number of (two to four) bars (*bibhāga*) and each bar is constituted with a number of (two to four) beats (*aṅga* or *tāla*). In lines of the type referred to the components are not feet of four morae but bars of eight instants. These bars are the structural units of the poem. At the end of each bar of eight instants there is a minor breath-pause, often coinciding with the end of a phrase or a word-unit. This coincidence is not necessary, but the division into bars is induced by a pattern closely or

remotely influenced by division into phrases. *Word limits in Jayadeva's lyrics are not as important as in Bengali, yet they influence the metre to a limited extent.*

The minor pause between the constituent bars (corresponding to *diacresis* between two metra in Greek and Latin prosodies) is sometimes emphasised by an intra-linear rime, as is done in Song XI in lines like

*Palati patatre | vicalilapatre | śaṅkita bhavadupayānam*

It is to be noticed in this connection that the commonest metres in popular poetry in New Indo-Aryan languages of Eastern India (East Magadh group) have been composed in lines consisting of measures of 8 morae and the caesura has occurred generally after multiples of 8 morae. For instance, in Bengali the two most popular metres since the earliest days, Payār and Dīrgha Tripadī (Lācaḍī), are based on measures of 8 morae. It is so also in Assamese and Oriya, the two sister languages.

It is interesting to notice that the metrical pattern under discussion has been employed by many poets in Bengal in later days and is a popular type even now. This is the metre of Rabindranath's famous song, the national anthem of India :

*janagana mana-adhi | nāyaka jaya ke | bhārata bhāgya  
vi | dhātā.*

It has been exploited in Vaishnava lyrics in lines like  
*candana taru yava | saurabha choḍava | sasadhara  
varikhaya | āgi ;*

by Bharatachandra in lines like  
*niśāna pharphar | nināda dhardhar | kāmāna gargar |  
gāje ;*

by Iswar Gupta in lines like  
*Tuṣṭiniketana | riṣṭi vināśaka | sṛṣṭi pālana laya | kārī :*

by Dwijendralal Roy in lines like  
*Syāma-bīṭapi-ghana- | taṭa-viplāvinī | dhūsara-taraṅga- |  
bhaṅge*

and by many others. *Jayadeva is actually more a pioneer of the new metrical style in Eastern India than a follower of the older tradition,*

There is a close parallelism between this metrical type and certain patterns of musical time, well-known and long established in Northern India. Common time in North Indian music, known as *tri-tāla*, moves in bars of 16 instants, containing 4 beats of 4 instants each. When it is in slow (*vilambita*) time the bar consists of 32 instants, and the beat of 8 instants. (Sometimes the syllables in the beat are all long.) This is known as Dhūmali or Dhīmā in North India, Dhīmā/or Dhimā in Mahārāṣṭra, and Dhime Teuilā in Bengal. For centuries in medieval India popular poetry of the more serious variety was mostly written in this measure characterised by its slow time and even flow. On account of its traditional character it is sometimes also called Ādi Tāla. It is in this particular musical time that most of Jayadeva's lyrics are written, excepting a few frisky lyrics in which syncopated bars of 5 or 7 instants are components of the section. In the particular metre under discussion it is noticeable that each line ends in a spondee,—a feature associated with a variety of *tri-tāla*, associated with popular music.

A bar of 8 units is composed of either (i) two beats of 4 instants each or of three beats arranged as (ii) 3+3+2 or as (iii) 4+2+2. These divisions into beats correspond to recognised divisions in time-measures of Indian music. Formula (iii), for instance, corresponds to *Tripata Chatusra* of Carnatic music, and formula (ii) to a type of *Tripata Tisra*, and formula (i) to a half-measure of regular *Tritāla* or Ādi-tāla.

A beat can always be distinguished from the next by the accent with which it begins and the constancy of the flow of sound until the next beat. The particular rhythmic tone of a bar is due to the length and mutual proportion of the constituent beats, and it is by playing variations on the scheme of beats in bars of the same length and weight that a poet produces an impression of beauty and novelty with an agreeable sense of diversity in unity.

One of the most remarkable features in Jayadeva's lyric metres is his art in placing the long syllables. *A long syllable in his lyrics invariably marks the commencement or the close of a beat.* This is an unmistakable evidence that Jayadeva was a Bengali poet, for according to the habits of speech and reading even now in Bengal

a beat can have only one long syllable and its proper position is at the commencement or the end of a beat. So the line

*taba śubha āśiṣa māge*

is read as

*taba śubha : āśiṣa | mā:ge.*

This metrical habit is there also in Assamese and Oriya. The following lines from Assamese are here quoted to illustrate the point.

*tribhūvana-:vāndana/dāivaki-:nāndana/jō*

*hari:mārāla:kāṁśā = 8+8+12*

*jaga-jana- :tārana/dēvanā:rāyaṇa/śaṅkara:tākeri:aṁśa =*

*8+8+12*

(MĀDHAVA DEVA)

The lengthening of 'rā' to the exclusion of 'nā' in the 2nd line is to be specially noticed. A line like

*candana : carcita/nilaka : levara/pitava : śana bana/māli*

is therefore to be taken as a musical section with 4 bars, each bar containing 2 beats. The normal length of a bar is 8 instants ; the last is metrically catelectic, only 4 units long, the catalexis being meant to indicate the full pause and the occurrence of the end-rime at the close of the section. The beats correspond to four-morae feet in prosody, the whole line may be prosodically scanned.

Other lines in the same metre have slightly different sequences, as, for instance, in lines like

(i) *lalita la:vāṅga la/tā pari:śilana kōmala:malaya sa/mirē*

(ii) *dhīrā sa:mirē/yamunā:tirē/vasatīva:nē vana/māli*

(iii) *racayati:śayanām/sacakita:nayanām/pāśyati:tava pān/  
thānām*

It will be noticed that the various beats in the pattern may be dactyls, spondees, anapaests or proceleusmatics, the preference being for lively dactyls, but amphibrachs are strictly avoided. This is a feature of the *simple rhythmic movements* permitted in these lyrics—falling, rising or level—movements which could be mathematically represented by a linear equation. This is also the principle of arrangement of beats in the bar in languages like

Bengali. This is another evidence indicative of the kinship between the metres of Jayadeva and those current in New Indo-Aryan languages in Eastern India.

We might in this connection recall that amphibrachs with their waved rhythm are not permitted in the popular Pajjhāṭikā metre as defined by Gangādāsa.<sup>11</sup> Popular poetry appears to have preferred simplest rhythmic movements always.

Nothing exactly like the metre discussed is to be found in Apabhraṃśa. There is, of course, an apparent resemblance between this metre and the Apabhraṃśa metres *Doai* and *Duyai*, which are also composed in couplets with lines 28 morae long. But *Doai*, according to *Prākṛta Pīṅala*, is written in lines where the formula for distribution of morae into feet is 6+4+4+4+4+4+2, the last foot being a solitary longum. *Duyai* in later Apabhraṃśa is composed in couplets with lines of 28 morae with a caesura after 16 morae, but the rhythmic flow is different from what we have in Jayadeva, as the fundamental musical pattern in Jayadeva's lyrics is not preserved. Hemachandra catalogues a metrical type called *Laya* in which the lines are composed of 7 feet of 4 morae each, but it is doubtful whether it was at all a metre in actual use. Anyhow Jayadeva who wrote long before Hemachandra was unlikely to have been influenced by it.

AMULYA DHAN MUKHERJI

1. The mystic poets of the Buddhist school have written not only in Dohā, the typical Apabhraṃśa metre, but also in Arilla, Ullālā, Rolā, Dwipadī etc. Here is a Dohā from Sarahapā (c. 8th century):

Sa-sāmvittī tāttū phālū/Sarahapā bhāṇantī=13+11

jō maṇa-gōara pāvīai/sō pārāmāthā nā hōnti=13+11

2. In *Vikramorvaśī*, Act IV, there are verses in Dohā besides those in couplets with 16, 15, 14 morae to the line. Here is a Dohā:

mañi jāṇia mialōaṇi/ṇisīaru koi harēi=13+11

jāvā ṇū ṇavatāṇisāmālō/dhārāharu varisēi=13+11

3. Puspadanta wrote extensively in Alillā, Caupaiā, Chulialā, Ullālā etc. Here is a Caupaiā:

arivarasiriharahō/pāliyaharahō/sarī-jalakīla Karāntāhō=11+8+12

bālāmuṇālābhūā/sirivammasūā/caliā pāsi ja kāmtāhō=10+8+12

(Naya Kumara Cari, 11, 1)

4. Joindu also wrote verse in Dohā ; e.g.  
 jō jāyā jhāṇāgnīṭh/kāmma-kalamka uhōvi=13+11  
 piccā-ṇirāṇjaṇa nānamaya/tō paramāppa ṇāvōvi=13+11
5. Dhanapāla, author of Bhavisayatta-kahā, used several popular metres. Here is a couplet in the Karpura variety of Ullāla :  
 jai-jaṇaṇi-bayaṇa visā-visā-maṇi/dāiya-māccharu maṇi vāhāi  
=15+13  
 to tūmhaha āmhaha sayanahamī/vāmcibi kuli parihau karai=15+13
6. Gangā-stotra, stanza XIII.
7. The very names, Dohaḍikā and Pajjhaṭikā, indicate that these metres must have been taken over from Prākṛta and Apabhraṃśa sources.
8. Piṅgala uses the same name (Sikhā) for different types.
9. Acaladhṛti seems to be an exception ; but it was in use only in the later period in the history of Sanskrit, being the same as the lyrical metre Gīti-āryā.
10. It has been suggested that Chulikā and Chulilā (the name of an Apabhraṃśa metre) are etymologically interconnected. Metrically they are different.
11. There are of course other definitions of Pajjhaṭikā according to which there must be an amphibrach at the end of a Pajjhaṭikā. The use of these names is not always consistent, specially in Apabhraṃśa.

## Abhinava Gitagovinda

A brief notice of a palmleaf manuscript containing Abhinava Gitagovinda by Gajapati Purushottama Deva was first made by Mm. Haraprasad Shāstri in 1934.<sup>1</sup> For the last 15 years. I was trying to secure a manuscript of this famous work, and my attempt was luckily crowned with success last year, on the acquisition of a palmleaf manuscript of A. G. G.<sup>2</sup>, from Parivrājaka Śrī Sītārāma of a Chandikhol in the district of Cuttack. The manuscript containing 61 folios, each measuring (11.5" × 1.1") is in a fair state of preservation. There are on the average three lines of writing in old Oriya characters of an archaic nature on both sides of each folio.

The manuscript is complete and is very important as it contains an unusually long eulogistic colophon quoted below, describing the achievements of its author, Gajapati Purushottama Deva (1466–97 A.D.) of the Solar dynasty and giving the exact date of its copy in the 34th Anaka year of this royal author.

*Sakaladēvādidēvaśrīmadjagannāthapriyatanaya satataparipālana vidhvastavi vidhapratyaha nirapāyikṛita śrī durgaputra niranara nārāyaṇacaraṇasarasija makarandapānalaṃpaṭacañcarikacitvāse śrīdharaparirambhāpramada bharabharitamānasa śrinrisimhabhaktiviśeṣhasamādi? (sādita) sāmrajya lakṣmī vibhāvita mahāmahima santata vēdānta nigamavāsanayāsītanīrmalannaḥ karaṇa gajapati gauḍeśvara prabala kalavaraga jalajaladhimandhāchala nijabhujabhiyopārjita vipakṣa rājapakṣiśālimeti birudapada virājamāna kalabaragēśvara virakēdāra bandikaraṇa mōchana samaya samarpita karṇāṭa rājya prācina mahārāja cakra samupārjita mahārḍhapēṇḍāma nāma maṇipāṭalatajanita santōsha pariṇita navakōtikannā(rṇā)ṭā mahipati mayakōṭi kannā(rṇā)-tādhiśayaśah samāsādita kaṭyubhiśālimēti tādīya birudapada navakōti kannā(rṇā)ṭēśvarasvacakrabhinnani jadurvinayāmātva-dushṭacēṣhṭālutātantu santānaviśakalana-pracaṇḍa-caṇḍakara*

*sūryayaṁśakamalaviḥāsabhāskara paramamāhēśvara paramayaish-  
ṇava paramabhaṭṭāraka ripurājaṭṭaramalla vishamasamarani-  
śaṅka mahārājādhirāja śripurushōttamadēva gajapaterasyēva  
vardhamāna vijaya rājyē catustitaśadaṅke vaiśākha śukla pratipadi  
bhānuvāsare samāptamida pustaka.*

*Srī Rādhākriṣṇa caraṇe saraṇam bhava. Bhīmasyāpirāṇēbhaṅgo  
munērapi matibhramah yadi śuddhamaśuddham vāmamaḍōshō na  
vidyate. Srī rāmachandra jagadguro trāhimām. Pustakam haratre  
yastu kāṇoduḥkhi bhayēnnara, mritaḥ svargaṁ na gaccēt pitaram  
narakam nayēt. Śrīdhara śarmaṇā lēdadah pustakam. lēkhako.  
nāstidōshah.*

The date of copy of this work as noted in the above colophon is 'Vaiśākha, Śukla, Pratipad, Sunday in the 34th Aṅka year of the increasingly victorious reign of Gajapati Purushottama Deva of the Solar dynasty. The exact corresponding date according to the Christian Era is the 6th April, 1494 A.D. which was also a Sunday as well as the first tithi or Pratipada of the bright fortnight of the lunar month of Vaiśākha.<sup>3</sup> Thus it can now conclusively be ascertained that the 34th Aṅka year or the 28th regnal year of Gajapati Purushottama Deva was current from the 24th August, 1493 upto 12th September, 1494: both the dates being Sunia or Bhādra Śukla Dyādasi from which tithi, the Aṅka years of the Orissa kings are calculated, and the exact date of his accession on the throne, fell in 1466 A.D.

The author is called "Srimat jagannātha priyatanaya, śrī durgāputra, Paramamāhēśvara, paramayaishāṇava paramabhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja" in the above colophon. We find the following epithets before the name of his father Gajapati Kapileśvara Deva in an inscription of 1460 A.D.<sup>4</sup>

‘Mahēśvaraputra x x Śripurushōttamaputra śrīdurgāputra  
x x Srimān mahārājādhirāja paramēśvara

The epithets *Virā śrī gajapati gauḍēśvara navakōṭīkarṇāta kalabargēśvara* referring to Kapileśvara's victories over the countries of Gauḍa, Karṇāta and Kalavarga found for the first time in his Veligalani grant of the Saka year 1380 or 1458 A.D.<sup>5</sup> are elaborately described in the above colophon. Besides these



epithets, the long compound term *Vandikaraṇa mōcana samaya samarpitakannā(rṇā)ṭa rājya prācina mahārājacakra samupārjita mahārghapēṇḍāma nāma maṇipāṭakaṭa janita santiōsha pariṇāta navakōṭi kannā(rūā)ṭa mahipati* has historical significance. The capture of the king of Karṇāta and his re-installation in power after submission to the Gajapati supremacy is corroborated by the 'Sarasyati Vilāsa' and the Ananta Varam plates of Gajapati Pratāparudra Deva of year 1500 A.D.

