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अखिलमुखवननजनमशेममभज्जादिठीले
विविजविनतभूतवातरसंकादृकसे ।
श्रुतिशिरसि विद्रीप्ते ब्रह्माणि श्रीनिवासे
भवनु मम परस्मिन्, शेषुक्षणी अक्किलप ॥

महाकविचन्चकांभापलसरसौरभोज्षिसिता
महार्गुणानाथकमयमालंकर्मुकोंज्ज्वच ।
महामहिमदेवतास्तात्रवनहर्षरत्नाद्विता
दृशाद्रिपतिपाद्योसच्छातुतनरुपतियं क्रति: ॥
Look at this dedication to Lord Sri Venkatesvara! That will remind you of the Glory and Purpose of His Manifestation in this world of sin and exalt you to the region of the blessed and the immortal. With a salutation to the great Sages Vālmīki and Vyāsa, the work begins and gives an elaborate account of Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Purāṇas, with all their recensions, editions and commentaries. The vast expanse of Classical Sanskrit Literature has been arranged on the model of standard works on foreign literature. The main classes are three, Sravyakāvya, Drṣyakāvya and Sāhitya. First come the poems proper, of two classes, major and minor, (Sravyakāvya)—, which is all verse, or all prose or mixed prose and verse with all their minor varieties, topical and ingenious. Secondly comes the drama (Drṣyakāvya) in all its technical ramifications and with all motifs temporal, spiritual and allegorical. Next is science of poetry (Sāhitya) in its widest sense embracing rhetoric, dancing, music and erotics. To this is appended a chapter on Prosody or metrics (Chandas). All topics are introduced by an exposition of the rhetorical definitions and theonsations and treated from their traceable beginnings, which to some extent are traditional and theological, but I would not call them ‘mythical’ implying a stigma of falsity and fiction. As far as it was in my reach, all that has been said about any author or work anywhere in books, journals or papers has been entered in the references and this will help special studies. Dynasties of Kings that ruled in India in different parts and at different times have been fully honored by a collation of relevant notes, epigraphical and archaeological, not merely because the kings were the fountains of literature, but many of them were themselves poets of celebrity. Works known and unknown, lost and extant, printed and unprinted, catalogued and uncatalogued, have all been mentioned and in many cases the stray places where they are still available in manuscript. Above all there is the quotation of gems of poetry of varying interest from amour and nature to devotion and renunciation, and these in themselves are an anthology of meritorious specimens of poetic thought and expression.
PREFACE

The Introduction deals with several topics of general interest, all of which is the study of Classical Sanskrit Literature, such as for instance is the spiritual origin and aspect of language as envisaged in the Vedas and as elaborated by schools of grammarians, the progress of structural and linguistic changes in the expression of the Sanskrit language, from Chandas to Bhasa, and the like, this will assist the study of Comparative Philology, of which "The Discovery of Sanskrit" is acknowledged to be the origin. Of foremost importance, there is the subject of Indian Chronology. India has its well written history and the Puranas exhibit that history and chronology. To the devout Hindu and to a Hindu who will strive to be honest in the literary and historical way, Puranas are not 'pious frauds.' In the hands of many Orientalists, India has lost (or has been cheated out of) a period of 10-12 centuries in its political and literary life, by the assumption of a faulty synchronism of Candragupta Maurya and Sandracottus of the Greek works and all that can be said against that "Anchor-Sheet of Indian Chronology" has been said in this Introduction. In the case of those early European Orientalists, very eminent and respectable in themselves, this thought of resemblance and historical synchronism was at least sincere, for it was very scanty material that they could work upon. But for their successors in that hierarchy who are mostly our "Professors of Indian History," that have given a longevity and a garb of truth to it by repetition, there is to my mind no excuse or explanation, if at all it be a confession of neglect and a recognition of India's glorious past in its entire truth.

The Index of Authors and Works (in Sanskrit) is followed by a small supplement (in English) on miscellaneous matters. The Index is not merely a means of reference and indication, but embodies corrections and additions, so as to act as what is usually expressed as "Errata et Corrigenda et Addenda." Many authors and works that could not be mentioned in the body of the work, because they came to be known too late, are entered there. The reader will therefore take the Index as part of the main work and not merely as an easy appendix to it. In all, the number of works and authors would be some thousands, arranged alphabetically on the plan of Stein's Index to Kashmir Catalogue and Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum. Recent and living authors have been, so far as I could get at, noticed, and this work, it is submitted with all humility, deals with the history of Classical Sanskrit Literature from the earliest times to the present day.
In the year 1906, I published a small book, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature. Being the first and only work of its comprehension, it was well received everywhere in our Universities and was quoted profusely in the publications of the Universities of the United States of America. I was often asked to reprint the book, but conscious of its inadequacy I did not do it, but in its stead I thought of a comprehensive work that would present at a glance the full vista of Sanskrit literary domain and that in the light of past historical researches. Even the ardent Pandit knows not the vast literature that has been lost or lies hidden in the libraries of India.

But what are your chances of using these libraries? Manuscripts and catalogues now out of print are all stored in these receptacles. They may be there for years, unthought and untouched, save for changes of physical location. The pages may turn red, brown, blue and brittle, but they still lie uncut by the hand of any reader. The Guardian (Curator, Secretary, Librarian, call them as you please) will well watch these receptacles on their pedestals. The guardian will applaud your attempt at research and will promise to help it by a loan of books on your application, but he is "helpless" and must soon express his regret in reply as "rules are against loan." If you apply to a higher authority for relief, the paper runs through the regular channels to the same guardian, and on his report, after a lingering expectation, you get an order (a copy of the prior one) with a difference only in the preamble and the subscription. Libraries "are meant for visitors," but most of them do not look in, but look on, all the more so, if a museum or a house of curios is adjacent to the library. And these rare books are only rarely wanted and that by a uncultured antiquarian of my ilk. One that comes there does not need the book, one that is far away cannot get it. If you do go there, stealing a holiday, the key of a particular almirah where your wanted work is kept may be with the guardian who is away elsewhere. What then is a library for? It is not a Palace of Toys! Much of this tale was true of the Oriental Manuscripts Library of Madras some years ago, when I commenced the preparation of this work. I am not sure if at present the position is better. But I am aware that not many years ago, there was an indictment of the methods of this Library by His Holiness Śrī Yaṭājīvaswāmi in his preface to his edition of Śṛgāra-prakāṣa. The expression of his chagrin, in language poetic, is well worth reading as a piece of excellent prose literature.
I wrote for information to libraries, I rarely had a reply, for some of these guardians have "no staff, no provision for paper or postage". If I asked for an extract from any manuscript—say the first and last few lines—some institutions demanded copying charges. I applied for a copy, the charges were exorbitant. For instance, for an indifferent copy in two quarter sheets of thirty-two anustubh verses (of 32 letters each) I was asked to pay about a rupee and postage. I paid and consoled myself by the thought that this fee went for the maintenance of a poor Pandit, and that it was in no way more rapacious than the fee charged recently by a Banker for giving an extract of a single line from a ledger, viz., Rs 5 for search, Rs 5 for copying the line, and Rs 5 for adding a certificate that it was a 'true copy', and these charges are only made 'according to rules'. We have to get on 'under the rules', no one cares to look into these iniquities.

Equally so was it with many Professors of Colleges. They would have no time to reply and the few that deigned to oblige after reminders had very little to say. To trace an author and his affairs, I had in many cases to correspond with several persons, and only perseverance did win it. If the post office could exempt my letters from postage, it would give a different aspect, but alas, not. It is under these auspices I began and progressed. But I cannot refrain from expressing that the acquisition of the material gathered in this book has been too costly for an equanimous retrospect and I shall not be far wrong to say that each author, save those few that are too well known, cost me on an average four annas. I have often felt that it is not an enterprise that a prudent householder should have embarked upon, but it was too late to think of the folly.

Amidst official work in judicial service, in places distant from metropolis, there was little leisure for a continuous study. A few days snatched at intervals during the recesses of summer and other holidays were rarely sufficient for visits of references to libraries scattered all over India. After all the work was ready—ready in bulk—about 8 years ago, it went to print. After a year, it was carried away in the current of an estate that vested in the Official Assignee. A request and a claim got it out of the muddle. The Press was sold. Delay there was, but the printing was resumed. I fell ill and I raved about this work and its contents, astonishing the doctor what it was all about, though I thought I was lecturing sensibly on Sanskrit Literature. There was again a change in the management and there was another lull.
After sometime, the printing was taken up and slowly moved on. Once the manuscript of a whole chapter which was in the custody of a manager was lost—"said to be not sent at all"—but after all traced as 'mislaid', after I re-wrote much of it from scanty material gathered again from memory. If with all these mishaps and vicissitudes the work took 20 years and more, need I say that the suspense is enough to dole dismay to a chronic optimist which I presumed that I was.

In the preparation of the work, I have had the fullest sympathy from all Universities (except probably the University of Madras) and all Local Governments and the Governments of Indian States and the Government of Ceylon. They have been magnanimous and let me have their Sanskrit and other publications free as presents and that has well nigh contributed to the fullness of the notes, literary, epigraphical and archaeological. To them I am ever thankful. To Sjt P R, Rama Aiyar, the Proprietor of Messrs P R Rama Aiyar & Co, Booksellers, Madras, who with his selfless generosity first received this work in his Press for love of literary research, I express my first regard. Due to tortuous ways divine, his Press changed hands, but blest was it, that it became the Press of Sri Venkatesvaram Devasthanam, Tirupat. At the hands of His Holiness Sri Mahant Prayaga Dossjee Varu of Sri Hatheeramjee Mutt, Tirupati, then its Vicharanakartha, I received a kindly appreciation, he directed that the printing part of the work be done free in the Press, a work that has been meant to be dedicated to Sri Venkatesvaram of Tirupat, at whose feet my family does humble hereditary service. When the management of the Devasthanam was assumed by the Committee appointed by the Local Legislature with its Commissioner, Mr K Sitarama Reddi, B.A., B.L., I was allowed to have the same concession with certain alterations. It is with this assistance and the particular interest which the present Commissioner, Mr Ranganatha Mudaliar, B.A., B.L., evinced in speeding up the printing, the work is now seeing its publication. To the Committee and the Commissioner, gratitude will ever be transcendent in my memory—all the more so because they are the custodians of the Wealth and Glory of Lord Venkatesvara.

Owing to pressure of Official duties and the anxiety to see the end of the publication, which has been by various causes often impeded during the last eight years, errors of print have crept in, but I slyly feel that the learned eye of my loving reader will easily skip through the
भगवान—

अनेक विक्रान्ते श्रीलक्ष्मीजनपदनिवासिना धन्यकर्त्ता कृपोन—

पितृ-पादानां श्रीमती श्रीनिवासरक्षनाथार्थार्थां सबको दासेन शैलाचे भव्य-
वाहितीपरिच्छेदकः। अति-स्मृते ज्ञानमये बहुतु पतनें माधुर्यकर्मलया व्रतिहीता-
विष्णु लकारतां आमने वह जीवित राजकीयमणे शान्तिविषयक बहुमत्तरणांे च वैशालीं वाणीं
यथाभिन्यते सुक्रियासंबंधितविवादेवस्विधिने न पारिते दासेन। तथापि पूतबिंबिः जन्मानि कृते-
नामदतें कर्मकेशन शारदाया आरायने समुदोंमैंे दास: संस्कृतकथकाथापरिच्छेदकः।
तथार्थरूपं समुचितसामथ्येनेनातूरुरुसिना दासेनवेति विखितं निविकल्पाः।
अब्युष्न पूत प्रथा। कियान्ता कवितंतूपुरी हीविसाणविभीम्यार आत्मदति कृति प्रायः न
ज्ञानित बहो बिठलाः, विरोधया दूरशीतारामाकर्षणालयां वृशीतां च। पद-
सहायता: पदमहाकाजन्यता: प्रभुना: निधिना निधिनाठ्य। रूपार्णि च तयाध्वः केवल
प्रथा: क्षेत्राय नामनामचिदिः कृतिरिहैव पुत्र। आशालक्षमचिरास्तेपि वर्णेनष्ठमवतरण-
निर्विवादिः।

पूजा विशारदिविविनिमयिताः प्रथमः:

अनुसारहस्तरूपस्वाविनिमयसाहित्यालक्षणाश्च भक्तिभावार्थगर्भवर्षयकविरचित
सुप्रसंविषयेत धृति महता ख्रेणसेन वनस्पथेन च तेजक्ष्या वीराणवाणीपरिचरणविवृत
भगवान्य शाश्वेतः। प्राकृतेन महतां ज्ञातिपरिमातिमातः।

वथाजाति वयसानुसरण त्रयवाच्चार व्याश्यामसुप्रसंहरां वा पुजावति कालेण हस्तमार्गः
श्रद्धामयी तुममस्मृतिमहत्समस्तोऽस्मात्मकः विशुद्ध संक्रामने संसारमात्रिकाजयात अधाविध गाप्पोक्यमः समेक्षित्यस। किंच उपोक्ते च शुभवसुकलें सामसमाधिमाहास्यसुप्रसंहराः।
वथाजाति वयसानुसरण त्रयवाच्चारेऽरिहैव पुरुषोक्तां शाश्वेत प्रसंहराः प्राकृति।
तपस्यामित्वानि ब्रह्मानि हस्तनिता च अब्युष्नः। राजोक्ताः वाक्यसारः तथा तथा सन्तने समुचितें वाचितः। इत्या प्रथा पूजा भविष्यति
सुभाषितमाज्ञाणारः सहदयाहाराः।

तथासूत्रं प्रबन्धं महतां पादस्तोत्तं समयं विश्वदर्दितोपेत स्वतार्थोक्तालयां समी-
हते दासः।
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INTRODUCTION

1. The sacred literature of India, inferior to none in variety or extent, is superior to many in nobility of thought, in sanctity of spirit and in generality of comprehension. In beauty or prolixity, it can vie with any other literature ancient and modern. Despite the various impediments to the steady development of the language, despite the successive disturbances, internal and external, which India had to encounter ever since the dawn of history, she has successfully held up to the world her archaic literary map, which meagre outline itself favourably compares with the literature of any other nation of the globe. The beginnings of her civilization are yet in obscurity. Relatively to any other language of the ancient world, the antiquity of Sanskrit has an unquestioned priority. "Yet such is the marvellous continuity" says Max Muller "between the past and the present of India, that in spite of repeated social convulsions, religious reforms and foreign invasions, Sanskrit may be said to be still the only language that is spoken over the whole extent of the vast country." So says M Winternitz "Sanskrit is not a 'dead' language even to day. There are still at the present day a number of Sanskrit periodicals in India, and topics of the day are discussed in Sanskrit pamphlets. Also, the Mahabharata is still today read aloud publicly. To this very day poetry is still composed and works written in Sanskrit, and it is the language in which Indian scholars converse upon scientific questions. Sanskrit at the least plays the same part in India still, as Latin in the Middle Ages in Europe, or as Hebrew with the Jews."

"No country except India and no language except the Sanskrit can boast of a possession so ancient or venerable. No nation except the Hindus can stand before the world with such a sacred heirloom in its possession, unapproachable in grandeur and infinitely above all in

1. Indiu. 78-9.
2 History of Indian Literature, i. 45.
INTRODUCTION

The Vedas stand alone in their solitary splendour, serving as beacon of divine light for the onward march of humanity.”

The sciences of Comparative Pathology and Mythology owe their origin to what has been termed the “Discovery of Sanskrit.” The antiquity and extent of its literary documents, the transparency of its grammatical structure, the comparatively primitive state of ancient system and thorough grammatical treatment it has early received at the hands of native scholars, must ever secure its foremost place in the comparative study of Indo-Aryan researches.”

2 A Weber in his Indian Literature thus summed up his reason for asserting the antiquity of the Vedic Literature

In the more ancient parts of the Rigveda-Samhita, we find the Indian race settled on the north-western borders of India, in the Punjab, and even beyond the Punjab, on the Kubha, or Kupna, or Kabul. The gradual spread of the race from these seats towards the east, beyond the Sarasvati and over Hindustan as far as the Ganges can be traced in the later portions of the Vedic writings almost step by step. The writings of the following period, that of the epic, consist of accounts of the internal conflicts among the conquerors of Hindustan themselves, as, for instance, the Mahabharata, or of the further spread of Brahmanism towards the south, as, for instance, the Ramayana. If we connect with this the first fairly accurate information about India which we have from a Greek source, viz., from Megas, it becomes clear that at the time of this writer the Brahmanism of Hindustan was already completed, while at the time of the Periploos (see Lassen, I AK., u 150, n, I St u 192) the very southernmost point of the Dekhan had already become a seat of the worship of the wife of Siva. What a series of years, of centuries, must necessarily have elapsed before this boundless tract of country, inhabited by wild and vigorous tribes, could have been brought over to Brahmanism. And while the claims of the written records of Indian literature to a high antiquity—its beginnings may perhaps be traced back even to the time when the Indo-Aryans still dwelt together with the Persa-Aryans—are thus indisputably proved by external, geographical testimony, the internal evidence in the same direction, which may be gathered from their contents, is no less conclusive. In the songs of Rik, the robust spirit of the people gives expression to the feeling of its relation to nature, with a spontaneous freshness and simplicity, the powers o

1 Hindu superiority 180
nature are worshipped as superior beings, and their kindly and besought within their several spheres. Beginning with this nature-worship, which everywhere recognises only the individual phenomena of nature, and these in the first instance superhuman, we trace in Indian literature the progress of the Hindu people through almost all the phases of religious development through which the human mind generally has passed. The individual phenomena of nature, which at first impress the imagination as being superhuman, are gradually classified within their different spheres, and a certain unity is discovered among them. Thus we arrive at a number of divine beings, each exercising supreme sway within its particular province, whose influence is in course of time further extended to the corresponding events of human life, while at the same time they are endowed with human attributes and organs. The number—already considerable—of these natural deities, these regents of the powers of nature, is further increased by the addition of abstractions, taken from ethical relations, and to these as to the other deities divine powers, personal existence and activity are ascribed. Into this multitude of divine figures, the spirit of inquiry seeks at a later stage to introduce order, by classifying and co-ordinating them according to their principal bearings. The principle followed in this distribution is, like the conception of the deities themselves, entirely borrowed from the contemplation of nature. We have the gods who act in the heavens, in the air, upon the earth, and of these the sun, the wind, and fire are recognized as the main representatives and rulers respectively. These three gradually obtain precedence over all the other gods, who are only looked upon as their creatures and servants. Strengthened by these classifications, speculation presses on and seeks to establish the relative position of these three deities, and to arrive at unity for the supreme Being. This is accomplished either speculatively, by actually assuming such a supreme and purely absolute Being, viz., "Brahman" (neut), to whom these three in their turn stand in the relation of creatures, of creatures, of servants only, or arbitrarily, according as one or other of the three is worshipped as the supreme god. The sun-god seems in the first instance to have been promoted to this honour? the Pers-Aryans at all events retained this standpoint, of course extending it still further, and in the older parts of the Brahmanas also—to which rather than to the Samhitas the Avesta is related in respect of age and contents—we find the sun-god here and there exalted far above the other deities (prasanita devanam). We also find ample traces of this in the forms of worship, which so often preserve relics of antiquity. Nay,
as “Brahman” (masc), he has in theory retained this position, down even to the latest times, although in a very colourless manner. His colleagues, the air and fire gods, in consequence of their much more direct and sensible influence, by degrees obtained complete possession of the supreme power, though constantly in conflict with each other. Their worship has passed through a long series of different phases, and it is evidently the same which Megasthenes found in Hindustan, and which at the time of the Periplus had penetrated, though in a form already very corrupt, as far as the southernmost point of the Dekhan.”

3 The Gods created Devavānī

Vidyāraṇya adopts Ātañjali’s views in his Introduction to his commentary on Rg Veda and there in speaking of the importance of the study of Grammar, he says
Dvijendranath Guha collects some other references

तृतीय मगनाथ यास्क — "चत्वारी यास्कति बेदा वा पुढ़ उत्ता। वरो कथा पादा। इति सवनानि नामी। दे द्वीप मागनाथयी। सत वल्लभ सत ढळाव। नवजा बदलेन्द्रा बद्री मन्नायांकष्ठः। सुकृती रोशनीवरो रोशनमस हर्षपरम्यः। सामग्रिकविन्दमुः। स्वसति यद्यिष्ठ जंतुसति सामसः। स्वचः। महो देव इति हि महान्। देवो यथः सत्ताः आतिकरीर्य नमुनायानाविविखति वजनाय। (इति वैतके परिशिष्टे--१३१६१९).

यद्य—

चत्वारी बाल्यपरिवेश तानि बिद्वानोस्वयम् ये मन्नानि।

श्रीमा नायिका निदित्त सुरियो वाचो महायात्व वर्तति।

कर्मेऽद्१३१६४५७, अपेक्षेऽकृत्ये ६१३३१६६३१६६१।

अनापि श्यामाकार्यपादाद — "चत्वारी वाच परिवेश कार्यानि पादानि तानि विद्वानोस्वयम् ये श्रीमातन्त्र। श्रीमा नायिका निदित्त सुरियो वाचो महायात्व वर्तति। कलात्नि तानि चत्वारी पदात्मयोगस्वरो महायात्वश्योसे। नामार्थः। शूपप्रसीनिविकार्यः। नामार्थः। नामार्थः। कल्यो श्रावण चद्य्युं यावशायािकनीति यादिका। कल्यो युज्युं तामानि चद्य्युं स्वामा चद्य्युं यावशायािकनीति नैसता। सर्गानि वात्यस्तान्त्रे दृढः सर्वस्थान्त्रे चद्य्युं यावशायािकनीति। प्रश्नु तुषे श्रेष्ठ गृहानासत्सन्ते बृहदसामवता। अनापि श्रावण वर्तति। हा वै वाचक स्पस्तः चद्य्युं
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व्यभिचारानि लोकानि नीपि पशुपु दरीयम्। या पुरुषित्या साधना, सा यथाते यथार्थोऽ, सा वामानि ना बामदेवः । या दिव्यि साधिते, या ब्रह्मि ना तत्त्विति। अथ पशुपु ततो या वाणिज्यंकस्मात् वाणिज्या उसयों वाच वदनित या च देवाना या च सहस्यानासिति।” (श्री नैति परिखिते—१३१।१६)। अवश्यिकरसक सुदृढ़ तावद् काव्येदि १६४१८, अवभावेदि ६२८१५, साहित्यिय आर्यकर १०१३, पुनः काव्येदि १०३७१८, नैति परिखिते व १३१।१०-१३ वहिते। (अनलहुताचार्यवाचार्यानयिन दद्यम्)।

मृयश्च नैतिके पुर्ण्यानार्करेण पद्धतिद्वये उत्तमम्—“रश्वनेत्राति चतुर्गिरि पद्धताति नामास्याति नोपपर्गनिपात्य तान्निसानि महति।” अनन्तर सत्त्वस्तूणि-वृद्धसारणिप्रूणानीति शृद्धये। यथा—“स्वे सर्वा द्रव्यस्तानि । स्वै उप्रां नवज्ञानि-राज्यानि। स्वै स्पष्टा मूलपरिशालन ।” (साहायोद्यमानन्त्याकपिय, २८२।३)। अल स्वरुपापु इन्द्र पुरु कारे (अथवा स्वे अकारायावहुवेश्ला सर्वा देवताजन इन्द्रेण उद्वर्तिता)। शाश्वतं—प्राचीनता चन्द्रेण च। कादेव अपर्यावातिनि सहुदार्करणेण सहदेवेन च बर्णितानि (कक्षयाद लापिवं युतिभाष)। अत्र बाहुसाप्तम्—“स्वे सर्वा अकारायाव हेतुके बलिनार्यानो देवस्ववन्यानि। स्वै उप्रां श्रावत्तादय जयपापे-विराज-कर्पसवाल्मण । स्वै स्पष्टा कादेव व्यपजनानि मूलपरिशालन।

* * * *

इन्द्राद्ये नेत्रे देवता प्रस्थतात । वषम्व आचार्याचार्य (नन्दशाहवाद देवनगराधिक) सत्त्वस्तूणिप्रूणारणिविशेषाय। तत्त्वकीर्ति ““देवनागर वपु” श्रद्धिकम्ये तद्निविनात माषा “देवमाणा” श्रद्धिविपत्ये। वस्तानि—“पूजि ये वेदा प्रश्न तद् महावणाए।” अश्वस्यितायापरि रेत प्राची (२१००।११)—“देवाय वा वांमजन्यं देवाङ्का विश्रुपा-पश्चाय वदनित।”

अल साण्यसाम्यम्—“पुरा माध्यमिका बालू संवाण्यवीज्यं धर्मंमितादिनी महतीति विश्वीपुरुवत्ती प्रतियति या देवी धीतमाना माध्यमिका बार देवा माध्यमिका अजनयं जनयति वा बार विश्रुपा विश्वारं अप्यत्ववाच्च पश्चाय वदनित तत्पुर्वकत्वाय बारव्यप्तते * * *

दीर्घाम सृष्ट्य पुनरेत—“मन्नवेदे दिवो अधुप्य गुरुः विश्वयो वान्विबन्त्यां विश्वयो मिन्याम्” (काव्येदि १५६४।११।१)। साण्यसाम्यम् तेनेत—

* * * *

दिवे पुनः गुरुकोवलके अस्तित्रे मन्नवेदे यस्म परसार मायेने देवा क्षः विष्येन विश्वदेवनसमध्ये विष्येदलितो तत्त्व सहस्यामिनि वाच गाजेतलखामुः।

1. JSSP, XVIII.
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The Veda has two-fold interest. It belongs to the history of the world and to the history of India. In the history of the world the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. It carries us back to times of which we have no record anywhere, and gives us the very words of a generation of men, of whom otherwise we could form but the vaguest estimate by means of conjectures and inferences. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race, and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in that long row of books which contains the records of the Aryan branch of mankind, will belong for ever to the Rig-veda. The world of the Veda is a world by itself, and its relation to all the rest of Sanskrit literature is such, that the Veda ought not to receive, but to throw light over the whole historical development of the Indian mind.

The literature of the Vedas is termed śruti, meaning what has been heard, that is, what is not the work of man.

Vedas are eternal (मन्त्र, beginningless (आपूर्ति) and not made by man (आपूर्ति), (2) they were destroyed in the deluge at the end of the last Kalpa, and (3) that at the beginning of the present Kalpa.
commencing with the *Kṛta-yuga* of this present Mahāyuga, the Rishis, through *tapas*, re-produced in substance if not in form the ante-diluvian Vedas which they carried in their memory by the favour of God. This is another expression of the historical view of modern scholars, like Mr Tilak. They state that the Vedic or Aryan religion can be proved to be interglacial, but its ultimate origin is still lost in geological antiquity, that the Aryan religion and culture were destroyed during the last glacial period that invaded the Arctic Aryan home, and that the Vedic hymns were sung in post-glacial times by poets, who had inherited the knowledge or contents therein of an unbroken tradition from their ante-diluvian fore-fathers.

On the commencement of Vedic era, opinions are at the opposite poles. Tradition takes it to a remote age of millions of years on the computation of yugas.

In his *Arctic Home in the Vedas*, B G Tilak divides the whole period from the commencement of the Postglacial era, corresponding to the beginning of our Kṛta Yuga of the present Mahayuga to the birth of Buddha in five parts —

"I 10,000-8,000 B.C.—The destruction of the original Arctic home by the last Ice Age and the commencement of the post-glacial period.

II 8,000-5,000 B.C.—The age of the migration from the original home. The survivors of the Aryan race roamed over the northern parts of Europe and Asia in search of lands suitable for new settlements. The Vernal Equinox was then in the constellation of Punarvasu, and as the Aditi is the presiding deity of Punarvasu, according to the terminology adopted by me in Orion, this may therefore, be called the Aditi or the Pre-Onion Period.

III 5,000-3,000 B.C.—The Orion Period, when the Vernal Equinox was in Orion. Many Vedic Hymns can be traced to the..."
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early part of this period and the bards of the race seem to have not yet forgotten the real import or significance of the traditions of the Arctic Home inherited by them. It was at this time that the first attempts to reform the calendar and the sacrificial system appear to have been systematically made.

IV 3,060-1,400 B.C.—The Krīttikā Period, when the Vernal Equinox was in the Pleiades. The Aitāraya Samhitā and the Brahmapas, which begin the series of Nakshatras with the Krīttikas are evidently the productions of this period. The compilation of the hymns into Samhitās also appears to be a work of the early part of this period. The traditions about the Original Arctic home had grown dim by this time and very often misunderstood, making the Vedic hymns more unintelligible. The sacrificial system and the numerous details thereof found in the Brahmapas seem to have been developed during this time. It was at the end of this period that the Vedaṅga Jyōtisha was originally composed or at any rate the position of the equinoxes mentioned therein observed and ascertained.

V 1,400-500 B.C.—The Pre-Buddhist Period, when the Sūtras and the Philosophical system made their appearance.

6 “The atmosphere of England and Germany seems decidedly unpropitious to the recognition of this great Indian antiquity so stubbornly opposed to the Mosaic revelation and its Chronology dearly and piously cherished by these Western Orientalists. Strongly permeated with the Chronology of the Bible which places the creation of the Earth itself about 4,004 B.C., European scholars cannot place the great separation of the Original Āryan races themselves earlier than 2,000 B.C., and the first historical entry of the Hindu Āryas into the continent of India before 1,500 B.C.” Arthur A. Macdonell, may be said to summarise the opinions of these Western Orientalists, when he says—

“History is the one weak spot in Indian literature. It is, in fact, non-existent. The total lack of the historical sense is so characteristic, that the whole course of Sanskrit literature is darkened by the shadow of this defect, suffering as it does from the entire absence of exact chronology. Two causes seem to have combined to bring about this remarkable result. In the first place, early India wrote no history, because it never made any. The ancient Indians never went through a struggle for life, like Greeks in the Persian and the Romans in the Punic wars, such as would have welded their tribes into a nation, and developed political greatness. Secondly, the Brāhmans, whose task it

B
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would naturally have been to record great deeds had early embraced the doctrine that all action and existence are a positive evil, and could therefore have felt but little inclination to chronicle historical events. Such being the case, definite dates do not begin to appear in Indian literary history till about 500 A.D. The chronology of the Vedic period is altogether conjectural, being based entirely on internal evidence. Three main literary strata can be clearly distinguished in it by differences in language and style, as well as in religious and social views. For the development of each of these strata a reasonable length of time must be allowed, but all we can here hope to do is to approximate to the truth by centuries. The lower limit of the second Vedic stratum cannot however be fixed later than 500 B.C., because its latest doctrines are presupposed by Buddhism, and the date of the death of Buddha has been with a high degree of probability calculated, from the recorded dates of the various Buddhist councils, to be 480 B.C. With regard to the commencement of the Vedic Age, there seems to have been a decided tendency amongst Sanskrit scholars to place it too high; 2,000 B.C., is commonly represented as its starting point. Supposing this to be correct, the truly vast period of 1,500 years is required to account for a development of language and thought hardly greater than that between Homer and the Attic age of Greece. Professor Max Muller's earlier estimate of 1,200 B.C., forty years ago, appears to be much nearer the mark. A lapse of three centuries, say from 1,300-1,000 B.C., would amply account for the difference between what is oldest and newest in Vedic hymn poetry. Considering that the affinity of the oldest from of the Avestan language with the dialect of the Védas is already so great that, by mere application of phonetic laws, whole Avestan stanzas may be translated word for word into Vedic, so as to produce verses correct not only in form but in poetic spirit, considering further, that if we know the Avestan language, at as early a stage as we know the Vedic, the former would necessarily be almost identical with the latter, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Indian branch must have separated from the Irânian only a very short time before the beginnings of Vedic literature, and can therefore have hardly entered the North-West of India even as early as early as 1,500 B.C. All previous estimates of the antiquity of the Vedic period have been outdone by the recent theory of Professor Jacobi of Bonn, who supposes that period goes back to at least 4,000 B.C. This theory is based on astronomical calculations connected with a change in the beginning of the seasons, which Professor Jacobi thinks has
taken place since the time of the *Rigveda*. The whole estimate is, however, invalidated by the assumption of a doubtful, and even improbable, meaning in a *Vedic* word, which forms the very starting point of the theory.”

7 “The history of the Sanskrit literature divides itself into two great ages, Vaidika and Laukika—Sacred and Profane,—Scriptural and Classical! The Mahabharata War is the dividing line between the two. The Vedic Age may again be divided into several distinct periods, each of which for length of years may well compare with that of the entire history of many an ancient nation, 1 Chandas Period, 2 Samhita Period, 3 Brahmana Period, 4 Aranyaka Period and 5 Upanisad Period. Each of these periods has a distinct literature of its own, vast in its extent, and varied in its civilisation, each giving rise to the subsequent period under the operation of great social, political and religious causes, and the philosophical historian of human civilisation need not be a Hindu to think that the Ancient Aryas of India, have preserved the fullest, the clearest and the truest materials for his work.”

8. “There are four Vedas, Rik (ऋक्), Yajur (यजुर्), Sāma (साम) and Atharvana (अथर्वन) and each Veda has Samhitā (मंत्र) Brahmans, Sūtra and Upanisad. The first three Vedas are called together as *Trayi* and they are called in Brahmanas also by the name *ricas*, Samanī and Yajūṃṣi, or Bhāvycas, Chandogas and Adhvaryus. The Sutras apply the term chandas to the Samhitās. Pāṇini uses the terms chandas and Bhāṣa to distinguish Vedic and non-Vedic literature. *Yajurveda* has two Samhitās called *Sukla* and *Kṛṣṇa*, or Vajasaneya and Taittiriya.”

“The Samhita of the Rik is purely a lyrical collection, forming the immediate source of the other three. The next two are made up of verses and ritual formulæ, meant to be recited at sacrifices. The Atharva Samhita resembles the Rik in that it forms a store of songs, devoted to sacrifices mostly in connection with incantations and magical charms.”

9 The Brahmanic period comprehends “the first establishment of the three-fold ceremonial, the composition of the individual Brahmanas and the formation of the *Charanas*. They connect the sacrificial songs and formulas with the sacrificial rite by pointing out on the one hand their direct relation, and on the other their symbolical connection with each other. Their general nature is marked by masterly grandiloquence, and antiquarian sincerity. Though in the words of Prof,
Eggeling, these works deserve to be studied as a physician studies the twaddle of idiots or the raving of mad men, they lack not striking thoughts, bold expression and logical reasoning. The Brahmanas of the Rik generally refer to the duties of the Hotr, of the Saman to those of Udgatr, of the Yajus, to the actual performance of the sacrifice. They are valuable to us as the earliest records of Sanskrit prose.

10 "The Sûtra literature forms a connecting link between the Vedic and the classical Sanskrit. 'Sutra' means a 'string' and compatibly with this sense, all works of this style are nothing but one uninterrupted chain of short sentences linked together in a most concise form. Sutras represented a scientific expression of the tradition and discussion recounted in Brâhmaṇas. They systematised the source of the rituals and so far as Kalpasūtras or Śrautasūtras go, they relate strictly to sruti or the Vedas. To these sūtras have been added Gṛhyaśūtras or those that regulate domestic rites. They are partly based on srutis and partly on smṛtis (unrevealed literature). Sūtras have been the consequence of a national need for concise guide-books for ceremonial, and represented a 'codification of case-law' in the sphere of sacrifices and ceremonials.

11 Upaniṣads are expressions of philosophical concepts. They embody the beginnings and progress of esoteric ideas, which had to a large extent been mentioned in Āranykas, writings supplementary to Brâhmaṇas.

12. A Weber sums up the direct data attesting the posteriority of the Classical Period thus —

(i) Its opening phases everywhere presuppose the Vedic period as entirely closed, its oldest portions are regularly based on the Vedic literature, the relations of life have now all arrived at a stage of development of which in the first period we can only trace the germs and the beginning.

The distinction between the periods is also by changes in language and subject-matter.

1 It might be seen that the usefulness of this species of composition was so much appreciated that in every branch of learning sūtras came to be composed and indeed are said to be the most ancient form of the sciences.

2. The authority of compositions like Upaniṣads has come to be respected to such an extent that in later times, several of that name were brought into being very often sectarian in their tenor. We have '108 Upaniṣads' and if not more on various topics, for instance, Garbhopanisad on embryology and Manmathopanisad on erotics.
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First, as regards language —

1. The special characteristics in the second period are so significant, that it appropriately furnishes the name for the period, whereas the Vedic period receives its designation from the works composing it.