- (1) "Jivagrāham ariṃ pragrihya samarē karṇāṭabhūmidhayaṃ  
dinōktēḥ prayanāṇṣisimhamanujādhiṣaṃ punarmuktayān"  
sarasyati vilāsa.<sup>6</sup>

\* \* \* \*

- (2) "Yasmai nityatara pratāpadahana jvālāyamānadhyaja-  
staṃbhayaddhakusumbha-raktayasana prekshā-vibhaṅgadyishē  
sandhbāhayāyācajñāñcalimahō datyōdayādrim bhayā-  
dātmanam mrimucē ṇṣisimhanṛipatiḥ karṇāṭadēśādhipaḥ"  
Anantavaram plates<sup>7</sup>

Thus the conquest of Karṇāta by Gajapati Purushottama Deva must have been achieved some years before 1494 A.D. the year of copy of this work. The verse quoted above from the Ananta Varam plates states that Nṛsimha, the king of Karṇāta, concluded peace with his captor Purushottama Deva by ceding the territory round the Udayagiri fort *Datyā Udayāndrim*. But in the above colophon it is stated that the king of Karnāta gave *Peṇḍama* to secure his release from imprisonment by Purushottama Deva '*Vandikaraṇa mōcana samaya samarpita*.' Peṇḍama may be identified with modern Penukonda in the Anantapur district of the Andhra State, where there was a fine hill fort of great historical importance. There is a large number of inscription in this fort ranging from 1182 A.D. to 1666 A.D.<sup>8</sup>

The epithet of *Vira Kēdāra* and *Ripurāja Tōḍaramalla* found in the above colophon can also be traced in the long text of blessing or *Āsisha* chanted in a chorus by the leaders of the Brāhmaṇas of the sixteen Sāsanas or Brāhmaṇa villages founded by the Gajapati (3 sāsanas), his nine queens (nine sāsanas) and three Brāhmaṇa officers (3 sāsans) on the left bank of the Mahānandi

in the district of Cuttack. The text from which some relevant lines are quoted below was handed down from generation to generation, end is recorded in an old Oriya chronicle called 'Chayni Chakaḍā'.<sup>10</sup>

*'Tōḍhara mallōpēkshitabala \* \* \* sūryayaṁṣa sambhūta  
viraśrī Purushōttama deva suḥumāra kumārān janayatu*

\* \* \*

*'Pūrvadakṣiṇa paścima uttara vijaya tudita vira kēdāra \*\*\*  
vira śrī Purushōttama dēvasya \* \* sarvēśatravaḥ kshayam-  
yānnu'*

\* \* \*

*'Vīravara raṇavaṇik atōḍharamalla cūḍamaṇḍala śarāṇapañ-  
jara virakēdāra rāṣṭrarakhaṇḍa maṇḍit prasanna purushōttama-  
pura śāsanavastithataśēsha mahājanānāmāśīrvacāṁsi tath-  
yāni santu'*

There are still places with the names *Vira Kēdārapura* and *Tōḍaramallasāhi* in this area near the village Śrī Prasanna Purushottampur.<sup>11</sup>

The epithet of *Vira bhaṭṭa Kēdāra* or *Kēdāra* is also found in the eulogistic colophon at the end of each section of *Pratāpa Mārttāṇḍa* a Smṛti work, the authorship of which is attributed to Gajapati Pratāparudra Deva<sup>12</sup>.

As regards the term *Tōḍharamalla* it may be stated here that this epithet is also found used before the name of a General named Raṅganātha in a Telugu record of S. 1348 (or 1426 A.D.) found in the temple of Simhāchalam.<sup>13</sup>

The term *Sya cakra bhinna nija durvinavāmātya dushṭa cēṣṭā-lutatantu* is reminiscent of the conspiracy made against Gajapati Purushottama Deva at the time of his accession on the throne of Orissa, by some officers of the State, who tried to offer the throne to Hammīra Deva, but their attempt was frustrated due to the zeal, valour and statesmanship of Purushottama Deva. This is supported by (i) *Bhuvanēśvari pūjāpallava* written by the Gajapati himself, (ii) Sarasvati Vilāsa and (iii) Madalāpāṇji or the chronicle of the Jagannātha temple at Puri.

In the *Mangalācaraṇa* verses of his *Bhuvanēśvari pūjāpallava* three of which are quoted below, he humbly states that through the grace of Bhuvaneśvari, he was able to ascend the throne of Orissa at the age of seventeen by crushing his enemies, just after the death of his father on the bank of the river Kṛṣṇā.

‘Yasyāḥ prabhāyamahimā svacakraripumaṇḍalam bhityā  
Sāmrājyaśriya macirāt saptadaśō māmalamvaryā varshē  
(verse 3)

Ratnaśyahēmayāraṇa vicitravastrāṇyanēkam yānāni  
yasyāḥ prabhāyamahimā kṛṣṇātīremama prādāt (verse 7)  
Kapilēndera naudanōham tatkrīpāmātralabdha sāmrājyaḥ  
svayamanubhūyatadiya mātmyam sāstrato viditvāpi  
padahatimētām karishyāmi<sup>14</sup>

The Sarasvatī vilāsa states that Purushottama was successful in bringing his greatest enemy Hammīra to his knees.

Yōhammīramahāripum samatanōt pādābjapīṭhānatam  
śōyam śripurushōttamō gajapatimadvāg vilāsāspadam<sup>15</sup>

The fight between Hammīra and Purushottama Deva for the throne of Orissa is vividly described in the *Madalā Pāñji*.<sup>16</sup>

According to tradition recorded in the *Madalā*—when the recitation of the *Gitagovinda* was introduced as a daily *sevā* of Lord Jagannātha by Kavi Narasimha Deva,<sup>17</sup> who is identified with Narasimha II of the Ganga family (1278-1307 A.D.). Since that time the *Gitagovinda* became immensely popular in Orissa. Being emulated by the noble example set by Jayadeva, imitations of his famous *Gitagovinda* were made in Orissa, of which, the earliest one known so far is the *Abhinava Gitagovinda* by Gajapati Purushottama Deva. The exact date of composition of this work can not be ascertained at present. But the date of copy of the manuscript being the 6th April, 1494 A.D. it must have been composed some years after his accession (1466-67 A.D.) on the throne. So the composition of this work may tentatively be assigned to c. 1480 A.D.

The real author of the A.G.G. was Kavichandra Rāya Divākara Miśra, a famous poet of the court of Gajapati Purushottama Deva and his son Pratāparudra Deva, who attributed its authorship to

his first patron Purushottama, as a token of gratitude for the kind patronage shown to him.<sup>18</sup> But the name of the real author was lost into oblivion and his royal patron Purushottama, whose name occurs at several places of this work as its author became widely reputed not only in Orissa but all over India, within a few years after its composition.

The intention of the author was obviously the introduction of its recitation in the temple of Lord Jagannātha in place of the Gitagovinda by Jayadeva, the recitation of which had formed a part of the daily *sevā* of the Lord since the reign of Gaṅga Narasiṃha II. But this attempt of the King was not crowned with success, as this innovation was strongly objected to by the learned Pandits of his age, at which the king was overwhelmed with sorrow and prayed to Lord Jagannātha, to save him from humiliation. The Lord taking mercy on his royal devotee ordered to interpolate twelve verses of his A.G.G. in the Gitagovinda of Jayadeva.

This tradition is vividly described in the 'Bhaktavijaya' written in the Marathi language by Mahipati in a slightly different manner. Some relevant lines of its English translation are quoted below "There was a king in Jagannatha whose name was Satvik.

He also composed a book similar to that of Jayadeva. He had copies made of his book, sent them to people and ordered it to be read by all. When the pandits heard this news, they were very angry".

\*

\*

\*

"The King replied bring both the books here at once we will place them for the night before idol of Jagannath"

\*

\*

\*

"On the next morning early all the Brahmanas assembled together, and at the time of wick-waving all the priests also came into the temple. There they saw the superior book of Jayadeva. This book was placed near him, by the Supreme Being. The King's book was treated with contempt and tossed outside the people. The assembled Brahmanas rejoined and the king had to hang his head in shame.

\*

\*

\*

“O, Jagannatha, you threw my book outside, I therefore shall now commit suicide. Thus spoke the King “xxxxxxx At his pleading words, He was pleased and He (Jagannatha) took from the king’s book 24 verses. The life of the world then wrote them down in Jayadeva’s book. By doing so the king was comforted.<sup>19</sup>

‘In this story, the king of Jagannatha Puri is called Satvika, instead of Purushottama Deva, as the Marathi poet living at a far off place from Puri, recorded the tradition, which he had heard, in his work, without trying to ascertain the real name of the king, because he was more concerned to glorify the Gitagovinda of Jayadeva. According to this tradition 24 verses of the king’s work were interpolated into the Gitagovinda of Jayadeva.

According to Orissan tradition regarding Jayadeva as recorded in the Oriya work ‘Dārḍhyatābhakti by poet Rāma Dāsa of the 18th century,<sup>19</sup> twelve verses of the king’s work were incorporated at the beginning of 12th chapter of the Gitagovinda by Jayadeva. The work of the king is also called another Gitagovinda.

According to Pandit Śrī Shiva Dutta Sharmā, the following verses of the Gitagovinda which are not commented upon by Mahāmahopādhyāya Śrī Śaṅkara Miśra might have been composed by the Orissan monarch,

“Gitagovinda”,

1. 1st Sarga, Verse 12,  
‘Rāsöllāsabharēṇa ..... hariḥ pātuvaḥ’
2. 2nd Sarga, Verse 12,  
‘Sākuta smitamākula haratu vah klēśam navaḥ kēśavaḥ’
3. 3rd Sarga, Verse 16,  
‘Tiryakkaṇṭha vilōla ..... kshēmam kaṣākshōmaryaḥ’
4. 4th Sarga, Verse 13,  
‘Vriṣṭivṛyākula gōkulāvana ... śrēyāmsi kamsadvishāḥ’
5. 5th Sarga, Verse 7,  
Rādhāmugdha mukhāravindamadhupa...tvām dēvakin-  
andanaḥ’
6. 6th Sarga, Verse 4,  
‘Kim viśrāmyasi krishnabhōgibhavane ..... praśastya-  
garbhāgirāḥ’

7. 7th Sarga, Verse 10,  
'prātarṇīlanicōla macyutamuraḥ ..... jagadānandāya  
nandātmajaḥ'
8. 8th Sarga, Verse 3,  
'Antarmōhanamauli ghurṇanacala ..... vaḥ śreyāmsi  
vaṁśīravah'
9. 9th Sarga, Verse 3,  
'Sāndranandapurandārādīdivishad ..... subhaskandāya  
vandāmahe'
10. 10th Sarga, Verse 8,  
'Sa prīti tanutām hariḥ ..... kamsasya kōlāhalaḥ'
11. 11th Sarga, Verse 10,  
'sānundam nandasūnurdisatu...valitagriyamālōkayanuvaḥ'
12. 12th Sarga, Verse 11,  
'jayaśrī viuyastērmahita ..... bhujadaṇḍo muraḥjitaḥ'
13. 11th Sarga, Verse 12,  
'Saudaryēkanidhēraṇḡgalalana ..... dēyāt mukundōmudam'
14. 12th Sarga, Verse 6,  
'Vyākōśakēṣapāśa ..... mugdhakāntīrdhinōti'
15. 12th Sarga, Verse 7,  
'Irshanmīlita drishṭi ..... dhayatyananam'
16. 12th Sarga, Verse 13,  
'Itham kēlatati virhuta yamunākule samarādhyā

\* \* \*

*Vyāparaḥ purushōttamasya dadatu sphītam mudāṁ saṁpadam*<sup>21</sup>

It may be noted here that out of the 16 verses quoted above, verses 10 and 12 of the 11th Sarga e.g. *Sānandam* and *Soundary-ēkanidhi* and verse 13 of the 12th Sarga e.g. *Itram Kēlatati...* *mudrāsampadam* are not found in the *Gītagovinda* translated into Oriya verses by Dharanidhara Misra, who may tentatively be assigned to the sixteenth century. Dharanidhar has translated one (verse 6 of 12th sarga) out of the above sixteen verses, which are not found in the text of the *Gītagovinda* commented upon both by Rānā Kumbha and Saṅkara Miśra, but are found in the foot notes of pages 164 and 170 of the book published by the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press." Thus in the *Gītagovinda*, which was in circulation in Orissa, by the time of Dharanidhara, we come

across 13 verses which are also found in the text used by Rānā Kumbha, whereas the Oriya text gives two additional verses which are quoted below.

The Sarvāṅgasundarī Tikā on the Gitagovinda written by Kavirāja Nārāyaṇa Dāsa, the great-great grand father of Viśva-nātha Kavirāja (C 1390–1420 A.D.) is the earliest known commentary on the Gitagovinda, so far noticed<sup>22</sup>. As he was a court-poet of king Narasimha Deva of Orissa (either Narasimha I Narasimha II) he may definitely be assigned to the second half of the 13th century A.D.<sup>23</sup> In this hither to-known earliest commentary the following eighteen verses<sup>24</sup> commented upon by Rānā Kumbha Karṇa are not found.