2. Among the various dialects of the different Indo-Aryan tribes, a greater unity had been established after their emigration into India, as the natural result of their intermingling in their new home. The grammatical study of the Vedas fixed the frame of the language so that the generally recognised Bhasha had arisen. The estrangement of the civic language from that of the mass accelerated by the assimilation of the aboriginal races resulted in the formation of the popular dialects, the prakrits—proceeding from the original Bhasha by the assimilation of consonants and by the curtailment or loss of termination.

3. The phonetic condition of Sanskrit remains almost exactly the same as that of the earliest Vedic. In the matter of grammatical forms, the language shows itself almost stationary. Hardly any new formations or inflexions make their appearance yet. The most notable of these grammatical changes were the disappearance of the subjunctive mood and the reduction of a dozen infinitives to a single one. In declension the change consisted chiefly in the dropping of a number of synonymous forms.

4. The vocabulary of the language has undergone the greatest modifications. It has been extended by derivation and composition according to recognised types. Numerous words though old seem to be new, because they happen by accident not to occur in the Vedic literature. Many new words have come in through continental borrowings from a lower stratum of language, while already existing words have undergone great changes of meaning.

Secondly, as regards the subject-matter —

1. The Vedic literature handles its various subjects only in their details and almost solely in their relation to sacrifice, whereas the classical discusses them in their general relations.

2. In the former a simple and compact prose had gradually been developed, but in the latter this form is abandoned and a rhythmic one adopted in its stead, which was employed exclusively, even for strictly scientific exposition.

"That difference of metre should form a broad line of demarcation between the periods of literature is not at all without analogy in the literary history of other nations, particularly in other times. If once a
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new form of metre begins to grow popular by the influence of a poet who succeeds in collecting a school of other poets around him, this new mode of utterance is very apt to supersede the other more ancient forms altogether. People become accustomed to the new rhythm sometimes to such a degree, that they lost entirely the taste for their old poetry on account of its obsolete measure. No poet, therefore, who writes for the people, would think of employing those old fashioned metres, and we find that early popular poems have had to be transfused into modern verse in order to make them generally readable once more.

Now it seems that the regular and continuous Anushtubh sloka is a metre unknown during the Vedic age, and every work written in it may at once be put down as post-Vedic. It is no valid objection that this epic sloka occurs also in Vedic hymns, that Anushtubh verses are frequently quoted in the Brahmanas, and that in some of the Sutras the Anushtubh-sloka occurs intermixed with Trushtubhs, and is used for the purpose of recapitulating what had been explained before in prose. For it is only the uniform employment of that metre which constitutes the characteristic mark of a new period of literature.

13 "The languages of the world have been divided into three families, the Aryan or Indo-European, the Semitic and the Turanian. The first comprises the Indian branch, consisting of Sanskrit, Pali and the Prakrits, and the modern vernaculars of Northern India and Ceylon, the Iranian branch consisting of Zend, the sacred language of the Parsees, the Pehlevi and the other cognate dialects, the Hellenic or the Greek branch, comprising the languages of Ancient Greece and its modern representatives, the Italic branch, consisting of the Latin and cognate ancient languages of Italy and the dialects derived from Latin, the Italian, the French and the old Provencal, the Spanish, the Portugese, and the Wallachian, the Keltic or the language of those Kelts or Gauls that so often figure in Romam History, and distinguished into two varieties, the Kyrric, now spoken in Wales and in the Province of Brittany in France, and the Galic, spoken in the Isle of Man, the Highlands of Scotland, and Ireland, the Lithuanian and Slavonic, comprising the languages of Lithuania, Russia, Bulgaria, and of the Slavonic races generally, and the Teutonic branch, consisting of the Scandinavian group, i.e., the languages of Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and Denmark, of the High German i.e. the old and the present language of Germany, and of the Low German, which comprised the old Anglo-
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Saxon and the other languages spoken on the coasts of Germany, the modern representatives of which are the English, and the dialects spoken in Holland, Friesland, and the North of Germany. The second family comprises the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Carthaginian, and the cognate and derived languages, and the third, the Turkish and the languages of the Mongolian tribes. To this last family the dialects spoken in Southern India are also to be inferred. The Zend approaches Sanskrit the most, but the affinities of this latter with Greek and Latin are also very striking, and such as to convince even a determined sceptic. Sanskrit has preserved a greater number of ancient forms than any of these languages, hence it is indispensable for purposes of comparative philology.”

14 “India may justly claim to be the original home of scientific philology. In one of the most ancient Sanskrit books, the Samhita of the Black Yajurveda, there are distinct indications of the dawn of linguistic study. The Brahmaas of the Vedas which rank next to the Samhitas, and even the Tattuuya Samhita itself, the composition of which differs in no particular from its Brahmana, are all full of etymological explanations of words, though often they are fanciful. One Acharya followed another, and they all carefully observed the facts of their language, and laid down the laws they could discover. They studied and compared the significations and forms of words, observed what was common to them, separated the constant element from that which was variable, noticed the several changes that words undergo in different circumstances, and by such a process of philological analysis completed a system of grammar and etymology. In the Nirukta, Yaska, whose exact date we do not know, but who must have flourished several centuries before Christ, lays down correct principles of the derivation of words.

The Ait Brahm gives the etymology of श्रेष्ठ (III 9), of सांस्कृत (III 28), of ज्ञान (VII 18), the Tait Samh, of श्रेष्ठ (I 5, 1), of भृगु (II 4, 12 and II 5, 2) as Tait Brahm, of अवधि (I, 1, 5), o नारद (II 7, 18), &c &c.
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The last of the grammarians Acharyas were Patanjali, Katyayana, and Prakrit dialects which sprang from Sanskrit were next made the subject of observation and analysis. The laws of phonetic change or decay in accordance with which Sanskrit words became Prakrit were discovered and laid down. The Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit elements in those languages were distinguished from each other. This branch of philology also was worked up by a number of men, though the writings of one or two only have come down to us.

In this condition Sanskrit philology passed into the hands of Europeans. The discovery of Sanskrit and the Indian grammatical system at the close of the last century led to a total revolution in the philological ideas of Europeans. But several circumstances had about this time prepared Europe for independent thought in philology, and Sanskrit supplied the principles upon which it should be conducted, and determined the current in which it should run. The languages of Europe, ancient and modern, were compared with Sanskrit and with each other. This led to comparative philology and the classification of languages, and a comparison of the words and forms in the different languages led scholars into the secrets of the growth of human speech, and the science of language was added to the test of existing branches of knowledge.¹

It has been said by eminent writers that at one time sanskrit was the one language spoken all over the world. "Sanskrit is the mother of Greek, Latin and German languages and it has no other relation to them," that "sanskrit is the original source of all the European languages of the present days," and that "in point of fact the Zand is derived from the sanskrit."²

15 Tradition traces the beginnings of the sanskrit language to the fourteen aphorisms or Mahesvara sutras. They are ओ र ॐ औ onwards to ओ ॐ। These sounds, vowel and consonant, emanated from the sound of Siva's damaru (drum) at the time of his dance. To these letters and sounds is attached a mystic significance and Nandikesvara has explained their import with all solemnity. As the Kārikas of Nandikesvara are rare, they are printed here.³

¹ R G. Bhandarkar, Lectures on Development of Language of Sanskrit, Bombay.
² Hindu Supersority, 1733, A Dubos' Bible in India, Max Muller's Science of Language, I 325-6 note, Dwijendra Nath Guha's, Devabhasha, JSSP, XVIII. 150.
³ They are printed with the commentary of Upamanyu, in the Nirmayashagara, edn. of Mahabhasya, p. 132.
1. इतिसंगीत नरेन्द्रराय नानाद दंका नवपप चार।
 उदाहरणाम सनकादिक्षर नेवराय मे शिवसूक्तदालम्।

2. अन संवत दूसरे अलवर्णचुंद्रेश।
 धातर्व संपुष्पादित पाणिन्यादीद्वितिः।

3. अकारो जङ्जहुः स्थिरिश्वेत सर्वव्यथुः।
 विकलामि समाभिषिक जनंत्र पूणे भर।

4. अकारसर्ववर्णोऽग्र प्रकाश परस्मेवः।
 आज्ञायतः स्योगादहुग्मिलेभ जायते।

5. सर्व परामर्श पूर्व शास्त्रासाभिषिक जगन्त।
 शांतेश्वर प्रश्नं सत्यम् वाक्यं तत् समुत्त।

6. वक्रे विषुद्धनकाक्षः बैक्षरी सा सता तत्।
 सर्वाविश्वासामाधाय सत्यवा वाक्यं समा समा।

7. अकारे श्रवणीश्च सतातां कारणतवः।
 इकारे सर्ववर्णानां शतिवाक्लारण गतवः।

8. जगलकक्षुसूक्तदीप्त्या यदाध्वासीहीलामवृट्याः।
 कामकीमिति महुःणेऽ वौद्धपारमाः।

9. अकारो शक्तिमाल स्यदिकारशिक्तस्मा सता।
 उकारो विश्वाराहायौपकन्तक्काराथः।

10. कारक सर्वभौरो माया मनोहृत्तिविद्वृहयते।
 ताभिः इश्वासम्बल जगव्यपमोर्जनधृतं।

11. इश्वासिद्वितिरस्तं सदिक्षो न विचरये।
 चतुर्भिरकाथां युद्धावागार्योरिपिः।

12. श्रवणा लस्य चित्तित्वस्ति विस्मृतरूपोद्धरसोः।
 वर्णानं सत्यम् हर्षविंतवर्गवेच्च विन्दुः।

13. पूर्वेऽऽोऽ भरायेत्सैव्यती सर्वव्यथुः।
 साक्ष्यतात्तत्त्वादृताः स पुक्त द्वि निष्क्रिताः।
Introduction

14. ऐंठाँ चु श्रवणजनपदः सन् जगस्वतर्गत ततः।
ि कृ ष्णसं विस्तरं करुणाविरासीमहादैविनः।
ि हि य च रो।

15. भूतपूर्वकेतस्माद्यवरण महेश्वरादि।
ि व्योमावशयंवहस्यायत्वतयान्यात्र श पुष्य हि।

16. हकारो व्योमसं च यकारो बायुरुप्येत।
ि रक्षारक्षितो यु वक्तारादिति सैव वाक।
ि छ शु।

17. आधारसूतं सूर्यनामाकालादीनाः च कारणम्।
ि अजात्वस्तती जीवकारणात्वां गृहीतं।।
ि न मद्य न मू।

18. शब्दस्याभं सुपरसगचारं लमंकोनम्।
ि व्योमाकालां सुणा ख्याते जानीयात्वर्यस्तस्वस्तु।
ि छ भ छु।

19. वाक्पाठी च श्रमामवीदराकुपचिदामन:।
ि सर्वोत्तुधु विशेषं स्थाबरादी न विधते।
ि वर्गीयं तुर्यवर्गं ये कल्पितवण्यं हि ते॥
ि घ छ घ छु।

20. वन्दण्यू च वर्मूलानां पादपायु उपस्थकः।
ि कल्पितवण्यं ख्याते जाता हि परमार्थं।
ि ज व ग छ द शु।

21. श्रोतस्युतंनदानाणि हृणं श्रीश्रीपरकः।
ि सर्वास्मापि जातुमांधिरति जबगडश्च।
ि ख छ छ ठ थ च ठ त बु।

22. आण्यादिपतकः चैव मनोहरदिस्यक्तिः।
ि बमु जजाराणलेन खम्भूटथ चर्तवोः॥

23. वर्गिणितीयकण्योत्षः आण्यापः चंचवायचः।
ि स्माध्यवर्गिणिज्ञाता वंश-करणकृतं॥
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16 "The literature of Sanskrit presents, as ordinarily considered, two varieties of the language, but a third may also, as I shall presently endeavour to show, be clearly distinguished. Of these the most ancient is that found in the hymns of the Rigveda Samhita. These were composed at different times and by different Rishis, and were transmitted from father to son in certain families. Thus the third of the ten collections, which make up the Samhita bears the name of Visvāmitra, and the hymns contained in it were composed by the great patriarch and his descendants. The seventh is ascribed to Vasishtha and his family. The composition of these hymns therefore extended over a long period, the language is not the same throughout, and while sometimes they present a variety so close to the later Sanskrit that there is little difficulty in understanding them, the style of others is so antiquated that they defy all efforts at interpretation, and their sense was not understood even by the Rishis who flourished in the very next literary period, that of the Brāhmaṇas. Still for our purposes we may neglect these differences and consider the Vedic variety of Sanskrit as one."

17 The history of Sanskrit affords considerable scope for a study of the growth of language. It presents distinct varieties of speech which are linked together exactly as Modern English is with the Anglo-Saxon. The most ancient form is that composing the text of the Rig Veda Samhita. Consisting of ten books, it was the work of different rishus, preserved by oral tradition in their families. Despite the multitude distinctions in the language of the Rik Samhita, we may for all practical purposes treat
the Vedic variety of Sanskrit as a compact dialect. Prominently, this dialect presents some peculiarities of form and usage, which may thus be summed up

(i) The nominative plural of noun ending in अ is अत्सः as well as अबु as देवास or देशा, the instrumental being देवास्म or देशेषः.

(ii) The nominative and the vocative dual and plural of nouns in अ not rarely end in आ as देवासः विष्णा चप्पक्ता कृतानि।

(iii) The instrumental singular of feminine nouns in ए is occasionally formed by lengthening the vowel as धीती and पदी।

(iv) The locative singular termination is often elided as परमेः व्योभनृ।

(v) The accusative of nouns in ए are formed by ordinary rules of euphonic combination as तत्वाः or तत्वाः, and the instrumental by affixing आ or या or द्वा as द्विया or लापुया।

(vi) The dative of the personal pronouns ends in प as पृष्ठे or अत्सः

(vii) The parasmaipada first person plural termination is महिः as वामश्चाक्ष्वस्ति, and of the third person plural is रे or रूते as इत्सः or इत्सः।

(viii) The द् of the अत्मानेपदा termination is often dropped as दक्षिणतप्पेः, and instead of इ there is क्षीर, आ वारयम्बातः।

(ix) In the place of the imperative second person plural, there are त, तन, धव and ताव as रणोत, पवर्, यतिन and हप्पतात।

(x) Eight different forms of the mood छेदः, signifying condition, are everywhere abundant as धण आयुब्धि तारिसते।

(xi) Roots are not restricted to particular conjugations and at the caprice of the Rishi the same comes to more than one class

(xii) The infinitive suffixes are से, चे, अथे, तवे and तबे as वठे, असे, पुरृषे, दत्रे and मादयथे, the accusatives of some nouns are treated as infinitives governed by दृष्ट, as विमान नक्षिकन, the terminations ते and तस् occur when combined with देखर as विचित्रते or विनिपित्र, the potential participles are
denoted by the suffixes तैः, इः, पुण्य and त्व as स्मेचितवेः, अवराहे, दिलक्षण्य and कर्ष्य, the indeclinable past ends in त्वाय as गत्वाय, some forms as पत्ती are also met with

(xiii) A variety of verbal derivatives as दृष्टत (handsome), जीवस् (life) and कुलस् (product) are frequent

(xiv) A large number of words which have become obsolete or lost their significance in later Sanskrit are everywhere abundant as परिपतिः, वृष्ण and अमीमा

These peculiarities have been noted as the most frequent and the most salient, but many others are mentioned by Panini. The Vedic dialect is the first record of the Sanskrit tongue, from which by processes of phonetic decay and natural elision the later language has been perfected

Here is a specimen of Vedic Sanskrit —

1. यक्षिधि ते विचो यथा प्र देव वर्ण नभत् || मिनीमालित पदिपावि ||
2. मा नो वधाय हल्लेवे जिलीचानस रीरध || मा हुणासल मन्यवे ||
3. कदा ज्ञत्रुसर्व नरसा वर्ण करामहे || मुद्दीवाभससम ||
4. वदा ये वीना पदमनरिक्षेन पतातायं || वेद नाव समृदिय ||
5. नि बशाद चतुर्थो वर्ण पत्ताला || साल्मालयें थुकं ||
6. अते विश्वायुद्दत विकितिः अभि पस्यति || छतानि या च कल्ल ||
7. स नो विशालं हुक्तुरादिलं सुपथा करतु || प य आमृति तारिष्ट ||
8. हस्य भे वर्ण धुधो हुमरथा च मुल्लय || त्वायवस्थुर चेिक ||

"These eight verses contain 72 different padas or grammatical forms, not counting the prepositions as separate padas. Of these, 19 have become altogether obsolete in classical Sanskrit, and 12 have changed their significations"

18 The Brahmanas of the Rk and the Yajus present the second stage in the development. Many of the peculiar words have become obsolete, and the declensions have mostly approached the classical grammar. The roots have no indiscriminate conjugation. The subjunctive is almost gone out of use. The indeclinable past and the gerundial infinitive end in त्वा and दृष्ट, verbal forms of all moods and tenses are seen in abundance. Still there are the touches of the vedic relationship and archaisms are not rare —

(i) Some feminine nouns have common forms for the dative and the genitive, as पूर्विक्ये राजस्य ;
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(i) The न of the third person is often dropped as before, as सबौ बी पलवामाणानि ,

(ii) Some of the aorist forms do not follow the rules of Panini, as अहत वा अहत दर्ता ,

(iii) Some atiquated words occur as अभाव (a shaft) लिहान (reference) भगवान (prosperous)

The Aitareya Brähmana quotes some gāthas which are obviously more archaic than the rest of the work. Notwithstanding these irregularities, the Brähmanas are "the best representatives extant of the verbal portion of that language of which Panini writes the grammar, though he did not mean these when he spoke of the bhasha." The gradual and perhaps rapid progress in the symmetry and simplicity of the language had still to be accelerated by the work of later authors and their writings furnish an ample illustration of the next stage of linguistic development.

19 Yaska’s Nirukta forms the intermediate link between the Vedic and the non-Vedic literature. It is not devoid of archaic expressions, for we meet with such phrases as ‘उपेक्षाय ग्रामयन् ‘ (unable to teach) and विशिष्ट रक्षितं (invested with sovereignty). But we have no clue to the dawn of a change of style from simplicity to complexity. To the same period in the history of Sanskrit belongs Panini. His Astādhyāyī is based on the grammar of the bhasha. No language has survived to us that literally represents Panini’s standard of dialect. Perhaps the later Brähmanas are the only best representatives. At any rate there is no portion of the existing Sanskrit literature that accurately represents Panini’s Sanskrit, as regards the verbs and the nominal derivatives. Probably his grammar had for its basis the vernacular language of his day. Yāska and Pāṇini stand to us the authorities on record of that form of the language which immediately followed the purely Vedic stage.

20 Times had advanced, and with it the language Pāṇini’s bhasha could no longer stand stationary. The operation of the concurrent causes of linguistic progress had by the days of Kātyāyana and Patanjali modified Pāṇini’s denotation and introduced new changes in the grammar of the language or in the scope of the aphorisms. Kātyāyana’s Vārttikas and Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya are devoted to the proper interpretation of the sūtras and to the apt introduction of the missing links. If to Kātyāyana’s eyes 10,000 inaccuracies are discernible in Pāṇini, the only explanation must be that to Pāṇini they were not
inaccuracies, but by Kātyāyana’s time the language had progressed and necessitated a fresh appendix or erratum in Pāṇini’s grammatical treatise. The period of intervention must have been sufficiently long to allow old grammatical forms to become obsolete and even incorrect and words and their meanings to become antiquated and even ununderstandable.

21 Pañjālī discusses the change and progress of the language, in the sāstraic form of a dialogue between an objector and a mover thus:

अस्त्रामयुक्तः
सति वै शब्दः अपयुतः तथा—उष, तेर, चक, पेचेति।
किमो यत्सरस्ययुक्तः
प्रायोगाधि स्वातेष शब्दानि साधुतमवस्थस्य य इदानीमण्युता नाव्यः साधुकस्यु।
हद तताय विभाविश्रः—यद्यपि—सति वै शब्दः अपयुतः। हृद, यदि सतिः ना-पयुतः, अथापयुता न सति, सति चापयुताः विभाविश्रः। प्रायोगः एवं ग्रंथ स्वातानि
शतिः शब्दः अपयुतः इति केक्श्यानीमन्ये सववशातीय पुरूष शब्दानि। प्रवेशोऽि साधुकस्यु।
नैतु विभाविश्रः। सतीति तताय भूम यद्यतान शास्ताविद्व शाक्षेपाविश्रविधाते। अपयुता इति
भूम, यद्यकेक्श्यापुनिः इति। तद्युपथ्यः—केक्श्यानीमन्ये सववशातीय पुरूष शब्दानि। प्रवेशोऽि
साधु, स्यातिः। न भूमोक्ष्यास्तरस्ययुक्तः।

क्री तदाय ।
कोऽकेक्श्यापुनिः।

हद च भथानस्यस्यहो। कोऽके।
अपएतरोम्हकः। कोऽके, नतवां ह्यकः।

अस्त्रामयुक्तः। इति चेष्टायेऽथ शब्दः। केक्श्यावेलातः।
अस्त्रामयुक्तः। इति चेष्टात तद किः कारणः।
अर्थं शब्दयोग्याताः। अर्थं शब्दः। अपयुतः।
सति चेष्टा शब्दानामस्य वेष्टेऽधु प्रयुज्यते।

अपयोगः। प्रायोगानववलातः।

अपयोगः। शब्दयेशा शब्दानाः स्वाभ्।
कुत ॥ प्रायोगानवलातः। वदेशः। सवस्तानस्यस्यनातस्य शब्दार्थः। आपयुजः।
तथा—उजिष्यः। शब्दस्यस्य, क युपुःशिया), वेष्टेऽस्यस्येऽस्येऽ, फः युपु तीयः। चेष्टायेऽथेऽ, क युपु तुःचन्तः। पेचेति।
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There exist (some) words which are not used, for instance, भर, तेज, चक, वेच. (These are forms of the second person plural of the Perfect.)

The Siddhānta, or the principal teacher, who advocates the doctrine that is finally laid down asks —

Sīd What if they are not used?

Pūrv You determine the grammatical correctness of words from their being used Those then that are not now used are not grammatically correct

Sīd What you say is, in the first place, inconsistent, viz., that words exist which are not used If they exist they cannot be not used, if not used, they cannot exist To say that they exist and are not used
is inconsistent. You yourself use them (utter them) and say (in the very breath) there are words which are not used. What other worthy like yourself would you have to use them in order that they might be considered correct? (lit. What other person like yourself is correct or is an authority in the use of words)

Purv This is not inconsistent. I say they exist, since those who know the Sastra teach their formation by [laying down] rules, and I say they are not used, because they are not used by people. Now with regard to [your remark] What other worthy, &c” [when I say they are not used] I do not mean that they are not used by me

Sid What then?

Purv Not used by people

Sid Verily, you also are one amongst the people

Purv Yes, I am one, but am not the people

Sid (Vart अथस्मृतः शिि चेतार्थे चन्द्रयोगार्थम्) If you object that they are not used, it will not do (the objection is not valid)

Purv Why not?

Sid Because words are used to designate things. The things do exist which these words are used to designate (Therefore the words must be used by somebody. If the things exist, the words that denote them must exist)

Purv (Vart अन्योगः प्रयोगान्यत्वाद) (It does not follow) Their non-use is what one can reasonably infer

Sid Why?

Purv Because they (people) use other words to designate the things expressed by these words, for instance, क युप्तिः in the sense of ऊष्ण, क यूं तीर्थाः in the sense of तेर, क बृह कृंतवया in the sense of वष, क यूं पकवया in the sense of पेव (We here see participles had come to be used for verbs of the Perfect Tense)

Sid (Vart अथस्मृतः शििलस्वर्थः) Even if these words are not used; they should be essentially taught by rules. अस्ति Long sacrificial sessions are. It is in this way. Long sacrificial sessions are such as last for a hundred years and for a thousand years. It is not that modern usage none whatever holds them, but the writers on sacrifices teach them by rules, simply because [to learn] what has been handed down by tradition from the Rishis is religiously meritorious. And moreover (Vart सर देशान्तरे), all these words are used in other places
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PURV —They are not found used.

SID —An endeavour should be made to find them. Wide indeed is the range over which words are used, the earth with its seven continents, the three worlds, the four Vedas with their angas or dependent treatises and the mystic portions, in their various recensions, the one hundred branches of the Adhvaryu (Yajur-Veda), the Sama-Veda with its thousand modes, the Bahuṣṭya with its twenty-one varieties, and the Atharva Veda with nine, Vakovakya, Epics, the Puranas, and Medicine. This is the extent over which words are used. Without searching this extent of the use of words, to say that words are not used is simple rashness. In this wide extent of the use of words, certain words appear restricted to certain senses in certain places. Thus, धातृि is used in the sense of motion among the Kambojas, the Aryas use it in the derived from of ध्रव, हत्वाति is used among the Surashṭras, रहूि is used among the eastern and central people, but the Aryas use only गन्ध, गाति is used in the sense of 'cutting' among the easterns दाति is among the northerners. And those words which you think are not used are also seen used.

PURV —Where?

SID —In the Veda. Thus, सतासे रेवति रेवूष । यदी रेवति रेवला तवूष ॥ यमे नर शुश्रृः चकर । बनानशक्ता जस के तदनापि ।

["We here see that the objector says that certain words or forms are not used by people, and therefore they should not be taught or learnt. The instances that he gives are forms of the perfect to some roots and observes that the sense of these forms is expressed by using other words which are perfect participles of these roots. These statements are not denied by the Siddhantı, but he does not allow that the forms should not be taught on that account. Though not used, they should be taught and learnt for the sake of the religious merit consequent thereon, just as the ceremonial of long sacrificial sessions, which are never held, is. Then the objector is told that though not used by people, the words may be current in some other country, continent, or word, or they must have been used somewhere in the vast literature of the language. As regards the particular instances, two of them are shown to be used in the Vedas. It thus follows that in the time of कैत्ययाण and Patanjali, such verbal forms had become obsolete, and participles were used in their place. But it must have been far otherwise in the time of Parśu. He gives minute rules for constructing the innumerable forms of the Sanskrit verb."]
A few of those prominent changes are given below —

(i) Pāṇini in a special rule says that श्वर has श्वरम् for its neuter in the Vedas. Obviously he intended to exhaust the list Kātyāyana has to add एकतर to it.

(ii) Pāṇini, when he says विक्षर्क शक्तिनिविकरो वा, would imply that each form has no other sense than that of a bird, but Kātyāyana adds that both the forms are optional in the sense of 'birds,' while in any other sense they represent separate words.

(iii) The vocative singular of neuter nouns ending in अर, such as वहावर is according to Pāṇini वहावर, but Kātyāyana would add an optional वहावर.

(iv) Some feminine formations are not noticed by Pāṇini, which Kātyāyana is forced to allow, as आयोणी and उपायोणी.

(v) The word आश्वेन is rendered as अनिल by Pāṇini; Kātyāyana substitutes for it अहुर.

(vi) The words and meanings of words employed by Kātyāyana are such as we meet with in the classical period and his expressions would not invite any special attention. This cannot be said of Pāṇini. Many of his words are antiquated in the later language as मैति (carrc) उपस्वाद (bargain), होत्स (priest).

"In Pāṇini's time a good many words and expressions were current which afterwards became obsolete, verbal forms were commonly used which ceased to be used in Kātyāyana's time, and some grammatical forms were developed in the time of the latter which did not exist in Pāṇini's Pāṇini's Sanskrit must, therefore, be identified with that which preceded the Epics, and he must be referred to the literary period between the Brahmana and Yaska. Hence it is that the Brahmana, as observed before, are the best existing representatives of the language of which Pāṇini writes the grammar. Kātyāyana on the other hand wrote when the language arrived at that stage which we have called classical. Thus, then, we have been able to trace three distinct periods in the development of Sanskrit. First, we have the Vedic period, to which the Rgveda Samhita, the Mantra portion of the Yajurveda, and the more antiquated part of the Atharva-Samhita are to be referred. Then commences another period, at the threshold of which we find the Brahmana, which, so to say, look backwards to the preceding,
that is, present the Vedic language in the last stage of its progress towards Panini's Bhasha, and, later on, we have Yaska and Panini. This may be called the period of Middle Sanskrit. And last of all, there is the classical period to which belong the Epics, earliest specimens of Kavyas and dramatic plays, the metrical Smritis, and the grammatical work of Katyayana. Panini's work contains the grammar of Middle Sanskrit, while Katyayana's that of classical Sanskrit, though he gives his sanction to the archaic forms on the principle, as he himself has stated, on which the authors of the sacrificial Sutras teach the ritual of long sacrificial sessions, though they had ceased to be held in their time. Patanjali gives but few forms which differ from Katyayana's and in no way do they indicate a different stage in the growth of the language; hence his work is to be referred to the same period. The form which the language assumed at this time became the standard for later writers to follow, and Katyayana and Patanjali are now the generally acknowledged authorities on all points concerning the correctness of Sanskrit speech. We shall hereafter see that the last two stages have left distinct traces on the Prakrits or the derived languages.

Professor Goldstucker has shown from an examination of the Vartikas, that certain grammatical forms are not noticed by Panini, but are taught by Katyayana and concludes that they did not exist in the language in Panini's time. I have followed up the argument in my lectures 'On the Sanskrit and Prakrit languages,' and given from the Vartikas several ordinary instances of such forms. From these one of two conclusions only is possible, viz., either that Panini was a very careless and ignorant grammarian, or that the forms did not exist in the language in his time. The first is of course inadmissible, wherefore the second must be accepted. I have also shown from a passage in the introduction to Patanjali's Mahabhасhya, that verbal forms such as those of the Perfect which are taught by Panini as found in the Bhasha or current language, not the Chhandasa or obsolete language, had gone out of use in the time of Katyayana and Patanjali, and participles had come to be used instead. Professor Goldstucker has also given a list of words used by Panini in his Sutras in a sense which became obsolete in the time of Katyayana and shown what portion of Sanskrit literature did not probably exist in Panini's time but was known to Katyayana, and in one case comes to the not unjustifiable conclusion that the time that had elapsed between Panini and Katyayana was so great that certain literary words which either did not exist in Panini's time or were not old to him came to be considered by Katyayana to be as old as
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those which were old to Panini. Again, according to Panini's rules the Aorist expresses (1) past time generally, or the simple completion of an action, (2) the past time of this day and not previous to this day and (3) recent past time, and thus resembles in every respect the English Present Perfect. But in the later language the distinction between that tense and the other two past tenses is set aside and the Aorist is used exactly like these. Now, the language of the verses ascribed to Panini and generally the language of what Professor Max Muller calls the Renaissance period is grammatically the same as that of Katyayana and Pananjali, and is the language of participles instead of verbs, and even from theirs it differs in making extensive use of compounds and neglecting the distinction between the Aorist and the other past tenses. The Sanskrit of Panini's time is more archaic than that of Katyayana's time, and Panini's rules are nowhere more scrupulously observed than in such an ancient work as the Aitareya Brahmana. The many forms and expressions which he teaches, and which must have existed in language are nowhere found in the later literature, while specimens of them are to be seen in that Brahmana and like works. Between therefore the archaic language of the sutras and the language which Panini calls Bhasha and of which he teaches the grammar, on the one hand, and the language of the Renaissance period on the other is such a wide difference that no one will ever think of attributing a work written in the style and language of this period to the Great Grammarian. As Yaska and Panini to the same period of Sanskrit literature the style and manner of a work written by Panini the grammarian, must resemble those of the Nirukta, but in the few verses attributed to Panini there is no such resemblance whatever. Should the entire work be discovered and found as a whole to be written in an archaic style, there will be time enough to consider its claim on behalf of these artificial verses.

23 "The earliest Sanskrit Alphabet was possibly made up of five semi-vowels, five nasals, five soft and five hard aspirates, in all twenty consonants. The twenty sounds found in the aphors ह र, ह ल, ह बस, ह रत, ह रु, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, ह र, are the oldest, the final consonants being of course later additions. As no consonants can be pronounced without a vowel, the sound of a, au or o, according to the idiosyncrasies of the several tribes, came to be unconsciously blended with it. The aphors श, द and द ब्र, belong to a subsequent age, the four consonants in them being more or less connected in origin with ज．

1 B. G. Bhandarkar, Date of Patanjali.
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Of time the aspirates produced the unaspirates, and the aphors जचांधकरत्तु and करु, were added, the three consonants ब्यत् being placed before व्. The order in which the vowels a, i, u, auga, iva are arranged is the same with that of the semi-vowels h, y, v, r, l, thus raising a suspicion that the correspondence between the 5 vowels and the 5 semi-vowels was not quite unknown in the age of the composition of the vowel-aphors. There is again a suspicion, that the vowels e and o, which have a separate aphor एवंौ assigned to them, were originally monophs, not diphs, the only diphs known in this age were at and au, formed of a+u and o+u respectively. These four aphors thus belong to an age, when 9 vowels in all, 7 monophs and 2 diphs were recognised. Were the seven monophs pronounced short or long? Their traditional pronunciation is no doubt short, but in an age not accustomed to the distinction between short and long, the pronunciation was possibly also long, at least among some of the tribes.

Did Pāṇini recognise the vowel ओ in the aphor नल्क़्रीः? or did the aphor in his age contain only ओ? The aphors शष्य and हर्ष contain only one letter each, and it may be held, that like them the aphor नल्क़्री also contained only one letter, namely ओ. There is only one root, viz., कहो, containing the vowel ओ. But Pāṇini does not recognise the root as कहो, according to him (कहो-18, 3 VIII), the root is कहु and कहो is formed from कहु, by changing the sound of ओ in it to ओ. Pāṇini, thus deriving कहु from कहु, recognises no ओ in the aphor नल्क़्री the grammatical tradition is therefore quite correct in not ascribing the authorship of the alphaphors to him. The fourteen aphors are thus the product of a pre-Pāṇini age, these aphors describe a dialect which possessed only seven short monophs and two diphs, and which had, besides, no lack of words containing the vowel ओ and the semi-vowel ओ in them. The sound of the semi-vowel possibly resembled that of अयु in Arab and Hob, and as such must have had a distinct sigh assigned to it, though now irrecoverably lost. The age of Pāṇini is thus conspicuous by the loss of the sign of the semi-vowel ओ, and by the scarcity of the vowel ओ, the former event having led to the confounding of the semi-vowel ओ with the spir ओ, while the latter led to the non-recognition of the vowel ओ. The age of the composition of the Fourteen Alphabet-aphors, recognising the seven short monophs, two diphs and the semi-vowel ओ, may be called Pre-Pāṇini Age I.

The age of Pāṇini will be found conspicuous not only by the loss of one short vowel ओ, but of three more short vowels, आ, इ, and ओ.
may claim at least a few words, while the semi-vowel ह has not been ousted from the premier place, though no words have been preserved for it to claim. But the short vowels ए, ऐ and ऑ, to use a scientific expression, have evaporated without residue. Sakatayana knew two उ, and two ऊ, the one light and the other heavy. Panini makes mention of Sakatayana having known them, but as to whether any distinction was made between them, when he (Panini) lived, absolutely nothing is known. This age of short ए and of the two-fold उ and ऊ may be called the Pre-Paumi Age II.  

24. Samskrtā Here then the Samskrit language had assumed a shape true to its name Samskṛta. The later epics, poems and dramas do not show any progress in the grammar, structure and significance of the language, though as regards style, they class themselves into an isolated species of literary composition. For all practical purposes, the language as perfected by the work of Kātyāyana and Patanjali has been the standard of later literature, and these are now the acknowledged authorities on all points concerning the grammar or construction of the Sanskrit speech.

"श्रृङ्खला देवमाण कहे व्याकृतिमाज्ञात | तदानी "सक्तत" आभिहितम्। दापनमः तु "सक्तत नाम दैवी वाग्नामाण्यताः महत्वियम् " (काव्यदर्शी १२३), इत्युत्तमा दैवी बागेय प्रहतालयादयविमाचायस्तस्करार्यपेण संस्कृतमार्गीति व्याकृताम्।

वाम्भराजसूरीर च (२१३) स्पष्टत भवितम्—

"सक्तत लगिग्रमाण माण शब्दशास्त्रेण निक्षिता!" उद्धा संस्कृतमाण मुषपदेह संवेद सर्वेन प्रकाशाण्। तथा च, कार्यदृष्टि तस्माद उद्वेषाः दिशिष भाषात्तथा वाप्य उपचत। यो वा तत् आगच्छित तस्म दश्युष्णत हिं ह स्माह पुष्य हि बाप्य रिकृष प्रकाशाण्।" इति.