1st Sarga, Verse 11—

*'Nityōtsāṅga ... pikānām girah'*

Verse 12—

*'Rāsöllāsabharēṇa ... pātuvaḥ'*

2nd Sarga, Verse 12—

*'Sākutasmitamākula ... klēṣam navaḥ kēśavaḥ'*

3rd Sarga, Verse 16—

*'Tiryakkaṇḍavilōla ... kshēmam kaṣṭākshōmaryaḥ'*

4th Sarga, Verse 13—

*'Vrīṣṭiyākulagōkula ... śrēyāṁsīkamsadvīṣaḥ'*

5th Sarga, Verse 7—

*'Radhāmugdha mukhārāvinda ... dēvakīnandanaḥ'*

6th Sarga, Verse 4—

*'Kim viśrāmyasi ... prāśastyagarbhāgirah'*

7th Sarga, Verse 10—

*'Prātaḥ nila nicōla ... nandātmajah'*

8th Sarga, Verse 2—

*'Tavēdam paśyantyā ... kimapilajjāṁjanayati'*

8th Sarga, Verse 3—

*'Antarmōhāna mauli ... śrēyāṁsi vaṁśīravvḥ'*

9th Sarga, Verse 3—

*'Sāndrānandapurandara ... subhaskandāyavandāmahe'*

10th Sarga, Verse 8—

*'Sa prīti tanutām ... kaṁsasya kōlāhalaḥ'*

11th Sarga, Verse 10—

*'Sānandam nandasūnu ... ālōkayan vaḥ'*

11th Sarga, Verse 11—

*'Jaya śrī vinyasta ... murajitaḥ'*

11th Sarga, Verse 12—

*'Saundaryekanidhē ... dēyān mukunda mudam'*

12th Sarga, Verse 6—

*'Vyākōśa kēśapāśa ... mugdhakāntidhinōti'*

12th Sarga, Verse 7—

*'Irshanmilitadriṣṭi ... dhayatyānanam'*

12th Sarga, Verse 13—

*'Iṭham kelitātiryihṛitya yamunākule samam rūdhaya*

\* \* \*

*Vyapārāḥ puruṣhōttamasya dadatu sphitam mudam*

*sampadam*"<sup>24</sup>

The famous Rāṇā Kumbha, who is reputed as the author of the Rasikapriyā commentary wherein the above 18 verses are found, died in 1463 A.D.<sup>25</sup>. This commentary was written during the last ten years of his reign, which were peaceful.<sup>26</sup> Gajapati Purushottama ascended the throne in 1466–67 A.D. and the first three years of his reign were not peaceful due to strong opposition of Kumāra Hammira, Mahāpātra, who was a claimant for the throne of Orissa. Thus Abhinava Gitagovinda was written after the death of Kumbhakarna and the authorship of these 18 verses found in Rasikapriyā commentary can be attributed to Gajapati Purushottama Deva. In that case they were composed by some other king of Orissa, prior to his reign, and after the composition of the Sarvāṅgasundarī Tīkā, which may tentatively be assigned to 1285 A.D.

This conclusion is supported by the examination of two original manuscript of A.G.G. where none of following eighteen verses is found. One of these two manuscripts belongs to the Manuscripts library of the Orissa State Museum, which is the subject matter of this paper and other one belongs to the Manuscripts library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal<sup>27</sup>.

According to another tradition current in Orissa, one Purushottama Deva, of the Gaṅga family tried to introduce the



recitation of his work in the Jagannātha Temple at Puri in place of the famous Gitagovinda by Jayadeva<sup>28</sup>. In the imperial Gaṅga family there is no king who is well-known by his name Purushottama. But in some inscriptions of Bhānu Deva II (1309-1328 A.D.) the Anka years of the king have been calculated in the name of Purushottama Deva (in this case Lord Jagannātha of Puri, whose deputy he was)<sup>29</sup> which might have been taken as his second name by the common people, who were ignorant about the significance of this expression used in his epigraphic records.

In his Punjabi Maṭha copper plate grant, this king is described as a great devotee of Govind (Gōvindasya padārabindarajasā sāndrī kritanandanān māni) and Sripat the consort of Śrī (Maktyayuto Sripatan Viśarūpē) and a great scholar and patron of scholars.

*‘Pāṇḍityamaṇḍita mahākavimaṇḍalasya*

*kidrukasahsra viśayē kuśalatvamasyā’*

*‘Virasī śravaṇagatā sa mahimā bāg dēvata bhūṣaṇaḥ’<sup>30</sup>*

Therefore it might be possible for the king, who was a devout worshipper of Govind and himself very learned and whose court was adorned by great poets to write some work, the name of which is not yet known, in imitation of the Gitagovinda, the recitation of which in the temple of Jagannāth was introduced by his father Kavi Narasimha or Narasimha II (1278-1307 A.D.)

This is supported by the last line of the last verse “Vyāpārāḥ Purushottamasya dadatusphitām mudrām sampadam” of the text of the Gitagovinda commended upon by Kumbha Karṇa<sup>31</sup>, which contains a veiled reference to a king Purushottama, ruling prior to him, who might for the present be identified with the above Gaṅga king. Elsewhere Kumbha Karṇa also refers to a work written by some king “Prabandhaḥ Prithvibhartrā Prabandhaḥ Prītayē harēḥ”<sup>32</sup> while commenting on the 13th verse of the 4th Sarga. But no definite conclusion can be made in this matter, until and unless the manuscript of this work by Purushottama, a Gaṅga king of Orissa, is available for study and research.

This work as its very name indicates was a new Gitagovinda or its imitation and as such the theme and arrangement are practically similar in both the works, the only difference being

that G.G. has 12 sargas whereas A.G.G. is divided into 10 sargas as noted below :

*Iti śrī purushōttamasya gajapati mahārāja kṛite abhinava gita-  
gōvindamahākāvye virahāṇī varṇane vidhurarādhō nāma prathamah  
sargaḥ*

*Iti śrī purshōttama ..... nāyikābhilāsha varṇane sōtkhaṇḍa  
vaikuṇṭho nāma dvitiyaḥ sargaḥ*

*Abhisārikā varṇane muditārādhō nāma tritiyaḥ sargaḥ*

*Kalahāntarītā varṇane mūṣharādhō nāma catruthaḥ sargaḥ*

*Vipralabdā varṇane bidagdhamādhayo nāma pañcamaḥ sargaḥ  
vātaka samjṇavarṇane samkshabdharādhō nāma sashṭhaḥ  
sargaḥ*

*khaṇḍita varṇane vilakshapuṇḍarikāksho nāma saptama  
sargaḥ*

*Māninivarṇane sōktavaikunṭho nāmāshaṭamaḥ sargaḥ*

*Prōshītabhartrikā varṇane anukūlarādhō nāma navamaḥ  
sargaḥ*

*Svādhīnabhartrikā varṇane nandamuḥundō nāma dasamaḥ  
sargaḥ*

As regards the use of Rāgas we find only these ten rāgas, viz., Karṇāṭaka, Gujjari, Gōṇḍakiri, Dēśivarādi, Varāḍi, Vasanta Vibhasa, Bhairav, Mājavā, Rāmakeri used in the Gitagovinda, whereas the number of rāgas in the A.G.G. is 58. They are arranged alphabetically below and the sarga in which each raga is used is given within brackets ('S' indicating sarga.) Scholars interested in the study of the development of rāgas in Orissa will find ample new materials in this work.

*Amarapañcama, Ābhiri, Kukubha, Karṇāṭa, Karṇāṭabaṅgāḷa  
Kalahamsa or Balahamsa (?) Kalyāṇanāṭa, Kāmbhōji, Kuruñji,  
Kēdāragauda, Kōlahala, Gāndhāra, Gujari, Gōṇḍakiri, Gauḍi,  
Ghaṇṭātrya, Cintadēśi, Chchāyānāṭi Tōḍi, Dipak, Dēśākhya,  
Dēśi, Dhanāsi, Naṭanārāyaṇa, Nādarāmakiri, Nārāyaṇagaḍa  
Nārāyaṇadēśākhya, Pūravi, Baṅgāḷagaḍa, Baṅgāḷavarāḍi,  
Vasanta, Bahuji, Vēlāvali, Bhinnashaḍja, Bhūpāḷa, Bhairava,  
Bhairavi, Maṅgaḷagujari, Madhyamāti, Mallāra, Māḷayagaḍa,  
Mālāsri, Mukhāri, Rāmakriri, Rēhagupti, Lalita, Saṅkarābha-  
raṇa, Sri, Suddhanāṭa, Suddhabaṅgāḷa, Suddhavarādi, Sāddha-  
yasanta, Sālakarṇāṭa, Sāmavarāḍi, Sōma, Saurashṭragurjari<sup>33</sup>.*

Most of these rāgas began to be used in the Oriya Kāvya from the beginning of the 16th century.

Like the famous Daśāvatārastuti or prayer to the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu of the Gitagovinda, we find a similar hymn in the first chapter of the A.G.G., the only difference being that Lord Buddha, the ninth incarnation prayed to by Jayadeva has been substituted by Kṛṣṇa. In this imitation, which indicates the total decline of Buddhism and strong hold of Kṛṣṇa worship over the classes and masses in Orissa by his time. The Daśāvatārastuti is repeated in an abridged manner in the last chapter of the A.G.G., which is absent in the Gitagovinda. Lord Jagannātha worshipped over the blue mountain (Nīlāchala who is described as Jagadīśa (the synonym of Jagannātha) by Jayadeva in this above Daśāvatārastuti is given more prominence in this work as the royal author was a great devotee of Jagannātha.

The royal author has tried to make the language of his work as simple, sweet and melodious as that of the Gitagovinda, but he attained success in this matter to a great extent as will be evident from the quotation from this work. This new Gitagovinda, by the celebrated Gajapati Puruṣhottama Deva, which can stand comparison with the well-known Gitagovinda, deserves publication, so that it can win the approbation of the World of Oriental scholars.

By K. N. MAHAPATRA

#### FOOTNOTES

1. A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. VII, Kavya Manuscripts. No. 5180 pp. 111-115.

2. Abinava Gitagovinda is abbreviated as A.G.G.

3. An Indian Ephemeris' by Swami Kannu Pillai, Vol. V. p. 190.

4. Warangal Inscription of Raghu Drea, Kali year 1561, E. I. Vol. XXXIII, P., III, p-199.

5. Edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar E.I. Vol. XXXIII Pt. VII.

6. Sarasyativilasa—edited by Dr. R. Shama Sastri P. 7.

7. Quoted in the 'The Suryavamsi Gajapatis of Orissa' by R. Subrahmanyam p. 37.

8. List of Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras by Robert Sewell Vol. I P-119.

9. Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—p. 194.
10. Printed in Oriya characters by Sri Sudhakara Pattanaik, B.A. pp. 54-55.
11. Printed in Oriya characters by Sri Sudhakara Pattanaik, B.A. pp. 30-31.
12. A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Edited by Mm, H. P. Shastri Vol. III, Smriti Manuscripts, P. 120.
13. *Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency* by V. Rangacharya Vol. II. P. 1684.
14. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts* of Orissa compiled by me. Vol. II, Preface p. XCII.
15. *Sarasvati Vilasa* (p. 7) edited by Dr. R. Shama Sastri.
16. 'Madala Panji' published in Oriya characters by the Prachi Samiti, Cuttack, pp. 47-49.
17. "Eutrāru kavinarasimha dēva rājā hōyilā. *Gitagōvinda śīlōu kale (śubhadēlē)*" *Madala Panji*, Prachi Edition—p. 36.
18. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts* of Orissa Vol. II compiled by me. Preface pp—CV—CVII.
19. English translation of the story of Jayadeva in the Marathi 'Bhaktavijaya' has kindly supplied to me by Pandit Sri Shiva Dutta Sharma of New Delhi in 1967.
20. Dardhyatabhaka, i, 55th Chapter p. 457.
21. Nirnaya Sagar Press Edition.  
1st Sarga—p. 86; 2nd S.—p. 52; 3rd S.—p. 62; 4th—p. 75; 5th—p. 87; 6th—p. 93; 7th—p. 115; 8th—p. 121; 9th—p. 126, 10th—p. 136; 11th—p. 155, p. 156, p. 157; 12th—p. 165, p. 166, p. 193.  
In the Oriya text their position has been altered.
22. First noticed by Mr. H. P. Shastri vide Des. Cat. of Sans. Mss. Vol. VII; Kavya Manuscripts p. 18 No. 5160 & 5161.
23. For detailed information about Narayana Dasa, please see P. LXX of the Preface of 'A Des. Cat. of Sans. Mss. of Orissa' Vol. II compiled by me.
24. Compared with the palm-leaf manuscript of the Sarvangasundari Tike preserved in the Manuscripts Library of the O. R. Museum.
25. The Delhi Sultanate. (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan) series Vol. V P 815.
26. Ibid—pp. 336-337.
27. I am grateful to Sri Bibarana Chandra Chatterjee, Sanskrit Professor S. N. College, Calcutta, who gave me a chance to examine this manuscript which he intends to edit.
28. Prachina Utkala (Oriya) by Jagabhandhu Simha p. 49.
29. S. I. Inscriptions Vol VI. Nos. 714, 998.
30. Punjabi Math O.P. inscription of Bhanu II edited by Sri S. N. Rajāguru, O.H.R.J. Vol. IX Nos. 1 & 2 pp. 22-24.
31. Nirnaya Sagara press edition p. 173.
32. Ibid—p. 75.

## Abhinava Gitagovinda

Dr. Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* III p. 6a notices one *Abhinavagitagovinda* by Purushottamadeva, a Gajapati King of Orissa, on the authority of the information given in MM Haraprasad Sastri's Report on Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts 1895-1900 p. 18. Again on p. 144 of Vol. VII of the Des. Cat. of Mss. in the Asiatic Society of Bengal is found a work named *Abhinavagitagovinda*<sup>1</sup> attributed to Gajapati Purushottamadeva the second king of the Gajapati dynasty of Orissa at the 15th century A.D.<sup>2</sup> The authority for fathering this work on the King is obviously derived from the colophon<sup>3</sup> of the work and on an imperfect stanza found at the beginning of the same.

*Rādhāmūrāri ramaṇīya rahasyalīla sadyo hi ... mamanda-  
purabhiramam  
Sāhityasara samudayabudhaḥ prabandhamētam karōti Puru-  
shōttamabhumibarta*

Apparently and taken independently, the ascription of the work to Purushottamadeva is correct. But there is a conflicting evidence to this.

In his *Bharatāmrtakāvya* (ASB. Des. Cat. VII p. 145) an epic poem in 30 cantos describing the kings of the lunar dynasty, Divakara mentions that he wrote a poem called *Abhinavagitagovinda*. The latter half of the concluding verse of the 27th Canto of the *Bharatāmṛta* runs.

*Kāvyē tasya sahōdarāt Abhinavaśrīgitagōvindatō  
Pyojah śālīni saptayimśatitamah sargaḥ samāptobhavat*

From this it is quite clear that Divakara composed an *Abhinavagitagōvinda* and also the *Bharatāmṛta*, which is more significant in point of 'Ojas' than its brother, i.e., *Abhinavagitagōvinda*. Is it not then probable to suppose that Divakara, after composing the *Abhinavagitagōvinda*, dedicated it to his

patron, King Purushottamadeva? As time passed by, the real author was not known and the work came to be associated with the name of the King.

This habit of a poet composing a poem and fathering it on his patron or some other renowned scholar of his time is not quite uncommon in India. See for instance, the stanza in Alankarāśekhara :—

*Prākpratyak prthivibhrutoh parishadi prakhyata samkhyavatam  
Ahnayadbhuta tarka karkasataya vichchidya vidyāmadam  
Ye kepyutkalabhupate tava sabhāsambhavitah paṇḍitah  
Pātram śri jayadēva paṇḍitakaviḥ tanmurghni vinyasyati*

This clearly shows that a poet Jayadeva at the time of the Utkala King passed off his work or works on some renowned scholars of his time. In the light of this fact there is nothing improbably assuming that Divakara attributed the authorship of his work to patron Purushottamadeva.

Another point with respect to the authorship of the Abhinava-gitagovinda is this: In Catalogus Catalogorum I. p. 253a one Divakara Purushottama is given as the patron of Krishnadatta Maithila, author of a drama entitled Purañjanacarita (Mitra Notices 200). The same Kṛṣṇadatta wrote a commentary<sup>4</sup> called Ganga on Jayadeva's Gitagovinda. Aufrecht<sup>5</sup> attributes to him Candicaritacandrika kavya (L. 2008). The play, Purañjanacarita in five acts, was first staged in the court of Purushottamadeva of Orissa. For in the *prastāyana* he mentions

*Paramaramaṇīyakarasya Sridivākarapurushottamasya sabhāyam* etc., which seems to contain a reference to Divakara also. Perhaps Maithila Kṛṣṇadatta, a court-poet of Purushottamadeva composed his Ganga on Jayadeva's Gitagovinda and envious of this, it is probable that Divākara, another court-poet of Purushottama wrote an independent work called Abhinavagitagovinda and fathered it on his patron, fearing that his jealousy would be detected. The new composition seems to have pleased the King much. Perhaps there is also a veiled reference to the favour enjoyed by Divakara at the Royal hands, when in his *prastāyana* Kṛṣṇadatta says '*Divākarapurushōttamastha Sabhāyam* which

means the assembly in which Divakara and Purushottama are present.

The possibility of Kṛṣṇadatta's writing his Gāṅgā on Jayadeva's Gitagovinda, being inspired by Divakara's Abhinavagita-govinda also should not be lost sight of here. But the contrary seems to be nearer the fact, when we think of Bhartṛhari's tag: *Bōdharo matsaragrastāḥ*.

Again the phrase—*Divākara-purushōttama*—admits of still another explanation. Divakara need not necessarily be different from Purushottama. Divakara might have been the real name of the King and Purushottama merely a qualification. But this possibility seems to be far-fetched.

Then how to explain the colophon found at the end of the Abhinavagitagōvinda which gives Purushottama as its author? The explanation has already been offered, i.e., Divakara passed off his work in the name of the King.

Let us now see what information can be had of Divakara. A glance at the colophons or more correctly the concluding verses of the Cantos of the Bharatāmṛta kāvya induces one strongly to think that Divakara was a close follower or Sri Harsha, author of the Naishadha. For, both are similar in giving some personal details in their concluding verses. About Divakara we know the following particulars. He was a brahmin belonging to the Bhāradvājagotra and the Vajasaneyi Sakha. His father was one Vaidyesvara and his Mother Mukta<sup>6</sup>. His paternal uncle was called Nārāyaṇa Kaviratna<sup>7</sup>, under whom he studied sahitya-sastra. He had two brothers, Govinda (cousin) and Madhusudana<sup>8</sup>. Divakara was much honoured for his erudition in the court of Kṛṣṇarāya, Raja of Kārṇāṭa:

*Karṇāṭādhipakṛṣṇarayasadasi khyātasya vidyattaya*

Here is a striking similarity between Divakara and Harsha, who obtained,

*Tambūladvayamāsanam ca labhate yaḥ kanyakubjēśvarāt*

Divakara was also the author of the following works:—(1) A bhāṣa called *Dhūrtacaritra*<sup>9</sup>, (2) a hymn to Devi in 100 verses<sup>10</sup>,

and (3) *Rasamañjari*<sup>11</sup>, a collection of charming verses, probably an anthology known also by the name Padyāvali which is to be differentiated from a similar work of the same name by Rupa-gosvamin.

In his paternal uncle, Narayana, Divakara had a cousin brother named Govinda, who was an intimate friend of Divakara and probably of the same age, and who seems to have collaborated with Divakara in his poetical compositions. See the words 'kavipate hastavalambaḥ' in the following :

*Gōvindaḥ kavīśēkharaḥ kavipatē hastavalambaḥ pitu—  
bharturyō jāni yasya tasyam sukrto dvāviṃśasargō gataḥ*

Divakara got<sup>12</sup> the title (Kavichandrarāya' from a King Rudra). Who this Rudra is unknown. Divakara's ancestors were, well-skilled in Vedangas and all the systems of Philosophy<sup>13</sup>. That Sri Harsha influenced Divākara much can also be seen when he adopts the same metre, Vamśasta as in the Naishadha, in opening his Bharatāmṛta kāvya :

'*Prāṇētumamnavayidhimanēkadha*' etc.

By E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN

#### REFERENCES

1. This work is to be differentiated from one Gitagovinda, probably called Abhinavagitagovinda, by a king Nilāchala. According to the Bhaktamala, a king of Nilachala composed one Gitagovinda and tried to pass it off as Jayadeva's work (90 Cat. Eggeling p. 1480 f.n)
2. Mr. Manomohan Chakravarti seems to identify this Purushottama-deva with the Utkala king of the same name, who lived during 1470-97. A.D. (Jl. of Asiatic society of Bengal, 1906 p. 164). But evidences are lacking.
3. Iti Sripurushōttamadeva gajapatimahārāja krte Abhinava gitagovinda mahākāvye etc.
4. 90. 3875; Mithila MSS. II pp. 4617
5. Cat. Cat. I, 210b
6. Yam prasuta pativṛta mukta vimuktatmanah  
Srivaideśvarato vibhūshitabharadvājanvayatmajam



His mother was not called Pativrata as supposed by Mm. Haraprasad Shastri and Dr. Aufrecht (Cat. Cat. III, p. 55a). Her name was Mukta, Pativrata being only an adjective. Otherwise the term Mukta goes without explanation.

7. Kāvye tasya pitruvyataḥ kavinrupat sāhityaśikṣabhṛtaḥ  
Sṛīnārāyaṇa namato rasamayaḥ sargastritiyo gataḥ
8. Yadbhṛata madhusūdana madhuraḥ kam kam ānandayaḥ
9. Bhāṇo bhāṇyat yēna dhṛtācārītaḥ cetascamatkarakṛt
10. Yo devyaḥ stutimadrirajaduhituh śtōkaiḥ sātenakaroḥ
11. Yascake rasamañjarīti rasikahlādayaḥ padyaavālini
12. Yascapatkavicandrayapadeva śrīrindrabhūmibhujah
13. Gōtrē jayata yāḥ śhaṇḍāṅgi (nga ?) vidūṣham śhaddarśanidarśinām.

## Radha: Consort of Kṛṣṇa's Vernal Passion

The source of Jayadeva's heroine in his poem, *Gītagovinda*, remains one of the puzzles of Sanskrit literature. While no definitive solution presents itself, well-documented references to Rādhā in more than twenty works of Indian literature which antedate the *Gītagovinda* are quoted. From these emerges a characterization of Rādhā and her unique association with Kṛṣṇa which suggests an old tradition surrounding the celebration of the secret love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in springtime. Vedic and Epic mythology as well as classical Indian aesthetic theory are related to the development of Jayadeva's central female figure.

IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING a textual analysis and translation of Jayadeva's *Gītagovinda*, it has become increasingly clear that the poem achieves its power through a highly-contributed interweaving of formal and thematic elements drawn from various kinds of sources within the Indian literary tradition. In order to transform the Sanskrit original into a viable English poem, it has become necessary to attempt to unravel these elements, trace their sources, and penetrate the particular way in which the poet Jayadeva combined them into his exquisite lyrical poem of passionate devotion in the twelfth century.<sup>1</sup>

The figure of Rādhā is one of the most elusive in Sanskrit literature. Until Jayadeva made her the heroine of his poem, she appeared only in stray verses scattered through anthologies of Prākṛit and Sanskrit poetry, works of literary aesthetics, grammar, poetry and drama, and a few inscriptions. Unless one comes to appreciate Jayadeva's method of composition in its various aspects, it is difficult to understand how much his characterization of Rādhā depends on the way he skillfully plays with specific details and multiple associations from earlier mythological and

literary contexts. The entire poem is formally expressed in two distinct types of metrical system: individual stanzas in a variety of syllabic meters (*akṣara-chandas*) are interspersed with songs in time measured, or moric, meters (*mātrā-chandas*). Most of the latter are structured into repeating patterns of four-beat units (*catur-guṇa*), which reflect the four-beat unit of the most common rhythmical patterns (*tāla*) of both systems of Indian classical music.<sup>2</sup> With specific reference to the songs, each of the twenty-four is a composite of a repeating pattern of three formal units: (1) *Pada*, the verse, which usually occurs in units of eight and from which comes the common designation of the songs as *padāvalis* or *aṣṭapadis*,<sup>3</sup> (2) *Bhaṇita*, the last *pada* in each song, which repeats the poet's signature, *Jayadeva*, and usually some form of the root *√bhaṇ* (designating "saying" or "singing"), and which relates the poet's creative activity and the audience's aesthetic appreciation to the experiences of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa; (3) *Dhruva-pada*, the refrain, which is repeated after each verse and serves to intensify the descriptive details of the verses.<sup>4</sup>

The entire poem abounds in various kinds of word-play, whose reverberations relate levels of content within the poem and often expand the context of a verse. As an obvious example, Jayadeva is fond of introducing, by punning, the names of the meters in which stanzas are composed: *śikharṇī* in the stanza *durāloka*... (2.6.11),<sup>5</sup> *śārdūlavikṛīḍita* in the stanza *āvāso*... (4.8.10); *upendravajrā* in the stanza *smarāturām*... (4.9.10); *puṣpitāgrā* in the stanza *kṣaṇamapi*... (4.9.12); *pṛthvī* in the stanza *dṛśau tava*... (10.19.7). Also, there are elaborate puns and half-puns on the names of Kṛṣṇa, especially Mādhava, Madhusūdana, and Hari. The poet's own signature, *Jayadeva*, is played on in the refrain of the second song: *jaya jaya deva* [or, *jayadeva*] *hare*, where the word *jaya* may refer to the type of composition characteristic of the poem.<sup>6</sup> The variety of figures of speech used in the songs and stanzas is further indication of how Jayadeva exploits both frequent and more obscure classical forms in his work.<sup>7</sup> The elaborate sound patterns of alliteration, assonance, consonance, and end-rhyme, which are marks of the poem's distinctiveness in Sanskrit literature, occur in earlier Sanskrit works, but only sporadically.<sup>8</sup> It is the songs in moric metres and

these sound patterns that have led scholars like Pischel and Renou<sup>9</sup> to suggest that the entire poem may be based on an Apabhraṃśa original, but if one analyzes Jayadeva's style in terms of the separate elements of meter, figures of speech, and structure, the classical antecedents are there in both Sanskrit and Prākṛit sources. The poem is deceptively simple in its surface, but its profounder meaning is embedded in a structurally intricate form which relies on sophisticated literary traditions for its means.

The clues to Jayadeva's poetic method afforded by this superficial elements in the *Gitagovinda* can now begin to illuminate his development of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa relationship in the poem. Although neither Rādhā nor the pair of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa is the subject of any known work prior to the *Gitagovinda*, their treatment in the stray verses of many literary works makes us take seriously Jayadeva's claim that he is basing his poem on a known theme. The second verse of the prologue in *Gitagovinda*, (1.2) reads :

vāgdevatācaritacitritacittasadmā  
padmāvaticarapañcārāṇacakraṇvartī |  
śrīvāsudevaratikeliḥkathāsametam  
etaṃ karati jayadevakaviḥ prabhandham ॥

Before I examine the main features of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa relationship in the *Gitagovinda*, it seems appropriate to offer a catalogue, in chronological order, of sources antedating the *Gitagovinda* which make reference to Rādhā or Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.<sup>10</sup> I shall then try to point to distinctive feature in the stray verses and references which seem relevant to Jayadeva's conception. As with formal elements of the *Gitagovinda*, no one source can account for Jayadeva's development of the poem's main theme, but the sources suggest how the poet's devotion and literary skill shaped the material.

*Artharva Veda*, XIX.7.3 (c-d). [*Atharvaveda Saṃhita*, edited by W. D. Whitney and R. Roth (Berlin: Ferd. Dummler's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1856), p. 356.] :

rādhe viśāḁke suhāvānurādhā  
jyeṣṭhā sunāḁśatram āriṣṭaṃ mūlam ॥

It should be noted that although Whitney reports all manuscripts examined to read *rādhe* (fem. dual) and commentaries to explain this as meaning that *rādhā* is another name for *viśākhā*, he feels that it is an interpolation based on a later misunderstanding of *anurādhā* as meaning “the one after (*anu*) or following *rādhā*.” He therefore changes the reading to *rādho* and translates it “be the two Viśākhās bestowal (*rādhās*).” [W. D. Whitney (trans.) *Atharva-veda saṃhita* (1905; rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962), vol. II, p. 908.]

If one follows the manuscript evidence and reads *rādhe*, it can be understood that the two stars called *Viśākhā* are identified with a dual *rādhā*. The identification is supported by the fifth century lexical work *Amarakoṣa*, I.3.22 [Amarasimha, *The Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam (Amarakoṣa)*, edited by Pandit Śivadatta (Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgara Press, 1944), p. 38]: *rādhā viśākhā puṣye tu sidhyatiṣyam śraviṣṭhayā*, etc. The implication will be discussed below, as will the relation between *Rādhā* and Vedic *rādhās*, *rādhaspati*.

*Mahābhārata* I. 104.14(b), 181.28(a), etc. [*The Mahābhārata*, critically edited by V. S. Sukthankar, et al. (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933-1966), vol. 1, *The Ādiparvan*, pp. 469, 736.]:

*tam utsṛṣṭaṃ tadā garbhaṃ rādhābhartā mahāyasaḥ* |  
*putratye kalpayāmāsa sabhāryaḥ sūtanandaḥ* || I.104.14 ||  
*ko hi rādhāsutaṃ karṇaṃ śakto yodhayituṃ raṇe* |  
*anyatra rāmād droṇād vā kṛpād vāpī śaradvataḥ* || I.181.28 ||

This *Rādhā* has no apparent relation to Kṛṣṇa's consort of later literature. In the epic she is the wife of Adhiratha and foster mother of Kuntī's son Karṇa; her character is not developed.