25. "The earliest literature presents a fluent and simple style of composition. The sentences are short and verbal forms are abundant. Attributive and nominal expressions do not find a place therein. This construction is facilitated by a succession of concise ideas, which gives it a sort of simple grace and fine-cut structure. This then is the form of the Brahmana language. It lacks not striking thoughts, bold expression and impressive reasoning. Leaving out of account the unnatural appearance of the sutra style—which was not however a literary composition—we come to Yāska and his Nirukṣa. Scientific as it is, the language of Yāska often reminds us of the earlier writings. The
frequency of verbal forms was current during the time of Panini. It was after the epoch of the Ashtadhyayi that a change had come over literary styles. Attributes attached greater attention and compounds could alone compress long dependent sentences into the needed form. ‘In argument the ablative of an abstract noun saves a long periphrasis.’

The minute rules of Panini for constructing the innumerable verbal forms facilitated this mana for conciseness of expression. Thus the fluent or simple style came gradually to be displaced by the formative or attributive style. To this was added the richness and flexibility of the sanskrit language itself, which allowed any sort of twisting and punning of the literary vocabulary. The Puranas and the Itihasas were composed at the transitional stage in the history of literary styles. They present at the same time the simplicity of the earlier language and the complexity of the later composition. So do the earliest specimens of poetic and dramatic literature, hence the natural and not improbable conclusion is that if an author shows an easy and elegant style and if the flow of his language is more natural, it must be either his taste is too aesthetic for his age or his work must be assigned to an early period in the history of literature. This artificial style was greatly developed in the field of philosophy and dialectics. Patanjali’s language is most simple, lucid and impressive. The sentences if therefore really consists of a series of dialogues, often smart, between one who maintains the pūrvapaksha, and another who plays down the saddhānta. Hence, the language is plain and simple, and the sentences are short, and such as a man may naturally use in ordinary conversation or oral disputation.

The forms of words are all similar to the earlier dramas or the Puranas. Sabaraswamin has a lively style, though this presents a further stage in the downward progress. Now the philosophical style sets in and continues to a degree of mischief which is now beyond all reformation. Sankara represents the middle stage. His explanations are aided by dialectic terminology. The sentences are much longer than those of the earlier writers, the construction is more involved, there is a freer use of attributive adjuncts, and the form is that of an essay or a lecture, instead of an oral disputation. But his language is fluent and perspicuous, but not petrified as that of later writers. The last stage is reached in the works of the Nāyāyikas. These latter hate the use of verbs. The ablative singular and the indeclinable particles play a prominent part in their composition. Nouns are abstract and even participles are rare. The style is one of solidified formulae, rather of
Thus the end is that the movement which started with the simple sentence and predicative construction has run up to a stage where the original character is entirely modified and the Sanskrit language has become a language of abstract nouns and compound words.

The greater use or attributive or nominal forms of expression gradually drove out a large portion of the Sanskrit verb, and gave a new character to the language, which may be thus described — Very few verbal forms are used besides those of such tenses as the Present and Future, participles are frequently met with, the verbal forms of some roots, especially of those belonging to the less comprehensive classes, have gone out of use, and in their place we often have a noun expressive of the special action and a verb expressive of action generally, compound words are somewhat freely employed and a good many of the Taddhita forms or nominal derivatives have disappeared, and in their stead we have periphrastic expressions.

26 Spiritual Aspect, "The grammatical dissertations of the Hindus were not confined to a narrow field, nor were the Hindu grammarians content with mere formulation of rules for the formation of words. The spiritual aspect of sound seems to have made a deep impression upon their mind and left its stamp on their whole outlook regarding sabda. The sabdikas succeeded in discovering a way of spiritual discipline even through the labyrinthine mass of grammatical speculations. Enquiries into the ultimate nature of vak led them to a sublime region of sadhana—a region of perfect bliss and pure consciousness. The cultivation of grammar gave rise to a spiritual vision which, to speak, enabled the vag-yogavād to visualise Brahman in the wreath of letters (varnamala). Letters are denoted in Sanskrit by the same term (aksara) as is often applied to Brahman. A glance at the language in which aksara has been interpreted by grammarians of old will serve to open our eyes to the supreme importance of varnas. To the spiritual insight of Patanjali varnas were not only phonetic types but the glowing sparks of Brahman illumining the entire sphere of existence.

Vārṣa

The study of grammar has been declared to be the direct means of attaining the Supreme Being who, though one and without a second,
appears to be manifold owing to the operation of maya. Grammar in its religious and mystical speculations is in line with the teachings of the Upanisads, reinterpreting the same doctrines of yoga and upasana as are generally found in the sacred texts of India.

It was left to Patanjali and his followers to unlock the portal of a new kingdom of thought, so as to throw light upon the ultimate end of all enquiries into words. The Mahabhasya portended the birth of a form of sadhana in which sabda or Eternal Verbum should be worshipped with all the reverence shown to a Divinity. In order to attain union with Brahman or to get oneself completely merged in the Absolute, one is directed to take up the mysterious course of Sabdabrahma. Patanjali seems to have been the first among the Indian grammarians to give a spiritualistic colour to the speculations of grammar. The sabdabrahmapasana, as is formulated in the Upanisads, had undoubtedly influenced his trend of thought.

The mysticism underlying the phenomena of speech was undoubtedly the aspect which seems to have made the deepest impression upon the grammarian. The utterance of sound is with him a vivid materialisation of inner consciousness. To the grammarian sabda is not a lifeless mechanism invented by man. It is more than a mere sound or symbol. It is consciousness that splits itself up into the twofold category of sabda and artha, and what we call vak, as the vehicle of communication, is nothing but an expression of autanya lying within. Patanjali has taken notice of two kinds of words, namely, nitiya (eternal) and karya (created). By the former he understands the Supreme Reality that transcends all limitations of time and space. The attributes whereby the Vedantin describes Brahman or Absolute

1. यदेक व्रक्तावाक्यंद्वैषूचा प्रकटिवर्णम् ||
   तद्व्रक्तावाक्यस्य प्रकट्वाक्यमिन्नत्वम् ||

2. तस्य वाक्यम प्रकट तत्क्षणस्य व्याख्यायम् ||
   Yoga sutras, 27-28

3. Patanjali says that one should pursue the study of grammar for the supreme object of attaining equality or sameness with the Great God.

4. While commenting on the Bh (Rgveda, X 6, 71), Patanjali had laid stress on the necessity of making a thorough study of grammar, because it renders the grammarian capable of attaining union with Brahman (सारुप्यानि जाते)

5. अबलवैत्तिकात्मकसवि वाक्यमिन्नत्वम् परम्परानां वाक्यमिन्नत्वमिन्नति इति ||
   Puṣyārāja under Vākyapadiya, I 1.
have all been used by Patanjali in this interpretation of *nitya sabda*. He has more than once drawn our attention to this eternal character of *sabda*. This will give us some idea of the magnitude in which *sabda* was understood by the famous grammarian whom tradition makes an incarnation of *Sesa*. His poetical description of varnas, to which we have already referred, best illustrates the spiritual outlook of his mind. From the stotras he has quoted in laudation of *vak* and *vyakarana*, and it is sufficiently clear that he was an ardent and devout worshipper of *vak*, belonging to that class of mystics who in their spiritual experience make no distinction between *para vak* and *para Brahman*. Patanjali used to look upon *sabda* as a great divinity (*mahan devah*) that makes its presence felt by every act of utterance.

He was a yogin whose inward vision (*pratibha jnana*) permitted him to have a look into that eternal flow of pure consciousness that is undisturbed from outside. He was a true type of Brahmin who visualised the ultimate nature of *vak* by dispelling the darkness of ignorance through the aid of his illuminating knowledge of *sabda-tattva*. The worship of *vak*, which has its origin in the Upanisads and which found so prominent an expression in the Agamas, was earnestly followed up by the *sabdikas*, particularly by Patanjali and Bhartrhari. Sabdabrahmopasana, as we find in grammatical dissertations, is only a reproduction of the teachings of the Upanisads.

Words are not mere sounds as they ordinarily seem to be. They have a subtle and intellectual form within. The internal source from which they evolve is calm and serene, eternal and imperishable. The real form of *vak*, as opposed to external sound, lies far beyond the range of ordinary perception. We are told that it requires a good deal of sadhana to have a glimpse of the purest form of speech. The *rk* to which Patanjali has referred bears strong evidence to this fact. *Vak* is said to reveal her divine self only to those who are so trained.

---

1. *Mahābhāṣya*, I, 1, 1
2. *Helarāja* under *Vākyapādiya*, 3 89.
3. *Prādiḍopāyota*
4. *Chāṇḍogya*, VII 2
5. *Mahābhāṣya*. 
as to understand her real nature. Such was the exalted nature of vak upon which the grammarian used to meditate."

27 Writing It has been said that ancient India knew no writing and that writing was introduced somewhere about 1800 B.C., by traders coming into India from Phoenicia and Mesopotamia. The Vedas were meant for recital and the bards sang the hymns. The idea involved in the name *truti* for the Vedas is recitation and 'hearing,' for it is the sound waves started by the voice regulated by intonations that create the mystic or magnetic effect. Indeed, there is a species of work called Vedaprayoga wherein the use of particular hymns for specific objects is prescribed. Such, for instance, are hymns for getting a sprout of water from barren ground or for driving out evil spirits or for promoting easy delivery.

The various *astras* ranging from Brahmāstra, the most infallible one, are mere mantras and when Visvamitra initiated Rama into *astras*, he taught *mantra-grāma*.

From the circumstance that Vedic hymns were used for recitals, it cannot be said that the Vedic age had no script. It is the tradition that Vighnesvara wrote all Mahābhārata to Vyāsa's dictation. The sages who were omniscient and who could foresee and create things supernatural would not have failed to have a means of recording their ideas and expressions for the benefit of posterity.

Rg-Veda (I 164, 94, IX 13-3) uses the word *alāra*. The word *sūtra* found on the Madhukanda of the Brāhmaṇas of White Yajus signifies a metaphorical use of the *sūtra* proper, meaning 'thread' or band. Goldstucker in his *Study of Panini* distinctly expressed that the words *sūtra* and *grantha* 'must absolutely be connected with writing.' Pāṇini explained the formation of the word *Yavanāni* and Kātyāyana's Vārtika says that the noun 'ḥṣṭ' (writing) must be supplied to signify the writing of the Yavanas.

---

2. *भ्र्रमारा ग्रहणति वा ब्रह्मामातिबर्तित्तथा |* *ददै रामायण सुविधाविनाय मम अस्त्रन्तरारामुच्यम् || I. 22. 12*
3. *नपतस्तु द्वन्द्वस्तव्विशेषाशिरवर्जी धीमत।* *उपस्तुद्वेद्यऋष्ट्रिहविवर्तितं सर्वं श्रव्यं सारं राष्ट्रुः || I 27 22-23*
4. *Panini, 26, MAXMULLER, IS1, V 20, 21, 11 26, WEBER, JL 15, 221.*
5. *IS1, V. 5 8, 17, IV. 89.*
Patanjali has a long discussion on Akaśara thus:

अक्षर न क्षर विपादश्वतिविः सरोक्षरम्।
न हीयते न क्षरत्िति बायक्षरम्॥
अक्षर तिविः पुनरमूलरेस्विद्ध सर्वन प्रस्य ध।
अवस्येन नित्त्वक्षरम्।
करण वाह सुचून ज्यता पूर्वनुन कर्ष्याक्षरभिति सत्ता कियते।
किमथूपदीश्यते?

करण्ड्वान वानीश्यां यथा वच जहा वत्ते।
तद्यथं श्रुत्यं लघां चोपदिश्यते॥

Of the Northern Indian scripts descended from the Brāhmī is Nāgarī or Ī葳vanāgari and the alphabets of that script are the formulæ of Mahesvarasūtras, making up vowels अच्छ and consonants हेनं.

A study of paleography has come to distinguish the types of early writings Kharoshti and Brāhmī. The former was current in Gāndhāra (East Afghanistan and North Punjab) and was borrowed from the Aramaic type of Semitic writing in use doing the fifth century B.C. The latter, Brāhmī is "the true national writing of India, because all late Indian alphabets are descended from it, however dissimilar they may appear at the present day."

28 History. It has been said that the Hindus possess no national history. Max Muller accepts this proposition as a postulate, builds on it and explains the so-called absence of anything like historical literature among the Hindus to their being a nation of philosophers.

1. For Philology, language and paleography generally, see the following —

Origin of Devanagari Alphabet, (IA, XXXV, 268, 270, 311), Dravidian elements in Sanskrit dictionaries (IA, I, 236), Hindu Science of Grammar (IA, XIV 89), On Kharoshti writing (IA, XXIV 265, 311, XXXIII 79, XXXIV 1, 35, 45), Progress Report of Linguistic Survey of India (IA, XII, 179), Scripts and Signs from Indian Neolithic (IA, XLVIII 77), Philological position of Sanskrit in India (IA, XVIII 124, XXIV 81, XIV 89).

"Greece and India are, indeed, the two opposite poles in the historical development of the Aryan man. To the Greek, existence is full of life and reality; to the Hindu, it is a dream, a delusion. The Greek is at home where he is born, all his energies belong to his country; he stands or falls with his party, and is ready to sacrifice even his life to the glory and independence of Hellas. The Hindu enters this world as a stranger, all his thoughts are directed to another world, he takes no part even where he is driven to act, and when he sacrifices his life, it is but to be delivered from it."

But A. Stein in his Introduction to Rājaṭarangini has thus answered it: "It has often been said of the India of the Hindus that it possessed no history. The remark is true if we apply it to history as a science and art, such as classical culture in its noblest prose-works has bequeathed it to us. But it is manifestly wrong if by history is meant either historical development or the materials for studying it. India has never known, amongst its Sāstras, the study of history such as Greece and Rome cultivated or as modern Europe understands it. Yet the materials for such study are equally at our disposal in India. They are contained not only in such original sources of information as Inscriptions, Coins and Antiquarian remains, generally, advancing research has also proved that written records of events or of traditions concerning them have by no means been wanting in ancient India.

H. H. Wilson in his admirable Introduction to his translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, while dealing with the contents of the Third Book, observes that a very large portion of the contents of the Itihasas and Purāṇas is genuine and writes:—

"The arrangement of the Vedas and other writings considered by the Hindus—being, in fact, the authorities of their religious rites and beliefs—which is described in the beginning of the Third book, is of much importance to the History of the Hindu Literature and of the Hindu religion. The sage Vyasa is here represented not as the author but the arranger or the compiler of the Vedas, the Itihasas and the Puranas. His name denotes his character meaning the 'arranger' or 'distributor', and the recurrence of many Vyasas, many individuals who remodelled the Hindu scriptures, has nothing in it, that is improbable, except the fabulous intervals by which their labours are separated. The re-arranging, the re-fashioning, of old materials is nothing more than the progress of time would be likely to render necessary. The
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last recognised compilation is that of Krishna Dvaipayana, assisted by Brahmins, who were already conversant with the subjects respectively assigned to them. They were the members of the college or school supposed by the Hindus to have flourished in a period more remote, no doubt, than the truth, but not at all unlikely to have been instituted at some time prior to the accounts of India which we owe to Greek writers and in which we see enough of the system to justify our inferring that it was then entire. That there have been other Vyasas and other schools since that date, that Brahmins unknown to fame have re-modelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and especially the Puranas, cannot reasonably be counted, after dispassionately weighing the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of their intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients. But the same internal testimony furnishes proof equally decisive, of the antecedent existence of ancient materials, and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or the authenticity of the contents of the Puranas, in the face of abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines, which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe at least three centuries before the Christian Era. But the origin and development of their doctrines, traditions and institutions were not the work of a day, and the testimony which establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity, carries it back to a much more remote antiquity, to an antiquity, that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions or beliefs of the ancient world.

Again, in dealing with the contents of the Fourth Amsa of the Vīṇa Purāṇa, the Professor remarks —

"The Fourth Book contains all that the Hindus have of their Ancient History. It is a tolerably comprehensive list of dynasties and individuals, it is a barren record of events. It can scarcely be doubted, however, that much of it is a genuine chronicle of persons, if not of occurrences. That it is discredited by palpable absurdities in regard to the longevity of the princes of the earlier dynasties, must be granted, and the particulars preserved of some of them are trivial and fabulous. Still there is an artificial simplicity and consistency in the succession of persons, and a possibility and probability in some of the transactions, which give to these traditions the semblance of authenticity, and render it likely that these are not altogether without foundation. At any rate, in the absence of all other sources of information the record, such
as it is, deserves not to be altogether set aside. It is not essential to its celebrity or its usefulness, that any exact chronological adjustment of the different reigns should be attempted. Their distribution amongst the several Yugas, undertaken by Sir William Jones, or his Pandits, finds no connivance from the original texts, rather than an identical notice of the age in which a particular monarch ruled or the general fact that the dynasties prior to Krishna precede the time of the Great War and the beginning of the Kali Age, both which events are placed five thousand years ago. This, may, or may not, be too remote, but it is sufficient, in a subject where precision is impossible, to be satisfied with the general impression, that, in the dynasties of Kings detailed in Puranas, we have a record, which, although it cannot fail to have suffered detriment from age, and may have been injured by careless or injudicious compilation, preserves an account not wholly undeserving of confidence, of the establishment and succession of regular monarchies, amongst the Hindus, from as early an era, and for as continuous a duration, as any in the credible annals of mankind.”

And lastly, in discussing the general nature of the Puranas and of their values as historical records, he says —

“After the date of the Great War, the Vishnu Purana, in common with other Puranas, which contain similar lists, specifies Kings and Dynasties with greater precision, and offers political and chronological particulars to which, on the score of probability there is nothing to object. In truth, their general accuracy has been incontrovertibly established. Inscriptions on columns of stone, on rocks, on coins, deciphered only of late years through the extraordinary ingenuity and perseverance of Mr. James Prinsep, have verified the names of races and titles of princes—the Gupta and the Andhra Rajas mentioned in the Puranas.”

29 In his Rajasthan, Col Tod says —

“Those who expect from a people like the Hindus a species of composition of precisely the same character as the historical works of Greece and Rome, commit the very egregious error of overlooking the peculiarities which distinguish the natives of India from all other races, and which strongly discriminate their intellectual productions of every kind from those of the West. Their philosophy, their poetry, their architecture are marked with traits of originality, and the same may be expected to pervade their history, which, like the arts enumerated,
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took a character from its intimate association with the religion of the people

In the absence of regular and legitimate historical records, there are, however, other native works, (they may, indeed, be said to abound) which, in the hands of a skilful and patient investigator, would afford no despicable materials for the history of India The first of these are the Puranas and genealogical legends of the princes which, obscured as they are by the mythological details, allegory, and improbable circumstances, contain, many facts that serve as beacons to direct the research of the historian—"

30 “Another species of historical records is found in the accounts given by the Brahmins of the endowments of the temples, their dilapidation and repairs, which furnish occasions for the introduction of historical and chronological details In the legends respecting places of pilgrimage and religious resort, profane events are blended with superstitious rites and ordnances, local ceremonies and customs The controversies of the Jains furnish, also, much historical information, especially with reference to Guzerat and Nehrwala during the Chaulac dynasty From a close and attentive examination of the Jam records, which embody all that those ancient sectarian knew of science, many chasms in Hindu history might be filled up”

“Every Matha or religious college of any importance preserves the succession of its heads Among the Jains, we have the Pattavalis or successions of pontiffs, for a full and lucid notice of some of which we are indebted to Dr Hoernle they purport to run back to even the death of the last Tirthamkara Vardhamana-Mahavira.”

31. “The preservation of pedigrees and successions has evidently been a national characteristic for very many centuries And we cannot doubt that considerable attention was paid to the matter in connection with the royal families and that Vamsavalis or Rajavalis, lists of the lineal successions of kings, were compiled and kept from very early times We distinctly recognise the use of such Vamsavalis,—giving the relationships and successions of kings, but no chronological details beyond the record of the total duration of each reign with occasionally a coronation-date recorded in an era,—in the copper-plate records We trace them, for instance, in the introductory passages of the grants of the Eastern Chalukya Series which, from the period A.D. 918 to 925 onwards, name the successive kings beginning with the founder of

1. See III, i 95, II, v. 181.
the line who reigned three centuries before that time, but do not put forward more than the length of the reign of each of them, and, from certain differences in the figures for some of the reigns, we recognise that there were varying recensions of those VAMSNAVALIS. We trace the use of the VAMSNAVALIS again in the similar records of the Eastern Gangas of Kalinga, which, from A.D. 1058 onwards, give the same details about the kings of that line with effect from about A.D. 990, and one of which, issued A.D. 1296, includes a coronation-date of A.D. 1141 or 1142. There has been brought to light from Nepal a long VAMSVALI, which purports to give an unbroken list of the rulers of that country, with the lengths of their reigns and an occasional landmark in the shape of the date of an accession stated in an era, back from A.D. 1768 to even so fabulous an antiquity as six or seven centuries before the commencement of the Kali age in B.C. 3102.”

32 In his Rajaatarangini, Kalhana mentions certain previous writers,—“Suvrata, whose work, he says, was made difficult by misplaced learning, Kshemendra who drew up a list of kings, of which, however, he says, no part is free from mistakes. Nilamuni, who wrote the NILAMATAPURA, Helaraja, who composed a list of kings in twelve thousand verses, and Snimhira or Padmamhira, and the author of the SRICHAVILLA. His own work, he tells us, was based on eleven collections of RAJAKATHAS or stories about kings and on the work of Nilamuni.”

“Tamrasasana, or “copper-chapters” consist sometimes of a single plate, but more usually of several plates strung together on a large signet-ring which bears generally the seal of the authority who issued the particular chapter. The stone records usually describe themselves by the name of SITALASANA, ‘Stone-chapters,’ SITALIKEHA, ‘Stone-writings,’ or PRASASTI, ‘Eulogies.’ They are found on rocks, on religious columns such as those which bear some of the edicts of

1. EL, IV 188
2. JASB, LXXV 229,
3. Kalhana made use of

(i) Pratischta, edicts—inscriptions regarding the creation of consocation of temples etc,

(ii) Banda, edicts—inscription recording grants, chiefly of grants and allowances engrossed on copper plates,

(iii) Sandhyapad, tables containing laudatory inscriptions or places,

(iv) Shastr, works on various sciences.
Priyadasa and others which were set up in front of temples as "flag-staffs" of the Gods, on battle-columns or columns of victory such as the two at Mandasor, on the walls and beams and pillars of caves and temples, on the pedestals of images, and on slabs built into the walls of temples or set up in the courtyards of temples or in conspicuous places in village-sites or fields. And they are often accompanied by sculptures which give the seal of the authority issuing the record, or mark its sectarian nature, or illustrate some scene referred to in it."

33 The Chronology of Classical Sanskrit Literature

starts with Mahabhārata war and Kaliyuga. Kaliyuga commenced on 18th February 3102 B.C., just on the day on which Sri Kṛṣṇa departed to his divine abode. The Kuru-Pândava war was fought 37 years before Kali, that is in 3139 B.C. Onwards from the commencement of Kaliyuga, Purāṇas contain accounts of various kingdoms that flourished from time to time and successive dynasties that ruled and fell during the course of about 35 centuries. To an impartial observer the tenor of these accounts warrants their accuracy and to the mind of the Hindus—the Hindus of those bygone ages, when scepticism had not called tradition superstition—life here is evanescent and life's endeavour must be the attainment of beatitude eternal. Ancient sages (gītas) perceived the divine hymns of the Vedas and passed them on for the edification of posterity. Since the advent of Kali, a prospective crop of vice and folly was predicted and to wean the erring world from such sin and misery, Vyāsa formulated Purāṇas, with the object of Vedopabhāma vedānta shāstra, that is, supplemented the exposition of Vedic teachings, and that in the garb of a language and narrative that would be easily assimilated by the masses. To such philosophical minds, the rise and fall of kings and kingdoms was not worth remembrance, save as another realistic means of illustrating the tenets of philosophy, e.g., the truth of the divine essence, Brahma, the unreality of sensual pleasures, the liberation of individual soul and the attainment of eternity in beatitude or oneness with the Spirit Divine and above all the inevitable occurrence of God's mandates shortly termed Destiny or otherwise called Kāla or Niyāti.

If this is the object of Puranic literature, it is a sacrilege to charge the author or authors of them, whoever it was, with having fabricated scriptural testimony for attributing an antiquity to Indian literature and Indian civilization, which it did not possess, for even if they had been, as many orientalists have said, made up late after the Christian era,
the authors could not have anticipated this method of study of political history of the 18th and 19th centuries A.D. The Purāṇic lists of dynasties of kings and kingdoms furnish details of dates to an extent that even in days of historical records may be surprising, for they mention even months and days in their computation. Whatever those ancient authors did or wrote, they did it with sincerity and accuracy, 'truth' being the basis of accuracy. Our educational institutions are saturated with the teachings of modern scholars on the untruth of these Purāṇic accounts, but it is still hoped that time will come when truth will triumph and display a real orientation of ancient Indian History.

34 Of the several kingdoms and dynasties of which Purāṇas have recorded political history, there is the kingdom of Magadha. For our present purposes of sifting and settling the chronology of India up to the Christian era the history of Magadha is particularly relevant, for it is at Magadha, 'Chandragupta' and 'Asoka,' ruled and it is on these names that the modern computation of dates has been based for everything relating to India's literary history and it is those two names that make the heroes of the theory of Anchor Sheet of Indian Chronology.

35 The Kingdom of Magadha was founded by Bṛhadraṭha, son of Upamucara Vasu, the 6th in descent from Kuru, of the Candra Vamśa. That happened 161 years before Mahābhārata war. Tenth in descent from Bṛhadraṭha was, Jarāsandha Jarāsandha perished at the hand of Kamsa and in his place Sahadeva was installed on the throne. Sahadeva was an ally of Pāṇḍavas and was killed in the war, that is in 3139 B.C. His son Marjān or Somādi or Somavīr) was his successor and the first king of Magadha after the war. From him 22 kings of this Bṛhadraṭha dynasty ruled over Magadha for 1000 years, or roughly stated, for 1000 years.

For instance, Maṇḍya Purāṇa says—

व्रतिवधितिः कैरे सतितार बृहद्रता ।
पूर्व राजसंहृत हु तैशा राज्य मित्रपति || 159, 30

Ripunjaya was the last king of this dynasty. He was assassinated.

1 F. E. Pargiter has given an admirable summary of Early Indian Traditional History as recorded in Purānas in IRAS (1914) 267 et seq.
2 See K. P. Jayaswal, Brhadraṭha Chronology, JIOBS, 171, 1, Sitanath Pradhan, Chronology of Ancient India, Calcutta, Hemachandra Raychaudhuri, Political History of India from the accession of Parshvanath to the extinction of the Gupta dynasty, Calcutta.
by Pulaka and Pulaka succeeded to the throne. His son was Pradyota or Balaka. Thus came the Pradyota or Balaka Dynasty in 2133 B.C.

Thus Mañjya Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

37 Sisunāga got in by conquest or usurpation and founded Sisunaga Dynasty in 1995 B.C. There were 10 kings of this dynasty and they ruled for 360 or 362 years i.e. 1635 B.C. Thus Vāyu Purāṇa says —

Sisunaga

The periods vary according to the versions of the Purāṇas or their readings. But Mañjya Purāṇa makes the period 152 years.

1 Pradyota (23), Bālaka (24 or 28), Viṣṇukanyapa (50 or 53), Janaka or Suryaka or Rājaka (31 or 31), Nandīvarṇāhana (20 or 20)

The periods vary according to the versions of the Purāṇas or their readings. But Mañjya Purāṇa makes the period 152 years.

2 Sisunāga (40), Kākayama (36), Kṣemavarma (26, 20 or 20), Kṣitranjas or Kṣemapit (40 24 or 20), Viṣṇuśarma or Bimbisāra or Vindhyasāra (28 or 28), Ajāṭhaśatr (27 or 25, or 22 or 52), Darsāka or Darbhaka (24), Udāyana or Udāyasva, or Ajaya or Udāyabhādra (38), Nandīvarṇāhana (42 or 40), Mahānandin (43 or 43). It was Udāyin that built the city of Kusuma on the Ganges.

Udāyin Mahānandin

It was Udāyin that built the city of Kusuma on the Ganges.

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —

Pradyota Balaka

When the Bāhradratas, the Vihotras and the Avantras have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunjaya) will install his son Bālaka as King Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshatrynysas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36 Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunjaya married to his son Pradyota and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty² and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says —
Here ended the ŚISUNAGA DYNASTY in 1635 B.C.

38 Mahāpadma known as Nanda was the illegitimate son of Mahānandin, the last king of that dynasty, and came to the throne. He founded the NANDA dynasty in 1635 B.C. He ruled for 88 years and his sons Sumālīya and seven others ruled for 12 years until 1635 B.C. This dynasty lasted for 10 years.*

**Vig9u Purāṇa says**

Mahānandin sat ŚITANAGA dynasty did not end in 1635 B.C.  
He was the illegitimate son of Mahānandin, the last king of that dynasty.

Vasīṣṭha Nanda was his son and came to the throne in 1635 B.C.

He ruled for 88 years and his sons Sumālīya and seven others ruled for 12 years until 1635 B.C.

This dynasty lasted for 10 years.

**Bhāgavata Purāṇa says**

Mahānandin sat ŚITANAGA dynasty did not end in 1635 B.C.

Vasīṣṭha Nanda was his son and came to the throne in 1635 B.C.

He ruled for 88 years and his sons Sumālīya and seven others ruled for 12 years until 1635 B.C.

This dynasty lasted for 10 years.

---

1 See K. P. Jayasval, ŚISUNAGA and MAURYA Chronology, JBOBS, I. i.
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तत्र प्रस्तुति राजानो महिम्यं शुद्धयोनयं।
एकराट् सह महाप्रथो एकमेवो महिम्यति॥ ३२७॥
अद्भुतीति तु सम्बन्धी पृथिवी पालियं शति।
सर्वज्ञानमेव शुद्धान्त्रेक्ष वै बलात्॥ ३२८॥
सहुल तस्तहि यथा समा द्राक्ष ते चुपा।
महाप्रथो पर्यंते महिम्यति चुपा क्षमात्॥ ३२९॥
उद्दरियति तत् सर्वानु कौटिल्ये वै दिजङ्गम।
शुक्लासि हर्ष वर्षशृंग नन्देस्यः स महिम्यति॥ ३३०॥
चन्द्रगृह नृप राजे कौटिल्य स्खापप्रियति।
चुदंविशत् समा राजा चन्द्रशृंग महिम्यति॥ ३३१॥

—Chapter XCIX.

Maṭṣya Purāṇa Says —

महान्तिसक्तार्कपि षुद्याय क्रिकांशु क्रियां॥ १८॥
जनंन्तरे महाप्रथो सर्वज्ञानान्तको नुप।
तत्र प्रस्तुति राजानो महिम्यं शुद्धयोनयं॥ १९॥
एकराट् सह महाप्रथो एकमेवो महिम्यति।
अद्भुतीति तु सम्बन्धी पृथिवी पालियं शति॥ २०॥
सर्वज्ञानमेव शुद्धान्त्रेक्ष चेतित:।
सुभाष्यानिदित्वा यथै समा द्राक्ष ते चुपा।॥ २१॥
महाप्रथो पर्यंते महिम्यति चुपा क्षमात।
उद्दरियति कौटिल्य समेद्राक्षमिन्तु ताव॥ २२॥
कौटिल्यन्द्रगृह स ततो राजेशुस्मृयति।
शुक्लासि महारीं वर्षशृंग ततो मौर्यन् गभियति॥ २३॥

—Chapter CCLXX.

Brahmānda Purāṇa gives the following account —

महान्तिसक्तार्कपि षुद्यायं काठिसवं॥ १॥
उत्पत्त्वते महाप्रथो सर्वकामत्रं नृप॥ १२॥
तत्र: प्रस्तुति राजानो महिम्यं शुद्धयोनयं।
एकराट् सह महाप्रथो एकमेवो महिम्यति॥ १४॥
अद्भुतीति तु सम्बन्धी पृथिवी पालियं शति।
सर्वज्ञान समुद्रस्य महान्त्रेक्ष वै बलात॥ १४॥
The following is the description of the Nanda Dynasty as given in the Kalyuga Rājaviṃśṭānta:

- Mahāpadma, Embodiment of the Dynasty:
- The Dynasty was established by Mahāpadma.
- Numerous extracts quoted in full from the various important Purāṇas, which are practically identical with one another, that the Founder of this Dynasty was Mahāpadma well.
known otherwise as Dhana Nanda, that he was the son of Mahānandana, the last of the Śaisunāga Dynasty, that he was born to that king from a Śūdra wife, that he was most avaricious and powerful, that he extirpated the Kshatriya rulers of his time like a second Parāsurāma the destroyer of the Kshatriyas in the olden times, that he subjugated the different lines of Kings of the Solar and Lunar dynasties who began to rule in the various parts of Northern India from the time of the Mahābhārata War commencing from the Coronation of Yudhishthira in the year 3139 B.C., that he became a paramount King and Emperor of the whole of India between the Himalaya and the Vindhya mountains by putting an end to the ancient families of Kings, such as Aikshvākus, Pāṇḍalas, Kauravyas, Hanhayas, Kalakas, Ekalīgas, Śūrasenas, Maithilas etc., who ceased to rule as separate dynasties ever since that time, that he ruled the kingdom under one umbrella for a period of 88 years, that his 8 sons jointly ruled the kingdom for a short period of 12 years, that these Nine Nandas, including the father and his eight sons ruled Magadha altogether for a total period of 100 years from 1635 to 1535 B.C., that these Nandas were extirpated by the Brāhmaṇa Chāṇakya, well known as Kautilya, on account of his crooked and Machiavelian policy, and that he replaced his protege Chandragupta, an illegitimate son of Mahāpadma Nanda by his Śūdra wife Mrūrā on the throne of his father.”

But Vincent A. Smith chooses to assign to these nine Nandas a total period of only 45 years for their reigns

40 Candragupta came to the throne as the son of Mrūrā; so he was a Maurya and the dynasty which he started was Maurya dynasty. Candragupta’s son was Bindusāra and Bindusāra’s son was Asoka or Asokavarāṇa. An old grantha manuscript of Maṇya Purāṇa gives this account
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This version of the Matsya Purāṇa tolerably agrees with that given in the Kāliyuga Rājaviṃśa

Thus Candragupta reigned from 1535 to 1501 B.C. for 34 years, Bindusāra from 1501 to 1473 for 28 years and Asoka from 1473 to 1437 B.C. for 36 years. And in all there were twelve Kings of Maurya dynasty, the last of whom was Bhadrārāja.

1 Candragupta, Bindusāra or Bhadrasāra or Nandāsāra or Vairisāra (26 or 28), Asoka or Açokavardhana (36 or 37), Suyasas or SUPARSHA or Kumāra or Kula (g), Dasāratha or Bandhupālita (8 or 10), (8) Indrapallita (7 or 10), Harga or Hargavardhana (4), (8) Sangā or Sammati or Samrāti (9), Śaktula (13), Somasarman or Devavarman or Devavarman or Dāsavarman (7), Śatadhanvan or Śatadhara (3 or 9), Bhadratha or Bhadaśa (37 or 70 or 71)
Regarding this dynasty the readings and versions of the Purāṇas are hopelessly confused and incorrect but the passages quoted, of which the authenticity is doubtless, show that the Maurya Dynasty lasted for 316 years from 1535 to 1219 B.C.

Pusyamitra was the commander-in-chief of Bhadratha. He removed his master and ascended the throne. Thus he started the Sunga Dynasty. According to Matsya Purāṇa, there were ten kings of this dynasty who ruled in all for 30 years from 1219 B.C. to 919 B.C. Kaliyuga Rājagrhaṇa says:

पुष्यमित्र सनानीप्रम्प्रभृतिरायः
अतिव रुद्र राजा न सहुज्जल भ्रमणः
स वै प्रकाशायाती सधिरिष्टवाचयः
पालविष्णविसंये चासना च प्राणिनयेव
तत्र पुरुषोत्तमदन्त योगी पवाणात समा-
तत्स्या तस्यमक्षर्व वल्लारसेनहजः
ब्रह्मविश्वातु समा राज्य कारविष्णवीति वै कल्ली
भविष्या चापि संयुच्छतस्या दश सप्त च
tतत्स्या सदर्काश्चापि विशंसर्वीणि मोह्वयति
पुष्यदक्षस्यविश्वाविवি঵ি঵িব
Of these kings, it is noteworthy that Puṣyamitras is described by Kaliḍāśa in Mālavikāgnimitra as the conqueror of Āryāvaṭa and Agnimitra is mentioned by Paṭanjalī as having performed Aśvamedha sacrifice.