Because of the fluidity of Purāṇic texts in general, it is impossible to date or locate the relationship of *Rādhā* and Kṛṣṇa from them. However, the occurrence and absence of references to *Rādhā* in some major Purāṇas is relevant to understanding the development of the figure. Many of the references are gathered

from the writings of the Gosvāmins, who combed the Purāṇic texts to demonstrate Rādhā's old and high status within orthodox Vaiṣṇavism.<sup>11</sup> There is no clear reference to Rādhā in the *Hari-vaṃśa*, *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, or *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, but the occurrence of the form *ārādhita* in the tenth book of the *Bhāgavata* [X.30.28, *anayārādhito nūnam bhagavān harir īśvaraḥ | yan no vihāya govindaḥ prito yām anayad rahaḥ ||* (Gorakhpur: Gita Press, 1962)] led the disciples of Caitanya to derive the name Rādhā from *ārādhita* as it occurs in this passage.<sup>12</sup> Following this, reference to Rādhā is claimed by commentators in similar passages in the *Hari-vaṃśa* [63.33, *The Hari-vaṃśa*, critically edited by P. L. Vaidya (Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1969), vol. I]<sup>13</sup> and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* [V. 13.33-46 (Gorakhpur: Gita Press, 1962)].<sup>14</sup> References to Rādhā by name are listed below in tentative chronological order.<sup>15</sup>

*Matsya Purāṇa* XIII.38. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, no. 54, edited by H. N. Apte (Poona : Ānandāśrama, 1907), p. 23.] In verses 24-53 of this section, Devī enumerates her various names at different holy places in response to Dakṣa's question as to what names are to be invoked at the *tīrthas* :<sup>16</sup>  
*śiyakuṇḍe śiyānandā nandini devikātaṭe |*  
*rukmiṇi dvārvatyāṇ tu rādhā vṛndāvane vane || 38 ||*

*Līṅga Purāṇa*, *Uttarārdhe* 48.14. [Edited by P. J. Vidyasagara (Calcutta : Valmiki Press, 1885), p. 830.]

The verse is one of a series of mantras [48.5-26] in imitation of the Gāyatrī, all ending *pracodayāt*, in which various gods and goddesses are invoked ; 48.12 invokes Viṣṇu, 48.13 invokes Lakṣmī :

*samuddhṛtāyai vidmahe viṣṇunaikena dhimahi |*  
*tan no rādhā pracodayāt || 14 ||*

*Vārāha Purāṇa* 164.33-35. [Bibliotheca Indica, no. 109, edited by Hṛshikeśa Śāstrī (Calcutta : Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1887), p. 617.]

Kṛṣṇa's encounter with Rādhā here follows his slaying of the demon Ariṣṭa :<sup>17</sup>

*tatra rādhā samāśliṣya kṛṣṇam akliṣṭakāraṇam |*  
*svanāmnā viditam kuṇḍam kṛtam tirtham adūrataḥ || 33 ||*  
*rādhākuṇḍam iti khyātam sarvapāpaharam śubham |*  
*ariṣṭarādhākuṇḍābhyāṁ snānāt phalam ayāpnuyāt |*  
*rājasūyāśvamedhānām nātra kāryyā vicāraṇā |*  
*gohatyābrahmahatyāyāḥ pāpam kṣipram vinasyati || 34 35 ||*

*Brahmayaiyārta Purāṇa, Kṛṣṇa-janma-khaṇḍa, adhyāyas 2-5, 15, 17, 27-30, 52, 53, 57, 58, 66-68, 92-98, 110, 111, 123-128.*

[Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, no. 102, edited by V. G. Apte (Poona : Ānandāśrama, 1935), vol. 2, pp. 433-911 ; translated by Rajendra Nath Sen, Sacred Books of the Hindus, vol. 24 (Allahabad : Pāṇiṇi Office, 1922), pp. 99-564.]

Rādhā occupies a leading position in the section devoted to Kṛṣṇa's birth. This elaborate section seems to be as late as the sixteenth century in its present form,<sup>18</sup> but since it is an obvious compilation of various strands of the Rādhā legend it furnishes many suggestions about the nature of the figure and her relationship to Kṛṣṇa which are relevant to Jayadeva's conception.

*Padma Purāṇa, Pātāla-khaṇḍa (IV), 52, "Śrīrādhā-janmāṣṭamī-mahātmya,"*

[Edited with Hindi paraphrase by S. S. Śarma (Bareilly : Samskṛti-Samsthāna, 1968), vol. 2, pp. 122ff.]

This section is noted several times in the attempts of the Gosvāmins to fix Rādhā's place in established textual traditions, but the section itself seems to me a crude interpolation aimed at elevating Rādhā's position in a more orthodox Viṣṇu cult. Rādhā's lowly birth as a cowherdess is rationalized by explaining that she is called *gopī* ('cow-protectress') because she conserves energy; she is one of the chief deities, the *hlādinī-śakti* of Kṛṣṇa; she is Mahālakṣmī and Kṛṣṇa is Nārāyaṇa, etc.<sup>19</sup> The literary references in prākṛit and Sanskrit<sup>20</sup> are as follows :

*Sattasāi* of Hāla (dated first to seventh centuries by various scholars),<sup>21</sup> Vulgate edition, 1.89; Weber critical text, 86. [Vulgate, entitled *Gāthasaptasāi*, edited with the commentary of Gangādharaḥṭṭa by P. Durgāprasād and K. S. Parab,

Kāvya-māla, no. 21 (Bombay : Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1933), p. 44 ; *Saptasatakam des Hāla*, edited with German translation by Albrecht Weber, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. V, no. 3 (1870 ; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein : Kraus Reprint, Ltd., 1966), p. 102.]<sup>22</sup>

*muhamāruṇa taṃ kaṇḥa gorāṃ rāhiāḥ avāṇento |*  
*etāṇaṃ vallaviṇaṃ aṇṇāṇaṃ vi gorāṃ harasi || I.89 || [NSP]*

The Sanskrit version would be :

*mukhamārutena tvaṃ kṛṣṇa gorāḥ rādhikāyā apanayan |*  
*etāsāṃ ballavinām anyāsām api gauravaṃ harasi ||*

*Gauḍavaho* of Vākpati (dated late-seventh or early-eighth century according to the dating of Vākpati's patron, Yaśovarman of Kanauj),<sup>23</sup> verse 22. [*Gauḍavaho : A Historical Poem in Prākṛit*, edited by S. P. Pandit Bombay Sanskrit Series, no. 34 (Bombay : Central Book Depot, 1887), p. 7.]

*ṇaha-rehā rāhā-kāraṇā oṃ karuṇaṃ harantu vo sarasā |*  
*vaccha-tthalammi koithuha-kiraṇānti oṃ kaṇḥassa ||*

Pandit's Sanskrit version reads :

*nakharekhā rādhākaraṇā (rādhayā gopyā nirmitāḥ karaṇa-  
prahārāḥ) karuṇānimittaṃ (saṃsārādūḥkhaṃ)  
harantu (nāśayantu) sarasā (ādrā) vakṣaḥsthale kaustubha-  
kīraṇāyamānāḥ kṛṣṇasya.*

I would render the verse somewhat differently, to exploit the meaning of *sarasa* :

*Veniṣaṃhāra* of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa (antedates A.D. 800),<sup>24</sup> *nāṇḍi* 2. [Edited by Julius Grill (Leipzig : Fues's Verlag, 1871), p. 3.]

*kāḷindīyāḥ puliṇeṣu kelikupitām utsṛjya rāse rasaṃ  
gacchantim anugacchato' śrukaluṣāṃ kaṃsadyiṣo rādhikām |*  
*tapādapratimāniveśitapadasyodbhūtaromodgater  
akṣuṇṇo'nunayaḥ prasannadayitādrṣṭasya puṣṇātu vaḥ ||*

This *nāṇḍi*, like the two others accompanying it in most editions, could have been added to the text at any time, but the subject of Rādhā's sulking and Kṛṣṇa's pacifying her is sufficiently relevant to the theme of Draupadī's insults and



Bhīma's soothing her with revenge to be part of the original play. It is noteworthy too that after the recitation of the three *nāndī* verses, the *sūtradhāra* goes on to praise Viṣṇu and to inform the audience that Kṛṣṇa has undertaken to act as mediator between the Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas.

*Dhanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana (dated mid-ninth century), illustrative verse in *vr̥tti* following *kārikā* 6 of *uddyota* 2, illustrative verse in *vr̥tti* following *kārikā* 41 of *uddyota* 3. [Edited, with the commentary of Abhinavagupta, by P. Durgāprasād and K. P. Parab, *Kāvya-mālā*, no. 25 (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1891), pp. 77, 214-15; Critically edited by K. Krishnamoorthy (Dharwar: Karnatak University, 1973), 2.5 (p. 48), 3.40 (pp. 236-38). ]<sup>25</sup>

*teṣāṃ gopavadhūvilāsasuhṛdāṃ rādhārahaṣākṣiṇāṃ*  
*kṣemaṃ bhadra kalindaśailatanayātīre' latāveśmanām |*  
*vicchinne smaratalpakalpanamṛduchedopayoge 'dhunāte jāne*  
*jaraṣhibhavyanti vigalannilatviṣaḥ pallavāḥ || 2.6 ||<sup>26</sup>*

*durārādhā rādhā subhaga yad anenāpi mṛjatas*  
*tavaitat prāṇeśājaghanavasananāśru patitam |*  
*kaṭhoraṃ strīcetas tad alam upacārair vīrama he*  
*kriyāt kalyāṇaṃ vo harir anunayeṣv evam uditāḥ || 3.41 ||*

[According to Abhinavagupta, these are the words of Rādhā., *Dhanyālokalocana* of Abhinavagupta (dated early tenth century)] commentary on the two *Dhanyāloka* verses quoted above; another reference to Rādhā quoted in the *Locana* on the *vr̥tti* following *kārikā* 4 of *uddyota* 1. [*Kāvya-mālā* ed., p. 25]<sup>27</sup>

*yāte dvāravatiṃ tadā madhuripau taddattakampānatāṃ*  
*kālindītaṭarūḍhavaṇjulalatām āliṅgya sotkaṇṭhayā |*  
*tadgitam gurubhṛṣṭpagadgadagalattārasvaraṃ rādhayā*  
*yenāntarjalacāribhīr jalacarair apy utkam utkūjitam ||*

*Kāvya-mīmāṃsa* of Rājasekhara (dated late-ninth or early-tenth century), two verses comparing the breaths of Śiva and Viṣṇu are quoted in *adhyāya* 13 following the comment *atha tulya-dehitulyasya bhidāḥ . . . . tasyaiya vastuna viṣayāntarayojanāḍ*

*anyarūpāpattir viṣayaparivartah.* [Edited by C. D. Dalal and R. A. Shastri, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, no. 1 (Baroda : Central Library, 1916), p. 71.]

*ye simantitagātrabhasmarajaso ye kumbhakadyeṣiṇo  
ye liḍhāḥ śravaṇāśrayeṇa phaṇinā ye candraśaityadruhaḥ |  
te kupyadgiri-jāyibhaktavapuṣaś cittavyathāsākṣiṇaḥ  
sthāṇor dakṣiṇanāsikāpuṭabhuvah śvāsānilāḥ pāntu vaḥ ||  
ye kirṇakvathitodarābjamadhavo ye mlāpitorahsrajo  
ye tāpāt taralena talpaphaṇinā pītapratapojjhitaḥ |  
te rādhāsmṛtisākṣiṇaḥ kamalayā sāsūyam ākarṇitā  
gāḍhāntardavathoḥ prataptasaraḷāḥ śvāsā hareḥ pāntu  
vaḥ ||<sup>28</sup>*

*Damayantikathā* (also called *Nalacampū*) of Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa (dated early-tenth century the oldest extant *campū-kāvya*, according to Keith, *HSL*, pp. 332-333.), chapter 4. [Edited by N. B. Parvaṇīkar, P. Durgāprasād, and P. Śivadatta, with the commentary of Caṇḍapāla (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1931), p. 108.]

*kevalam anavarataśikṣitavaidagdhyaḥkalāparādhātmikātrapā-  
parāparthṛtya guṇino gurūn parapuruṣe māyāvini kṛtakeśi-  
vadhe dhṛtamandarāge rāgaṃ badhnāti |*

The sense of this passage is based on a series of puns :

"She being not very much taught (or, 'not newly taught in the arts of cunning (or, 'passion') and committing a fault of giving up modesty (*aparādhā-ātmika*; *rādhā-ātmikā* means 'as Rādhā did'), ignoring the virtuous elders, set her passion on the highest man (or, 'a stranger, other than her husband'). Kṛṣṇa (*māyāvin* also means 'trickster'), slayer of demon Kesi (*kṛta-keśi-vadhe*; *kṛtake* 'śivadhe' means 'who is artificial, who confers evil'), upholder of Mt. Mandara (or, 'whose passion was inactive')."

*Yaśastilakacampūkāvya* of Somadeva (at the end of the text itself Somadeva says that he composed the work in Śaka 881 [A.D. 959]),<sup>29</sup> chapter 4, while the king is narrating the love of Amṛtamati, the example of Rādhā is cited. [Edited, with the

commentary of Śrutadeva sūri, by M. P. Śivadatta and K. P. Parab, *Kāvya-mālā*, no. 70 (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1903), p. 142.]

*tathā hi—purāpi kiṃ na reme gaṅgā saha mahēṣvareṇa, rādhā nārāyaṇena, bṛhaspatipatnī dvijarājena, tārā ca vālinā* !

*Inscriptions of Vākpati-Muñja*, a Paramāra ruler of Mālwa<sup>30</sup> (copper-plate inscriptions dated v.s. 1031 [A.D. 974], v.s. 1038 [A.D. 982], v.s. 1043 [A.D. 986]), the same two verses open each inscription, one in praise of Śiva as the lord of Girijā (Parvatī) and one in praise of Viṣṇu as *virahin*, the neglected lover in relation to Rādhā. [v.s. 1031 plate: N. J. Kirtane, "On Three Mālwa Inscriptions," *Indian Antiquary*, VI (Feb., 1877), pp. 48-53; v.s. 1038, 1043 plate K. N. Dikshit, "Three Copper-Plate Inscriptions from Gaonri," *Epigraphica Indica*, XXIII, no. 17, pp. 108, 109, 112.]

*yaś lakṣmīyadanendunā na sukhitaṃ yan nārdritaṃ vāridher vārā yan na nijena nābhisarasipadmena śāntiṃ gatam* !

*yac cheṣāhiphaṇāsahasramadhuraśvāsair na cāśvāsitaṃ tad rādhāvirahāturaṃ muraripor velladyapuḥ pātuyaḥ* ||

*Vakroktijivita* of Kuntaka (dated mid-tenth to eleventh century), the verse *teṣāṃ gopavadhū*<sup>o</sup>, quoted above from *Dhyanyaloka* (2.6) is cited illustratively in the *svopajñavṛtti* on 3.3-4; the verse *yāte dvaravatim*, quoted above from the *Locana* is cited in the *svopajñavṛtti* on 2.56, with the variants (a) *taddattasaṃpādanāṃ* (b) *kālindijalakelivaṇjulalatām ālambya*. [Edited by S. K. De, 3rd edition, chapters 1-3 (Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyaya, 1961), pp. 106, 147.]

*Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhoja (ca. A.D. 1000-1055), 2.294, 2.351, 3.110, 4.177, 5.235, 5.448, 5.493. [Edited, with the commentary of Rāmasiṃha on I-III and of Jagaddhara on IV, by K. Durgāprasād and W. L. S. Pansikar, *Kāvya-mālā*, no. 94 (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1934), pp. 275, 297, 364, 511, 638, 702, 728.]

*rātāvadyādhiraṅgā viśarararasavidvyājavākkṣmāpakārā rākā pakṣmābhāṣeṣā nayanānāyanasvā(sā)khayā stavayamārā* !

*rāmā vyastasthiratvā tuhinananahituḥ śrīḥ karakṣārādhārā  
rādhā rakṣāstu mahyaṃ śivamamamavaśiv yālavidyā*

*vatārā* || 2.294 ||

This verse is an exercise in word-play known as *kayināmāṅkhā-  
ṣṭapattrabandha*. Here the poet's name, Rājasekhara, is hidden  
in a poem of little intrinsic merit or meaning and is expressed  
through a diagram of an eight-petaled lotus. The diagram was  
executed by H. D. Phatak of the Mysore Oriental Research  
Institute.

*kuṣaḥ rādhe sukhito 'si kaṃsa kaṃsaḥ kva nu sā rādhā* |  
*iti pāriprativacanair vilakṣaḥāso harir jayati* || 2.358 ||

*kanakakalaśasyacche rādhāpayodharamaṇḍale  
navajaladharaśyāmām ātmadyutiṃ pratibimbītām* |

*asitasicayaprāntabhrāntiā muhur muhur utkṣipāṇ  
jayati janitavriḍāhāsaḥ priyāhasito hariḥ* || 3.110 ||<sup>31</sup>

*gehād yātā saritam udakaṃ hārikā nājihiṣe  
maṅkṣyāmīti śrayasi yamunātiravīrudgṛhāṇi* |

*gosaṃdāyi viśasi vipināny eva govardhanādrer  
na tvaṃ rādhe dṛśi nipatitā devakinandanasya* || 4.177 ||

*līlāo nīsaṇe rakṣhiu taṃ rāhīāi thaṇavaṣṭhe* |  
*hariṇo paḍhamasamāgamasaṃjhasaṃsarehiṇ veviro*

*hattho* || 5.535 ||

The Sanskrit version reads,

*līlāyito niyasane rakṣatu tvāṃ rādhikāyāḥ stanaprṣṭhe* |  
*hareḥ prathamasaṃgamasaṃdhyasaprasarair vepanaśilo*

*hastāḥ* ||

*pratyagrojḥhitagokulasya śayanād utsvapnamūḍhasya me  
sā gotraskhalaṇād apaitu ca divā rādheti bhīror iti* |

*rātrāv asvapato divā ca vijane lakṣmīti cābhysyato  
rādhāṃ prasmarataḥ śriyaṃ ramayataḥ khedo hareḥ*

*pātu vaḥ* || 5.448 ||

*helodastamahādharaśya tanutām ālokyā doṣṇa harer  
hastenāṃsataṭe 'valambya caraṇāv āropya tatpādayoḥ* |

*sailoddārasahāyatāṃ jīgamiṣor asprṣṭagovardhanā  
rādhāyāḥ sucitraṃ jayanti gagane vandhyāḥ karabhārn-*

*tayaḥ* || 5.493 ||

*Daśavatāracarita* by Kṣemendra (composed in A.D. 1066), VIII. 83, 170, 171, 176. [Edited by P. Durgāprasād and K. P. Parab, *Kāvya-mālā*, no. 26 (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1891), pp. 82, 90, 91.] Because the context seems important, the entire passage VIII.169-176 is quoted following VIII. 83.<sup>32</sup>

*prītyai babhūva kṛṣṇasya śyāmānicayacumbinaḥ* |  
*jāti madhukarasyeva rādhavādhikavallabhā* || 83 ||

*tataḥ prabhāte saṃnaddhaṃ ratham āruhya sānugāḥ* |  
*mnthurāṃ yayur akrūrasaṃkarṣaṇajanārdanāḥ* || 169 ||

*kathaṃ rādhāṃ anāmantryāgato 'ham iti mādhaveḥ* |  
*aratiṃ mlānatāṃ cintāṃ vrajan bheje viniḥśvasan* || 170 ||

*gacchan gokulagūḍhakunḍajagahanāny ālokayan keśavaḥ*  
*sotkaṇṭhaṃ valitānana vanabhuvā sakhyeva ruddhāñcalaḥ* |  
*rādhāyā na na neti niviharaṇe vaiklavyalakṣyākṣarāḥ*  
*sasmāra smarasādhyasādbhutatano rāvokti (?) ritkā*  
*giraḥ* || 171 ||

*govindasya gatasya kaṃsanagarīṃ vyāptā vīyogagninā*  
*snigdhaśyāmālakūlalinahariṇi godāvarigahvare (?)* |  
*romanthasthitagogaṇaiḥ paricayād utkarṣaṃ ākarṣitaṃ*  
*guptaṃ gokulapallave guṇagaṇaṃ gopyaḥ sarāgā*  
*jaguḥ* || 172 ||

*lalitaviḷāsakalāsukhakhalanālobhanaśobhanayauvana-*  
*mānitanaṃyamadane* |  
*alikulakokilakuvalayaḥajjalakālakalindasutāvivalajjalakā-*  
*liyakuladamane* |  
*keśikiśoramahāsuramāraṇadāruṇagokuladuritavidāraṇa-*  
*govardhanadharāṇe* |  
*kasya na nayanayugaṃ ratisajje majjati maṇasijātara-*  
*latataraṅge vararamaṇīramāṇe* || 173 ||

*udgiyamāne guṇasāgarasya guṇe rāgarasena śaureḥ* |  
*gopāṅganā gūḍharasānurāgā muhnr muhur mohahatā*  
*babhūvuḥ* || 174 ||

*govinde gurusamnidhau paravaśāveśād anuktvā gate*  
*suptānāṃ bakulasya śītalatale syairam kuraṅgīdśṭam* |

svapnāliṅganasaṃgate 'ṅgalatikāvīkṣepalakṣyā muhur mugdhā  
vañcaka muñca muñca kitavely uccerur uccair girah ॥ 175 ॥

rādhā mādhayaviprayogavīgalajjivopamānair muhur bāṣpaiḥ  
pīnapayodharāgragalitaiḥ phullatkadambākulā acchinna-  
śvasanena vegagatinā vyākīryamāṇaiḥ puraḥ sarvāśāprati-  
baddhamohamalinā prāvṛṇṇavevābhayaḥ ॥ 176 ॥

*Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* compiled by Vidyākara (latter half of the eleventh century), verses 131, 136 (= *Kāvyamīmāṃsa* verse quoted above, with variants in the first and second *padas* : (a) (*yesaṃtāpitanābhīpadmamadhavo ye snāpitorahsrajo* (b) *prita-pratipojjhatāḥ*), 139, 147 (= *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa* verse 3.110 quoted above, with variant in the fourth *pada* : *janitavriḍānamrapriyāhasito*), 108 (= *Dhvanyāloka* verse 2.6 quoted above, with variants in the second and third *padas* : (b) *kalindarāja*°, (c) *smarataṭpakaḥpanavidhi*°), 980. [Edited by D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 42, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 26, 27, 29, 148, 177.]

ete lakṣmaṇa jānakīvirahiṇaṃ māṃ khedayanty ambudā  
marmāṇiva ca ghaṭṭayanty alam amī krūrāḥ kadambā  
nilāḥ 1

itthaṃ vyāhṛtapūrvajanmairaho yo rādhayā vikṣitāḥ serṣyaṃ  
śaṅkitayā sa vaḥ sukhayatu svapnāyamāno hariḥ ॥ 131 ॥

agre gacchata dhenudugdhakalaśān ādāya gopyo gṛhaṃ  
dugdhe vaskayaṇīkule punar iyaṃ rādhā śanair yāsyati  
ity anyavyapadeśaguptahṛdayaḥ kurvaṇ viviktaṃ vrajaṃ  
devaḥ kāraṇanandasūnur aśivaṃ kṛṣṇaḥ sa muṣṇātu  
vaḥ ॥ 139 ॥

rathyākārpaṇīkaiḥ paṭaccaraśatasūtorukanthābalapratyā-  
diṣṭāhimāgamārtiṭvīśadaprasnigdhakaṇṭhodaraiḥ 1  
giyante nagareṣu nāgarajanapratyūṣanidrānudo  
rādhāmādhavayoḥ paraspararahāḥprastāvanāgita-  
yaḥ ॥ 980 ॥<sup>33</sup>

*Vikramāṅkadevacarita* of Bilhaṇa (dated fourth quarter of the eleventh century, according to the dates of Vikramāditya VI, the Chalukya king whom Bilhaṇa served as *vidyāpati* and in whose honor the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* was composed),<sup>34</sup> 1.5,

XVIII.87 [Edited by Georg Buhler, Bombay Sanskrit Series, no. 14 (Bombay : Central Book Depot, 1875), pp. 1, 164.]

sāndrām mudam yacchatu nandako yaḥ sollāsolakṣmīpr-  
tibimbagarbhaḥ |

kurvaṇn ajasraṃ yamunāpravāhalilarādhāsmaraṇam  
murāreḥ || 1.5 ||

dolāloladghanaajaghanayā rādhayā ya'ra bhagnāḥ  
kṛṣṇakṛiḍāṅgaṇaviṭapino nādhunāpy ucchvasanti |

jalpakṛiḍāmāthitamathurāsūricakreṇa kecit  
tasmin vṛṇḍāvanāparisare vāsarā yena nīāḥ || XVIII.87 ||

*Kāvyānuśāsana* of Hemachandra (dated A.D. 1088–1172), 2.8 (example 107 is the verse quoted above from *Vakroktiṭīvitā*, 2.56), 2.11 (example 113 is the verse *kanakakalaśa*<sup>o</sup> quoted from *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa*, 3.110), 2.29 (example 131 is the verse *ete lakṣmaṇa* . . . quoted above from *Subhāṣitaratnaśa*, 131). [Edited, with *Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi* and *Viveka*, by R. C. Parikh and V. M. Kulkarni (Bombay : Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1964), pp. 113, 115, 132.]

*Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana* of Hemachandra, eighth *adhyāya* (dated A.D. 1088–1172), illustrative verses in section describing characteristics of Apabhraṃśa : 4.420.2, 4.422.5. [*Prākṛit Grammar of Hemacandra*, rev. ed by P. L. Vaidya, Bombay Sanskrit and Prākṛit Series, no. 60, Appendix (Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1958), pp. 190–191, 271–272.]

hari naccāyiu paṅgaṇai vimhai pāḍiu lou |  
emvahiṃ rāha-paoharaham jaṃ bhāvai taṃ hou || 4.420.2 ||

The Sanskrit version reads :

hariḥ nartitaḥ prāṅgane vismaye pātitaḥ lokaḥ |  
idāniṃ rādhapayodharayoḥ yat (prati) bhāti tad bhavatu ||  
ekamekyaum jai vi joedi hari suṣṭhu savvāyareṇa |  
to vi drci jahi vi rāṃhi |  
ko sakkai savmareṇ vi daḍḍha-nayaṇā nehiṃ paluṣṭa ||  
4.422.5 ||

The Sanskrit version reads :

ekaikaṃ yadyapi paśyati hariḥ suṣṭu sarvādareṇa |  
tathapi dṛṣṭiḥ yatra kvapi rādhā | kaḥ śaknott saymaritum  
nayane snehena paryaste ||

*Naiṣadhīyacarita* of Śrīharṣa (dated latter half of the twelfth century), 21 83. [Edited, with the commentary of Nārāyaṇa, by P. Śivadatta and W. L. S. Pansikar, ninth edition (Bomay : Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1952), p. 909.]

*prāṇavatprāṇayirādha na rādhaputraśatrusakhitā sadṛśī te |*  
*śrīpriyasya sadṛg eva tava śrīvatsam ātmahṛdi dhartum*

*ajasram* ॥<sup>35</sup>

*Āryasaptasatī* of Govardhana (dated late twelfth century, according to dating of his patron Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal [ca. 1185–1205]; in *GitaGovinda* [I.4]<sup>36</sup> Jayadeva praises him for his erotic compositions),<sup>37</sup> 431, 488, 508, 599, 530 [Edited with the commentary of Anantapaṇḍita, by P. Durgāprasād and K.P. Parab, *Kāvya-mālā*, no. 1 (Bombay : Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1886), pp. 149, 164, 170, 176.]

*madhumathanamaulimāle sakhi tula yasi tulasi kiṃ*

*mudhā rādhām |*

*yat tava padam adasiyaṃ surabhayitum saurabhodbhe-*

*daḥ* ॥ 431 ॥

*rajaḥbhiṣekasānilakṣālitamauleḥ kathāsu kṛṣṇasya |*

*garvabharamantharākṣi paśyati padapaṅkajaṃ rādhā* ॥ 488 ॥

*lajjayitum akhilagopīnipitamanasaṃ madhudviṣaṃ rādhā |*

*ajñeva pṛcchati kathāṃ śambhar dayitārdhatuṣṭasya* ॥ 508 ॥

*lakṣmīniḥśuāsānilapiṇḍikṛtadughajaladhisārabhujāḥ |*

*kṣīranidhitirasudṛśo yaśaṃsi gāyanti rādhāyāḥ* ॥ 509 ॥

*vicarati paritaḥ kṛṣṇe rādhāyāṃ rāgacapanayanāyām |*

*doṣadigvedhaviśuddhaṃ viśikhaṃ vidadhāti viṣameṣuḥ*

॥ 530 ॥

An examination of these Purāṇic and literary sources clearly shows that the association of Rādhā with Kṛṣṇa was established and widespread by late classical times. Rādhā emerges in the stray verses as a special *gopī* whose secret love with Kṛṣṇa is enacted in a thicket on the Jamna riverbank deep in Vṛndāvana forest. The seasonal manifestations of Indian springtime (*vasanta*, *madhumāsa*) surround their love. Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa both suffer the pain of separation and Kṛṣṇa's love for her is as intense as hers is for him—powerful enough to arouse Lakṣmī's jealousy. Jayadeva must have been familiar with a tradition surrounding



the secret love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa because the particular form that their relationship takes in the *Gitagovinda* has affinity with varied elements from these sources. The opening verse of the *Gitagovinda* sets the background for the development of their love.<sup>38</sup>

*meghair meduram ambharam vanabhuyaḥ śyāmās tamāta-*  
*drumair*

*naktaṃ bhīrur ayaṃ tvam eva tad imaṃ rādhe*

*gṛhaṃ prapaya<sup>1</sup>*

*itthaṃ nandanideśalaś calitayohi pratyadhvakunjadrumaṃ*  
*rādhāmādhavayor jayanti yamunākule rahaḥkelayaḥ ||*

Further insight into Jayadeva's conception is found by following the way he telescopes in on his subjects through the movement of the poem's twelve parts. He begins on the cosmic level with the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu as Jagadīśa and, after identifying them all with Kṛṣṇa, he sets the mood of spring in the famous song *lalitalayaṅgalatapariśilana . . . . .* (1.3) and proceeds to present increasingly personal and intense aspects of Kṛṣṇa's relation to existence. The culmination of the poem comes in the ritualized, but sensual, intimacy of Kṛṣṇa's reunion with Rādhā—only after every aspect of neglected lovers' emotional suffering has been explored. Kṛṣṇa's love with Rādhā, enacted within the forest thicket, is at the center of existence. Its power, Jayadeva says, can allay the pain of living in the foul time of Kali Yuga.