“Devahūti, the last king of the Sunga dynasty, having been addicted to a life of pleasure and sexual enjoyment from his boyhood, entrusted the kingdom to the care of his Brahman minister Vasudeva, and he himself retired to Vīdīsa, noted in those days for its dancing girls, where he began to lead a most licentious and immoral life with his voluptuary companions, corrupting the fair maidens of the city to satisfy his lust and becoming an object of hatred to his own subjects. On hearing the extraordinary beauty of the daughter of his Brahman minister Vasudeva, who has been living with her husband, he sent for them to come to Vīdīsa and live by his side, and on one day, after

---

1 The kings are — Puṣyamitras or Puṣyamitra (86 or 50), Agnimitra (50 or 78), Vasumitra (86), Suṣṛṣṭha (17 or 7), Bhādraka or Anjaka or Anāthaka or Udanka (10 or 50 or 2), Pulinḍaka or Pulinḍa (3 or 88), Ghosavasu or Ghaṣa (8), Vajramitra (29, 14 or 7), Bhāgaśa (32), Devahūti or Devahūti or Kṣemabhumi (10).
secretly disposing of her husband, the king seduced her in the disguise of her husband, and the poor girl who was most true and devoted to her husband, coming to know of the treachery practised by the king, at once gave up her life. On hearing the sad news of the fate of his fair daughter and of her innocent husband, Vasudeva continued to send to the king a dancing woman, fully furnished with poison, dressed as one of the chief queens and had him killed by her hand. People hailed the death of their licentious king with joy, and made Vasudeva his upright minister, to take charge of the kingdom and rule the country henceforth with Pataliputra as its capital.”

42. Vasudeva of the race of Kanva Mahaṛaḥ thus came to the throne of Magadha and started the KANVA DYNASTY. There were four kings in all and they ruled for 85 years from 919 to 834 B.C.

Thus Kaliyuga Rajayāña says

43. The last two kings of Kapva dynasty were puppets in the hands of the commander-in-chief, Simhaka Svāṭakarna. He slew the last king Suśarmā and ascended the throne of Magadha. He traced his lineage to King Śātavahana of Praṭṭsthāna and his dynasty was there-

---

1 Vasudeva (39 or 5), Bhumimitra or Bhumiṭra (14, 24 or 34), Nārāyana (12), Suśarma (10 or 4)
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fore called ANDHRAVAMSA There were 32 kings of this dynasty who ruled for 506 years from 834 to 328 B.C. The last of the kings was Puloman III. The Kaliyuga Rajavarttānta gives the account.

44 In Sri Gupta dynasty there were seven kings and they ruled for 245 years from 328 to 83 B.C.

The Kaliyuga Rajavarttānta given this account:

1. Simhaka Śri Batakanū or Śomuka (93), Kṛṣṇa (13), Śrimalla (10, 13 or 56), Purūpotsanga (18), Śrībātārakā (68 or 40), Skandhaśambhīn (18), Lamboḍara (18), Apiśaka or Apiśaka or Viśālā (19), Meghasvāti or Sanghasvāti or Sauṅkṣema (18), Śatāsvāti or Śvātī (19), Skandhaśātākṣara or Skandhaśātākārī (7), Mṛgendra (3), Kumāla (8), Sauyama or Puṣpadana (13), Śāṭa or Śvāṭkarpā (1), Puloma or Pulomāvī (86 or 24); Megha or Meghasvāti (88), Arīśa (81), Hāla (6), Mandala or Bhāvaka or Pulaka or Tulaka (6), Purinḍasena or Purīkasena or Pulindasena or Pravila (1); Cakora (6 months), Mahendra (3 months or 8 years), Śiva or Śivaśvāti (28), Gaṇmārpatī (51 or 25), Pulomā II (92 or 28), Śivaśrī (7), Śivākanda (7), Yagnasrī (19), Viṣayaśrī (6), Candrasrī (8), Pulomā II (7) See para 298 post.

2. Candra-guptī I or Viṣayaśrītya (7), Samudragupta or Akoṭālītya (51), Candra-gupta II, Viṣayanādita (83 or 86), Kumāragupta (42), Skanda-gupta (25), Narasimha-gupta (40), Kumāragupta II (44).
पुजोमशातकर्णिक गौतमपुजनाचार तत्त्वः ||
अज्ञाताय समा मेघातकर्णि भद्रिविप्र ||
अनिद्धातकर्णिक पुन्नविनाशिततसराय ||
यमेवाधुः नेन्द्रसुधातिं आसविकःमनिः ||
तसः हालो महामायः कविलपापमेऽः ||
शासित्वति माहां पुन्न वर्षोऽऽ फुलग्रावः ||
तस्य मण्डलको राजा महिष्ठा पुन्ब्बः समा ||
पुरीन्दनसनो महिष्ठा समा: सोःन्येकस्विन्याः ||
हृद्यः शातकर्णिकस्तु वस्मेक भविष्यति ||
चकोरसारथकर्णिक श्रणसांताः सोःन्येत महामी ||
वासिष्ठीपुजंनानुः यः प्रस्तयति श्रुति वाष्यति ||
महेन्द्रातकर्णिकस्तु वीरुः मासानाऽसोःन्येत ||
अध्यविषयति वर्षोऽऽ शक्सनोनो महिष्ठाति ||
यमाहुस्यश्रीपुजुरनाना: यः प्रस्तयति महाजनः ||
आशिस्त्रकर्णिकम्भिता पुन्नविनाशितवतसराय ||
गौतमपुजनानं तु सह येव क्षार्यति शामिष्यति ||
पुजैमशातकर्णि द्राक्षिन्द्राधिष्ठिता समा: ||
वासिष्ठीपुजंनानुः तु शा नेषु य उष्णः ||
शिवाक्षिरशातकर्णिक तत्त्वः शाता महामाति: ||
महिष्ठति समा राजा सतैत्र हि कलाम गुणे ||
शिवस्कन्दः शातकर्णिपतिः सावधः ततः समा: ||
यम्भोशातकर्णिक गौतमपुजनानसः ||
एकोनविष्ठति राजा महिष्ठति समा: सुविः ||
विजयशातकर्णि: श्रेष्ठ सातिता समा: ||
चन्द्रशातकर्णिकस्तु चरणि वर्षोऽऽ मोक्षः ||
वासिष्ठीपुजंनाना: तु क्षार्यते यम्भो महिष्ठति ||
पुजोमाशि तथा चारण: समा: सत महिष्ठति ||
चन्द्रकोतिकं सुनिष्ठ चन्द्रकायितं पालः ||
Thus, these 32 kings of the Āṇḍhra Dynasty reigned for a total period of 506 years, although in summing up their total period of reigns, it states in round figures that they ruled for full 500 years (instead of 506 years); and their kingdom passed into the hands of Candragupta, son of Ghaṭotkaca Gupta and grandson of Śri Gupta, who appears to have come from Śri Parvata or Nepal and originally entered the service of Vījayaśri Sāṭakarpi as one of his generals and with whose help he managed to maintain his tottering kingdom.
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45 Before proceeding to consider the merits of Purânic history as reviewed by orientalists a brief statement of the cosmogonic and political calculations of time adopted in India may be useful.

"According to the Purânas, 360 lunar Samvatsaras or human years constitute one divine year, Kṛtā, Tretā, Dvāpara and Kali—a cycle of these four Yugas and their Sandhyās and Sandhyāmsas, consisting of 12000 divine years or 4,320,000 human years, constitutes one Mahāyuga. 1000 Mahāyugas constitute one Day of Brahmā or one Kalpa. An equal period of time (viz., 1000 × 4,320,000 = 4,320,000,000 human years) is also reckoned as one Night of Brahmā. 30 such days and nights make a month of Brahmā, and 12 such months his year, and 100 such years make the full period of Brahmā's life. The two halves of Brahmā's age are respectively called Pūrva-Parārdha and Uttra-Parārdha. The 1st or the Prathama-Parārdha has expired, the second or the Dvitiya-Parārdha has commenced with our present or Varāha-Kalpa. At the beginning of the first Parārdha was Brähma-Kalpa, when Brahmā or the present Kósma was born. At the end of the first Parārdha was Pādma-Kalpa, when the Loka-Padma (the Lotus of Lokas) appeared at the navel of Han. The first Kalpa of the Dvitiya-Parārdha which is the present Kalpa is called Varāha Kalpa, when Han incarnated as Varaha or the Wonderful Boar. We are now in the 1st day of the fifty-first year of Brahmadeva, called Svēta, and each of the days of the month of Brahmā bore a different name, like (1) Śvēta, (2) Nilalohita, (3) Vāmadeva, (4) Rathantara, (5) Raurava, and so on. So the present Kalpa called the "Śvēta-Varāha-Kalpa," forms the 18001st Kalpa of the Brahmā, a day and night of Brahma being calculated here as one Kalpa.

14 Manus reign during the day of Brahmā, each Manus reigning for 71½ Mahāyugas. Each Manvantara, therefore, consists of 857, 142½ divine years or 337, 142, 657½ human or lunar years. With every day and night the age of Brahmā declines. The present Manvantara is the seventh Manvantara of Varāha-Kalpa, the first six Manvantaras having already elapsed. The first six Manvantaras are known after the name of the respective Manus, as (1) Śvayambhuva, (2) Svāru-chisha, (3) Auttama, (4) Tāmasa, (5) Raivata and (6) Chēkshusha, and the present or the seventh Manvantara is called Vaivasvata Manvantara. The present Kali-Yuga is the fourth or the last quarter of the 28th Mahāyuga of this Vaivasvata Manvantara, and 5018 years of this Kali Yuga have expired by the 13th day of April 1917."
Kali-Yuga, begins from the year 3102 B.C., the year 1, expired or completed, being 3101 B.C. The four Yugas, or Ages, which comprise one Mahāyuga, have the following periods —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yuga</th>
<th>Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣa-Yuga</td>
<td>1,728,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tretā-Yuga</td>
<td>1,296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwāpara-Yuga</td>
<td>864,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali-Yuga</td>
<td>432,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Mahā-Yuga .. 4,320,000

The Kali Age is said to embrace Six Śakas. Thus it is said in Pancānga-Sarani —

«...»

In the Kali-age there are six founders of eras, First there was Yudhishthira in Indraprastha, whose era lasted for 3044 years. The second was Vikrama at Ujayan, whose era had run for 135 years. The third was Salivahan at Pratisthana. Here the era of Yudhishthira is made the same as that of the Kālyuga, which also dates from 3044 years before the era of Vikrama. The Yudhishtira era also is obtained by adding 3179 to the Saka year, (i.e., the Saka begins with the 3180th year of the Yudhishthira era) and "by adding 3044 to the Vikrama Samvat which, in its turn, is got by adding 135 to the Saka date."

46 Vikrama or Samvat Era began in 56 B.C. "A Hindu legend tells us that a celebrated king Vikrama or Vikramaditya of Ujain, in Malwa, began to reign in that year, and founded the era, which, in that view, runs form the commencement of his reign. Another version of it asserts that he died in that year, and that the reckoning runs from his..."
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death. It is common to both the Digambaras and the Svetambaras, and the GATHAS or Prakrit verses, upon which the earlier portions of some of the Jain PATTAVALIS or successions of the pontiffs are based, pretend to put forward such details about Vikramaditya as that “for eight years he played as a child for “sixteen he roamed over the country, for fifty-six”—(fifteen)—“he exercised rule, being given over to false doctrine, for fifty years he was devoted to the religion of the Jina and then obtained heaven.” An addition to the legend connects Vikramaditya with some foreign invaders of India who were called Sakas, and this, again, appears in two versions, one version represents him as regaining the kingdom of Ujjain after the Saka kings and dispossessed his father and had reigned there for four years prior to B.C. 57, and the other, as reported by Alberuni in the eleventh century A.D.,—brings the Sakas on the scene a hundred and thirty-five years later, and asserts that Vikramaditya marched against the Saka king, and put him to flight and killed him “in the region of Karur, between Multan and the castle of Loni,” and that in celebration of this, there was established the Saka era commencing A.D. 78. And another addition asserts that at the court of Vikramaditya there flourished “the Nine Gems,” namely, the poet Kalidasa, the astronomer Varahamihira, the lexicographer Amarasimha, and the various authors Dhanvantari, Ghatakarpara, Kshapanaka, Sanku, Vararuchi and Vetalabhatta.”

47. Salivahana-Saka, is “the Saka or era of Sālivāhana,” the Saka or era of the glorious and victorious king Sālivāhana, the year of the Saka or era established by Sālivāhana. And the popular belief, in that the Saka era was founded by a king Sālivāhana reigning in A.D. 78, at Pratiṣṭhānā, which is the present Pāṭhān on the Gūḍāvari, in the Nizam’s territory.”

1. J. F. Fleet, IA, XXXI, 1. JRAS, (1916), 809.

"See Professor Kalhorm’s examination of this question in the Int Anti vol. 20 (1901), p. 404 ff. His earliest instance of the word vikrama being used in connection with the era, in a not quite clear sense, namely, in the expression vikramākhya kāla, "the time called vikrama," is one of the year 598, in A.D. 542, from an inscription at Dholpur (p. 406 No. 10). His earliest instance of the era being plainly attributed to a king Vikrama was a literary one of the year 1050, in A.D. 998 (Ibid. No 43). An earlier instance is known now from the Eklingji inscription, which is dated in the year 1026 of king Vikramaditya in A.D. 971, JRAS, vol. 22, p. 166."


"The exact expression Sālivāhana Saka is mostly confined to dates recorded in prose. In dates in verse, other ways of introducing the name Sālivāhana were follow-
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Sakakāla, Sākāda or Saka era commenced thus in 78 A.D. It is either “the Era of the Saka king Kanishka, who conquered Kashmir and Western India in the 1st century after Christ” or the era of the defeat of the Sakas by a Hindu king.

“The astronomer, Varahamihira who lived in the sixth century A.D. cited the Saka Era as the Saka Bhupa Kala or Sakendra Kala, i.e., the Era of the Saka king. His commentator explains this as the Era when the barbarians called Sakas “were discomfited by Vikramaditya. Again, the astronomer Brahmagupta, who flourished in the seventh century A.D., cites the Era as Saka Nripante, i.e., after the Saka king. His commentator explains this as after the reign of Vikramaditya, who slew a people of Barbariins called Sakas.”

[“Manu says (Ch X, 144-145) that the Sakas, Yavanas, Kambhojas, Paradas and Pahlavas were originally Kshatriyas, but became outcastes by neglecting their Vedic duties, etc. The Mahabharata (Adiparvan, Ch, 85) speaks of these tribes as descendants of Kshatriyas and as having taken part in the Great War between the Pandavas and Kauravas. The Ramayana of Valmiki (Balakanda, Sarga 55) mentions them among the tribes who fought during the war of Visvamitra with Vasishtha. The Gautama Dharma Sutra (Ch IV, 21) speaks of the Sakas, Yavanas, etc., as a Pratiloma caste of the Aryas. It is stated in the Padma Purana (Svarga-khanda, Ch 15) that the Sakas, etc., were driven out by king Sagara, a descendant of Ikshvaku, to the countries beyond the borders of India, after getting their heads, etc., shaved under the advice of Vasishtha, although they were Kshatriyas. The Vishnu Purana (Amsa II, Ch, 3) describes the Yavanas as living in the west, the Sakas in the north-west, the Kiratas in the east, and the four Indian castes in the middle of India during the time of the Great War. The Matrya Purana also refers to Sakas, Yavanas, etc., as degraded.

ed, and the shorter form Sātvāha was sometimes used, to suit the metro, see e.g., Professor Kielhorn’s List of the Inscriptions of Southern India in Ep. Ind vol. 7, appendix, Nos 466, 475, 503, 519, 1004, 1005. This chipped form is also found occasionally in prose see, e.g., ibid., No 597. Compare Satavāha as the shorter form of Satavāhana.”

1 Colbroke’s Algebra, etc., from the Sanscrit, p xlvi, London. See on this era, Duth’s Cat. 1 21, Fleet, Traditional Date of Kanishka, JRAS, (1906), 283, J H Marshall, Date of Kanishka, JRAS (1905), 192.
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Aryan tribes living on the frontiers of Bharata Varsha Panini refers in his Ashtadhyayi (II 2-84) to Sakas and Yavanas and requires to be placed before , and Panini even according to Western Orientalists lived long before the time of Alexander the Great. The Sakas, therefore, could under no circumstances, be identified with any foreign tribes that invaded India after Alexander's time."

48 **Harsa Era** of Nepal began in 457 B.C.,* and that is the date that is referred to in Nepālavamsāvah.*

**Cedi or Kalacuri Era** began in 249 A.D

**Hamsa Samvat or Era of Harsavardhana** began in 606 A.D *

**Valabhi Era** began in 319 A.D *

49 **Bṛhaspaticakra or Jovian cycle of sixty years** "The Hindu Cycle of 60 years, technically known as the Bṛhaspati Chakra or Cycle of Jupiter," begins with the year Prabhava and ends with the year Kṣaya (60)

"In Northern India a year of the Jovian cycle is omitted once on an average of 35 5/22 years, or 22 in 1875 years, hence it has advanced on the southern system by 11 in about 950 years. The year of the cycle in Northern India is found by multiplying the Saka year by 22 adding 4291 and dividing the sum by 1875, then adding the Saka date to the integral of the quotient, and dividing by 60, the remainder is the year of the cycle. Thus, for Saka 1772 the first operation gives 23 and a remainder of 260, then 1772+23 divided by 60 gives as a remainder the 55th year of the cycle or Dürmati current. If the Kaliyuga year is used, the usual rule is to multiply it by 1.0117, and to the integers of the product add 26 and divide the sum by 60 as before"

50. **Kollam** or Malabar Era began in 25th August 825 A.D on the sun's entry into Kanyā according to the Chronogram,

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{आ· चा यः बग मे चा} \\
0 & 6 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 1
\end{array} \]

* See Alberuni's India (Sachau's Transl II, xlix 7) and Bhagwanlal Indrajī's Nepāla-Vamsāvali in IA, XIII. 411-35
* IA, XLII, 207; XVII, 224, XVIII, 265.
* IA, XV. 105, 188.
* From Senapati Bhattarka. See Mys. Arch. Rep (1918), and IA, I, 45, IV, 104, 174, V, 904, 206, XV. 187 post. For Gupta-Valabhi Era, see IA, XIV. 9.
INTRODUCTION

By that day 1434160 days of Kali had expired. This is current in north Malayalam, but in Travancore and Cochin, the year begins on sun’s entry into Simha.

"The chief difference between the northern and southern systems is, that if the sun enters a sign of the zodiac during the day time, that day is reckoned in the northern calendar as the first day of the month corresponding to that sign, whereas in the south the sun must have entered the sign within the first 3 of the 5 parts into which the day is divided, otherwise the day next is reckoned the first of the month."

"The Andu year obtains in the Malayalam Country and in the Tinnevelly District. In the former, they are known as Kollam Andu, and in the latter merely as Andu. The Andu commences in the South Malayalam Country (Travancore and Cochin) and in the Tinnevelly District with Chingan (Avani), i.e., on the first day of the fifth month of the Solar Calendar (Tamil), and in the North-Malayalam country (British Malabar) with Kanni, i.e., on the first day of the sixth month of the same Calendar. The Andu year is thus not synchronous with the Cyclic, Kali or Saka year. Andu years would appear to have been originally reckoned in Cycles of 1,000 years each, and the second of them is stated to have expired in 825 A.D. However this may be, the current Cycle, which was begun in 825 A.D., has now been carried beyond the limit of 1,000 years, and it may be that this was done in ignorance of the above convention, if any such had existed."

51 Chronograms. A number of devices have been adopted in Hindu Works for expressing the number of years, an expression by chronograms. They were either expressed by significant words, words which denote their own number as the equivalent or by the use of letters on an algebraical formula.

"The first complete list is that given by Alberuni (A.D. 1031), the following is from his list, as translated by Woepke supplemented from Brown’s ‘Cyclic Tables’ and Inscriptions. As no limits can be placed to a fanciful practice like this, I cannot give this list as complete list.

Cipher - Sunya, kha, gagana, vyat, akasa, ambara, abhra, ananta; vyoma.

1 ... Adi, sans, indu, kshiti, urvara, dhara, putamaha; chandra, sitamsu, rupa, rasm, prithivi, bhu, tanu, soma, nayaka; vasudha; sasanka, kshma, dharani.
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2 Yama, Asvin, ravichandranu, lochana, akshi, Das yamala, paksha, netra, bahu, karna, kutumba, kara, drishti

3 Trikala, trijagat, tr, triguna, loka, trigata, paval vaisvanara, dhana, tapan, hutatana, jvalana, agni, vahni, tri chana, trinetra, Rama, sahodara, sikhin, guna

4 - Veda, samudra, sagara, abdhi, dadhi, dis, jalasay krita, jalanidhi, yuga, bandhu, udadhhi

5 Sara, artha, indriya, sayaka, bana, bhuta, ishu, Padava, tata, ratna, prana, suta, putra, viskha, kalamba, margana.

6 Rasa, anga, ritu, masardha, raga, ari, darsana, tark mata, sastra.

7 • Aga, naga, parvata, mahidhara, adri, muni, rishi, as svara, chhandas, asva, dhatu, kalatra, saila.

8 Vasu, abhi; gaja, dantin, mangala; naga, bhuti, ibha sarpa.

9 • Go; nanda, randhra, chhundra, pavana; antara, graha anka; nidhi, dvara.

10 • • Dis, asa, kondu, ravanasura; avatar, karma

11 .. ..Rudra, svara, Mahadeva; akshauhini, labha,

12 ... ... Surya, arka, aditya, bhanu, masa; vyaya.

13 ....... Visva, Manmatha, Kamadeva.

14 .. . . Manu, Loka, Indra

15 .. ..Tithi, pakshi; ahan.

16 .. ....... Ashti, nripa, bhupa, kala

17 .. .... Atyashahi

18 .. .. Dhriti

19 .. .. Atidhruti.

20 .. .. Nakha, kriti.

21 .. .. .. Utkriti, avarga.

22 .. .. Jati,

24 .. Jina

25 .. Tattva

Alberuni (1031 A.D.) says that numbers beyond twenty-five were noted in this way The following, however, occur but in late docu ments only

27 .. .... Nakshatra.
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32 ... Danta, Rada
33 . Deva
40 . Tana,

The list might be made much more extensive, as it is obvious that any synonyms of any word that can be used to signify a number can be used, e.g., any word signifying 'moon' besides those mentioned as equivalent to 1, may be used for the same purpose, and so with the others. The ordinary numbered words are commonly mixed with the words given above

In making numbers of this system units are mentioned first and then the higher orders, e.g., Rishnagakhendusamvatsara is year 1087 gaganastraakhendugante samvatsara is equal to 1063, dahanadrkhandugantasisamvastara is equal to 1073. It appears, however, that occasionally in recent inscriptions the words are put in the same order as the figures are written.

The algebraical formulae are —

i. कादिनव | क (1) | ल (2) and so on to ह (9)

ii. गदिनव | र (1) | र (2) and so on to ह (9)

iii. पादिनव | प (1) | ह (2) and so on to म (5)

iv. जापड़ै | य (1) | र (2) and so on to ह (8)

The order of the letters is from right to left, in conjunct letters, the last pronounced consonant only counts value and vowels have no value. Thus विष्णु means 54 an भगवान means 1059.

52. Santracottus It was Sir William Jones, the Founder and President of the Society instituted in Bengal for inquiry into the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences and Literature of Asia, who died on 27th April 1794, that suggested for the first time an identification to the notice of scholars. In his 'Tenth Anniversary Discourse' delivered by him on 28th February 1793 on "Asiatic History, Civil and Natural," referred to the so-called discovery by him of the identity of Candragupta, the Founder of the Maurya Dynasty of the Kings Magadha, with Sandracottus of the Greek writers of Alexander's adventures, thus

"The Jurisprudence of the Hindus and Arabs being the field, which I have chosen for my peculiar toil, you cannot expect, that I should greatly enlarge your collection of historical knowledge, but I

1. See I4, II. 861
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may be able to offer you some occasional tribute, and I cannot help mentioning a discovery which accident threw in my way, though my proofs must be reserved for an essay, which I have destined for the fourth volume of your Transactions. To fix the situation of that Pāthibothra, (for there may have been several of the name) which was visited and described by Megasthenes, had always appeared a very difficult problem, for, though it could not have been Prayūga where no ancient metropolis ever stood, nor Cānyacūba which has no epithet at all resembling the word used by the Greeks, nor Gaur, otherwise called Lashmanavati, which all know to be a town comparatively modern, yet we could not confidently decide that it was Pātaliputra, though names and most circumstances nearly correspond, because that renowned capital extended from the confluence of the Sone and the Ganges to the site of Patna, while Pāthibothra stood at the junction of the Ganges and Erranaboas, which the accurate M D'Anville had pronounced to be “Yamunā”, but this only difficulty was removed when I found in a Classical Sanskrit book near two thousand years old, that Hiranyabāhu or golden-armed, which the Greeks changed to Erranaboas, or the river with a lovely murmur, was in fact another name for the Sone itself, though Megasthenes from ignorance or inattention, has named them separately. This discovery led to another of greater moment, for Chandragupta, who, from a military adventurer, became like Sandracottus, the sovereign of Upper Hindustan, actually fixed the seat of his empire at Pātaliputra, where he received ambassadors from foreign princes, and was no other than that very Sandracottus who concluded a treaty with Seleucus Nicator, so that we have solved another problem to which we before alluded, and may in round numbers consider the twelve and three hundredth years before Christ as two certain epochs between Rāma who conquered Śālān a few centuries after the flood, and Vicramāditya who died at Ujjayini fifty-seven years before the beginning of our era.”

53 The passage regarding Chandragupta’s date is found in Justinims, Epitoma Pompet Trogo, xv 4 and Mr. McCrindle translated it as follows:

“[Seleucus] carried on many wars in the East after the division of the Macedonian kingdom between himself and the other successor of Alexander, first seizing Babylonia, and then reducing the Bactrians, his power being increased by the first success. Thereafter he passed into

India, which had, since Alexander's death, killed his prefects, thinking that the yoke of slavery had been shaken off from its neck. The author of its freedom had been Sandrocottus, but when victory was gained he had changed the name of freedom to that of bondage. For, after he had ascended the throne, he himself oppressed with servitude the very people which he had rescued from foreign dominion. Though of humble birth, he was impelled by innate majesty to assume royal power. When king Nandrus, whom he had offended by his boldness, ordered him to be killed, he had resorted to speedy flight. Sandrocottus, having thus gained the crown, held India at the time when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleucus came to an agreement with him, and, after settling affairs in the East, engaged in the war against Antigonus. The same transactions are referred to by Appianus.

"[Seleucus] crossed the Indus and waged war on Androcottus king of the Indians who dwelt about it, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage with him."

According to Strabo, Seleucus ceded to Chandragupta a tract of land to the west of the Indus and received in exchange five hundred elephants.

The inference drawn is this: Seleucus I Nikator of Syria (B.C. 312-280), "arrived in Cappadocia in the autumn of 302 [the year preceding the battle of Ipsos] The march from India to there must have required at least two summers. Consequently, the peace with Chandragupta has to be placed about the summer of 304, or at the latest in the next winter."

We know from various sources that Megasthenes became the ambassador of Seleucus at Chandragupta's court.

It follows from these statements that Chandragupta ascended the throne between Alexander's death (B.C. 323) and the treaty with Seleucus (B.C. 304)."

54 Earlier in the same discourse Sir William had mentioned his authorities for the statement that Chandragupta became sovereign of upper Hindusthan, with his capital at Pataliputra: "A most beautiful...

1 McCorindle's translation, 114.
3 Beloch's Grisch, Gesch, 8,1 146, n 8.
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poem" said he "by Somadeva, comprising a long chain of instructive and agreeable stories, begins with the famed revolution at Pataliputra by the murder of king Nanda with his eight sons, and the usurpation of Chandragupta, and the same revolution is the subject of a tragedy in Sanskrit entitled 'The Coronation of Chandra'". Thus he claimed to have identified Pahbothra with Pataliputra and Sandrokottus with Chandragupta, and to have determined 300 B.C. "in round numbers" as a certain epoch between two others which he called the conquest of Silan by Rama "1200 B.C." and the death of Vikramāditya at Ujjain in 57 B.C.

In the Discourse referred to, Sir William barely stated his discovery, adding "that his proofs must be reserved" for a subsequent essay, but he died before that essay could appear.

55 The theme was taken immediately by Col. Wilford in Volume V of the Asiatic Researches. Wilford entered into a long and fanciful disquisition on Pahbothra, and rejected Sir William's identification of it with Pataliputra, but he accepted the identification of Sandrokottus with Chandragupta in the following words—"Sir William Jones from a poem written by Somadeva and a tragedy called the Coronation of Chandra or Chandragupta discovered that he really was the Indian king mentioned by the historians of Alexander under the name of Sandrocoptus. These poems I have not been able to procure, but I have found another dramatic piece entitled Mudra-Rachasa, which is divided into two parts, the first may be called the Coronation of Chandra."  

Wilson further amended the incorrect authorities relied on by Sir William Jones, and said in his Preface to Mudra-Rakshasa, that by Sir William's "a beautiful poem by Somadeva" was "doubtless meant the large collection of tales by Somabhatta the Vrihat-katha".

1. Ibid.  
2. Asiatic Researches, V 262 Wilford wrongly names the author of the drama as Amanta (or Ananta).  
3. Theatre of the Hindus, Vol II.  
4. Wilson again is not quite correct in his Bibliography, Somadeva's large collection of tales is entitled Kathasarit sagara and is an adaptation into Sanskrit verse of an original work in the Pailacī language called Bṛhat Kāṭha, composed by ca. Guṇādhyā.
56. Max Muller then elaborated the discovery of this identity in his Ancient Sanskrit Literature. To him this identity was a settled incontrovertible fact. On the path of further research, he examined the chronology of the Buddhists according to the Northern or the Chinese and the Southern or the Ceylonese traditions, and summed this up "Everything in Indian Chronology depends upon the date of Chandragupta. Chandragupta was the grand-father of Asoka, and the contemporary of Selukus Nikator. Now, according to the Chinese chronology, Asoka would have lived, to waive the minor differences, 850 or 750 B.C, according to Ceylonese Chronology, 315 B.C. Either of these dates is impossible because it does not agree with the chronology of Greece." 'Everything in Indian Chronology depends upon the date of Chandragupta' is the declaration. How is that date to be fixed? The Puranic accounts were of course beneath notice. The Buddhist chronologies were conflicting, and must be ignored. The Greek synchronism comes to his rescue. "There is but one means by which the history of India can be connected with that of Greece, and its chronology must be reduced to its proper limits," that is, by the clue afforded by "the name of Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus, the Sanskrit Chandragupta."

From classical writers—Justin, Arrian, Diadorus Siculus, Strabo, Quintus Curtius, and Plutarch—a formidable array all of whom however borrowed their account from practically the same sources—he puts together the various statements concerning Sandrocottus, and tries to show that they all tally with the statements made by Indian writers about the Maurya king Çandragupta. "The resemblance of this name" says he "with the name of Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus was first, I believe, pointed out by Sir William Jones Wilford, Wilson, and Professor Lassen have afterwards added further evidence in confirmation of Sir W. Jones's conjecture, and although other scholars, and particularly M. Troyer in his edition of the Rajatarangini, have raised objections, we shall see that the evidence in favour of the identity of Chandragupta and Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus is such as to admit of no reasonable doubt." Max Muller only repeats that the Greek accounts of Sandrocottus and the Indian accounts of Chandragupta agree in the main, both speaking of a usurper who either was base-born himself or else overthrew a base-born predecessor, and that this essential agreement would hold whether the various names used by Greek writers—Xandrames, Andramas, Aggraman, Sandrocottus and Sandrocyptus—should be made to refer to two kings, the overthrown and the over thrower,
or all to one namely the overthrower himself, though personally he is
inclined to the view that the first three variations refer to the over-
thrown, and the last two to the overthrower. He explains away the
difficulty in identifying the sites of Pataliputra and Pataliputra geo-
graphically by "a change in the bed of the river Sone." He passes
over the apparent differences in detail between the Greek statements on
the one hand and the Hindu and Buddhist versions on the other quite
summarily, declaring that Buddhist fables were invented to exalt, and
the Brahmanic fables to lower Chandragupta's descent! Lastly with
respect to chronology the Brahmanic is altogether ignored, and the
Buddhist is "reduced to its proper limits" that is, pulled down to fit
in with Greek chronology.

57 Priyadāsi Next came inscriptions of Priyadāsi. These
edicts published in the tenth and twelfth years of Asoka's reign (253 and
251 B.C.) are found in distinct places in the extreme East and West of
India. As revealed in these engraved records, the spoken dialect was
evenly the same throughout the wide and fertile religions lying be-
tween the Vindhya and Himalayas and between the mouths of the Indus
and the Ganges. The language appears in three varieties, which may be
named the Punjabi, the Upām and the Magadhi. These may point to a
transitional stage between Sanskrit and Pali. "The language of the
inscriptions," says Princep, "although necessarily that of their date and
probably that in which the first propagators of Buddhism expounded
their doctrines, seems to have been the spoken language of the people
of Upper India than a form of speech peculiar to a class of religionists
or a sacred language, and its use in the edicts of Priyadāsi, although
incompatible with their Buddhist origin, cannot be accepted as a
conclusive proof that they originated from a peculiar form of religious
belief."

Asoka's name does not occur in these inscriptions, but that these
purport to emanate from a king who gives his formal title in various
Prakrit forms of which the Sanskrit would be DEVANAMPRIYAH Priya-

1. The Edicts are edited in IA, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22 24, 37, 38. On the
Edicts, see IA, XIII 804, XX 1, 85, 259, XXXV 230, XXXIV 246, XXXVIII
151, XLVII, 48.

Also, D.B. Bhandarkar, Asoka, Calcutta, V.A. Smith, Asoka, Oxford, F.W.
Thomas, Les Pravastī de Asoka, JA, (1910), E. Halloosch, Dates of Asoka, JRAS,
(1914) 948. H.H. Wilson, Identity of Asoka, JRAS, (o s), XXII, 177 249, (1901)
327 368, V.A. Smith, Authorship of Priyadāsi inscriptions, JRAS, (1901), 435;
Asokavadana, JRAS, (1901) 545, Bindusara, JRAS, (1901), 884.
darsi raja. It was James Prinsep that first ascribed Asoka's edicts to Devanampiya-Tissa of Ceylon. The discovery of the Nagajuna Hill cave-inscriptions of Sashalata Devanampiya, whom he at once identified with Dasiratha, the grandson of the Maurya king Asoka and the fact that Turnour had found Pyadassi or Piyadassana used as a surname of Asoka in the Dīpavamsa, induced Prinsep to abandon his original view, and to identify Devanampiya Priyadarsan with Asoka himself.

In February 1838, Prinsep published the text and a translation of the second rock edict, Gīrṇār version of it (1 3) the words Antiyako Yonarja and in the Dhauli version (1, 1) Antiyoke nāma Yona-lajā, and identified the Yona king Antiyaka or Antiyoka with Antiochus III of Syria. In March 1838, he discovered in the Gīrṇār edict vii (1, 8), the names of Turāmśya, Amīkona, and Magā, whom he most ingeniously identified with Ptolemy II Philadelphos of Egypt, Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia (?), and Magas of Cyrine. At the same time he modified his earlier theory and now referred the name Antiyoka to Antiochus I or II of Syria, preferably the former.

On the Gīrṇār rock the name of a fifth king who was mentioned after Magā is lost. The Shāhbazgahī version calls him Alikasundara. E. Norris recognized that this name corresponds to the Greek Ἀλικαςονδάρα, and suggested hesitatingly that Alexander of Epirus, the son of Pyrrhus, might be meant by it. This identification was endorsed by Westerguard, Lassen, and Senart. But Professor Beloch thinks that Alexander of Corinth, the son of Craterus, had a better claim.