In the *Gitagovinda* Rādhā stands in relation to Kṛṣṇa as his consort; she is neither a wife nor a devoted rustic playmate. She is an intense, solitary, proud figure who is addressed as Śrī, Caṇḍī, Mānini,<sup>39</sup> Bhāmini, Kāmini. She is Kṛṣṇa's partner in a mature, exclusive love<sup>40</sup> which is contrasted in the poem with the more frivolous *rāsa* dance Kṛṣṇa performs with the group of *gopīs*.<sup>41</sup> Kṛṣṇa's concentration on Rādhā, in contrast to the diffusion of his power in his play with the *gopīs*, is the perfection of his *līlā*. Rādhā's role is consonant with the meaning of her name, which is related to *rādhās*. In Vedic and Purāṇic literature, *rādhās* and other forms of the root *vrādh* have meanings of "perfection" and "success," even "wealth."<sup>42</sup> The Vedic god most closely associated with *rādhās* is Indra, who bears the epithet

*rādhāspati*.<sup>43</sup> In the *Mahābhārata* and various Purāṇas the rivalry between Indra and Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa results in the transference of elements of Indra's great power to Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa. Among these are female powers associated with Indra, such as Śrī in the episode of the churning of the ocean.<sup>44</sup> Indra lost Śrī by a curse the sage Durvāsa and Viṣṇu reclaimed her as his spouse. A similar pattern may well account for Kṛṣṇa's role as *rādhāspati* in relation to the feminine personification of *rādhā*, Rādhā. The explanation does clarify the parallelism between the pairs Lakṣmī-Viṣṇu and Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa which is suggested in many of the stray verses quoted above. There is no need to construct fanciful etymologies for the word *rādhā*, but this has been the approach of the Sanskrit commentators on the *Gītāgovinda*, of the Gosvāmins, and more recently the linguist Sukumar Sen.<sup>45</sup> Such accounts offer no clue to why the association between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa was made.

In the absence of direct textual evidence it remains impossible to know when and in what circumstances the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa pair originated. What we find in the available Prākṛit and Sanskrit sources suggests that the poets and critics are dealing with a familiar subject. Another dimension is added to the relationship by the appearance of the word *rādhā* in the *Atharva Veda* (XIX. 7.3, quoted above) in relation to the two stars called *viśakhā* and later references to Rādhā as a *nakṣatrā*.<sup>46</sup> Just as Indra is *rādhāspati*, he is also called *gopā* and is paired with a *viśakhā* in several Vedic contexts. In the *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa* (3.1.1.11)<sup>47</sup> the two *Viśakhe* are described as the chief female consorts (*adhipatnī*) of the *nakṣatrat* and are paired with Indra and Agni, the two best *gopas*. In the *Taittiriya Saṃhita* (4.4.11),<sup>48</sup> in the section where the Agnicayana (piling of the fire altar) is described, the layers of bricks are pairs of feminine *nakṣatrās* and masculine deities. The feminine *Viśakhe* are paired with the masculine deities Indra and Agni. Following this the pairs of months of the various seasons are named; the months of spring (*vāsantikāv ṛtu*) are *Madhu* and *Madhava*. In the *Mahābhārata*, Viṣṇu is called both *Nakṣatrin* and *Madhava*.<sup>49</sup> *Madhusūdana*, or *Madhuripu*, and *Mādhava* are major epithets of Kṛṣṇa in epic and later literature.<sup>50</sup> Kṛṣṇa is also associated in several contexts with various *nakṣatrās*.<sup>51</sup> Whether or not the equation of *rādhā* with *viśakhā*

in commentaries on *Atharva Veda* XIX.7.3 is based on a "misunderstanding" of *anurādhā*, as Whitney suggests, it is clear that by the time of the *Amarakoṣa* *Rādhā* was considered another name for the *nakṣatrā Viśakhā*.<sup>52</sup> With the equating of months with *nakṣatrās*, *Viśakhā* becomes the name for one of the months of spring, creating another link between *Rādhā* and *Mādhava*. The name *Rādhā* thus came to carry overtones of meaning from both its etymology and "astral mythology." The somewhat character of these associations may have increased the appeal of *Rādhā* as a consort for *Kṛṣṇa* in a secret, erotic relationship. On the surface, she represents, like *Lakṣmī*, the power of "success" and she incarnates, like *Sītā* or *Parvatī*, a phenomenon of nature; both are important to her association with *Kṛṣṇa* in literary and religious works.

The heroine of the *Gitagovinda* is so complex that it seems absurd to seek the poet's model for her in the allusions to the arrogant girl (*dṛptā*) of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* episode cited by the Gosvāmins (X.30.14ff.).<sup>53</sup> The figure is presented there in a way which is highly critical of the exclusivism which *Kṛṣṇa*'s relations with her represent. If the *Bhāgavata* is referring to *Rādhā*, it seems to be rejecting her relationship with *Kṛṣṇa* as an inappropriate model for the devotee. The possessive attitude manifested in her secret encounter with *Kṛṣṇa* is antithetical to the values presented in this text; her attitude is specifically criticized for its perversity (*daurātmya*, X.30.42). It is not unlikely that the authors of the *Bhāgavata* know a rival cult centering on *Kṛṣṇa* and his *gopī* consort, and they are critical of it.

Charlotte Vaudeville, in her article "Evolution of Love-Symbolism in Bhāgavatism,"<sup>54</sup> has stated her supposition that the *Bhāgavata* was specifically rejecting the figure of *Nappiṇṇai* as she appears in the Tamil Ālvār poetry of Āṇḍāl and Nāmmālvār, where she is the daughter, or daughter-in-law, of *Nandagopāl*, the wife of *Kṛṣṇa*, and an incarnation of *Viṣṇu*'s consort *Niladevī*.<sup>55</sup> It is possible that *Nappiṇṇai* is the source of the *Rādhā* conception in Prākṛit and Sanskrit literature, but the two figures more likely represent independent variants; their characteristics are different. In the *kuravai*, *Kṛṣṇa* dances with his wife *Nappiṇṇai*; *Kṛṣṇa*'s relation with *Rādhā* is a secret, erotic rite.<sup>56</sup>

In the *Gītāgovinda* Kṛṣṇa's seasonal incarnation as the god of spring, Mādhava, in an aspect characterized by its sweetness (*mādhurya*) and association with honey (*madhu*), is central to understanding the Rādhā-Mādhava pair.<sup>57</sup> In the poem spring is presented as the emotion-rich environment (*sarasavasanta*, 1.3. *dhruvāpada*) in which the passionate love of Kṛṣṇa and his consort can be elaborated. It is through the elaboration of this passionate emotion, in separation and final reunion, that the intense aesthetic experience of erotic love (*śṛṅgāra-rasa*) is created and the poet's promise fulfilled.<sup>58</sup> Jayadeva says in a verse at the beginning of the poem (1.3) :

yadi harisamarāṇe sarasam mano yadi vilāsakalāsu kutū-  
halaṃ |  
madhurakomalakāntapadāvaliṃ śṛṇu tada jayadevasa-  
rasvatim ||

In the *bhaṇita* of one of the final songs (12.23.8) he says :  
śrījayadevabhāṇitam idam anupadanigaditamadhuripumodam |  
janayat rasikajaneṣu manoramaratirasabhāvyavinodam ||  
kṣaṇam adhunā nārāyaṇam anugatam anusara māṃrādhike ||

When Rādhā fulfills Kṛṣṇa's pleasure, she thereby provides the means for the audience of Kṛṣṇa-devotees who are also connoisseurs of art and love to enjoy through her extraordinary experience of Kṛṣṇa's sweet, rich springtime passion. Throughout the long night of the poem's action, she plays the classical heroine (*nāyikā*) in several stylized psychological states of relation to Kṛṣṇa : *virahotkaṇṭhitā*, *abhisārikā*, *vipralabdhā*, *khaṇḍitā*, *vāsakasajjā*, *kalahāntarītā* and finally *svādhinabhartṛkā*.<sup>59</sup> Through her passionate suffering, as described by her to her *sakhī* and by her *sakthi* to Kṛṣṇa, she and Kṛṣṇa are transformed into a pair of lovers capable of an awesome union.<sup>60</sup> It is not surprising that Jayadeva's Rādhā became the model for later literature and that he has frequently been thought to have "invented" her.

dṛṣṭapūrvā api hy arthāḥ kāvye rasaparigrahāt |  
sarve navā iyābhānti madhumāsa iva drumāḥ ||<sup>61</sup>

By BARBARA S. MILLER

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For a brief discussion of the poem and selected translations, see Barbara Stoler Miller, "Songs from Jayadeva's *Gitagovinda*," *Mahfil: A Quarterly of South Asian Literature*, VII, nos. 3-4 (1971), pp. 187-196. The *terminus ad quem* for Jayadeva is fixed by the presence of verses attributed to him in Śrīdharadāsa's anthology *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta*, which was compiled A.D. 1205 in Bengal; verses from the *Gitagovinda* are included in the critical edition of S. C. Banerji (Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965). In the *Gitagovinda* (I. 4) Jayadeva compares himself with poets Umāpatidhara, Govardhana, and Dhoyī, all of whom are associated with the Bengal court of Lakṣmaṇasenā (ca. A.D. 1185-1205), whose inscriptions show that he broke Sena tradition by becoming a Vaiṣṇavite; he may have been Jayadeva's patron, but the poet does not mention him. There is no single-volume study of the *Gitagovinda* in English, but there are lengthy introductions and notes in Latin, by C. Lassen in his edition, *Gitagovinda* (Bonn, 1836) and in Bengali, by Harekrishna Mukhopādhyāya in *Kavijayadeva o śrīgitagovinda* (Calcutta: Gurudās Mukhopādhyāya and Sons, 1363 B.S. (1957)).
2. On the meters, see Lassen, pp. xxvii-xxxv; Sivaprasad Bhattacharya, *Jottings on Sanskrit Metrics* (Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1963); articles by H. D. Velankar in *JBBRAS*, new series, vols. 19-25 (1943-1949). On *tāla*, see Alain Daniélou, *Northern Indian Music* (New York: Praeger, 1968), pp. 65-74; P. Sambamoorthy, *South Indian Music, Book II* (Madras: Indian Music Publishing House, 1968), pp. 18-28.
3. Technically the songs are referred to as *prabandha* by the commentators. See V. G. Apte (e.d.), *Saṅgitaratnākara*, AAS, no. 35 (Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1942), ch. 4 (*prabandhādhyāya*), pp. 271-354.
4. There is a striking repetition of vocabulary in the refrains, much of which is subject to word-play. The word-index to the *Gitagovinda* which I have prepared as part of my study will provide the basis for detailed discussion of this elsewhere.
5. References in this paper are to the edition of R. R. Telang, 8th ed., with the commentaries of Kumbha and Sankaramiśra (Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgara Press, 1937); references are to *sarga*, *prabandha*, and *pada* or *śloka* or to *sarga* and *śloka*. My own edition will differ somewhat from this text, based on the evidence of several manuscript traditions. It is published by the Columbia University Press, 1976.
6. See D. P. Pattanayak, "Champu" in *Sāhitya Beekhya* (published in Oriya, Cuttack: A. Mahapatra, 1965), pp. 81-94.
7. The *Rasikapriyā* commentary of Kumbha offers analyses of the standard figures employed in the individual stanzas; cf. Edwin Gerow, *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971).
8. See A. B. Keith, *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (1920, rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 197-198; Gerow, pp. 102-107,

An early instance of the use of *antānuprāsa* (end-rhyme) is the sixth *sarga* of *Sundara-kāṇḍa* of *Vālmiki-rāmāyaṇa*, critically edited by G. C. Jhala (Baroda : Oriental Institute, 1966), pp. 76-80. In Kṣemendra's *Daśavatāra-carita* (VIII. 173, quoted below from NSP ed.) the narrative is interrupted by a song sung by the *gopīs* in four lines of long, end-rhymed compounds set in a *mātra-chandas* of ten *catur-guṇas*, plus a final long syllable. The similarity between the form and content of this song and *Gītagovinda* songs seems to be the source of Sukumar Sen's opinion that it provided a prototype for Jayadeva's lyrics, see his *History of Bengali Literature* (Delhi Sahitya Akademi, 1971), pp. 15-16.

9. R. Pischel, "Die Hofdichter des Lakṣmaṇasena," *ASGW*, XXXIX. 1 (1894), p. 22; Louis Renou, et al., *L'Inde Classique*, vol. I (Paris: Payot, 1949), p. 443.