"The mention of these five contemporaries in the inscriptions of Devanampiya Priyadarshi," says E. Hultsch, "confirms in a general
way the corrections of Prinsep’s identification of the latter with Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, whose approximate time we know from Greek and Roman records: Antiochus I Soter of Syria reigned B.C. 280-261, his son Antiochus II Theos 261-246, Ptolemy II Philadelphos of Egypt 285-247, Antigonus Gonates of Macedonia 276-239, Magas of Cyrene c. 300—c. 250, Alexander of Epirus 272—c. 255, and Alexander of Corinth 252—c. 244."

58 This identification of Sandrocottus with Candragupta Maurya furnished a very certain starting point in investigating what appeared to be such a huge field of uncertainties as Indian Chronology. Thus, according to Buddhist traditions, it is said, Buddha died 162 years before Candragupta. Max Muller supposes that “Chandragupta became king about 315 B.C., and so he places the death of Buddha 162 plus 315 or 477 B.C. Or again 32 years after Chandragupta, Asoka is said to have become king, that is 315—52 or 263 B.C., and his “inauguration” is said to have taken place in 259 B.C. At the time of Asoka’s inauguration 218 years had elapsed since the conventional date of Buddha’s death.” Hence Buddha must have also died in 477 B.C.

59 Thus came in the Anchor Sheet of Indian Chronology. It fell to the glorious lot of Vincent E. Smith to sponsor this hypothesis and instal it on a firmer pedestal. Glory is god-made and V. S. Smith was destined for it. He took the chronological identity so premised by the predecessors in this historical hierarchy as the basis of further calculation of the exact dates of the different dynasties that ruled over Magadha before and after the Mauryas. He was able to invoke the aid of numismatics in addition to epigraphy. He could interpret the eras, particularly the Gupta era of the inscriptions and the legends on the coins, and discover a confirmation of the earlier opinions. He could not however get over, as if by compunction, the need to follow the Puranas in the enumeration of the kings and their dynasties, he took the dynasties and the succession of kings as they were, he did not call them fictitious. He had objection to the long

---

1 The reader may well be reminded of the facetious address of Gopi to Sri Krishna:

उन्माः कौशिकी महीं सरस्वती दोषारो छठो बीड़वा
तेन तव दिवि भूलसे न सतत गोवर्मनो नीवसे ।
त्वा नेहौख्यागर बहुमि क्रयोर्मो न तद्धपयते ।
किं वा केशव सापेन बुजना पप्पैन्यिको लम्बिते ॥

---
periods of years that these Purānas sometimes assigned to particular kings or dynasties. They were improbable and fanciful and so on their face unreliable. So he set out to sift the intervals of time and adjust the dates and periods on a rational basis, a basis that would quite convince the modern mind of a reasonable probability. The device of reduction of time is in short this:

Where the Purānas have different readings, the shortest number of years is adopted, where the Purānas give a long period to any reign, it is reduced to 20 years as the average ascertainable in royal histories elsewhere, where the Purānas give only brief terms of a few years or a few months, that is adopted as correct. The result of these reductions will be seen below—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puranas</th>
<th>V. Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nandás</td>
<td>100 (1635-1535 B.C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauryas</td>
<td>316 (1535-1219 B.C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sungas</td>
<td>300 (1219-919 B.C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanvas</td>
<td>85 (919-834 B.C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āndhras</td>
<td>506 (834-328 B.C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptās</td>
<td>245 (328-83 B.C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, according to Vincent Smith's Chandragupta became king in 322 B.C., and Buddha died in 487 B.C., this allows 50 years for the Nandás, before Chandragupta, and 250 years for the Saisunagas before the Nandás. And so he begins his Early History from about 602 B.C. Likewise, starting from 322 B.C., V Smith allows 137 years for the Maurya Dynasty and places Sunga kings in 185-73 B.C. and Kanva kings in 73 to 28 B.C., and so on bringing the list down to Āndhras and Guptās. I extract the passage:

"Although the discrepant traditionary materials available do not permit the determination with accuracy of the chronology of the Saisunaga and Nanda dynasties, it is, I venture to think, possible to attain a tolerably close approximation to the truth, and to reconcile some of the traditions. The fixed point from which to reckon backwards is the year 322 B.C., the date for the succession of Chandragupta Maurya, which is certainly correct, with a possible error not exceeding three years. The second principal datum is the list of ten kings of the Saisunaga dynasty as given in the oldest historical entries in the Puranas, namely those in the Matsya and the Vayu, the general correctness of which is confirmed by several lines of evidence, and the third is the probable date of the death of Buddha."
INTRODUCTION

Although the fact that the Saisunaga dynasty consisted of ten kings may be admitted, neither the duration assigned by the Puranas to the dynasty as a whole, nor that allotted to certain reigns, can be accepted. Experience proves that in a long series an average of twenty-five years to a generation is rarely attained, and that this average is still more rarely exceeded in a series of reigns as distinguished from generations.

The English series of ten reigns from Charles II to Victoria, inclusive, 1649-1901 (reckoning the accession of Charles II from the death of his father in 1649), occupied 252 years, and included the two exceptionally long reigns of George III and Victoria, aggregating 124 years. The resultant average, 25.2 years per reign, may be taken as the maximum possible, and consequently 252 years are the maximum allowable for the ten Saisunaga reigns. The Puranic figures of 321 (Matsya) and 332 (Vayu) years, obtained by adding together the durations of the several reigns may be rejected without hesitation as being incredible. The Matsya account concludes with the statement, ‘These will be the ten Saisunaga kings. The Saisunagas will endure 360 years, being kings with Kshatriya kinsfolk.’ Mr. Pargiter suggests that the figures ‘360’ should be interpreted as ‘163’. If that interpretation be accepted, the average length of reign would be only 16.3, and it would be difficult to make Buddha (died cir 487) contemporary with Bimbisara and Ajatasatru. It is more probable that the dynasty lasted for more than two centuries.

As stated in the text, the traditional periods assigned to the Nanda dynasty of either 100 or 150 years for two generations cannot be accepted. A more reasonable period of fifty years may be provisionally assumed. We thus get the 302 (252 plus 50) as the maximum admissible period for the Saisunaga and Nanda dynasties combined, and, reckoning backwards from the fixed point, 322 B.C., The Year 624 B.C., is found to be the earliest possible date for Sisunaga, the first king. But of course the true date may be, and probably is, somewhat later, because it is extremely unlikely that twelve reigns (ten Saisunaga and two Nanda) should have attained an average of 25.16 years.

The reigns of the fifth and sixth kings, Bimbisara or Srenika, and Ajatasatru or Kunika, were well remembered owing to the wars and events in religious history which marked them. We may therefore assume that the lengths of those reigns were known more or less accurately.
rationally, and are justified in accepting the concurrent testimony of the 
Vayu and Matsya Puranas, that Bimbisara reigned for twenty-eight 
years.

Ajatasatru is assigned twenty-five or twenty-seven years by different 
Puranas, and thirty-two years by Tibetan and Ceylonese Buddhist tradti-
on. I assume the correctness of the oldest Puranic list, that of the 
Matsya, and take his reign to have been twenty-seven years. The 
real existence of Darsaka (erroneously called Vamsaka by the Matsya) 
having been established by Bhasa's Vasavadatta, his reign may be 
assigned twenty-four years, as in the Matsya Udaya, who is men-
tioned in the Buddhist books, and is said to have built Pataliputra, is 
assigned thirty-three years by the Puranas, which may pass.

The Vayu and Matsya Puranas respectively assign eighty-five and 
eighty-three years to the sum of the reigns of kings numbers 9 and 10 
together. These figures are improbably high, and it is unlikely that 
the two reigns actually occupied more than fifty years. The figure 46 
is assumed.

The evidence as far as it goes, and at best it does not amount to 
much, indicates that the average length of the later reigns was in ex-
cess of the normal figure. We may assume, therefore, that the first 
four reigns, about which nothing is known must have been compara-
tively short, and did not exceed some seventy or eighty years collec-
tively. An assumption that these reigns were longer would unduly 
prolong the total duration of the dynasty, the beginning of which must 
be dated about 600 B.C., or a little earlier.

The existence of a great body of detailed traditions, which are 
not mere mythological legends, sufficiently establishes the facts that 
both Mahavira, the Jain leader, and Gautama Buddha were contem-
porary to a considerable extent with one another and with the kings 
Bimbisara and Ajatasatru.

Tradition also indicates that Mahavira predeceased Buddha. The 
death of these saints form well-marked epochs in the history of Indian 
religion, and are constantly referred to by ecclesiastical writers for 
chronological purposes. It might therefore be expected that the 
traditional dates of the two events would supply at once the desired 
cue to the dynastic chronology. But close examination of conflicting
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traditions raise difficulties. The year 527 (528-7) B.C., the most commonly quoted date for the death of Mahavira, is merely one of several traditionary dates, and it seems to be impossible to reconcile the Jain traditions either among themselves or with the known approximate date of Chandragupta."

60. This exposition of V.E. Smith has become the unalterable standard for later scholars. Great and sincere as many of these scholars have been, they did not dare or care to go behind Smith's facts and if any did differ from him, it was over the insignificant question of the particular year in which Chandragupta was crowned, if it was 312, 315, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326 or 327 B.C. Thus Fleet says —

Now, in all matters of the most ancient Indian chronology, the great "sheet anchor" is, and has been ever since 1798, the date of Chandragupta, the grandfather of Asoka the Maurya, as determined by the information furnished by the Greek writers. In recent years, indeed, there has been a tendency to believe that we have something still more definite in the reference to certain foreign kings in the thirteenth rock-edict of Asoka. But, as may be shown on some other occasion, there is nothing in that, beyond proof that that edict, framed not earlier than the ninth year after the anointment of Asoka to the sovereignty, and most probably in the thirteenth year, was framed not before B.C. 272, and that does not help as much, because the abhisheka of Asoka might, so far as that goes, be put back to even as early a year as B.C. 284. In all that we have as yet been able to determine about Asoka, there is nothing that enables us to improve upon what we could already determine about Chandragupta from the Greek writers, we know that Chandragupta became king of Northern India at some time between B.C. 326 and 312. Within those limits, different writers, have selected different years; B.C. 325, 321, 316, 315 and 312. The latest selection is, I suppose, that made by Mr. Vincent Smith in his Early History of India, 173, namely, B.C. 321. 3


2. See M. Senart, JAS., XX. 239; S. Gopala Iyer, IA., XXXVII. 341, Buhler, IA. VI. 149, 1711, 134; Fleet, JRAI, (1904) 1, (1906) 988, V. Smith, BHI, 173.

3. Fleet, JRAI, (1906), 984.
The deductions and inferences of V. Smith have come to stay. But the traditional reputation has been too staring in its assertion that Mahābhāratā War happened at the end of Dvāparayuga, 37 years before the advent of Kahyuga in 3102 B.C. Later scholars, to whom the tradition was a fraud resorted to the only alternative viz.: to post-date the beginning of Kahyuga so as to preserve the Purānic Synchronism of Mahābhāratā War with about the end of Dvāparayuga. Even there the sayings of V Smith were adopted as canons of indubitable truth and the dates were worked up on their basis only and this had been done in wholesale disregard of the care and precision with which the Purāṇas recorded the calculations of political history.

The Purāṇas uniformly give two methods, which are corroborative of each other, in calculating the dates of these Hindu Dynasties. One starts from the close of the Mahābhāratā War and almost coevally with the commencement of the Kaliyuga, from which time the number of years that each king reigned is given. The other starts from the Saptarśi Era or the Laukikābda, whose cycle consisting of 2700 years is accepted by all authorities to have commenced about 4992 years ago corresponding to 3676 B.C. Now the Purāṇas state the first cycle of this Saptarśi Era or Laukikābda commenced at the time of Parikṣat, that the Saptarśas were in Māgha at his time, that they move in a retrograde motion and take 100 years to pass from one Nakṣaṭra to another, that they were in Purvāgādha (or the 16th Nakṣaṭra from Māgha) at the time of the commencement of the Nanda dynasty, that they were in Ciśā-Nakṣaṭra (or the 24 Nakṣaṭra from Māgha) at the commencement of the Āndhra Dynasty and that at the beginning of the reign of the 27th king of the Āndhra Dynasty, the cycle repeated itself, the Saptarśas having come back to Māgha. So there must have elapsed at least 1500 years between Parikṣat and Mahāpadma Nanda, 2300 years between Parikṣat and Āndhra Simukha (Śrī Śatavarṇa) the Founder of the Āndhra Dynasty and 270 years between Parikṣat and Sivasri Śatavarṇa, the 27th king of the Āndhra Dynasty, and that this king Śivatsri must have commenced his reign in the year 377 B.C.

The Mahābhāratā War starts the Purānic chronology, that is, at 3139 B.C. The periods assigned to the eight dynasties that ruled over Magaḍha, Bārhadratha to Āndhra is made up 2811 years thus.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>No of Kings</th>
<th>years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bārhadraṭha (post-Bhārata)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pradyota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Saṇsunāga</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nanda</td>
<td>9 (2 generations)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maurya</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sunga</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kanva</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Andhra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2811 years after the Mahābhārata War or about 328 B.C., the sovereignty of Magadha passed into the hands of a line called Pārvatīyā and Anūhrabhṛtya, the first king of which was Candragupta.

**64** This Sapṭarṣi Era is fully described in all the Purāṇas in words almost similar to one another and the following passage from the Kāliyuga-Rājya-Viśānta may suffice as an example:—

1. As summed up in Kāliyuga Rājavīśānta or 2886 according to Mātyaya?

Vincent Smith commits an egregious blunder in making the first 10 or 11 kings of the Andhra dynasty contemporaneous with the preceding dynasties and holding that the slayer of the last Kaśya king "apparently must have been one or other of three Andhra kings namely No. 11, 12 or 13" Early History p 206.
तत्त्वेन कल्पितं यातं तत्त्वस्वस्तिकं हि कसंरः

इत्यतं श्रद्धा विषयः प्रवृत्तेऽपि यथस्वरूपः

तत्त्वं पृथ्वीं पराक्षः सूचना नाश्वतं कथाः

यदा महामयो यात्त्वतिः पूर्वोशादा सर्वेष्यः

तत्र: महामयं कहते वास्तवं निष्ठितं देशं

यदा यथिर्दिके राजा यह अस्तसे प्रतिलिपि

तदा सर्वेष्य माणुविन्न विचित्रितं रतं

पञ्चसत्ततिवेदीं ग्रांतं कः सत्य ते दिखा

महापालात्: महाराजे शास्त्रयुगीं यथिर्दिके

पञ्चविशालवेदीं गांवेन्द्रदल कहे गुरे

सामार्थ्रिप्यं लाभें युगयसते शतं समा

तदौ दृः पुरुषोऽधिपि महाप्रसाधनमालिकता

युंगे पारिवर्तनं स्वभावारोपियता धृवम्

तदौ अकिंकियांदोऽधिपि सत्ताविशालसाधन

थर्मपुन्द्रहापकारं होके तात्रत मर्यादित

सत्ताविशालसाधने: काठे मान्यस्व ते पुनः

आस्मान समर्पायनति गुरुस्यानि सर्वेष्यः

सर्वेष्यो महापुत्रः: काठे यथिर्दिके धतुम्

श्रवणे ते सम्भिष्यति काठे नन्दस्य भूपते

चतुर्चित्तं रक्षनं शविष्यन्ति शविष्यन्ति शतं समा

आन्नाराज्यारम्भालादारम्भिये तत्रतं

महाप्रशालिपिकाढू यशवंजनं परीक्षितं

एवेकं सहस्रं सु श्रेर पञ्चशस्तोतःरम

आन्नाराज्योपकाढू याबन्धनस्मेषिकतं

अन्तर तच्छवात्यस्य प्रमाणं समा स्वरूप

यदा पुराणस्य यास्तन्त्रे सर्वेष्ये पुनः

तदा श्रीरस्वर्वशतानि राजः दैवये गस्त्यति

पुराणमादं यदा ते ग्रांतं प्रश्वायति पुनर्भिहितं

इत्यतं गार्थां राज्यं तदा पाण्डव गस्त्यति

—Bhaga III Chapter III.
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The above passage may be freely translated as follows

'In the circle of the lunar asterisms (Nakshatras) wherein the great constellation of the Saptarishis (constituting the Great Bear or the Ursa Major) revolve, and which contain 27 asterisms (like Asvini, Bharani, Krutikā, etc.) in its circumference (ecliptic consisting of 360°, each Nakshatra or lunar asterism being equal to 12° 20' of the ecliptic), the Seven Sages remain for 100 years in each asterism in turn (like the Rishis taking 2700 years to make a circuit of the heavens)

This is the Cycle of the Seven Seers (consisting of 2700 human years) and is reckoned in the terms of Divine years (860 human years being equal to 1 Divine year) and the total period is equal to 7 Divine years and 6 Divine months (i.e., 7 1/2 times 300 or 2100 human years)

The constellation of the Seven Saints (or the Seven Stars of the Wain, consisting of Marichi, Vasishtha accompanied by the Sukshmatār Arundhati, Angiras, Atī, Pulaha and Kratu) takes a period of 100 years to go over each of the 27 asterisms, and it goes through these 27 asterisms in a retrograde order, as the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac which comprise these 27 asterisms are arranged in a retrograde order around the ecliptic. Thus the Saptarshī Kalā (or the Samvat of the Hātt Riksheshār), consisting of a cycle of 2700 years, has come to be constituted

The two front stars (Pulaha and Kratu) of the great constellation of the Seven Sages which are seen (in the northern region) when risen at night, the lunar asterism or Nakshatra which is seen situated equally between them in the sky is said to govern the same—the constellation of the Saptarishis being known as conjointed with that asterism for 100 human years. This is the exposition of the conjunction of the lunar asterisms and the constellation of the Saptarishis

When the constellation of the Seven Sages remained conjointed with the asterism of Maghās, then the Kali Age (the sinful Kaliyuga) comprising 1200 Divine years (or 480,000 common human years) began

When Lord Krishna returned to Heaven (i.e., left this mundane world), then in that very same year (on the first day of Chaitra of the year Pramathum according to the Southern school of Astronomers)—say the knowers of the ancient history—the present Kaliyuga (of the 28th Mahayuga comprising 12,000 Divine years) commenced

As long as the Great Incarnation of the Divine Vishnu continued to touch the Earth (with His holy feet), so long the Kali Age was unable to approach the Earth

When the Seven Rishis shall pass from the Maghas and reach the asterism of Purvāshādha, then will, indeed, the Kali Age begin to grow

When Prince Yudhishthira was for the first time crowned as king at Indraprastha (and established himself with his brothers, as master of half of the kingdom belonging to his father Pandu), then the Seven Rishis of the constellation of the Ursa Major entered the lunar asterism of Maghaas which were sacred and propitious to the Pitris

The Seven Rishis (of the Great Bear) entered the asterism of the Maghas, just 75 years before the beginning of the Kaliyuga (in the year 3177 B.C.) at the commencement of the reign of the great king Yudhishtira who ruled the Earth during the said period

These Seven Sages will enter the asterism of Āśeṣha on the expiry of 25 years from the commencement of the Kali Age (in the year 2977 B.C.) and they will continue to remain in that asterism for a period of 100 human years (from 2977 B.C. to 2977 B.C.)
In that very same year (3077 B.C.) will Dharmaputra (Yudhishthira, the eldest of the five Pandava brothers) ascend to Heaven (Svargarohana) after wandering over the earth for a long time (having abdicated the throne in favour of Parikshit, the grandson of his brother Arjuna and started on his Mahaprasthan with his brothers and wife on hearing the sad and sudden news of the departure of Sri Krishna from the world).

Then will the Lankakâda or the Lankâ K.era consisting of a cycle of 2700 years be started in the world in commemoration of the Ascension of Dharmaputra into Heaven

These Divine Sages (consisting the constellation of the Ursa Major) will reach (the lunar asterism) Âlesha a second time (in their revolution) at the time of the commencement of the reign of the 27th King of the Andhra Dynasty (Sivasei Satakarni) who began to rule Magadha in the year 2762 A.Y. corresponding to 377 B.C.—one complete cycle of 2700 years having elapsed since the expiry of the 25th year of the Kali Yuga, when they first reached Âlesha after the Mahabharata War.

These Seven Sages were conjunct with the asterism Magha for a period of 100 years during the time of Yudhishthira and at the time of the commencement of the reign of King Nanda (Mahapadma), they will be conjunct with the asterism (Sravana the 15th Nakshatra from Magha calculated, of course, in a reverse order).

From the commencement of the Andhra Dynasty (at Magadha) the Seven Bishas (of the Great Bear) will be found conjunct with (Chitra) the 24th lunar asterism (calculated from and inclusive of Magha).

The interval of time between the birth of Parikshit (son of Abhumanyu by Uttara, and grandson of Arjuna, who was in the womb of his mother at the time of the Mahabharata War) and the inauguration of Mahapadma Nanda (the Founder of the Nanda Dynasty) is to be known as 1500 years.

According to competent authorities (Pramana-pyas) the interval of time between the coronation of Mahapadma Nanda (who came to the throne of Magadha in 1504 A.Y.) and the commencement of the Andhra Dynasty (which began to rule Magadha in 1303 A.Y.) is stated to be full 800 years.

When the great constellation of the Seven sages of the Ursa Major shall again reach the asterism Punarvasu (in its second revolution after the Mahabharata War), the Empire of the great Gupta Kings shall begin to decline and when they shall actually enter the asterism of Purvabhadra thereafter, the kingdom of Magadha will pass from the Guptas to the Pala kings.

65. According to Vayu and Magiya Puranas the interval between the birth of Parikshit and coronation of Mahapadma Nanda, is 1500 years

महापालितेष्वराः स्वाभावपति परिशिष्ट ।
पुर्वः कर्मावहस्वम् श्रीव प्रत्यालोचनम् ॥

But some versions of Bhagavata Purana differ and state that interval to be 1115 years. The text reads

आरम्भ स्वत्तो जन्म यावाल्यान्दनिष्ण्णम्
पुर्वःकर्मावहस्वम् तु धाते प्रत्यालोचनम् ॥

—Skanda XII, Ch II, v. 26
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This will mean "From your birth (Parikṣiṣṭ is addressed by Śuka) to the inauguration of Nanda 1115 years will elapse." Yet according to the duration of the different intermediate dynasties as enumerated by it in Skanda XII, Chapter I, the interval comes to 1498 years viz,

- Bāhadrātha kings 1000 years
- Pradyōta kings 138
- Śaisunāga kings 360

Total 1498 years

This mistake has struck the celebrated commentators, Śrīdharasvāmin and Virarāghava and they distinctly suggest that the reading should be—

"परिक्षिष्टसहस्र तु जन्म पवित्रतेतरम्"

For Śrīdharasvāmin commenting upon this verse states

"आर्येत्यादिना—वर्षसहस्र पवित्रतेतर शतेऽधैति क्यािपि विवशया अबंतार सत्येयवर्त। बस्तुवत स्वप्नमिद्यन्योर्तत्त्व हार्य्य चतुर्वर्ष वार्षसहस्र सवर्ति। यत् परिशिल्सकालं माण्यं नाजीरिचार्मयं रिपुक्षयान्त विशिष्टिषराजत्। सहस्रवस्तर साहस्यलिहका नवमस्कर्ते—"

"ये बाहुव्र्ययाण्यां माण्यं साहससम्भरम्!"—हति। ततः परं पञ्चशष्टास्वरसाधूरं शतम्। विशिष्टिषराजत्, 'वपुलुत्तरतिस्य कोश्यान्ति श्रीमानम् हति जलवोक्तालः।"

Thus we have the authority of Śrīdharasvāmin and Virarāghava to say that 1500 years is the interval between Parikṣiṣṭ and Nanda.

But having adopted the wrong readings and reduced the period of interval between the birth of Parikṣiṣṭ and the coronation of Nanda to 1015, 1050 or 1115 years, these Orientalists bring down the date of the commencement of the Kali Yuga itself as low as possible. Assuming the wrong synchronism between Sandracottus of the Greeks and Candragupta Maurya, they place the accession of Candragupta Maurya to the throne of Magadha in 322 B.C., and calculating backwards and forwards from that date (while accepting the Lists of Kings given in the Purāṇas and the regnal periods given of those kings as correct) fix the date of the accession of Nanda to the throne in 422 B.C., just placing him 100 years before the accession of Candragupta to the throne, and conclude that Kali Yuga must have commenced 1015, 1050 or 1115 years before that date, that is in 1437 B.C. or 1537 B.C.
conceding for all practical purposes the commencement of the Kali Yuga to be synchronous with the Birth of Parikṣat, the Coronation of Yudhisṭhira and the Great War of the Mahābhārata. This false synchronism between Sandracottus of the Greeks and Candragupta Maurya of the Indians has become so much rooted in the bed of Indian Chronology, that scholars Śrīsa Chandra Vidyārṇava and F E. Pargiter placed the commencement of Kaliyuga in 1733 B.C.

"The method of calculation", says Śrīsa Chandra “adopted by the Purāṇas, however, is to take Nanda as the starting point. The last of the Śisunāga was Mahānandin, who had a son by a Śūdrā woman. He was known as Mahāpadma or the famous Nanda, whose eight sons succeeded him. This Nanda family was brought to an end by the Indian Machiavelli, Kautilya or Chāṇakya. Chandragupta was placed on the throne of the Nandas by this Kautilya or Chāṇakya. About this event V. Smith says —

'Mahānandin, the last of the Dynasty, is said to have had, by a Śūdrā or low caste woman, a son, named Mahāpadma Nanda who usurped the throne, and so established the Nanda family or dynasty. This event may be dated in or about 372 B.C. * * *

The Greek or Roman historians * * * ranking as contemporary witnesses throw a light on real history. When Alexander was stopped in his advance at the Hyphasis, in 326 B.C., he was informed * * * that the king of the Prāchēi etc. * * * was Xandrames or Agramis'.

The reference to this king is evidently to one of the Nandas. The date of the accession of Nanda is calculated from that of Chandragupta Maurya, who ascended the throne in 322 B.C. The Nanda Dynasty according to Mr Vincent Smith, lasted for 50 years, when it was replaced by the Maurya. So adding 50 to 322, the above figure 372 B.C., is arrived at by Mr V. Smith as the date of the accession of Mahāpadma Nanda. But all the Purāṇas are unanimous in stating that the nine Nandas reigned for 100 years, and we have taken that in our calculations. The date of accession of Mahāpadma Nanda would, therefore, be 422 B.C. instead of 372 B.C.

* * *

Thus 422 B.C. is the starting point backwards and forwards in the Purāṇic calculations.

Chandragupta Maurya displaced the Nanda family. The nine Nandas reigned for 100 years. Before that, there was the Śisunāga Dynasty, and before that was the Pradyōta Dynasty, and before that...
The following table shows the periods of the reigns of these dynasties —

1. Chandragupta’s accession: 322 B.C
2. Nanda Dynasty: 100
3. Śūsanāgas: 360
4. Pradyṭṭhas: 152 (?)
5. Barhadrathas from the time of Chaidyopanchara: 1000

Total: 1612
Deduct from Chaidya to Sahādēva: 171
Balance: 1441, and adding 322

1763 B.C., the year of the Great War

The Mahābhārata War took place when Sahādēva of Bārhadratha family, was king. From Vasu Chaidya Upārchara up to Sahādēva there were 13 kings, namely, (1) Vasu Chaidya Upārchara, (2) Bṛha- dratha, (3) Kusāgra, (4) Vṛishabha, (5) Punyavan or Pushpavan, (6) Punya or Pushya, (7) Satyadhṛiti, (8) Dhanusha, (9) Sarva, (10) Sam-bhava, (11) Bṛhadratha, (12) Jarāsandha, and (13) Sahādēva. After Sahādēva there were 19 or 32 kings (or 22 according to Mr. Pargiter) up to Ripunjaya the last. The Great War, therefore, took place on the above assumption, one thousand four hundred and forty one years before the accession of Chandragupta in 322 B.C., or in other words that the Great War took place in or about 1763 B.C.”

67 Mr. Pargiter, however, in his Dynasties of the Kali Age arrives at the year 1810 B.C. as the date of the Great War of Mahābhārata. He says that from Śomādhī to Ripunjaya there were 22 kings in the Bārhadratha Dynasty who reigned for 920 years. The Pradyṭṭhas after Ripunjaya were 5 kings who reigned for 138 years. The Śūsanāgas who came after the Pradyṭṭhas were 10 kings and reigned for 330 years. Adding up the above-mentioned three figures, 920 plus 138 plus 330, he gets the sum 1388 years, which according to his calculation, was the interval between the installation of Mahāpadma Nanda and the birth of Parikṣit or the Great War. Adding 422 B.C., the year of the installation of Mahāpadma Nanda (which is of course assumed as a
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postulate of Indian History). Mr Pargiter comes to the figure 1810 B.C as the date of the Mahâbhârata War.

The fanciful speculations involved in these theories regarding the date of the Mahâbhârata War will be manifest to any disinterested reader of the Purânas and Itihâsas. The conclusions were so uncertain that Srisa Chandra Vidyârnava revised his own original theory at a later stage and refixed the date of the Great War in 1922 B.C (still following, the false synchronism between Candragupta Maurya and Sandracottus).

68 Thus, we see that Vincent Smith is the modern protagonist of this identity, the Anchor-Sheet of Indian Chronology. It is he that is quoted and followed without inquiry by our Indian Professors of history and it is that chronology that is and must be taught in our schools. By sheer repetition by men in authority and in the works that emanate from them, 'the theory had almost become an axiom and rarely does any thought occur for any fair investigation. Day after day the assumed identity takes a firmer root and it is considered a matter of senility or superstition to express a need for a reconsideration. Hasty generalisations lead to prepossessions and it is rarely human to attempt to demonstrate their reality. It may appear therefore, a futile cry to seek to go behind these established opinions and to ask the reader to forbear and see for himself on the original bases of this 'theory, if, after all, the narratives of the Purânas, so honestly planned, are 'pious frauds.' For the vindication of the morality of our sages and the merit of our traditional lore, a lore adored by the millions of Hindu India, an attempt must be made, be the effect what it may.

69 Max Muller himself was not slow to condemn this tendency to generalise. Says he "Men who possessed the true faculty of an historian like Niebuhr, have abstained from passing sentence on the history of a nation whose literature had only just been recovered, and had not yet passed through the ordeal of philological criticism. Other historians however thought they could do what Niebuhr had left undone; and after perusing some poems of Kalidasa, some fables of Hitopadesa, some verses of the Ananda-lahari, or the mystic poetry of"

1 See also R K. Mookerji, Later Gupta History and Chronology, Jl. of Ind. History, IV. 17; Dineschandra Sarcar, Dynastic History of Northern India, Jyotirmoy Sen, Riddle of Pradyota Dynasty, IHQ, (1980), 673; H D Bhil, Pradyota Dynasty, JBORS, (1921), K P. Jayaswal, Chandragupta II and his predecessors, JBARS, XVIII. 17
INTRODUCTION

The Bhagavad-gītā, they gave with the aid of Megasthenes and Appolonius of Tyana a so-called historical account of the Indian nation without being aware that they were using as contemporary witnesses authors as distant as Dante and Virgil. No nation has in this respect been more unjustly treated than the Indian. Not only have general conclusions been drawn from the most scanty materials but the most questionable and spurious authorities have been employed without the least historical investigation." H. H. Wilson, earlier, in the preface to his translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, had remarked "Impatience to generalise has availed itself of whatever promised to afford materials for generalisation, and the most erroneous views have often been confidently advocated because the guides to which their authors trusted were ignorant or inefficient."

70 The various accounts given of Candragupta and Asoka by Hindu and Buddhist writers, have contributed to a large extent to the manipulation of Indian chronology at the historian's pleasure. In his play Mudrārākṣasa Viśākhadaṭṭha who wrote about 5th century A.D. dramatizes the events relating to Candragupta and his account is mostly in agreement with the Purāṇic tale. He calls Candragupta a Maurya and does not describe his parentage.

The object of the play, says Wilson, "is to reconcile Rākshasa, the hostile minister of Nanda, the late king of Pālīputra (Pālīputra), to the individuals by whom, or on whose behalf, his sovereign was murdered,—the Brāhman Chāṇakya and the Prince Chandragupta. With this view, he is rendered by the contrivances of Chāṇakya an object of suspicion to the Prince with whom he has taken refuge, and is consequently dismissed by him. In this deserted condition, he learns the imminent danger of a dear friend, whom Chāṇakya is about to put to death, and in order to effect his liberation, surrenders himself to his enemies. They offer him, contrary to his expectations, the rank and power of prince minister, and the parties are finally friends."

71 The Buddhistic accounts such as Mahāvamsa and Dipavamsa give a description of the first three kings only of the Dynasty. The accounts given of Candragupta's origin and parentage are various and contradictory. By one account it is said that Mura, the mother of Candragupta, was the servant girl of Dhana Nanda, the last of the Nanda Dynasty, and by her influence she had her son placed on the throne of Magadha at Pālīputra. Another account makes him a member of an Āṇḍhra family, and says that he acquired the sovereign power by his
own skill and exertion. The writer evidently confuses here the accounts of the two Candraguptas, Candragupta of the Maurya Dynasty with Candragupta the Founder of the Gupta Dynasty, and an illegitimate son of the Andhra family, for the Andhra family itself came into existence about 700 years after the accession of Candragupta Maurya.

According to Northern Buddhistic accounts Candragupta was a member of the Sākya family which in consequence of some political intrigues was driven away from its territory. The family repaired to a forest in the Himavanta and there constructed a new town in a delightful and beautiful locality. The streets and houses in the town having been laid after the pattern of a peacock's neck, it was called by the name of Mārya-nagara, and the family by the name of Mārya, and the kingdom founded by it Mārya Dynasty. The explanation is ingenious and is probably based upon a confusion of the Prākṛt forms of the words Maurya (मौर्य) and Mayūra (मयूर).

The Tiṣka on this Buddhistic account gives a curious origin of the name of this prince Candragupta. It is stated that while Candragupta was still in the womb, his father's dominions were taken possession of by another powerful neighbouring chief, and his father himself was killed in the contest. "His mother, the queen consort of the monarch of the Mārya-nagara (मयूरनगर), the city before mentioned, was fully pregnant at the time when that powerful provincial Rāja conquered that kingdom, and put the Mārīyan king to death. In her anxiety to preserve the child in her womb, she departed for the capital of Pupphapura (Pushpapura) under the protection of her elder brother, and under disguise she dwelt there. At the completion of the ordinary term of pregnancy, she gave birth to a son, and relinquishing him to the protection of the devas, she placed him in a vase, and deposited him at the door of a cattle-pen. A bull named Chando (चन्द्र) stationed himself by him, to protect him. A herdsman, on observing this prince, moved by affection, like that borne to his own child, took charge of and tenderly reared him, and in giving him a name, in reference to his having been watched by the bull Chando, he called him 'Chandaguttā' (चन्दगुट्टा), and brought him up."

But all the Buddhistic works are agreed on one point that Candragupta owed his sovereignty entirely to Cāṇakya alias Kautilya, and not 'called to royalty by the power of the gods and by prodigies' as stated by Justin with reference to his Sandracottus. Nor is there any reference either in the Hindu or the Buddhistic accounts to
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Candragupta Maurya’s “having traversed India with an army of 600,000 men and conquered the whole” as stated by Plutarch

72 The Buddhistic accounts of Asoka, as given by the two great schools of Buddhism—Mahayana and Hinayana—not only differ from each other but also from the accounts given of Asoka, the grandson of Candragupta Maurya by the Puranic accounts of the Hindus. “There is a good deal of confusion in these Buddhistic works as regards the very family and genealogy of Asoka, the Buddhistic king, and one can easily trace that the life and time of Asoka must have been constructed by the Buddhistic writers who flourished several hundreds of years after him, by jumbling up the lives of three different Indian kings, viz., (1) of Asoka, (Dharmasoka) the third in ascent from Kanishka belonging to the First Gonda Dynasty of Kasmir kings as described in the First Book of KalhaYa’s Raja-Tarangini who is said to have freed himself from sins by embracing the faith of Gautama Buddha and by constructing numerous Viharas and Stupas, and by building the town of Srinagar with its ninety-six lakhs of houses resplendent with wealth, (2) of Asokavardhana (Chandasaoka) the grandson of Chandragupta Maurya, as described in the Purvas, and (3) of Samudragupta or Asoka the Great, (Mahasoka) the son of Chandragupta the Founder of the Gupta Dynasty, described by Mr. Vincent A Smith himself as the Indian Napoleonic, as narrated by his biographer Harshana, and in the Kalyuga Raja Vritanta, and as corroborated by his numerous coins and inscriptions recently unearthed by European scholars themselves.”