10. In compiling this catalogue, I have drawn on the work of several previous compilers: A. K. Majumdar, "A Note on the Development of the Rādhā Cult," *ABORI*, XXXVI (1955), pp. 231-257; B. Majumdar, *Kṛṣṇa in History and Legend* (Calcutta : University of Calcutta, 1969), pp. 155-232; S. L. Katre, "Kṛṣṇa, Gopīs, and Rādhā," in P. K. Gode *Commemoration Volume*, ed. H. L. Hariyappa and M. M. Patkar (Poona : Oriental Book Agency, 1960), pp. 83-92. In the literature of Vaiṣṇavism post-dating the *Gītagovinda* Rādhā is an ubiquitous figure in relation to Kṛṣṇa; since excellent studies of these sources exist, I do not deal with the material here. Sri Shashibhusan Dasgupta, *Srīrādhār kramabikāś darśane o sahitye* (Published in Bengali, Calcutta : E. Mukharji, 1952); Shashibhusan Dasgupta, *Obscure Religious Cults* (Calcutta : K. L. Mukhopadhyaya, 1962), pp. 113-146; S. K. De, *Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal* (Calcutta : K. L. Mukhopadhyaya, 1961); Edward C. Dimock, Jr., *The Place of the Hidden Moon : Erotic Mysticism in the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā Cult of Bengal* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1966); Norvin Hein, *The Miracle Plays of Mathurā* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1972), pp. 163-271; Milton Singer (ed.), *Krishna : Myths, Rites and Attitudes* (Honolulu : East-West Center Press, 1966); W. G. Archer, *The Loves of Krishna in Indian Painting and Poetry* (London, George Allen and Unwin, 1957). I have also omitted references from two works which make some claim for inclusion. Original verses on Rādhā quoted in *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, Banerji, ed., *op. cit.*, are attributed to Jayadeva's contemporaries Umāpatidhara and Saraṇa (I.53.5, I.55.3, I.61.2), another (I.58.4) is quoted below from *Vakroktijīvita* (2.56). Verses on Rādhā in *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* of Lilāśuka Bilvamaṅgala are numerous, but the dating of the work remains problematic (variously assigned to periods ranging from ninth to fifteen century). See S. K. De, *The Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta*, University of Dacca Oriental Publication Series, no. 5 (Dacca, 1938); Francis Wilson, *The Love of Krishna : The Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Lilāśuka Bilvamaṅgala* (Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975).

11. B. Majumdar, pp. 171-191,

12. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, Murshidabad edition, with the commentaries of Sridharasvāmin, Sanātana Gosvāmin, Jīva Gosvāmin, and Viśvanātha Cakravartī (Berhampur: Rādhāramaṇ Press, 1294 B.S. (1888).

13. The Seventeenth century Mahārāṣṭrian commentator Nilakaṇṭha explains the verse (*hāreti kurvatas tasya prahṛṣṭās tā varāṅganāḥ | jagṛhur niḥṣṭāṃ vāṇīṃ sāmūḍā dāmodarerieāṃ ||*, Poona ed., II. 20.33, edited by R. Kinjawadekar (Poona: Chitrashala Press, (1936). as Kṛṣṇa's call for Rādhā.

14. B. Majumdar, pp. 171-172; see the commentary of Sanātana Gosvāmin on *Bhāgavata* X.32.8, where the *gopī* of this passage who dares to frown on Kṛṣṇa is identified as Rādhā.

15. For discussions of Purāṇic chronology, see A. D. Pusalker, *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas* (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1963), pp. 205-230; R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, University of Dacca Bulletin, no. XX (Dacca, 1940); M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literature* (Leipzig: C. F. Amelangs Verlag, 1909), vol. I, pp. 440-483. In *The Purana Index* (Madras: University of Madras, 1951-55) under "Rādhā" V. R. R. Dikshitar lists additional references to Rādhā in *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* (III. 36.56; 42.21, 47-48; 43.21 and 29; 44.29) and *Vāya Purāṇa* (105.52), but these could not be located from editions available to me. The late date and derivative nature of treatments of Rādhā in *Devibhāgavata* (trans. by Swami Vijānanda in SBH, vol. 23 (Allahabad, 1922), ch. IX, pp. 797-1008.) and *Mahābhāgavata* (edited by M. J. Desai (Bombay: Gujarati Printing Press, 1913); see A. K. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, pp. 246-247; also, R. D. Hazra, "The Mahābhāgavata-purāṇa," *IHQ* 28 (1952), pp. 17-28.) has made me omit them from the list.

16. This verse is quoted by Jīva Gosvāmin in his commentary on *Bhāgavata* X. 21.17.

17. Note that *ariṣṭa* appears in apposition to the *nakṣatra Mūla* in the *Atharva Veda* passage quoted above (XIX.7.3).

18. However, an older version of this Purāṇa may be as early as the eighth century; see A. J. Rawal, "Some Problems Regarding the Brahmapurāṇa," *Purāṇa*, XIV, no. 2 (1972), pp. 107-124.

19. The Gosvāmin commentators quote this with reference to "Kārttikamahātmya," of Pātāla-khaṇḍa; see A. K. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-246.

20. Occurrences of the name Rādhā in prose portions of the *Lalitavistara* [*tena khalu punar bhikṣavaḥ samayena sujātāyā grāmikaduhiturdāsī rādhā nāma kālagaṭābhūt*, edited by P. L. Vaidya (Darbhanga, 1958)] and the vulgate of the *Pañcatantra* [*kiṃ paraṃ tu rādhā nāma me bhāryā gopakulaprasūṭā prathamam āsīt sā tvam atrāvātirṇā*, edited by K. P. Purab (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1950), p. 54] are difficult to date.

21. Keith, *HSL*, pp. 223-224,

22. In another verse (2.28; Weber, 131) an unnamed *gopī* is singled out and associated with singing and spring; the alliterative pattern of the verse also makes it relevant to the *Gitagovinda*.

*mahumāsamarūhaamahuarajhaṁkāraṇibbhare raṇṇe l  
gṛāi virahakharavaddhapahiamāṇamohaṇaṇi govī ll*

23. Pandit relies on Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅginī* in establishing the dating of the king, p. clxi.

24. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa is dated to the first half of the seventh century by D. D. Kosambi in his introduction to *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* [Edited by Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale, Harvard Oriental Series, no. 42 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. lxxxiii.], but the only basis for dating is the author's citation by Vāmana and Ānandavardhana, which places him before the ninth century; cf. A. B. Keith, *The Sanskrit Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 212.

25. It seems significant that Ānandavardhana is one of the earliest writers to illustrate his theories with examples from existing Sanskrit and Prākṛit literature rather than composing his own. Abhinavagupta, in commenting on these two verses, attributes the first to Kṛṣṇa after he has left Mathurā for Dvārakā; the second he says are Rādhā's words to Kṛṣṇa.

26. This verse is *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, 808, attributed to the Sanskrit poetess Vidyā [Kosambi and Gokhale, p. 148] This translation and all others of verses found in *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* are by D. H. H. Ingalls, see *Sanskrit Court Poetry*, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 44 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965).

27. In the *Abhinavabhāratī*, Abhinavagupta has four references to a play by Bhejjala called "Rādhāvīpralambha," in which Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are the chief characters. The play is not extant, but Abhinava says that it is mainly in the Prākṛit called Saindhava and refers to the author's proficiency in music. Further reference to it is given in the twelfth chapter of Bhoja's *Sṅgāra-prakāśa*, where it is called simply "Rāsakāṅka." See *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni*, with the commentary *Abhinavabhāratī*, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, nos. 36, 124 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1956 [rev. ed., 1954], vol. I, pp. 42, 217; vol. III, pp. 63, 72; also V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Sṅgāra Prakāśa* (Madras: Punarvasu, 1963), pp. 889-891.

28. *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* 136, with variants.

29. See K. K. Handiqui, *Yasastilaka and Indian Culture* (Sholapur: Jaina Samskṛti Samrakshaka Sangha, 1949), pp. 1-21.

30. On the relation between Vākpati-Muñja and Bhoja, see Kirtane, pp. 49-50. Dikshit notes, "The most important information contained in these plates is regarding the migration of Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country to Mālwā where they were recipients of donations at the hands of the Paramāra prince. In several instances the donees seem to have migrated all the way from Bengal . . ." p. 103.

31. Cited again as 5.17 (p. 577); same as *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, 147



[Kosambi and Gokhale, p. 29]; Hemachandra's *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* 2.110, with variants, [Parikh and Kulkarni ed. cited below, p. 115].

32. See note 7 above, Sen, pp. 15-16.

33. Attributed to the Bengali poet Dīmboka, who, like Jayadeva, is quoted in *Saduktikarnāṃṛta*; see D. H. H. Ingalls "A Sanskrit Poetry of Village and Field: Yogesvara and His Fellow Poets," *JAOS*, 74 (1954), pp. 119-131.

34. See Barbara Stoler Miller, *Phantasies of a Love-Thief: The Caurapañcāśikā Attributed to Bilhaṇa* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971); pages 188-191 outline Bilhaṇa's travels.

35. The name Rādhā is here played upon with reference to Kṛṣṇa's consort and Karna's foster-mother [the enemy of Rādhā's son Karna is Arjuna]; See the *Mahābhārata* verses quoted above. *Srīvatsa*, "Sri's child's, refers to the mark or curl of hair on Viṣṇu's chest.

36. Telang edition, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

37. See Pischel, "Die Hofdichter."

38. Commentators devote much discussion to this verse, e.g., Kumbha attributes the speech to Kṛṣṇa and glosses *nandanideśataḥ* with *nandasamipāt*, while Saṃkaramiśra relies on the episode of the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*, *Kṛṣṇa-janma-khaṇḍa*, 15, which makes Kṛṣṇa a child in Rādhā's care. I am inclined to follow Kumbha; Telang, pp. 3-6.

39. See D. H. H. Ingalls, *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry*, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 44 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1965), section 21, pp. 216-17.

40. The commentator Kumbha glosses *rahaḥkelayaḥ* with *suratakriḍāḥ*; Saṃkaramiśra gives *ekāntakriḍāḥ*; Telang, p. 3.

41. Cf. *prabandha* 3, *prabandhas* 23 and 24.

42. H. Grassman, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (1872, rpt. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955), 1160-1162; *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (Gita Press ed.), II. 4.14; IV. 7.57, 24.18, 31.11; IX. 21.17; X. 65.6.

43. *RV* VIII. 61.14, cf. 1.30.5, etc.; cf. related epithets *vasupati*, *vasudā*, etc.

44. J. Gonda, *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism* (1954, rpt. Delhi; Motilal Barasidass, 1969), pp. 224-225; see *Mahābhārata* I. 16.

45. E.g., R. C. Artal, "A Note on Kṛṣṇa and His Consort Rādhā," *Anthropological Society of Bombay*, VIII, no. 5 (1907-09), pp. 356-60; Sukumar Sen, "Etymology of the Name Rādhā," *Indian Linguistics*, VIII (1940-44, rpt. ed., Poona: Deccan College, 1965) p. 434. Sen speculates that the word *rādhā* must have been a common noun with the meaning of "beloved, desired woman." He supports his argument with reference to the Vedic usage of *rādhās* meaning "a desired object" and its masculine cognate in Avestan *rāda*, meaning "lover" in Yasna IX, vs. 23. My colleague Professor Dale Bishop informs me that the passage is problematic, but if taken with a Gāthic passage (Y. 29.9) where the only other reference to *rāda* occurs, the contexts suggest that the word could mean something

like "satisfaction" as an abstract; in any case, most scholarly interpretations indicate something or someone that "fulfills a need."

46. A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index* (1912, rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967), vol. I, p. 417.

47. Edited by Rajendra Mitra, *Bibliotheca Indica*, no. 125 (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1855), p. 4.

48. Translated by A. B. Keith, *Harvard Oriental Series*, vols. 18-19) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914).

49. *Mahābhārata* XIII. 135.60(c), *nakṣatranemir nakṣatrī*; in the episode of the burning of Khāṇḍava forest (I. 214ff.) Kṛṣṇa is repeatedly addressed as Mādhava, also Madhusūdana.

50. See Ingalls, *Court Poetry*, section 6, p. 93.

51. F. E. Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (London: Oxford University Press, 1922), p. 135.

52. It is noteworthy that the authors of the *Brahmayāvarta Purāṇa* incorporate Rādhā's *nakṣatrā* associations into the story of her heavenly birth and descent; cf. Walter Ruben, "The Kṛṣṇacarita in the *Harivaṃśa* and Certain *Purāṇas*," *JAOS*, 61 (1941), pp. 126-127.

53. Later commentators identify the figure of the solitary *gopī* with *hlādinī-śakti*, the means by which Kṛṣṇa gives bliss to his devotees; see Dimock, pp. 134, 203-204. It is significant that the *Bhāgavata rāsa* dance is an autumnal rite where the emphasis is on Kṛṣṇa's ability to love all the *gopīs* simultaneously; Kṛṣṇa's love with Rādhā is an erotic duet enacted in springtime.

54. *JAOS*, 82 (1962), pp. 31-40; see also Jean Filliozat, "Les Dates du Bhāgavatapurāṇa et du Bhāgavatamāhātmya," in *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*, American Oriental Series, vol. 47 (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1962), pp. 70-77; Thomas J. Hopkins, *The Social Teaching of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, and J. A. B. van Buitenen, "On the Archaism of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*," in Singer, *Krishna*, pp. 3-40.

55. The *Harivaṃśa* episode of Kṛṣṇa's marriage to Nīlā is not known in the Northern Recension and is given by Vaidya as Appendix I, no. 12. Local traditions contribute many variants to events and figures in the Kṛṣṇa story; see Walter Ruben, *Krishna: Konkordanz und Kommentar der Motive Seines Heldenlebens*, *Istanbuler Schriften*, no. 17 (Istanbul, 1944).

56. See J. S. M. Hooper, *Hymns of the Ālvārs* (Calcutta: Association Press, 1929), pp. 55, 62; V. V. R. Dikshitar, *Silappadikāram* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 229.

57. See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *From Honey to Ashes*, trans. from French by J. and D. Weightman (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1973); Gonda, pp. 16-17, 236-237.

58. See J. L. Masson and M. V. Patwardhan, *Sāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics* (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1969), *Aesthetic Rapture*, 2 vols. (Poona: Deccan College, 1970); V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* (Madras: Punarvasu, 1963), ch. 18.

59. Each of these forms of the *nāyikā* is mentioned by name by Jayadeva in the text of the *Gitagovinda*. The eighth traditional form of the *nāyikā*, called *proṣitabhartṛkā*, is absent in the *Gitagovinda*. See *Daśarūpa* of Dhanarājya, ed. and trans. by G. C. O. Haas (1912. rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962), II. 36-45, pp. 54-58; cf. Dimock pp. 215-220.

60. The influence of Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* on Jayadeva's conception and treatment of this subject seems significant and must be analyzed in depth.

61. *Dhvanyāloka*, 4.4 (p. 236); noted in J. L. Masson, "Suggestion in Sanskrit Poetics: The *Dhvanyāloka* and *Dhvanyālokalocana*," Harvard Dissertation, 1970, pp. 12. 13.

66590



CATALOGUED.

Sanskrit - Kavya  
Kavya - Sanskrit

**Central Archaeological Library,**

**NEW DELHI.**

Acc.No. 66590

Call No. Sa8K/Jay/K.H.

Author—Kuppuswamy, Gowri ed

Title—Jayadeva and Gitagovin

*"A book that is shut is but a block"*

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY**  
GOVT. OF INDIA  
Department of Archaeology  
**NEW DELHI**

Please help us to keep the book  
clean and moving.