The Mahavamsa, (according Wijesinha’s revised edition of Turnour translation) says “One Kāliśoka had ten sons, who after his death ruled the kingdom righteously for 22 years. They were succeeded by other nine brothers, who likewise, in order of seniority, ruled the kingdom for 22 years. A Brahman named Chāyaka, who had conceived an implacable hatred against Dhana Nanda, the last survivor of the nine brothers, put that king to death, and placed upon the throne Chandragupta, a member of the princely Morya clan descended from the line of the Sākyas, who ruled the country for 34 years. He was succeeded by his son Bindusāra, who ruled the land for 28 years. The sons of Bindusāra, the offspring of sixteen mothers, numbered one hundred and one, of whom the eldest was named Sumana, and the youngest Tishya. A third son, Asoka, uterine brother of Tishya, had been appointed Viceroy of Ujjain by his father. On receiving news of King Bindusāra’s mortal illness, Asoka hastened to Pataliputra, slew his
eldest brother Sumana and his 98 other brothers and ruled the country for 37 years”

The Dipavamsa, on the other hand, substitutes Susunāga for Kā-āsoka and makes Asoka, the son of Susunāga himself, and omits all mention of the nine Nanda brothers.

The Asoka-vadāna (according to the prose version in the Divyā-vadāna) gives the following account of the lineage and family of Asoka —

“(1) King Bimbisāra reigned at Rājagṛha. His son was (2) Ajataśatru, whose son was (3) Udayibhadra, whose son was (4) Munda, whose son was (5) Kākavaran, whose son was (6) Sahālin, whose son was (7) Tulakuchi, whose son was (8) Mahāmaudala, whose son was (9) Prasenajit, whose son was (10) Nanda, whose son was (11) Bindusāra. King Bindusāra reigned at Pataliputra and had a son named Susima. To him was born of Subhadrāngī, the daughter of a Brāhman, two sons, the elder named Asoka, and the younger named Viyatāsoka. Asoka secured the throne by putting to death the legitimate prince Susima by a stratagem devised by Rādhagupta by which Susima was inveigled while marching against the capital, so that he fell into a ditch full of burning fuel and there miserably perished.”

Here it will be observed that Candragupta is altogether omitted, and Bindusāra, the father of Asoka, is represented as being the son of Nanda. The metrical Asokavadāna, on the other hand, substitutes Mahipala for Ajataśatru, and exhibits numerous other variations, which deprive these Buddhistic accounts of historical worth. The conquests ascribed to Asoka in the various Buddhistic accounts are no doubt taken from the conquests of Samudragupta or Asoka the Great, and the embassy of the Ceylon king is also traceable to the same origin. The story of his having embraced the faith of Buddha, of his having built stūpas and vihāras, of his having reconstructed the city of Pataliputra and of his having introduced several reforms in the affairs of the kingdom and in the matter of the appointment of officers of state are all taken from the accounts of Asoka and his successors as given by Chhavilākara and by Kalhaṇa in his Rājaṭarangini.

73 Inferences have been drawn in support of this imaginary synchronism by the dates assigned to Buddha-Nirvāṇa. Opinions are various on that event. “The Northern Buddhists give dates ranging from 2422 to 546 B C, and the Ain-i Akbarī of Abul Fazl fixes 1246 B C, for
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the event. The Tamil Manimegalai gives the year 1616 of some unknown era, probably of the Kali, and the Buddhists of Ceylon, Burma and Siam have uniformly been regulating their calendars on the basis that the Nirvana occurred in B.C. 543. The Western scholars are likewise as much divided in their opinion, though their dates range only from 544 to 370 B.C. Professors Rhys Davids and Kern give 412 and 388 B.C respectively for the Para Nirvana, whereas Max Muller to the last maintained that 477 B.C. was the correct date. Dr Fleet considers the event to have taken place in B.C. 482 and Professor Oldenberg and M Barth fix it in 480 B.C. Mr V A Smith has given us three different dates, B.C. 508 in his 'Asoka', 487 in his 'Early India', and 480 to 470 B.C in a recently published article."

The Maurya dynasty ruled at Magadha according to the Puranas in 1535-1219 B.C., and Candragupta ascended the throne in 1538 B.C. But according to modern orientalists the Gupta era began somewhere about 325 B.C. There they vary in arranging the date of Candragupta's coronation between 325 and 312 B.C., such as 325, 321, 316, 315 and 312. For instance, V. Smith, as we have seen, fixes the coronation of Candragupta in 321 B.C. But Fleet has a word of condemnation: "Mr Smith's chronological details are even inter se wrong and irreconcilable. The most reliable tradition, adopted by Mr. Smith himself for other ends, gives an interval of 56 years from the commencement of the reign of Chandragupta to the abhisheka of Asoka, yet on the same page, Mr Smith has adopted only 52 years, placing the abhisheka of Asoka in B.C. 269. And further, he has placed only three years earlier, in B.C. 272, that which he has termed the "accession" — (in reality, the usurpation) — of Asoka, regardless of the fact that the same tradition makes that interval one of four years. A chronology which includes such inconsistencies and errors as these in some of its radical details cannot in any way be accepted as final."

1. JRAS, (1906) 179 and 669
2. Indian Review, VIII 561.
3. See M Senart, I4, XX 229, V Gobala Aiyar, I4, XXXVII 941; Buhler, I4, VI 149, 351; EHL, 15; Fleet, JRAS, (1904), 1, (1906), 989, V, Smith, EHL, 173
4. JRAS, (1906), 984
5. This is easily arrived at, by deduction, from the Dipavamsa, 6, I 90, 21. It is expressly stated by the commentary on that work, the Mahayavamsa, in the statement about Asoka (Turner 21 f) that —

Vematiivahu jhatte so hanyvaa ekunakam satam !
 sakala Jambuddharam ekarajam apakuni

L
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In a paper read before the First Oriental Conference in Poona in 1919 on the same subject, the epoch of the Early Guptas, Hiralal Amritalal Shah of Bombay again considered the question, and adducing quite different reasons, arrived at about A.D. 200 for the initial date of the early Gupta era.

74. In a scholarly examination of the subject R Shama Sastry thus summarises the results of his research:

"(1) Alberuni's statement that the Gupta Valabhi era A.D. 319-320 was started from the epoch of the extermination of the Guptas is shown to be correct, inasmuch as it is supported by the Prabhavakacharita.

(2) The initial date of the early Gupta era, as distinguished from the Gupta-Valabhi era of A.D. 319-320, is fixed to be in A.D. 200-201 on the authority of Jinasena's statement that Guptas ruled for 231 years and preceded the rule of Kalki whose birth date is fixed to be in the Mahamāgha-samvalsara, A.D. 402 on the authority of Nemichandra's statement made in his Bāhubalcharita that Chāmundaya (A.D. 970-1030) set up the statue of Gomateeswara in Belgola on Sunday, the Chastra sukla panchami of the year Vibhava in Kalki era 600 expired, corresponding to Sunday the 3rd March of A.D. 1028.

(3) With this starting point for the early Gupta era, the date of Silāditya VII or Dhruvakhaṭa of Valabhi, Gupta samvalsara 447 comes out to be 200-201+447=A.D. 647, making it possible for the Chinese traveller Huien Tsiang to meet him about A.D. 640.

(4) With this initial date of the early Guptas, the last date of Samudragupta's rule will be about A.D. 282 when or a little earlier he could possibly conquer the Shahan Shahr and the last king of the Muruna dynasty of Pataliputra, and when he could receive an embassy from Meghavarnābhaya, king of Ceylon, whose date of accession to the throne is A.D. 254.

(5) This initial date of the Early Guptas plus the inscriptive date

Jina-mabhātāto pachobhāt ābhisekato ābhisekato
dhārasam vassā saśam dvayam evam vjananyam l]
Pataśval chatauha vasahhi ekarṣa maḥāyaśaś i
pure Pataliputrem ātāsam ahhisechrāy [l]'

"Having slain (his) brothers, born of various mothers, to the number of a hundred less by one, he attained sole sovereignty in the whole of Jambudvīpa. After the death of the Conqueror (Buddha), (and) before the ascension of him (Akṣa), (there were) 218 years, thus it is to be understood Having reached (a point of time marked) by four years, he, possessed of the great glory of sole sovereignty, caused himself to be anointed at the town Pataliputra."
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269 of Mahānāman's construction of a Vihara in Bodhgaya is shown to tally with the Ceylonese date of king Dhatusena (469) whose contemporary was Mahānāman, the priest and founder of the Vihara.

(6) It has also been shown how the last of the Andhrabhātṛīya kings Śātakarni duṭṭa-kulanaṇḍa was contemporary with the first of the Guptas, the successors of the Brihadbāṣas in the north and how Mayuraraṇman, the first of the Kādambas and conqueror of the Brihadabāṇas in Mysore was contemporary with the same Śātakarni and how Kakusṭhasvarma living in the 80th year of Kādaṃba victory was contemporary with Chandragupta II living in the 82nd year of the Gupta era and probably gave his daughter in marriage to Chandragupta II.

(7) It is also shown how with this starting point for the Gupta era, Thursday coincides with Ashadhā Sukla Dvādasī of Budhagupta's inscriptive date, G S 165. Here the year taken for verification is A.D. 200-201. G S, 165 expired = 365-366. The twelfth Tithi of Ashadhā (June) A.D, 365 is shown to fall on Thursday.

(8) For the assumption that there were two Toramanas and two Mihirakulas, the Chinese accounts of the murder of Śimha, the 23rd Buddhist Patriarch, by Mihirakula in about 420 A.D are to be relied upon. It is however immaterial whether this assumption proves acceptable or not, for the burden of proof for the starting point of the Early Gupta era in A.D., 200-201 does not depend upon it.

(9) As the Early Gupta era of A.D. 200-201 is shown to be quite different from the Gupta-Valabhi era used by the Huns and probably by the Paurvājaka Mahārājās, my scheme does not come into clash with Dr. Fleet's scheme.

(10) Thus scheme throws a flood of light on what has hitherto been regarded as a dark period between A.D., 200 and 300 in the History of India.

75 Speaking of the Indian sources, Fleet wrote (IA, XXX 1):

"We should not be able to deduce the date of Asoka from the Puranas. But we should find that the Rajatarangini would place him somewhere about B.C., 1260. We shall find, indeed, that the Nepal Vamsavaḷi would place him, roughly, about B.C., 2600. As, however, that list does not mention him as a ruler of Nepal but only as a visitor to the country, we should probably infer a mistake in that account, and prefer to select the date of B.C., 1260. And then we should set about arranging the succession of the kings of India, itself, from the Puranas.
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with B.C 1260 for the approximate date of the accession of Asoka as our starting-point."

76 In his dissertation on the Chronology of the Hindus, written in 1788 (As Res Vol II, p 111, reprint of 1799) Sir William Jones took a different starting-point and fixed it in a different way. His paper was based on a work entitled Puranarthaparakasa, which was composed shortly before the time at which he was writing, by Pandit Radhakant Sarman and which seems to have been based, in its turn, chiefly on the Bhagavatapurana. In the first place he brought forward a verse given to him from a book entitled Bhagavatamrita, composed by "a learned Goswami," which purported to fix the Kaliyuga year 1002 expired as the date of the manifestation of Buddha. With this he coupled an 'assertion in the same book that, two years before that date, there occurred the revolution which placed on the throne Pradyot, the first king in the third dynasty before that of the Mauryas. And he thus exhibited a chronology which, taking the accession of Pradyot in B.C 2100 as its starting-point, placed the accession of Sisunaga in B.C 1962, the accession of Nanda in B.C 1602, and the accession of Candragupta (the grandfather of Asoka) in B.C 1502, and made the dynasty of the Andhrabhṛgyas run from B.C. 908 to 432. But he considered that the figures put forward by the Puranas were excessive both for generations and for reigns. And adjusting those figures according to his own estimate, and taking, as a starting-point B.C 1027 for the date of Buddha as fixed by the Chinese authorities as interpreted by De Geignes, he submitted a revised scheme, which placed Pradyot B.C 1029 Nanda B.C 699, and the rise of the Andhrabhṛtyas in B.C 149.

77. Pañjanjali mentions in Mahābhāṣya (I 1, 68) 'Candragupaśabhā' and 'Puṣyamātra-sabhā.' It is said that he mentions Mauryas in V 11, 39 as the vendors of idol images or beggars carrying these idols but does not connect them with any of the ruling races at all. The reading of the word 'Maurya' seems to be wrong. 'The old MSS. (of the Mahabhashya) of the South makes the allusion of making and selling idols apply not to Mauryas but to Pouras, a peculiar tribe also mentioned in the Vishnu Purana (IV xxiv), for example MSS Nos 31, 33 of the Adyar Library, which are, on paleographical examination found to be more than 3 and 4 centuries old respectively, may be consulted. If "Pouras" be the right word, so much controversy about the allusion of Pañjanjali to the Mauryas will vanish at once."
78. Kalhana’s Rājatarangini is not after all an unreliable record. As a chronicle of Kashmir annals it is a true representation. Its importance in literary history lies in the variety and detail of traditional information it gives of past history over a long period of 3500 years. He wrote the introduction to his work in 1148 A.D. He might have been in error in saying that the Mahābhārata war was fought in 663 B.C, for there were two astronomical views on the movement of Sapta-rṣis and he chose one of them.  

Kalhana says that the 24th year of the Laukika corresponded with the year 1070 of Śakakāla. “The year 1 of the Laukika coincided with 1047 of the Saka, or A D 1025, and as the cycle was a century one, the first year of each century must have corresponded with the 25th year of each Christian century.”

79. Loka Kala, Laukikābda or Sapta-Rṣi-Kāla is so named after the Sapta-Rṣis seven Rṣis or the seven stars of the constellation of Great Bear. It is supposed that the Rṣis move from star to star once in a hundred years, but on the actual reckoning there is a difference of opinion between Vṛddha Garga and Purāṇas on the one side and Varāhamihira and other later astronomers on the other. “By the former it is said the seven Rṣis were in Māgha between 3177 and 3077 B.C, that is in B C 3101 at the beginning of the Kali-yuga, while by the latter they are placed in Māgha just 653 years later, between B C, 2477 and 2377, that is in B C 2448. The reckoning of the Lok-Kal, as now used in Kashmir and the other hill states, is by the common luni-solar years beginning on Chaitra 1, or the new moon of Chaitra. The cycle consists of 27 centuries, each counting from 1 to 100 years, when a new reckoning is begun. The first year of each century corresponds with the 25th year of each Christian century.”

80. Modern historians are again uncertain on the date of Kanśika but the opinion prevails among them that he ruled in about 78 A.D. and according to some his name is connected with the Śāka era. If according to Kalhana, the reigns of kings that ruled in Kashmir after Kanśika made up a period of 2330 years up to his day, that is, the reign of King Jayasimha, Kalhana would then go up to 78 plus 2330 to 2408 A.D, but we are now in 1937 A.D.

1. See para 184-188 on Kalhana.
2. See for an elaborate discussion, Cunningham’s Indian Eras.
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81. The story of Candragupta as originally given in the Brhaṭ-kathā in the Pāścācī language by Gunādhya, the prime minister of King Sātavāhana of Praṣṭhāna, and as we now have it in Kaṭhāsarisāgara, a true translation of the said work in Sanskrit by Sōmadēva, is somewhat different from the accounts given of that prince in the Purāṇas on the one hand, and in Visākhadaṭṭa's Mudrārākṣasa and its commentary on the other. Here Candragupta is represented as the only son of Nanda, the king of Pātalīputra and a contemporary of Kaṭhāyana Vararuci, the celebrated author of Vārtkastas and a disciple of Varṣacārya, under whom Pāṇini also first began to study Grammar.

82. The following are the passages of Kaṭhāsarisāgara, dealing with King Nanda and Candragupta —

अतान्तरे हुष्याराज्ञ गुत्वा तीनानाद तपः।
आराधितो मध्ये देवे वरद पावैतीपति॥

लोकात स्त्रिया सहिनो वर्णितम्।
तदर्शातुमहदेव मया पृण्याहक च तद्॥

...

ब्रह्मायण भद्धुएक्षरायु व्यक्तवें समझ्॥
तत् व्रन्युं धृतक्रमार्गिणय तस्मात् तद्॥

tato vṛddyānātandhāmya vishvaptito varttā mati।

गृहस्वनोभवेतु लग्नकोरमें धीमानमिति॥

अनोमलं गृहवानं कर्तव्यं कथा मानमत्योजनात्॥

पुरुषराज सहुः। नन्दाधारितो गृहस्वनेवायु॥

गृहस्वनो मानमत्योत्स्थासरितु काचनायतेः।

वनायकाया नवते कोटिनामोचपो हि स्॥

वाचा तेनोपकोशा च माना नान्ताधिकृता।

अत वाचस्य से किंचिद् तद्वृत्त समवायते॥

हि विदितवर्णदस्य गृहस्वने वर्णवाचारिणः॥

आदाने चाक्षुसं च राजा प्यन्तवं गत।

राघुः केलाहुः नाति विषदेन संगैः न॥

अनुवादनि नियोजय तत्कथा ग्रामसिद्धिश्रमस्।

गतातीतस्य भूपस्य शरीरः प्रविष्टान्यहं॥

1. See par. 4-7 post.
अथवा वर्तमानस्तु दासाम्यस्ते च काव्यनवः।
व्याहन रक्षता मे देव तत्त्र अलागमार्धी।
हर्षुक्ता नन्देहान्तारिन्द्रदत्त समाविष्टतः।
पत्युजीवि भृः च राज्ये तनोत्सवो आवतः।।
श्रुः देवगुहे देवोमन्दिरचय रक्षितुम्।
व्याही सिंहे गतोऽकृमसंभा राज्ये।।
विजया वर्तमानारे च विवाह्य यशदलिष्टाम्।
योगस्त्रोती सया तज्ज्वेगोट्ट स गामित।।
तत्स य सङ्कटाधोलः सत्यन्द्रस्य मन्त्रिणाम्।
हर्षोक्ते सम्प्रदायम् दार्येेति संमाधिश्च।।
म्पूर्णो जीत्यते दृष्टा स संध्या प्रासादमिनि।।
न तच्च वाहनवानः मन्त्री किमेवं हि धीमता।।
देव दीयत हर्षुक्ता स च मन्त्रीलक्षित्वतः।
नन्दक तनयो बालो राज्ये च ब्रह्मचर्याम।।
ततु सम्प्रदाय रक्षार्थ तस्य देवमुद्रितः।
निश्चितैत्वर्ष स तत्त्वाय वायां सर्वनांवाहतः।।
चारैरिपूण तनमधे कुम्भा देवगुहाचतः।।
व्याह विधूष्य तदृ दुर्धर्मिन्द्रवचकेश्वरः।।

अपेक्षा योगनन्दस्य न्यायिना कांचित पुरः।।
अथान्यप्रदेशस्यान्तरिन्द्रजीवी योगस्थिता दिनः।।
अनाथश्वेत दृश्य विहारंचक्षरद्वीपः।।
तप्नुक्ता योगनन्दस्य कांस्यब्रजस्वामिष्वकः।।
देहदाहातु स्थिरे सर्निन् जाते निग्रीष में ददी।।
सुरैकोटे स तत्त्र शक्तामो भवामितिः।।
योगनन्दोऽथ बुले सनोको न्यायिन्यवैदतः।।
श्रीसुमूलोत्सर्स्तिः बिचोडः कि श्रीया सखियापि मे।।
तप्नुक्ता ब्रजस्वामः तं न्यायः काशोलिष्टमाष्टिः।।
हातंसे शक्तालेन तदेन विनंयास्याः।।
महामन्नीश्वरः सन्ध्वमित्रातृ त्वः विनास्येवः।।
पौवनन्ददत्त सन्यास्यस्य हि मूर्षिन्यः।।
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tस्मादरराचि मात्रिक्षुस्थेऽकृत येन ते।
प्रत्येकाया संवेदार्ज्ञ सिंह दिश्याध्यामया॥
रूपकंतकैव गते व्याधि दातु ता गृहदक्षिणाय।
तदेववाज्ञीय दृष्टा योगनदेन मान्यता॥

इति स्त्रिपिठुखेकं पचमत्तरंगं॥

dिशसेनन्द्र गण्डक्षात तदृत्त तपयाननसः॥
अभोध्यात उपागच्छति विप युक्तो मनि स्थिते॥
स भया स्थोनन्दस्य राज्यावार्तमुख्ष्णव्रत॥
सत्यमिश्राया मा सोऽष्ठ तस्मिन्मिष्ठ मन्बदी।॥
श्रुतृ नंदस्य युद्धमत तत्सकाशादाते तव।
कर्मःवाकास्तवलाभोऽवृक्षकारा भिक्षिणं स॥
स विन्तयुष्य करोपाय योगनन्दस्य मुक्तिः।
कृतिति खण्डनतमलाक्षणयास्व प्रिय सप्ति॥
किं गुण्डनस्तुन्तुके तेन विग्रहेः शाक्यवी।
दंसीदुमृग्यवच्च पादो प्रेतेन मे क्षत॥
तत्त्वः शास्त्रा मन्नी कोपन कृतिनिश्चयम्॥
ते विश्व योगनन्दस्य करोपायमन्योत॥
नाम गुण्डास्वीवत् तत देव स्मृत्। दापपामः ते।
असः संस्करिष्यार्धे गृहे नन्दस्य भुष्टे॥

dक्षिणातः सुर्यस्य लक्ष्म सम महायत।
मौर्यस्य पुरि भार्त्याः प्रक्षि तादःगृहेऽसम॥
कृत्यक्ष्व शक्तादस्ति चाणक्यमनवद्युक्त्॥
आद्राहेऽवर्त्तितु स च राधे स श्रीहे च तत॥
तत् स गतवा नामको चूरी शाबद उपाविष्ठत।
प्रवृत्तुप्रमा विश्रात तामसीच्छुरमासन।॥
तदृत्त गतवा शक्तादेन विस्तो नन्दस्यपारी॥
अवाधीश्चायरो ये-ये। सुकुमरुदुःरी विच्छुद।॥
आगायतौ च राजा होशक्ताहो महानंत।
न मेघराघ इत्युक्तः चाणक्याय न्येषदयत्॥
सोऽष्ठ कोपन चाणक्यों विशालिन समन्तः॥
निःशुमुक्तवा शिशुवा तत्र प्रतिष्ठामकरोविसम।॥
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The above passage has been briefly translated by H H Wilson as follows —

"After living for a considerable period in my hermitage, the death of Yogananda was thus related to me by a Brähman, who was travelling from Ayodhya and had rested at my cell, Šakatāla, brooding on his plan of revenge, observed one day a Brähman of mean appearance digging in a meadow, and asked him what he was doing there, Chānakya, the Brähman, replied "I am rooting out this grass which has hurt my foot." The reply struck the minister as indicative of a character which would contribute to his designs, and he engaged him by the promise of a large reward and high honour, to come and preside at the Śrāddha, which was to be celebrated next new moon at the palace Chānakya arrived, anticipating the most respectful treatment, but Yogananda had been previously persuaded by Šakatāla to assign precedence to another Brähman, Subandhu, so that when Chānakya came to take this place, he was thrust from it with contumely. Burning with rage, he threatened the king before all the court, and announced his death within seven days. Nanda ordered him to be turned out of the palace. Sakatāla received him into his house and persuading Chānakya that he was wholly innocent of being instrumental to his ignominious treatment, and contributed to encourage and inflame his in-
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dignation Chānakya thus protected, practised a magical rite, in which he was a proficient, and by which, on the seventh day Nanda was deprived of life Śakatāla, on the father's death, effected the destruction of Hiranyakagupta, his son, and raised Chandragupta, the son of genuine Nanda to the throne. Chānakya became the prince's minister, and Śakatāla having attained the only object of his existence, retired to end his days in the woods."

83. According to Kaṭhāsarit-Sāgara therefore Chandragupta was the only son of the genuine-king Nanda, and was very young when the genuine Nanda passed away and Indradaṭṭha entered the dead body of the king and began to rule the kingdom, so he was called by the name Yoga Nanda. Yogananda begot a son on the queen of the late real or Satya Nanda and he was named Hiranyagupta. Besides the mention of these two persons, there is no reference to "Nanda and his eight sons" anywhere in the said poem. These passages also show that Chandragupta was but a king in name, that he was in no sense a usurper or adventurer, that he took no active part at all in establishing himself on the throne of Nanda, that it was Śakatāla, the old minister of the king, and Cāpakya, a Brahman sage of great learning and determination that planned the death of Yogananda and of his son Hiranyagupta, and raised the young prince Candragupta, the legitimate son of the genuine Nanda to the throne of Magaṭha. Nowhere is there any reference to this Chandragupta being a conqueror of enemies or of having received ambassadors from foreign princes, either at Pataliputra or Ayodhya, the permanent and temporary capitals, and it is at Ayodhya the revolution came off on the death of king Nanda, leading to the elevation of Candragupta to the throne.

84. The statements of the early European writers may now be summed up—(a) At the time of Alexander's invasion, the Prasi or eastern kingdom of Magaṭha was ruled over by a king Xandrames, according to the officers of Alexander sent to investigate the country living ahead, and also according to Poros whom Alexander consulted, Xandrames was a powerful king who could bring into the field 20,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 2900 chariots and 4000 or 3000 elephants, he was nevertheless of mean origin, the queen of his predecessor had fallen

1. (Vide Appendix II to the Preface of his Mudrarakshasa, The Theatre of Hinduus, II. 140-141).
2. McChinda's collection and translation of all the passages from classical writers in six books are regarded as reliable by Vincent Smith, of which Indika et Megasthene and Arian are instructive.
in love with him and had helped him to murder her husband, and therefore he was very unpopular with his subjects (b) Sandrokottos or Androcottos as a young prince had met Alexander, and had offended him and incurred his displeasure, but after the retreat of Alexander he put himself at the head of a band of robbers, drove out the prefects of Alexander, and made himself king (c) Seleukus Nikator tried to regain the Indian conquests of Alexander, but found it wiser to contract an alliance with him (d) Megasthenes the ambassador of Seleucus dwelt at the court of Sandrocottus and wrote an account of those in whose midst he lived (from which account later writers have quoted copiously)

"The Greek writers mention as many as six names or variations, Xandrames, Andrames, Agrammes, Sandrocottus and Sandrocypius. Whether these apply to one or more than one individual; and Max Muller was not sure but in his obdurate zeal to demonstrate the identity he said "Xandrames...is the last king of the empire conquered by Sandracotus If however it should be maintained that those two names were intended for one and the same king, the explanation would still be very easy For Chandragupta is also called Chandra, and Chandramas in Sanskrit is a synonym for Chandra"

85 What was discovered was simply this—that in the celebrated inscriptions of king Priyadarsin—Rock Edicts III and XIII—Antiochus and Ptolemy are mentioned as Priyadarsin’s contemporaries. There is nothing in the inscriptions to show that Priyadarsin was Asoka Maurya, grandson of Chandragupta Maurya. Strict logic will justify only one inference from the first Greek Synchronism—that Sandrocottus whoever he was was the contemporary of Seleukus Nikator, and only one from the second—that Priyadarsin was the contemporary of a Greek ruler Antiochus. Unless proof is forth coming to show that either Sandrocottus or Priyadarsin was a Maurya king, it is wrong to say as Vincent Smith does say, that by the discovery of these two synchronisms "the chronology of the Maurya dynasty was placed on firm footing, and is no longer open to doubt in its main outlines"

86. Who was Xandrames? Let us compare the Greek and the Indian versions, understanding Xandramas to be the predecessor of Sandrocottus. First in Indian traditions Nanda, or more precisely Sumālya Nanda, was the immediate predecessor of Chandragupta Maurya. If therefore by Sandrocottus we are to understand Chandragupta Maurya,
we must identify Xandrames with Nanda. This is exactly what is done by almost all Orientalists like Vincent Smith, with a vague statement "that the king of the Gangaridæ and Parsu, was named, as nearly as the Greeks could catch the unfamilar sounds, Xandrames or Agrammes,...,...who must have been one of the Nandas mentioned in native tradition" and that somehow in order to maintain the hypothesis, Xandrames must be identified with Nanda. Max Muller as a philologist is convinced that Greek Xandrames is Sanskrit 'Chandramas or Chandra,' and rather than ignore grammar he is for identifying Xandrames and Sandrocottus. Secondly the Greek account of Xandrames does not tally either with Hindu or with Buddhist versions of Nanda, According to them Mahāpadma, first king of the Nanda dynasty, was the son of the last Śaṇṭunāgā King Mahānandin by a Śūdra wife, and was a powerful, avancious, wicked king, having Kṣatriya wives, but there is no allusion to any of his father's wives having become his paramour. The Purānic writers, had no love for Mahāpadma and they would certainly have mentioned such an incident in his life, if it really referred to him. His father Mahānandin is nowhere stated to have been murdered whether by Mahāpadma or his paramour. Thus neither from the name nor from the description, can Xandrames be reasonably identified with Nanda.

87 We have no less difficulty in identifying Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus with Candragupta Maurya. The description given of the mighty Sandrocottus by the Greeks cannot possibly compare with any Indian account whatsoever of Candragupta Maurya, who, far from being a great conqueror, owed his elevation and rule entirely to the Brāhmaṇa Cāṇākyā or Kantilya. The Hindu and the Buddhist versions are agreed here. Max Muller's explanation is only this, that because Candragupta Maurya was grandfather of the great Buddhist Emperor Asoka, therefore the Brahmans unduly lowered him, and the Buddhists as excessively exalted him, and that is mere fancy. The part played by Rākṣasa, the devoted minister of the Nandas at first and of Candragupta at last, and the power exercised throughout by the Brahma Cāṇākyā over Candragupta amply indicate that Candragupta and his immediate predecessors were in no way considered anti-brahmanical. Even King Priyadarsan of the Edicts was no persecutor of the Brahmans, for in his inscriptions he always enjoins the highest respect for "brahmanas and śramanas."

1. EHI, 40.
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88 The identification of Rāja Priyadārsin with Raja Asoka was based entirely upon Ceylonese Buddhist chronicles. Talboys Wheeler wrote in 1874, "The identification of Raja Priyadārsin of the Edicts with Raja Asoka of the Buddhist chronicles was first pointed out by Mr Turnour who rested it upon a passage in the Dipāvamsa. The late Prof Wilson objected to this identification." Prof Rhys Davids declared "It is not too much to say that without the help of the Ceylon Books, the striking identification of the King Piyadasi of the edicts with the king Asoka of history would never have been made." But the Ceylon chronicles are admitted to be utterly worthless as history and according to Wheeler "the Buddhist chronicles ....might be dismissed as a monkish jumble of myths and names," and even Vincent Smith in the preface to his Asoka himself said "I reject absolutely the Ceylonese chronology ...... The undeserved credit given to the monks of Ceylon has been a great hindrance to the right understanding of ancient Indian history." And yet it is on such undeserved credit that the identity of Priyādārsin with Asoka Maurya rests to this day.

89. In the literature of India there is no allusion anywhere to an invasion or inroad into India by foreign nations up to the time of the Andhra kings; and the only person who bore the name of Candragupṭa answering to the description of Sandracottus of the Greeks who flourished about the time of Alexander the Great in India, according to the Purāṇas, was Candragupṭa of the Guptā Dynasty who established the mighty empire of the Guptas on the ruins of the already decayed Andhra Dynasty about 2811 years after the Mahābhārata War, corresponding to 328 B.C., but he is now being placed in the 4th century A.D., on the sole strength of this mistaken Greek Synchronism by our Savants of Indian history. God save us from our friends!

90. Beyond the verbal resemblance of Candragupṭa and Sandracottus and Pātaliputra and Pālboṭra, there is nothing to justify the identification of Candragupṭa Maurya and Sandracottus of the Greeks. No attempt has been made to explain the various names Sandrāmes, Andrames, Andracottus, Sandracottus, Sandrocyphtus, and Sandrocuptas as used by the Greek writers to denote three different persons, as referring respectively to the last king of the previous dynasty, the usurper who has been actually reigning at Pātaliputra at the time when Alexander

1. History of India, Hindu, Buddhist and Brahmanical, 280
2. Buddhist India, 273
3. EB1, 171
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invaded India, and the king who concluded a treaty with Seleucus Nicator at the instance of Megasthenes. These facts would equally apply, if not more pointedly, to Candragupta of the Gupta Dynasty who usurped the throne of Candrasri, the last virtual king of the Andhra Dynasty, under the pretext of acting as guardian and regent of his minor son Puloman and who was succeeded by Samudragupta who established himself on the throne of his father with the aid of vagabonds and bandits at Pataliputra, and who is distinctly stated in inscriptions to have received ambassadors from various foreign princes, to have conquered the whole of India, then extending far beyond its present limits, and to have performed even an Abhimedha sacrifice in honour of his glorious victories.

91 Kaliyugarravatita, which is a part of Bhavisyotparapuran, describes the last two kings of the Andhra dynasty and the advent of Gupta dynasty thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{अन्नप्राय कालान्तरमें स्त्री, वर्ण शून्यता,} & \\
\text{वासिष्ठुँचमात्रा स्थायी यथा स्विच्छता} & \\
\text{पुलोमा नयो च वाच्यमात्रात मध्यमन्त्रय} & \\
\text{वल्लोयस्या यथा चन्द्रेष्ट्रन प्राप्तित} & \\
\text{पुन: द्वारिण्यन्त्रात्मा शोक्ष्यते बहुक्ष्यमात्रा} & \\
\text{शतानि पन्व पूर्णिनि तेषा राज्य स्विच्छता} & \\
\text{तेषा हु संस्थिते राज्ये मूर्धिन्यन्त्रात् गम्भीरता} & \\
\text{स्त्रीपर्वतीया अर्ध्याण्वी इत्यादि यान्ति ये तुया.} & \\
1 & \\
\text{अवस्तु: चन्द्रेष्ट्रस:} & \\
\text{पार्षदील्लोकक.} & \\
\text{सीतावेतनाविपये पौली भृगुस्मपति.} & \\
\text{सीताभोक्तचुदयस: तनयोपमितितिविकरभृत्} & \\
\text{कुमारेद्वीपसुधाक नेपालामुखितु दुःखम} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

1. The names underlined like this, Śrī, Śrī, etc., are mentioned in order shyly by Kalidasa in Baghuvamsa (I 11 18) e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{आसीनहीनोत्तम मध्यनिकम अष्टक्नदमाभिव} & \\
\text{प्रभुतः कालान्तरम} & \\
\text{विष्णु शैवनिविविन} & \\
\text{वणसंख्यं} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here the word श्री a single letter, is compared with the word श्री — a single letter of great sanctity. In I 91, Kalidasa says that Sudakṣaṇa was a Magadha princess, thus suggesting that Kalidasa had in mind Magadha kingdom when he wrote this poem.
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तब्धप्रवेशो राजेयाँशिंत्र हिष्ष्वीनां सहायता: ||
सेनाध्यक्षपर्व राज्य नानासैद्धनयसम्बन्धित: ||
हिष्ष्वीयां समुद्राश देववधनश्रीवेदनुजाय: ||
राष्ट्रियस्थानः सूर्या राजपत्या च नौदित: ||
चन्द्रास्यं धातायला सिमेन्वेव हि केनचिद: ||
तपुजनावतंखे च राध्या चैव नियोजित: ||
वैच्छसुत सतावः: शासराज्यो बाहरामणीसी। ||
तपुजन च पुलोमान सिनहव नुङमकाय: ||
आचार्यो घारध्य राज्य सरसावधारिष्यति: ||
कलेवः कैन पुरस्वि हिष्ष्वीयेन संस्कृत: ||
विज्ञानिज्ञानाः तु सत्य पालकिता समाः: ||
सत्याः च शर्क लेकि स्थापितिः भूते: ||

एकस्वस्थभववती पुनर्ज्ञतः महायथा: ||
नेपालाधीशार्कृतिः स्थेन्यीतैः समाप्तत: ||
विषयं पितरं छत्रा सह्युँव सजान्तवः ||
अहलकारिणाः तु प्रज्ञातो जगतीतिः ||
सत्यं विगतशोकः मातरं वाशसिन्दयवः ||
सह्युँवयो मिष्टिः सार्थाद्वस्तत: परस्य: ||
विजयं सक्तायुगो धर्मपुल इवाप्यर: ||
समाहरणस्थमेरां व्याशायेन विचित्रसे: ||
वशेशाणेविवर्तिणांवेनः समसिप्पूनित: ||
शाश्वसाहित्यसनरास्तेम: कविभूनितुः ||
सह्युँव्याः: पुर्णिः चतुःसारगविदिताय: ||
पञ्चाशयं तथा चौका सौक्यत्वबैकराष्ट्र समाः: ||
तस्य पुषोपनर्धन्यास्ताश्यो बीरकेसरी: ||
यवनां तथा हृयानु देशादिप्रवायन् रक्तात्: ||
विक्रमादिविंशसिंहं पिन्यते: परसिद्धिः ||
शापस्वप्नित्तुपराः विद्वासलाभन्विश्वधः ||
विक्रमादिविख्यातं च उनमुः प्रणोद्य गताः ||
वसांविन्यासः समुत्तमें वाल्हितार्देनु विज्ञानं च ।
To translate a few of these verses

"Chandrasri Satakarni, known also as the son of Vashishthi will enjoy (the kingdom) for 3 years. After him yet another Puloma, will be king for 7 years under the protection of Chandragupta, son of Ghatotkacha. These thirty-two Andhra kings (already enumerated) will enjoy the earth, and their reign will cover full 500 years (in round
numbers While they are yet on the throne, the country will pass to the Guptas who will be known as the śrīparvatiya andhrabhiśa kings (i.e., those that had come from Śrīparvata, and had been in the service of the Andhras) .... And so the valiant Chandragupta, the head of the Parvatiya clan, grandson of the ruler of Śrīparvata named Śrīgupta, and son of Ghatotkacha Gupta, will marry Kumaradevi daughter of the king of Nepal Then with the help of the Lichchhavis he will gain influence in the Government (of Andhras), become the Commander-in-chief, and head of a large army He will marry a Lichchhavi Princess, the younger sister of the Queen of Chandras, and thus will become the King’s brother-in-law, And instigated by the Queen he, by some stratagem, will get King Chandrasṇi killed He will be appointed Regent in place of her son by the Queen, and in seven years he, un-daunted, will become sovereign himself, after killing the young Prince Puloman And thus by force he will seize the Kingdom from the Andhras, and will rule Magadha along (or jointly) with Kacha, his son by the Lichchhavi wife He will reign for seven years under the title of Viyaditya and shall establish on earth an era in his own name."

"After that (i.e., after Chandragupta) his son, son likewise of the daughter of the King of Nepal, with the aid of Mlechchha bands, will slay his treacherous father together with his son and other (unfriendly) relations He will be known on earth under the title of Asokaditya, himself freed from all misery, (spiritually?) and causing joy to his mother, Samudragupta will become supreme ruler of earth. He will conquer the whole world like a second Dharmaputra, and with the help of Brahmanas he will perform the horse-sacrifice according to the scriptures He will be honoured by (subject) Kings both in his own and in foreign countries, and will be praised by poets for his learning and talents in music Thus Samudragupta will reign supreme over the earth from sea to sea (at surrounded by the four oceans)"

92 This eulogy should bring to mind at once the Greek picture of Sandrocottus The sensitiveness of Prince Samnāra must have been stung by his father’s undue favouritism towards Kaca The statement that Candragupta ruled along with Kaca not merely indicates the cause of quarrel between Samudragupta and his father, it explains also the numismatic puzzle as to how Kaca’s coins came to be struck. Thus, then, Androkottus of Plutarch who tried to persuade Alexander to invade the Prasī, but whose “insolent behaviour” according to Justin led to a quarrel between him and Alexander, the Androkottus who
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afterwards collected bands of robbers and drove out the præfects of Alexander, who was called to royalty by the power of the Gods and by prodigies, who overthrew Xandrames, and humbled Seleucus Nicator, was the same as Samuḍragupta who with Mleccha troops overthrew his "treacherous" father, and whose conquests inscribed by Harisena on "Asoka's pillar" at Allahabad amply bear out the statement of the Purāṇas that Samuḍragupta was supreme ruler of the earth from sea to sea, to whom even Ceylon and Bactria and Assyria paid homage. And this same Samuḍragupta "the Indian Napoleon" of Vincent Smith, was the Sandrocottos of Megasthenes, and he reigned for fifty-one years, Samuḍragupta like all the Guptas had a title ending in adiṣṭya he was ASOKADITYA!

93. SANDROCOTTOS WAS ALSO PIYADASSI.—We have read of "Asoka the Buddhist Emperor of India" and "The first and most authentic records are the rock and pillar edicts of Raja Priyadası ....the reputed grandson of Sandrocottos. ...The second .. consist of the Buddhist Chronicles of the Rajah of Megadha" From a careful study of these two classes of records Talboys Wheeler whose "History of India" appeared in 1874, that is, before the traditional conventions of Orientalists took the fatally rigid shape which they have since assumed, drew his picture of Rāja Priyadarśī Asoka and found how like his picture was to that of the Greek Sandrocottas as depicted by Megasthenes Asoka, while young, was at variance with his father and seems to have gone into exile like another Rama. He is said to have been appointed to the Government of the distant province of Ujjain, and subsequently to have repressed a revolt in Taxila in the Panjab. The main incidents of Asoka's early career thus present a strange similarity to those recorded of Sandrokottos by Greek writers. Sandrokotatos was also an exiled prince from Pataliputra, and he ultimately drove the Greeks from Taxila. Again Asoka usurped a throne and founded an empire, so did Sandrokottos. Asoka originally professed the Brahmanical religion, and then embraced the more practical religion of the edicts Sandrokottos sacrificed to the Gods in Brahmanical fashion, but he also held a great assembly every year in which every discovery was discussed which was likely to prove beneficial to the earth, to mankind and to animals generally. ... It would be a startling coincidence if the great sovereign whose religion of duty without deity has been engraven for more than twenty centuries on the rocks

1 Talboys Wheeler's History of India, Hindu Buddhist, and Brahmanical p. 269.
2 Ibid. pp. 281, 487.
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and pillars of India, should prove to be the same prince who met Alexander at Taxila, who offended the Macedonian conqueror by his insolence and assumption, who expelled the Greeks from the Panjab during the wars of Alexander's successors, and ultimately married the daughter of Seleukos Nikator." In fact Talboys Wheeler had little doubt that Sandrokoctos of the Greeks and Asoka of the Buddhists were identical. In one or two places he calls Asoka" the reputed grandson of Sandrokoctos or Chandragupta & and adds in a note "The term 'reputed grandson' is here used advisedly. It will appear hereafter that there is reason to believe that the name Sandrokoctos and Asoka are applied to the same individual." The title Asokaditya applied to the king in the Kalyugardavattanā confirms the conjecture made by Talboys Wheeler from internal evidence.

94 Asoka and Samudragupta — The correspondence between these two names rests on not mere fancy. Asoka is said to have resented the ill-treatment accorded to him by his father, so did Samudragupta resent Asoka in becoming a King became a parricide, or fratricide also, so did Samudragupta become too. Both were Hindus at the outset. Special mention is made of the conquest of Kalinga by both Asoka was converted to Buddhism by Upagupta, who is described as a blood relation of Asoka's Samudragupta, it is admitted, was a pupil of the celebrated Buddhist teacher Vasubandhu. Asoka of the edicts though an earnest Buddhist enjoined the highest respect for Brähmapas Samudragupta, though an 'orthodox Hindu' was a great patron of Buddhism, and throughout the Gupta period "the Buddhist rule of life was observed. Buddhist monasteries were liberally endowed by royal grants." Both Asoka and Samudragupta had intimate relations with Ceylon, with Bactria and other foreign countries. These correspondences cannot fail to establish the identity of the two Emperors. Vincent Smith claims that modern oriental investigators have unearthed the history of Samudragupta, and wonders how "this great king, warrior, poet, and musician who conquered nearly all India,

1. Ibid., pp 209 and 476.
2. i.e., p. 487.
3. Ibid., p. 476.
4. Hariśena makes special mention that Samudragupta was received by his father with open arms. Where was the need for this special mention unless it were intended to contradict current beliefs to the contrary?
6. Ibid., pp. 283, 398-934, 297.
7. Ibid., p. 286.
INTRODUCTION

and whose alliances extended from the Oxus to Ceylon was unknown even by name to the historians of India.* The explanation is simple, Asoka, the title assumed by the emperor, completely replaced his personal name, and became a household word all over India, it was carried to Ceylon in the anecdotes regarding Raja Prayadarsāri Asoka. But Samudragupta was known to the Greeks as Sandrocottos only, and the name was also inscribed on the coins which lost to medieval India have now been discovered.

Asoka's pillar at Allahabad may, in one word, be said to link together all the three groups of contemporary evidence. It is the pillar of Samudragupta. Asoka Priyadarsin. The Greeks knew him not as Priyadarsin because Megasthenes had left Pahbotha before Sandrocottus became a Buddhist. The Ceylonese Buddhists knew not of the Hindu Samudragupta but only the Buddhist Priyadarsin. In India itself, except in popular tales about Asoka, both the names Samudragupta and Priyadarsin were forgotten, the older Purānic accounts all close with the Andhra line of kings practically. The monuments were all pulled down by the Mahomedan invaders.

Thus we see that the Gupta dynasty ruled from 328 BC to 83 BC, and of these kings Candragupta ruled from 328 to 321 (7 years) and Samudragupta for 51 years from 321 to 270 BC. This would make this Candragupta and Samudragupta contemporaries of Alexander, Selekus Nicator and Antiochus. Is this the correct synchronism?

Here is an inscription on the metal pillar in Buddha Gaya of a king Candra.

1. Ibid., p 269.
"He, on whose arm fame was inscribed by the sword, when in battle in the Vanga countries (Bengal), he kneaded (and turned) back with (His) Breast the enemies who uniting together, come against (Him), he, by whom, having crossed in warfare, the seven mouths of the (River) Sindhu, the Vahlikas were conquered, he by the breezes of whose powers the Southern ocean is even still perfumed. He, the remnant of the great zeal of whose energy, which utterly destroys (his) enemies (like the remnant of the great glowing heat) of a turned out fire in a great forest, even now leaves not the earth, though, he, the king, as if wearied has quitted this earth, and gone to the other world, moving in (bodily) form to the land of paradise won by (the merits of his) actions, (but) remaining on this earth by (the memory of his) fame; —By him, the King,—who attained sole supreme sovereignty in the world, acquired by his own arm and (enjoyed) for a very long time, (and) who having the name of Chandra, carried a beauty of countenance like (the beauty of) the full moon having in faith fixed his mind upon the (God), Vishnu, this lofty standard of divine Vishnu was set up on the hill (called) Vishnupada."

97. By this indictment of the present condition of Indian historical studies it is not in the least meant to belittle the labours of those illustrious savants of Sanskrit learning, who had left their countries and devoted their time and means for the understanding and dissemination of India’s ancient literature. India owes to them a debt of gratitude, which lapse of time, however long, cannot tend to obliterate, for those scholars, like Max Muller, Jones and Wilson have all left behind them monuments of learning and research in their editions of Sanskrit works and their translations which have gone out to the wide world for appreciation. It is all the same barely consistent with that expression of thankfulness that as time progresses and new material emerges, scholars should exercise their thoughts on questions on which there may be a possibility for review and reconsideration. Among such subjects is this topic of the Greek synchronism. The fancy that dawned in the mind of William Jones, was hatched by Wilford, was reared by Max Muller, was well clothed by Vincent Smith with the garb of reality. The dissent of Taylor expressed in the preface to Rājaṭarangini was lost to view before the modern ideas of A Stein in his new Edn. of that work, and so too went down the feeble protest of Wilson.
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98. To my lamented friend, T. S. Narayana Sastri, High Court Vakil, Madras, with whom I collaborated, was due a categorical investigation of this faulty identification and his Age of Sankara and The kings of Magadha embodied the results of our research. Then followed a similar exposition of Śrī Kalyāṇananda Sarasvatī of Virāpākṣa Mutt and an address to an Oriental Conference by M. K. Acharya. Now comes my reiteration. It may not be a forelorn hope that, as I said, at some day or in some clime these thoughts may again have a revival and a recognition. Let me repeat the words of Bhavabhūti:

बेनाम कृष्णेदिहु नः प्रथयन्त्वस्त्रां जानति ते किमपि तांत्र प्रति नैव वलनः ।
उत्तप्तवङ्गेन सम हु कोपि समानथम्भो कालो ज्ञाये निरंभितिपुलारः च पुष्पी ||

These prefatory pages will now introduce the reader to the study of Classical Sanskrit Literature.
**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Abhinava-Bhāraṭi of Abhinavagupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Cunningham’s Ancient Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aayar</td>
<td>Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Adyar Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>Annals of Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>Max Müller’s Ancient Sanskrit Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Bhāvaprakāśana of Śāradātānaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>Mss in Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BOD          | Catalogus Codicum Sanskritarum Bibliotheca Bodh-
<p>| Cat Bod      | | næ |
| Oxf          | Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta |
| Bibl Ind     | Buhler's Kashmir Report |
| BKR          | Bombay Sanskrit Series |
| KR           | A Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts contained in the |
|              | Private Libraries of Guzarat, Kathnavad, Kachchh,&amp;c |
|              | compiled under the superintendence of G. Buhler |
| Bts          | A catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the library of |
|              | the Mahārāja of Biknēr, compiled Rajendra Lala |
|              | Mitra, Calcutta |
| Bhr          | Report on the search for Sanskrit Mss in the Bombay |
| BR           | Presidency by R G Bhandarkar |
| Burnell      | A classified index to the Sanskrit Mss in the Palace at |
| BTC          | Tanjore by A C Burnell, London |
| OC I, II, III| Aufrechte’s Catalogus Catalogorum, Pts 1, 2, 3, Leipzig |
| CSC          | Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College, Calcutta |
| COJ          | Calcutta Oriental Journal |
| CVUS         | Columbia University—Indo-Iranian series |
| CII          | Corpus Ins Indicorum |
| CAL          | Catalogue of manuscripts in Adyar Library |
| Adyar        | Hiralal’s Catalogue of Manuscripts in Central Provinces |
| CASB         | Catalogue of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dasarupa of Dhananjaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Epigraphica Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHI</td>
<td>V Smith's Early History of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>R G Bhandarkar’s Early History of the Deccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHD</td>
<td>Epigraphica Carnatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>A E Gough's Records of Ancient Sanskrit Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS</td>
<td>Gaekwad Oriental series, Baroda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOS</td>
<td>Harward University Oriental Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Reports on Sanskrit manuscripts in S India by E Hultzsch, Madras 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISf</td>
<td>Indisch Strahlen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAAlt.</td>
<td>Indische Alterthumskunde, Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Indian Antiquary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Indian Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the India Office, London by Eggeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind Rev</td>
<td>Indian Review, Madras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatique, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAHS</td>
<td>Journal of Andhra Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASSP</td>
<td>Andhara Sahitya Parishat Patrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASB</td>
<td>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (Bombay Branch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSSP</td>
<td>Journal of Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDL</td>
<td>Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>Journal of Oriental Research, Madras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>Journal of Mythic Society, Bangalore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Catalogue of Manuscripts in Jessalmere Library (G O Series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess, Cat</td>
<td>Catalogue of Manuscripts in Jessalmere Library (G O Series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kad</td>
<td>Kavindracandrodaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith's SD</td>
<td>A B Keith's Sanskrit Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith's CSL</td>
<td>A B Keith's Classical Sanskrit Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith's SL</td>
<td>A B Keith's Sanskrit Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kav</td>
<td>F W, Thomas Edn of Kavindracanasamuccaya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

K ... A Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts existing in the
    Central Provinces—Edited by Keilhorn, Nagpur
Kh ... Report on the search for Sanskrit manuscripts in the
    Bombay Presidency during the year 1880-1 by
    Keilhorn, Bombay 1881 8

l c  loc. cit. ... (hanc citato)—‘in the passage previously cited,’
L ... Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts by Rajendra Lalé Mitra
Mitra ... Mackenzie Collection A descriptive catalogue of the
    Oriental Manuscripts collected by the late Lieut.
    Col Colin Mackenzie by H H Wilson, Calcutta,
Mak ... Manjusa, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta
Manj Jl ... Manjusha, Sanskrit Journal, Kanadi (Conjeeveram)
MBh Jl ... Mitragosti, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta
MG Jl ... A descriptive catalogue of manuscripts in Mithila by
    K Jayaswal
MM ... Maithuravangi, Sanskrit Journal, Belgam
MVT ... C V Vaidya’s Mediaval India,
MT ... Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in Oriental Library,
    Mysore and Supplement
Mys. OML ... Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts
Mys ... Modern Review, Calcutta,
Sup ... Natyadarpana of Ramacandra
Mys Sup ... A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libra-
    ries of the North-West Provinces, Benares and
    Allahabad.

NW ... Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal
NP ... Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts existing in Oudh.
Nepal Cat ... Catalogue Codicum Sanscritorum Bibliothecae Bod-
    leanae by Auffrecht, Oxoni, 1864.
Nepal ... Oxf
Oudh ... Bod
Cat. Bod,...  

op. at  o. c. ... (opere citato)—‘in the work cited.’
Oppert ... Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries in
    Southern India by Gustav Oppert, 2 Vols Madras,
Opp ... Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras,
OML ... Padumgaçañgini
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pady</td>
<td>Padyaveni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Peterson's Reports of the operations in search of Sanskrit MSS in the Bombay Circle (I to IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raj</td>
<td>Kalahana's Rajaatarangini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Rasārṇavasudhākara of Śingabhūpāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RgS</td>
<td>Rasikajīvana,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Mysore and Coorg by Lewis Rice, Bangalore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radh</td>
<td>Pustakānam Sucipatram of the library of Radhakrishna of Lahore used by Aufrecht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Jl</td>
<td>Samskṛta Bhārata, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Jt</td>
<td>Samskṛta-candrikā, Sanskrit Journal Kolhapur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMM Jl</td>
<td>Samskṛta-mahā-mandala, Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Sāhityaḥarpāṇa of Visvanātha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Saraswaṭīkanthābharaṇa of Bhoja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Śṛṅgāraprakāsa of Bhoja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Sanskrit Poetics by S. K. De.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Śāktisundara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHar</td>
<td>Subhāṣīṭaharāvali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smt</td>
<td>Śūktimukṭāvali,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sah</td>
<td>Sahodaya, Sanskrit Journal, Madras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Samvat Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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TRANSLITERATION

| अ  | a  | क  | k  | त  | t  |
|——|——|——|——|——|——|
| आ | ā | ख | kh | थ | th |
| इ  | i  | ग  | g  | द  | d  |
| ऐ  | āi | घ  | gh | ध  | dh |
| उ  | u  | ङ  | n  | न  | n  |
| ऊ  | ū | च  | c  | प  | p  |
| ऋ  | ō | छ  | ch | फ  | ph |
| ल  | l  | झ  | jh | भ  | bh |
| लँ | l̄ | ञ  | n̄ | म  | m  |
| ले | l̄e | ट  | t  | य  | y  |
| लो | l̄o | ठ  | th | र  | r  |
| लो | l̄o | ड  | d  | ल  | l  |
| म  | m  | ढ  | dh | व  | v  |
| .  |  | ह, f | n  | श  | s  |
|  |  |  |  |  | h  |

N.B.—(i) In the case ट and ह and ठ and ठ the transliteration till now adopted by many, ठ and ठ and ठ and ठ has been reversed in this book as more consistent with the natural sounds of the English alphabets.

(ii) In the case of the nasals only the letters n and m have been adopted, without further modifications of these two types, to facilitate printing.

(iii) In the Sanskrit spelling the strict grammatical rule of nasal sandhis has not been followed for typographical reasons. For instance, सपनि might have been spelt as सपनि.
BOOK I

EPIC POETRY

CHAPTER I

SECTION I

Vedic Forms of Epics

"In India, says M. Wilhams," literature like the whole face of nature, is on a gigantic scale. Poetry, born amid the majestic scenery of the Himalayas, and fostered in a climate which inflamed the imaginative powers, developed itself with oriental luxuriance, if not always with true sublimity. Although the Hindus, like the Greeks, have only two great epic poems (the Ramayana and Mahabharata) yet to compare these vast compositions with the Iliad and the Odyssey, is to compare the Indus and the Ganges, rising in the snows of the world's most colossal ranges, swollen by numerous tributaries, spreading into vast shallows of branching into deep divergent channels, with the streams of Attica or the mountain torrents of Thessaly. It is, of course, a principal characteristic of epic poetry, as distinguished from lyrical, that it should concern itself more with external action than internal feelings. It is this which makes Epos the natural expression of early national life. When centuries of trial have turned the mind of nations inwards, and men begin to speculate, to reason, to elaborate language and cultivate science, there may be no lack of refined poetry, but the spontaneous production of epic song is, at that stage of national existence, as impossible as for the octogenarian to delight in the giants and giant-killers of his childhood. The Ramayana and Mahabharata then, as reflecting the Hindu character in ancient times, may be expected to abound in stirring incidents of exaggerated heroic action."

1. Indian Wisdom, 506.
The beginnings of epic poetry in India are to be found in the early Vedic Literature. The Ṛg Veda contained hymns of a narrative character, and short legends in prose and in verse called Gāthas, Nārāsamsas, Ithihasa etc., occur in the Brāhmaṇa literature. The Nirukṣa contains prose tales and likewise the metrical Bhyaddevaṭa. The Yamasabhiyas, the Indrajananīyas, the Ākhyaṇas, Cañaraṭas and probably Granṭhas Sūṣukraptiyas, narrated the course of epic history. In the Vedic literature there was no essential difference between Aṭṭa, Ākhyaṇa, Purāṇa and Ithihasa and generally Kaṭhā. They meant ordinarily an old tale, story, legend or incident and they were often interchangeable. Kaṭhā is non-specific and may be a causative rather than a tale. There may be a Dhyvyakāṭhā, like the legend of Agastya, or a Kaṭhamṛta or essence of several Upākhyāṇas, or a Kaṭhāśara, an abridgment of a story. But their essential characteristic is the narration of stories of great kings or Gods in the past. So we hear of Dhyumāṇa sena solaced by the tales of former kings, such as Rāma and Nala. Purāṇa, literally old and Ithihasa (Ith-ha-śa), literally ‘so it was’ are almost synonymous, and these terms are found associated with each other in the early literature. The word Ithihasa may become a saying, a proverb rather than a legend. In this sense the words Gīta and Gāthā were also used. Gāthā need not necessarily be sung and means only a proverbial verse. Vyāsa called his Mahābhārata or “Jaya”, Samhīṭa, Purāṇa, Ākhyaṇa, Upākhyāṇa, Kaṭhā, Ithiḥasa, Kavya etc.

1. Brshaj, II, 4-10, IV, 1-2, IV, 5-9, Satapatha XI 7-1. See also Atharva Samhīṭa, XV 6, IST 138
2. Pāṇini, IV, 11 83, VI, 2 103. Goldstucker’s Pāṇini, 28, IST, V, 27
3. Maxmuller, ASL, 40
4. Mah, IX, 100, 2
5. Mah, XII, 340, 137.
6. Mah I, 140, 74, III, 398-7
7. The story of Nala is being indifferently called Kṛṣṇa, Ithiḥasa and Purāṇa
8. Mah, III 78, 10, 11, 16
9. See Chan Up, VII, 1, 2, 4, VII 9, 29, III 45.
10. Mah, III 99, 85, III 135, 45, 54

We find these Gāthās incorporated in legal and philosophical literature also.
11. Mah I 2, 568, 565, 587, 589. Similarly Rāmāyaṇa is called Ākhyaṇa and Samhīṭa (Rām. VI, 193, 123, 124. This reference as Kavya modifies Lassen’s opinion (Indian Antiquities, I, 435) that Kavya is a distinct title of Rāmāyaṇa
In thus describing his work Vyāsa must have had in mind some special characteristic of each class and therefore added that his work possessed all these qualities so as to stand forth as an encyclopædia of all learning. In the extant literature, the terms Itihāsa and Purāṇa have acquired a distinct use. Itihāsa may correspond to an epic and Purāṇa to a series of narrations, without the main prop of a running tale, meant solely to explain cosmological and theological tenets. In this sense a Purāṇa has been thus described as pācalakāraṇa; it treats of five topics, creation, destruction and recreation, genealogy of the Gods, periods of Manus, and history of royal races.

Broadly speaking, therefore, epic literature in India consists of Itihāsas, and Purāṇas. Of the former we have Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata and with these we shall now proceed to deal.

Section II

Ramayana

Rāmāyaṇa, literally the history of Rama, is the immortal poem of Vālmiki. Vālmiki, known also as Bhārgava and Pracetas, was a sage with his hermitage on the banks of the Ganges. His original name was Raṅnakara. In the Ādiyāṭma-Rāmāyaṇa Vālmiki describes his

---

1 See Vāyu Purāṇa, IV, 10, and Amarasimha’s Nāmalingāmudānam, 3.
2 Vālmiki the descendant of Bhārgu was the 24th Vyāsa in the Vaivasvata-manvanṣa (Visnu Purāṇa, III, 6).

---

See Commentary on Sā占据pā llama Sām., IV, 4866-71.
past history —By whom or how, O Rama, can the greatness of thy name be rehearsed,—that name by whose power I, O Rama, have attained the rank of a Brahmin saint? In bygone times I was bred among Kiratas, with the children of Kiratas. But by birth only was I a Brahmin, for I was perpetually devoted to the practices of Sudras. From Sudra women many children were born to me of unsubdued passions. And at last, having fallen in with robbers, I myself of yore became a brigand,—bearing constantly a bow and arrows and resembling to men, God of death. In a great forest, on a certain occasion, I saw before me the seven Munis, resplendent, and glorious like fire and the sun. Through curiosity I pursued them, longing to seize their possessions, and I shouted "Stop, stop." Seeing me the Munis asked "Wherefore has thou come, base Brahmin?" "To acquire something, O most excellent of Munis" was my reply to them "My children, my wife and others—many—are starving. To save them I wander through the mountain forests." Upon this, they, undismayed, said to me, "Go and ask your family one by one, whether they consent or not to participate in the guilt of the numerous sins that are daily committed by thee. We will certainly remain here until you return." Replying "yes" I went home, and put the question propounded by the Munis to my children, wife and others. They replied to me, O noblest of the Raghavas, 'All the sin is, we deem, thy own alone, we are willing to be sharers in the immediate fruit of it only.' Contrite on hearing this, I went back, thoughtful, to the place where the Munis, with hearts full of compassion, were waiting. At the very sight of them my soul was purified. Flinging away my bow and other weapons I fell prostrate crying, "Save O excellent Munis, me who am on the road to the sea of perdition." Beholding me lying before them, the venerable Munis said to me."Rise, rise, blessings be upon thee, Communion with the pious is effectual. We will instruct thee somewhat, and so thou shalt be saved." Looking at each other they continued. "This vile Brahmin, as being addicted to evil course deserves only to be shunned by the virtuous. Since, however, he has come for sanctuary, he must be diligently protected by being taught the way of salvation." So saying, O Rama, they enjoined that, with fixed attention, I should unremittingly meditate in that very place, upon thy name, its syllables being transposed namely, ma ra. "Meditate" said they "as directed, till we come again." Having thus spoken, the divinely wise Munis departed. At once I did as I had been bidden by them. With concentrated mind I meditated, and lost all consciousness
of thing external Above me, rigid in figure, and detached from all commerce with the world, there arose, after a long lapse of time, thus employed, an ant-hill Subsequently at the close of thousands of cycles, the Rishis returned "Come out" said they to me, and immediately, on hearing this command, I stood up And I emerged from the ant-hill, like the sun from the mist of morning The band of Munis then addressed me, "Great Mun, be thy name Vālmiki, for thy egress from the white-ant-hill (Valmika) has been to thee a second birth Thus speaking, O most eminent of the race of Rāghu, they proceeded on the road to heaven."* 

Nārada was struck with that devotion and thought that he was the best person to commemorate the story of Rāma He narrated to him the story of Rāma and blessed that to him the world would be indebted for its publication Once when out in the forests, Vālmiki was moved by the killing of one of a fond pair of birds by a hunter, leaving the female bird to lament the death of her mate and that feeling of pity manifested itself in the form of a melodious verse —


When contemplating on this verse with melancholy Brahmā appeared and directed him to compose Rāmāyana. Blessed by Brahmā with a perception of the events of Rāma’s history, he wrote his poem and gave it the names, Rāmāyana, Sitācarita and Paulaśīvavatika. He taught it to his pupils Lava and Kuśa, the sons of Rāma, who were born and bred up in his hermitage while Śītā was in banishment, and they sung it to lyre for the first time at Rāma’s Asvamedha sacrifice.

In the present form Rāmāyana is divided into seven Kāndas or books Tradition gives the number of verses as 24,000 in 500 chapters or Sargas, each thousand verses beginning with a letter of Gāyaṭī- manṭra Interpolations and alterations made in different parts of India and at different times account for the work now being seen in three distinct recensions, the Bombay, Bengal and the West Indian,* the

1. This narrative is to be found at I. 84-85 of the Sixth chapter of the Ayodhyā-kānda of the Aṣṭādhyāyī-Rāmāyana.

2. These recensions are so named by Macdonell (Sansk. Lit. 303) Gonseth’s Edition is the Bengali recension. Regarding the Bombay Edition, see ISt. II. 285. For the differences in the Bengali and Bombay versions, see O. V. Valda’s Riddle of the Ramayana, Appendix JABS, XIX. 308 S, Muir’s Original Sanskrit Text, 377-418. Rāma’s horoscope is not found in the Bengali recension. On Rāma’s horoscope,
earliest being probably that of Bombay. These variations, says Macdonell “are of such a kind that they can for the most part be accounted for only by the fluctuations of oral tradition among the professional reciters of the epic, at the time when three recensions assumed definite shape in different parts of the country, by being committed to writing” The manuscripts of the Berlin library, contain, it is said, a fourth recension.

The following summary of the story is taken by R C Dutt's *Civilisation in Ancient India*

Formerly there ruled over the kingdom of Kosala (capital Ayodhya) a king called Dasaratha. He belonged to the Solar race, and counted among his ancestors such famous names as Manu, Ikshvaku (first king of Ayodhya), Sagara, Bhagiratha (who brought the Ganges down from heaven), Kukutstha, and Raghu. He had three wives: Kausalya, Sumitra, and Karkeyi, the first was the eldest, the last, the most beloved. Dasaratha ruled long and prosperously but had only one daughter, Suta and no sons, though he was getting old. Following the advice of Vasishtha, his family preceptor, Dasaratha offered a sacrifice in which his son-in-law Rushyasringa, officiated as head-priest. As a consequence, the king got four sons: 1 Rama, the eldest, born of Kausalya, 2 Bharata, born of Karkeyi, 3 Lakshmana, and 4, Satrughna, both born of Sumitra.

The kingdom of Videha (capital Mithila) was to the east of the kingdom of Kosala. It was at this time ruled by the saintly king Janaka, who, as he was once for a holy sacrifice preparing the ground with a plough, came upon an infant, and brought her up as his own daughter. This was Sita thus miraculously sprung from the Earth. The girl grew up in the company of Urmila, another daughter of Janaka, and of Mandavi and Srutakirti, daughters of Janaka’s brother Kusadhwa. As Sita became of an age to be married, Janaka instituted a *Svayamvara* who whoever should succeed in bending a mighty bow (which Janaka had received from God Siva) was to marry the princess. Many attempted, but none succeeded.

---

see Weber, *On the Ramayana*, I, I 190) In his abridgment of Rāmāyana (Sankśipta-Rāmāyana) C R Vaidya purports to eliminate all accretions and to give what might have been the Rāmāyana as composed by Vālmīki. The running story has been culled but and edited by P P S Sastri and A M, Śrinivasasārya, Madras. See Karmam Gundurao’s essay, *Andhra Patrika*, Annual number (1916), 216

1. Weber’s Cat 119,
One day there came to the court of Dasaratha the royal sage Visvamitra who, finding the demons frequently molesting his penances, requested the king to send two of his sons, Rama and Lakshmana, with him to his penance-grove. Since a person of Visvamitra’s position could not be denied anything, Dasaratha reluctantly agreed to give over his sons, though yet in tender years. Visvamitra resumed his holy rites and when the molestors came, Rama, at Visvamitra’s behest, killed the demon Subahu and the terrible she-demon Tataka. Pleased at the prince’s valour, Visvamitra thereupon taught him the mystic formulae relating to all the missiles that he knew, and particularly the _frunbhaka_ missile, which had the power of producing instantaneous stupor or paralysis in the ranks of the assailants. After the conclusion of the sacrifice, Visvamitra took Rama and Lakshmana with him to Mithila, the capital of Janaka. Janaka was very favourably impressed by the princes, and Visvamitra called upon Rama to try his hand at the mighty bow. Young though he was, Rama not only succeeded in bending it, but even breaking it in twain, and thus winning him a wife. Visvamitra now proposed that, along with Sita’s marriage to Rama, there be celebrated the marriages of Sita’s sister Urmila and her cousins Mandavan and Srutakirti to the three brothers of Rama, Lakshmana and Bharata and Satrughna respectively. The proposal was agreed to, and Dasaratha was called from Ayodhya, and the marriages were celebrated with due pomp.

The nuptial joys, however, were interrupted by the arrival of Parasurama, son of Jamadagni. Parasurama was a fiery Brahman, sage and warrior, who had twenty-one times rid the earth of all Kshatnyas. He was a devotee of God Siva, and was incensed to learn that Rama had not only bent but broken the bow of his favourite Divinity. As nothing short of a fight with the young prince would satisfy him, Rama managed to reduce him to terms, and sent him away humbled and abashed. The four princes then returned to Ayodhya with their brides. Here they passed some twelve years.

_Dr. K. V. Rama_
That Bharata, Kakeyi's son, be appointed heir-apparent, that Rama be forthwith sent away into exile for fourteen years. As the king could not believe his words, Rama had to submit to the wishes of his step-mother, which he cheerfully does. His wife Sita and his brother Lakshmana refuse to be left behind, and they are all three accordingly carried away through the weeping multitudes. The old king was so much afflicted by this great blow that he barely lived to hear the news of the exiles being taken over safe beyond the boundaries of his kingdom.

Bharata, who all this while was in utter ignorance of the happenings at Ayodhya, is now sent for in order to perform the obsequies of his father and assume the sovereignty thus devolved upon him. He returns, but discovering the mean conduct of his mother, he reproves her bitterly, and refuses to take charge of the kingdom and thus give his consent to the base intrigue. He resolves immediately to start in search of Rama, and to implore him to return. On the other side of the Ganges, near the mountain called Chitrakuta, close by the saint Bharadvaja's hermitage, Bharata finds Rama leading a forester's life in the company of his wife and brother. Rama is struck by Bharata's magnanimity, but insists upon the carrying out of his father's command to the letter, and is unwilling to return before the completion of the full term of fourteen years. Bharata thereupon resolves to keep company with Rama, the latter, however, reminds him of the duty they all owed to their subjects, and persuades him to return, which Bharata does, only on the condition that Rama will come back at the appointed time, himself in the meanwhile conducting the affairs of the state only as Rama's agent. **End of Ayodhya-Kanda**

Rama now resolves to withdraw further away from his kingdom and learning that the regions on the other side of the Vindhyas were infested with wild demons and cannibals, he set forth in that direction. At his entrance into the Vindhyas forests he meets the demon Viradha, whom he kills. He then meets a number of sages and ascetics, in whose company he is said to have passed no less than ten years. Going further south into the Dandaka forests he reaches the river Godavari, and there, in the part of the country known as Janasthana, comes upon the hermitage of Agastya and his wife Lopamudra. The holy pair heartily welcome the newcomers, and here at the foot of a mountain called Prasravana, in a region known as Panchavati, Rama resolves to build a small hut and to pass the rest of his exile.
peacefully in the company of the saint Agastya and the vulture-king Jatayus

Peace, however, was not vouchsafed to him long. At this time there ruled in the island of Lanka (identified with modern Ceylon) a demon king, Ravana. He was called ten-headed and was a terror to the world. Having established his power in Lanka proper, Ravana crossed over to the mainland and overran the whole of Southern India, subduing everything that came in his way. Ravana, however, found more than his match in Valin, king of the Monkeys, whose kingdom comprised the part of South India then known as Kishkundha. An agreement was entered into whereby, except for a narrow strip of land along the coast, the bulk of the peninsula came into the possession of Valin. Ravana's territory touched the Janasthana, and here he left a large army of demons under the command of Khara (Ravana's younger brother) and Dushana and Trisiras.

Once Surpanakha, a widowed sister of Ravana, came upon Rama in the Panchavati, and smitten with his graceful form made him frank overtures of love, promising to eat up Sita and thus put her out of the way, if Rama would consent. Rama in jest sent her to Lakshmana, who rewarded her insistence by cutting off her nose and ears. Surpanakha went weeping and bleeding to her brother Khara, who in anger despatched fourteen picked men to capture Rama. As they did not return, Khara marched with his whole army, 14,000 demons strong and engaged Rama in a close fight. Rama stepped back a few paces so as to gain room for working with his bow, and then, one after another, he killed the entire army of demons, as also its three leaders.

Surpanakha vows revenge. She now repairs to Ravana in Lanka and inflames his mind with a passion for Sita, whose charms she praises loudly. Ravana resolves to capture her. He asks Maricha, another demon, to assume the form of a golden deer, and to lure Rama in chase away from his cottage. Maricha does this and is mortally wounded by Rama's arrow. Before he dies, however, imitating the voice of Rama, he calls upon Lakshmana for help. Lakshmana was left behind to guard Sita in the cottage, but upon hearing the cry, which she mistook for her husband's, Sita urges and even commands Lakshmana to go, which he does reluctantly. Utilizing the favourable moment Ravana now pounces upon the forlorn Sita and flies away with her, striking down on his way the vulture-king Jatayus, who from his mountain peak had watched this daring act and attempted to intercept
the abductor, Jatayus falls down to die, surviving just long enough to inform Rama and Lakshmana (already returned from the deer-chase amazed at not finding Sita in the cottage) of what had happened, Rama's grief was unbounded. **End of Aranya-Kanda**

Wandering further onward, the princes at last reach the lake called Pampa. Here they come upon Sugriva and his trusty friend and minister Hanuman, alias Maruti. Sugriva was the brother of Valin, king of the Monkeys, and had been dispossessed by him both of his kingdom and his wife. Rama and Sugriva enter into an alliance whereby Rama agrees to restore Sugriva to his kingdom, and in return the latter promises to send out search-parties and help Rama to punish the abductor and recover his lost wife. Rama accordingly asks Sugriva to challenge Valin to a duel, and as the two brothers join in combat, Rama wounds Valin mortally with an arrow. For this unprovoked wrong and treachery Valin reproaches Rama severely, the latter simply replies that as an agent of the sovereign king of Ayodhya he took upon himself the duty of inflicting proper punishment upon malefactors who, like Valin had usurped a brother's throne and wife. The death of Valin leaves Sugriva master of the kingdom of Kishkindha, and in gratitude he now sends, under proper leaders, parties of Monkeys in search of Sita. The most important of these was the one sent to the south under the command of Maruti. This party presses forward and southward until it gains the sea-coast. **End of Kishkindha-Kanda.**

The waters seemed to offer an impassable barrier, as the island of Lanka stood on the other side of the ocean, but Maruti undertakes to clear it by a leap. Thus he does and enters Lanka. Here he was fortunate enough to meet Sita, sorrowing in Ravana's garden under the shade of an Asoka tree, she-demons of hideous and terrible looks keeping watch over her day and night. In glowing terms they describe to her the glory and the greatness of Ravana, and work alternately upon her hopes and her fears to the end that she may consent to have Ravana Sita refuses to listen, and Ravana is too proud to stoop to force

Maruti soon finds opportunity to console Sita and assure her of a speedy deliverance. Having thus achieved the chief object of his journey, Maruti now leaves Lanka, not without meeting sundry adventures, in the course of which he succeeds in killing a few hundred demons and setting the whole city on fire. Once more he leaps over the ocean and returns to Kishkindha with the glad news. **End of Sundarakanda.**
Rama immediately resolves to invade Lanka. Sugriva with his army of Monkeys and Jambavant with his army of Bears offer their assistance and the whole army soon gains the Southern Ocean. Here they are joined by Vibhishana, the youngest brother of Ravana. Vibhishana had tried to remonstrate with his eldest brother against the evil course of conduct he was pursuing, and being rewarded with contempt he now came over to Rama's side. Rama receives him well and promises him the kingdom of Lanka after Ravana's death. To make it possible for the army to cross over, Rama now resolves to construct a stone bridge over the ocean, and to this he is helped by the engineering genius of Nala. Having gained the island he next lays siege to the capital. The battle which follows lasts, according to the several inconsistent time-indications, for four or fifteen or thirty-nine or eighty-eight days. Ravana together with his brothers and sons and the entire army of demons is put to death, and Rama, in accordance with his promise, installs Vibhishana as king of Lanka.

Having thus vanquished the enemy and wiped out the insult, Rama now meets Sita. He is, however, unwilling, for fear of public scandal, to take his wife back until she has proved her purity. Pierced to the quick by Rama's suspicion Sita proposes the fire-ordeal. A huge pyre is kindled and with a firm tread she walks towards it and is engulfed by the flames. Immediately, however, she reappears, led forth by the Fire-god himself, who in the hearing of all proclaims her innocence. Rama now accepts her, saying that he never doubted her innocence, but had to do what he did for the sake of the people. The fourteen-year period of exile having now almost expired, Rama, along with his wife, brother, friends, and allies, makes a journey northwards, utilizing for the purpose the aerial car called Pushpaka which belonged to Ravana. The reach their home, where they meet Bharata and the Queen-mothers anxiously awaiting the return of the exiles. Rama's coronation is now celebrated with due pomp and there is rejoicing everywhere.

End of Yuddha-Kanda.

The epic should naturally end here, but there is one more book or kanda dealing with the history of Rama from his coronation to his death. Here we are told how a few months after the coronation rumours regarding Sita began to be circulated amongst the people, who did not like that Rama should have received his wife back after she had been nearly a year in the house of Ravana. Through his spies Rama comes to know of this, and resolves to abandon Sita, although at this
time she was in a state of advanced pregnancy Rama charges his brother Lakshmana with the carrying out of this plan Lakshmana obeys, places Sita in a chariot, takes her into a forest on the other side of the Ganges, and there leaves her, after communicating to her the actual state of things

Thereupon Sita sends back to Rama a spirited reply and patiently succumbs to the inevitable. In her forlorn condition she fortunately chances upon the saint Valmiki, whose hermitage was near by. Valmiki receives the exiled queen under his protection. In his hermitage she gives birth to twin sons, Kusa and Lava, whom Valmiki brings up and educates along with his other pupils.

Meanwhile in Ayodhya Rama is not at peace. From a mere sense of duty he discharges his manifold functions as a king, but is always haunted by the image of her whom he had treated so unjustly. Years go by, and at last he resolves to perform a horse-sacrifice. For the festivities attending the completion of the sacrifice there came Valmiki bringing with him the twins, Kusa and Lava, whom he had taught to sing the Ramayana, a panegyrical poem on Rama which Valmiki had composed. With great applause the boys recite the poem in the presence of Rama and the whole assembly. Rama inquires about the boys and is pleasantly surprised to learn from Valmiki that they are Rama's own sons. Understanding that Sita is still alive, he sends for her. Sita comes, Rama asks her to give further evidence of her innocence and purity. 'If it is true', exclaims Sita, 'that in mind and deed and word I have never been unfaithful to Rama, may Mother Earth receive me into her bosom!' Just as she utters these words the Earth gapes open and a divine form stretches forth her hands to Sita, who enters the abyss and there finds eternal rest.

Soon after the disappearance of Sita, Rama feels his own end drawing near. The kingdom is divided amongst the four brothers, who in turn settle it upon their children. In the meantime the aged queen-mothers die. Thereafter Lakshmana, whom Rama, for no fault of his own, was compelled to send away from him, gives up the ghost. Finally Rama himself enters the waters of the river Sarayu, and his other brothers, and the whole city of Ayodhya in fact, follow after him to heaven.

(1) Similar summaries of the story are found in several books, such as Sir William Jones's works, Maurice's Hindustan, Moor's Pantheon etc.
On the authenticity and signification of the narrative itself, various theories have been advanced

*R C Dutt*—"The Ramayana is utterly valueless as a narrative of historical events and incidents. The heroes are myths, pure and simple. Sita, the field-furrow, had received divine honors from the time of the Rig Veda and had been worshipped as a goddess. When cultivation gradually spread towards Southern India, it is not difficult to invent a poetical myth that Sita was carried to the south. And when this goddess and woman—the noblest creation of human imagination—had acquired a distinct and lovely individuality, she was naturally described as the daughter of the holiest and most learned King on record, Janaka of the Videhas! "But who is Rama, described as Sita's husband and King of the Kosalas? The later Puranas tell us he was an incarnation of Vishnu—but Vishnu himself had not risen to prominence at the time at which we are speaking! Indra was the chief of the Gods in the Epic period. In the Sutra literature we learn that Sita the furrow goddess is the wife of Indra. Is it then an untenable conjecture that Rama, the hero of the Ramayana, is in his original conception like Arjuna, the hero of Mahabharata, only a new edition of the Indra of the Rig Veda, battling with the demons of drought? The myth of Indra has thus been mixed up with the epic which describes a historic conquest of Southern India."

*Jacobi*—The foundation of the Ramayana would be a celestial myth of the Veda transformed into a narrative of earthly adventures according to a not uncommon development. Sita can be traced to the Rig Veda, where she appears as the Furrow personified and invoked as a goddess. In some of the Grihya-sutras, she again appears as a genius of the plough-fields, is praised as a being of great beauty and is accounted the wife of Indra or Parjanya the rain-god. There are traces of this origin in the Ramayana itself. For Sita is represented, as having emerged from the earth, when her father Janaka was once ploughing and at last disappears underground in the arms of the goddess Earth. Her husband Rama would be no other than Indra, and his conflict with Ravana would represent the *Indra-Vritra* myth of the Rig Veda. This identification is confirmed by the name of Ravana's son being Indrajit or Indra-Satru, the latter being actually an
epithet of Vritra in the Rig Veda Ravana's most notable feat, the rape of Sita, has its prototype in the stealing of the cows recovered by Indra, Hanumat, the chief of the monkeys and Rama's ally in the recovery of Sita is the son of the wind-god with the patronymic Maruti and is described as flying hundreds of leagues through the air to find Sita. Hence in his figure perhaps survives reminiscence of Indra's alliance with the Maruts in his conflict with Vritra and the dog Sarama who as Indra's messenger crosses the waters of the Rasa and tracks the cows occurs as the name of the demoness who consoles Sita in her captivity.

Weber — (1) "In the Ramayana we find ourselves from the very outset in the region of allegory and we only move upon historical ground so far as the allegory is applied to an historical fact, viz., to the spread of Aryan civilization to the south more especially to Ceylon. (2) The Greeks are mentioned only twice and that under the vague name of Yavanas, which word embraces not only the Greeks but many of those alien races that have from time to time made inroads on N. W India. The theory of the translation of the Greek poems into the Indian epics has no standing ground. So our epic composition must have preceded the Greek invasions. (3) The city of Pataliputra was built about 400 B.C. under Kalasoka and which about 350 B.C. became the capital of an empire. While the Ramayana refers to cities of Eastern Hindustan, it makes no mention of this important city. The only deduction is that its composition preceded the foundation of the city. (4) The capital of the Kosala Kingdom is called Ayodhya in the poem, whereas the name Saketa is given to it by the Buddhists and the Jains. It is said that Lava fixed his seat of Government at Sravasti. Our poem must have been composed when the old capital Ayodhya was not yet deserted and by Buddha's time the Kosala capital was under King Prasenajit of Sravasti. (5) The Ramayana speaks of Mithila and Visala as two independent principalities, whereas by Buddha's time they were united into the single city of Vaisali under an oligarchical Government. (6) The characters are not historical figures but merely personifications of certain occurrences and situations. Sita, in the first place, whose abduction by a giant demon and her subsequent recovery by her husband Rama, constitute the plot of the entire poem, is but the field-furrow to whom divine honors were paid in

1. Das Ramayana, Bonn, 1899, ZDMG, XLVII, 407
the songs of the Rik and in the Gnhya ritual. She accordingly represents Aryan husbandry, which has to be protected by Rama—whom I regard as originally identical with Balarama ‘halabri’ ‘the plough-bearer;’ though the two were afterwards separated—against the attacks of the predatory aborigines. These latter appear to be demons and giants, whereas those natives who were well—disposed towards the Aryan civilization are represented as monkeys—a comparison which was doubtless not exactly intended to be flattering and which rests on the striking ugliness of the Indian aborigines as compared with the Aryan race.” (7) “It is uncertain how far the story of Rama and Sita, as contained in its earliest form in the Dasaratha Jataka, may have a historical germ, or whether even that earliest version may not also have had as its ground work, in addition to such a germ, what Valmiki has undoubtedly interwoven into his representation of the story, namely, the adoration of a Demi-God, bearing the name of Rama, and regarded as the guardian of agriculture, but hindered in his beneficent activity by a temporary exile, and also of the field-furrow defied under the name of Sita.”

According to Lassen, “the development of the story of Rama may be divided into four stages. The first construction of the poem did not carry the narrative beyond the banishment of Rama to the Himalayas and the circumstances which caused his wife Sita and his brother Lakshmana to follow him into exile. The second changed the place of banishment to the Godavari and described the protection afforded to the hermits against the attacks of the aborigines. The third embraced the account of the first attempts to subdue the inhabitants of the Dekkan. The fourth modification which resulted from the knowledge gained by the Hindus of the island of Ceylon included the description of Rama’s expedition against Lanka.” Lassen commented on the views of Weber and his comments are instructive. It may be regarded as true that the now existing oldest form of the Rama-legend is presented in a Buddhistic narrative, according to which Rama, with his brother, and his sister Sita, is banished to the Himavat. But this narrative appears to me to be a misconception or distortion of the Brahmanical original, due to the Buddhists, who represent the sister as following the banished prince—a duty which elsewhere is only regarded as incumbent on the

1. See ‘On the Ramayana’ as translated by Boyd, IA, I 120 ff
2. Ind. Ant. II 505.
3. IA, III 102-4
wife. This conjecture would be raised to certainty if it should be discovered that any verses of the *Ramayana* were to be found in the Buddhist narrative. Secondly, in the *Ramayana*, with the exception of one single passage, no allusions to the Buddhist occur. In the passage referred to a Nastika is treated with contempt on account of his reprehensible principles, but this word, moreover, does not necessarily denote a Buddhist, but can just as well refer to a Charvaka, or materialist. But, besides, the passage is interpolated. It is further to be considered that the powerful kingdoms in Southern India were ruled by kings of Brahmanical sentiments, and that consequently an attack on the part of the Buddhists could only proceed from the side of Ceylon, the history of which is correctly handed down to us from the time of the second Asoka, and only relates war of the Singalese kings with the rulers of the opposite coasts. Again, the Brahmins always accurately distinguish second and the third Rama, and there is no ground for regarding the second as a divine presonification of agriculture. As the story of the first Rama is to be found in the *Aitareya Brahmana*, a work which makes no reference whatever to incarnations of Vishnu, it will be impossible to deny the historical character of the Pithoid (?) Rama, although at a later period he was included in the circle of the *avatars*. On the same ground I consider myself bound to accept as an historical personage the Dasarathi Rama. As soon as he was transported into the ranks of the gods, he was naturally followed by Sita, whose name of itself led to her being turned into a daughter of the Earth—into a deified Furrow. Again, the assumption that the flight to Helen and Trojan war were the prototypes of the abduction of Sita, and of the conflict around Lanka, appears very paradoxical. It presupposes, further, an acquaintance with the Homeric poems, of which there is no proof whatever. Among a people one of whose chief weapons was the bow, it was natural that stories of heroes who conquered their foes by superiority in the use of this weapon should be invented. By means of this style of comparison, the account of Arjuna's defeat of the rival suitors for Draupadi's hand through his superior skill in archery might be ascribed to Homeric influence. Besides, a comparison of the circle of tales current among the two nations would not be quite appropriate, as in the *Ramayana* the abduction of Sita forms an important part of the story, while in the Homeric songs the rape of Helen is indeed introduced as the motive of the war, but is nowhere described at length. Finally, although I am still convinced that the
have derived their zodiacal signs, not from the Greek but from the Chaldean astrologers, the astronomical data occurring in the Ramayana have no force as proofs. The reference to the Yavanas and Sakas as powerful nations in the northern region only shows, strictly speaking, that these nations were known to the Indians as such, but not that they had already established their dominion in that quarter. In conformity with my views on the history of Indian epic poetry, I regard as admissible the statement of the historian of Kashmir (Rajatarangini, I 166) that the king of that country, Damodara, caused the Ramayana, with all its episodes, to be read to him. "How much sooner the existing poem was composed will probably never admit of determination."

According to H. Williams, "the first orderly completion, of the two poems in their brahmamized form, may have taken place, in the case of the Ramayana about the beginning of the third century B.C., and in the case of the Mahabharata (the original story of which is possibly more ancient than that of the Ramayana) still later,—perhaps as late as the second century B.C. The posteriority of the brahmamized Mahabharata may be supported by the more frequent allusions it contains to the progress of Buddhistic opinions, and to the intercourse with the Yavanas or Greeks, who had no considerable dealings with the Hindus till two or three centuries after Alexander's invasion."

Talboys Wheeler says that the war between Rama and Ravana is but a poetic version of the conflict between Brahminism and Buddhism in the south.

H. H. Wilson says that the story of the Ramayana seems to be founded on historical fact and the traditions of the South of India uniformly ascribe its civilization to the subjugation or dispersion of its forest tribes of barbarians and the settlement of civilized Hindus to the conquest of Lanka by Rama.

J. C. Chatterje refers the incidents and locality of the Rāmāyana to the advance of the Aryans eastwards and to the Caspian, the Black and Mediterranean seas.

M. V. Kibe discovers, after elaborate literary and geographical research, the real Lankī of the Rāmāyana "A mysterious peak which

1 Indian Wisdom, 31-6 See Gauranganath Banerjee's Hellenism in Ancient India, 283-6
2 Translation of Vāyu Purāṇa, III 317 note
3 "Aryan Ancestors, where did they come from?"—Paper read at the Asiatic Society of Bengal—Hindu, Madras, 14th April, 1916.
is visible from the neighbourhood of the Amorakantak, the source of the Nurbudda, and which is surrounded by marshy land may be identified with Lanka"² There is much there for appreciation

Another theory is "that the Ramayana exhibits the progress of Aryan plough husbandry among the mountains and the fastnesses of Central and Southern India and the perils of the agricultural settlers from non-ploughing nomadic hunting tribes."³

It is said in the Rajatarangini (I 116) that king Damodara was condemned to wear the form of a serpent "until he should have heard the whole of the Rāmāvāna in one day" Gorāsana therefore infers that inasmuch as king Damodara lived about the beginning of the 14th century B.C., the passage decides in favour of at least the "remota antiqua del poema." But Weber almost derides him by saying that "the Ramayana is brought into connection with the banishment of a king, who is presumed to have reigned 2400 years before the date of Kalhana."⁴

The fantastic differences about dates among orientalists are seen for instance, in the following summary about Rāma in Balfour's Cyclopedia of India, Volume III "Rama of the solar line of Hindu chronology is, however, placed by brahmins, 867,102 B.C between the silver and brazen ages. But he has been variously supposed to have lived, 2022 B. C Jones, 950 Hamilton, and 1100 Todd, and according to Bently he was one year old in 960, born in 6th April 961, Rama preceded Krushma but as their historians Valmiki and Vyasa, who wrote events they witnessed, were contemporaries, it could not have been many years."⁵

Whatever may have been the fanciful interpretations of western savants and modern theorists, the epic has maintained its unity of plot and action from time immemorial. It is the Adikavya, the first poem and Valmiki was Adikavi, the first poet in Indian Literature. As a piece of poetic art the Rāmāyana stands supreme and Valmiki's poetic fancy and imagery have been the standard for imitation. There is no ideal, there is no reality, there is no fancy, there is no sentiment which Valmiki has not depicted and there is no expression which can excel or equal

¹ First Oriental Conference, Poona, Summaries of Papers, 128
² See Vaidya’s Riddle of the Ramayana, 64, Narayan Aiyangar’s Essays on Indio-Aryan Mythology; Tilak’s Arctic home in the Vedas, 348
³ Vol I Introduction, xcvi
⁴ On the Rāmāyana, IA, I 239,
his in grace or eloquence. Cosmogony and theogony, folk-lore and tradition, mythology and history, have all formed a part “in the weaving of the mighty web and work of magic drapery evolved by Vālmīki.” “Notwithstanding the wilderness of exaggeration and hyperbole through which the reader of the Indian Epics has occasionally to wander,” says M. Williams: “there are in the whole range of the world’s literature few more charming poems than the Rāmāyana. The classical purity, clearness and simplicity of its style, the exquisite touches of true poetic feeling with which it abounds, its graphic descriptions of heroic incidents and of nature’s grandest scenes, the deep acquaintance it displays with the conflicting working and most refined emotions of the human heart, all entitle it to rank among the most beautiful compositions that have appeared at any period and in any country. It is like a spacious and delightful garden, here and there allowed to run wild, but teeming with fruits and flowers, watered by perennial streams and even its most tangled thickets intersected with delightful pathways.”

These excellences of thought and expression have gained for Vālmīki the highest place in the pantheon of the world’s poetic geniuses. Wherever you roam over the vast continent of India, be it a peasant’s hut or a lord’s parlour, the story of Rāma is familiar, and is listened to with pleasure and devotion. This is the prediction of Brahma,

Yāvat sthāṣyantā girayas sarantas ca mahitale
Tāvat Rāmāyana-kathā lokēsu pracarīyati—I 240.

And the name of Rāma and the narration of his heroism will be current in the world “as long as mountains and rivers stand on the surface of the earth.” There is not one devout Hindu who does not believe in these words of Vālmīki. “He who reads and repeats these holy life-giving Rāmāyana is liberated from all his sins and exalted with all his posterity to the highest heaven.” Vālmīki reiterated the doctrine of fate and hope and thus expressed the means of solace in distress and when that poet put the old saying in the lips of despairing Sītā,

Kalyāṇī bata gātheyam laukīkī pratibhātī me
Eti jivantam śnando naram varṣaśaṭādapi

he had said all that could be said for peace in this mortal world.

1. Indian Wisdom, 365
2. Ed by V. L. S. Pansikar with Tilaka Commentary (Bombay), Ed by R. L. Bhattacharya, Benares, Ed by A. G. V. Schlegal with Latin preface (Bonn), Ed
Rāmāyaṇa-kathāsāra is a brief narrative of the Rāmāyaṇa in seven Kāndas, each Kānda in a different metre, by Subbaya Śāstrī, son of Yegnesa Sūrīn of Pulyada family and daughter’s son of VenkataŚvetamukha Mahān of Kompāla family. There are short poetical summaries, Āryā Rāmāyaṇa by Suryakavi and Sister Balambal.

Jayavanangrahamāyana of Rāmabrahmaṇanda in seven adhyāyās mentions the story of the Rāmāyaṇa, but adds many incidents not found in Vālmīki’s work.

by Gorresio, Paris, Ed., by Durgaprasad (Nirmaya Sanara Press, Bombay), Ed by Gopal Narayana (Bombay), Ed by Vyasacarya (Kumbakonam) with Govindaraja’s Commentary Translated into English verse by Griffith (Benares) and into English Prose, by M N Dutt, Calcutta, by Makhan Lal Sen (Calcutta, with a valuable introduction) and by C R. Srinivasa Iyengar with notes, Madras.

For versions of the story, see Belvalkar’s Int to Uttararamacarita (HOS, 21).

For critical remarks on composition and contents, see IA, I 120, 172, 29 III 102, IV 247, XXIX. 8 For Bhavabhuti’s quotation, see IA, II 123. On the author, and different versions, see IA, XXXI 351-2. For an Italian story resembling Rāmāyaṇa, see IA, VII 202, 292.

Was Ramayana copied from Homer? (IA, II 219, XIII 336, 480, III 124, 267) As to the quotation of the verse in the Mahabhashya of Patanjali, see IA, IV 247 ff. Weber, On the Rāmāyaṇa translated by D C Boyd (IA, I, 120, 172, 239), Ramayana and Jatakas (Mod Rev XVIII 96), Valmiki and Kalidasa by R V Krishnamacharya (Sahridaya, XVIII), Life of Valmiki (JASB, XXIII 494), Ein Beitrag Zur Ramayana Kritik by Jacobi (ZDMG, XL), Geography of Rama’s exile by Pargiter (IRAS, 1894, 231), Linguistic Aschraums of the Ramayana by T M Michelson (IAOS, 1904), Valmiki, as he reveals himself in his poem, by B Barna (UCU, III 251-90).

Jacobi, Das Ramayana (Bonn), Ludwig, Über Das Ramayana (Prag), Baumgartner, Das Ramayana (Freiburg), Hans Wirtz, Die Westliche Recension des Ramayana, H. Luders, Die sage von Rasyamngā.


Vaidya’s Ramayana, Mahabharata and Epic India reviewed in Ind Rev IX 686, Sri Ramachandra, the Ideal King by T Michelson (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar). For a valuable critique, see the Introduction (Telugu) to Gopmatha Ramayana, (Madras).

1 DC, XX 7909
2 TC, III 3021. It was composed on Sunday, the 10th day of the dark fortnight of the year Yuva
3 Printed, Madras
4 TC, I 955
Valmikihiñvdipam is an interpretation in verse of the spiritual significance of the story of Rāma. The author Anantacārā is the son of Kṛ-namācārya and the head of the famous Partvādīhiñavankara Mutt of Kānci. He was born on 24th March 1874 and is the author of several works in philosophy. By his extensive tours all over India he is spreading knowledge and religion. Among his works is Samsāra-cakram, a sanskrit novel, which will be noticed in a later Chapter.

Vasistha Rāmāyana, also called Jñāna Vāsishtha, is said to have been composed by Valmiki himself as an appendage to the Rāmāyana and originally taught by Vasistha to Rāma. It is in six chapters, Vairiṣya, Mumukiutva, Utpatti, Sthiti, Upāsana and Nirvāṇa and treats mainly of Yoga and Advaita Vedānta by means of illustrative stories, intended to explain the best means of attaining true happiness. There is commentary on it by Ānandabodhendra Sarasvati and a short compendium of it (anonymous) in 10 Prakaranas with a commentary by Mahidhara.

Vasisthottararāmāyana is not fully extant. In the 12th chapter there is the legendary account of the vanquishment of hundred-headed Rāvana by Sītā. It is called Sitāviyavam.

Adhūta-Rāmāyana or Adhūtottararāmāyana, also attributed to Valmiki, describes in 27 Cantos as a sequel to the Rāmāyana the early story and real nature of Sītā. In it Sītā is represented as having killed a Rāvana with hundred heads, whom Rāma was unable to vanquish.

Adhyātma-Rāmāyana is an extract from the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa. It is divided into seven books, bearing the same name as the Rāmāyana and its object is to show “that Rāma was a manifestation of the supreme spirit and Sītā, identified with Lakṣmi, a type of nature.” It is in the

1. Printed at Conjeeveram by the author
2. An abridgment (Laghu) has been translated by K. Narayanaswamī Iyer, (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar). This work is a standard book of study among the members of the Theosophical society. See further, M. Williams’ Indian Wisdom, 368.
3. He was the pupil of Gangādharendra Sarasvatī who was the disciple of Rāmacandrendra Sarasvatī, who was the disciple of Sarvajna Sarasvatī. See DC, IV 1292—1302.
4. TC, II 264, IOC, 232, 783.
5. TG, I 881, 882, II. 1303.
form of a dialogue between Uma and Va. Two Śāhāpyāna, the inner nature of Rāma is explained and his identification of Rāma with Viṣṇu as the supreme spirit is asserted. The fifth chapter of the seventh book, the Rāmagītā, explains the advantage of giving up all work in order to meditate upon and become united with the supreme spirit.²

Mūla Rāmāyana³ and Ānanda Rāmāyana⁴ describe the importance of Hanūmaṇ and is read much by the followers of Śrī Madhva.

Satyopākhyāna narrates the history of Rāma illustrated with a variety of stories not found in the Rāmāyana. It is said to have been originally imparted to Mārkandeya by Vālmīki, and then by him to Vyāsa, by Vyāsa to Śuta and lastly recounted by Śuta to the Rājasīs in the forest of Naimiśā. It may have been part of a Purāṇa but it has not been possible to identify the source.⁴

Rāmacaritra or Rāmāvana is a long work in prose and verse based on the Rāmāyana of Hemacārya. It differs considerably from the work of Vālmīki, and is an extravagant travesty of it. It closes with the narration of the death of Lakṣmana on hearing a false report of the slaying of Rāma and Rāma becoming an ascetic and attaining salvation, after which his sons Lava and Kusa became initiated into the Jain religion. Padmavijayagami, the author, was a disciple of Rajavijaya Śuri, a disciple of Vājakṣaṇa Śuri and composed the work in 1596, during the reign of Emperor Akbar.⁵

COMMENTARIES

The most well-known commentary is the Bhūṣanam of Govindarāja, of Kauśika-gotra. He was the son of Varadarāja. He was a Śrīvaṃśa brahmm, a resident of Kānci or Sholinghur. He calls himself a disciple of Sāthagopadeśka. The latter is probably the 6th Swami of the Ahobilam Mutt, who lived about the beginning of the 16th century.⁵ At the end of Yuddhakanda, Govindarāja says he was en-

¹ Printed in all provinces. See Monier Wilham’s Indian Wisdom, 368 Translated into English by Lala Baij Nath, Panini office, Allahabad (See Ind Rev, XIII. 334)
² Ed Nirmayasagara Press, Bombay Theosophical Publishing House Adyar
³ Ed by Jyestaram Mukundjee, Bombay
⁴ Ed Sri Venkateswar Press, Bombay
⁵ See Mūtra’s Rep
couraged in his composition by Bhāvanācārya. Bhāvanācārya was the great scion of Kandāla family of Vadhūla gotra and his son Sriranga’s desciple, Tenah Annava (brother of Tenah Ramakrishna) lived in the days of kings Krūmadevarāya and Rāmadevarāya of Vizianagar. We may therefore safely assign this commentary to the middle of the 16th century. When once on a visit to Tirupati he was directed in his dream at the entrance of the temple of Venkatesa to compose a commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa. The work is learned, discursive and authoritative and comprehends all that a reader may desire for a proper appreciation of the poem. The commentaries on the cantos have separate names, Maninājīra, Pitāmbarā, Ratnamekhala, Muktāhāra, Śrṅgārabilaka, the Manimukuta, and Ratnakirta.

Vālmikihṛdayam is a commentary by Ahobala of Atreya gotra. He lived at Conjeeveram. He was the desciple of Parānkusa, the 6th Swami of Ahobila Mutt who was contemporary of Emperor Rāmarāya of Vizianagar of the 16th century. He also translated into Sanskrit the commentary in Tamil of select verses of the Rāmāyaṇa by the commentators on the Dramidopanishad or Tiruvaymuli. In his tours in the north of India, he installed the images of Alvars in the temple of Jagannātha. Ahobala’s pupil Brahmavidyadhāvaṇī wrote a critical commentary on stray verses called Virodhabhanjani. He was son of Nṛsimha and Bhavāṇi of the Vēna family.

Dharmakūtaṇa is a splendid critique on the Rāmāyaṇa. Its object, as the name indicates, is to demonstrate to the reader how at every step of the poem, the story of the Rāmāyaṇa illustrates the code of morals by reference to the original sources of the Vēdas and the Dharma Sāstras. It is a unique work of the kind and was almost an original conception in Sanskrit literature.

Its author is Tryambaka Makhun. He was the son of Gangādhara, the minister of Ekoji, the founder of the Kingdom of Tanjore (1674–1687) and brother of Nṛsimha. His father’s father was Tryam-

---

1 See Veeresahngam’s Lives of Telugu poets, Part II 322
2 Ed. Madras and elsewhere
3 DC, IV 1272
4 TC, II 2305
5 See Ahobilam Inscriptions
6 DC, IV 1277 Probably it was this Nṛsimha that also wrote a commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa, TC, III 3071
7 The work is thus described Kṛtiṇīyam sakalatritsammatesm purāṇavacobhuralankṛta
8 His brother Nārāyaṇa wrote the Vikramasenacampū (IC, II 264)
When Shahaji became king (1687-1711), Iryambaka was appointed his minister and continued in that position throughout the reign. After the death of Shahaji and accession of Sarabhoji (1712-1727), Iryambaka was in charge of the portfolio of charitable endowments. After receiving a munificent grant of land, he retired for meditation to Swâmmalâ (near Kumbakonam) where stands the ancient temple of Skanda. Only a few chapters have been printed by the Vamvilas Press, Srirangam and it is still unfinished. Probably the manuscript is in the Tanjore Library.

Râmâyana-ânâvayî is a commentary by Rângâcârya, of Kidîlîmu family and of ĀtreyaGotra. He was the pupil of Gopâlâ, a descendant of Vâdîhamsa family. He probably lived at Arasâmpalâ near Conjeevaram. Râmâyana-bhûsanam is a commentary by Prabalâmukundâsaîn, son of Singayâra. Subodhm is a commentary by Abhinava Râma-bhadrârama, a disciple of Raghûtâmâsrama. He was an ascetic, probably a resident of the Circars. Guruâlivâmbhâvaprakâśakâ is a commentary by Harândandha, son of Lakûnârâyânâmâtya of the Mudigunda family, and of the Kaundinya gotra. Appayândikâta wrote Râmâyana-tâtâtparyanînava and Râmâyana-sârasangraha.

Râmâyana-tattva-dîpikâ, familiarly known as Tîrthâlyam is a commentary by Mahâsaâtîrtha. He was an ascetic and pupil of Nârâyanâtîrtha. Râmâyana-Dîpikâ is a commentary by Vidyanâtha Dikâtha. So is Sârvârthâsâra by Venkatesvara. Varadarâja of Udâl family of Malabar has left a fragmentary commentary. Aufrecht gives the names of the following commentators: Isvâradikâta, Umâmaheśvara, Nâgâsa, Râmânândâtîrtha, Lokânâtha, Vîsanâtha, Sivara Sanyâsîn, Hari Pandâtha.

Caturarthi is an anonymous commentary giving four meanings to several important verses. The author displays much learning and

1. DC, IV 1284 Vâdîhamsâmbudâcârya was the maternal uncle of Veḍânta Deśika
2. TC, II 1235, 2057 He refers to a commentator Varadarâja
3. TC, II 2491, III 3753
4. TC, II 2315, 2652
5. Op, II 4884, 8336
6. Printed Madras and Bombay and elsewhere
7. DC, IV 1274 Described in Burnells Tan Cat p 178.
8. TC, II 1373 (1910-13)
9. TC, II 2722
ingenuity in his interpretations Amrtakataka, Rāmāpaśāradipikā, Gurubālacitttaranjanī, and Viṇvanmanoranjanī, are anonymous and except the first, are only available in fragments

Rāmāyānasārasangraha is an exposition of stray verses by Vardaraja of Nodari family and of Ātreya gotra, known also as Cholapandita Brahmādhīrāja Rāmāyānasārasacandrika is a commentary on some select verses by Srīmālavātragavacārya of Srirangam. He calls himself a disciple of the ascetic Ranganātha. Rāmāyaṇa Tamālokī Vyākhyā is an elaborate exposition in Tamil by Pernavāchāmbillai. It has been rendered into Sanskrit by some unknown author and is very interesting study. Hamsayogin's Āṣagītā composed in Kali 3604 (502 A.D.) explains important passages. There is a commentary on it Khandarahasya.

Rāmāyana-vaṣama-paḍārtha-vyākhyāṇa by Bhatta Devarama is a running gloss on difficult portions of the Rāmāyana. Kalpavalliṅka is a similar exposition of several important verses by Bommakantu Nyāsihasāstrī, an aged living Pandit of Cocanada. He is the son of Peru Sastri. He interprets the Rāmāyana as the manifestation of the will of Tripurasundari and Rāma as her incarnation. Rasamśyanḍī is a learned original commentary on important verses by Panthyur Kṛṣṇa Sāstrīgal of South Indian Puranic fame.

Rāmāyana-arthapraṅkāśikā is a running discussion on certain minor incidents of the story of the Rāmāyana. The author is Venkata, son of Lakṣmaṇa. Rāmāyana-mahimādarsa is a discussion of several controversial points in the events and interpretation of the Rāmāyana.

---

1. DC, IV 1274.
2. DC, IV 1286-8.
3. DC, IV 1283.
4. TC, I 233-4.
5. TC, III 3951.
6. TC, II 2457.
7. TC, II 2100. The manuscript ends with 119th canto of Yudhakanda.
9. This is being edited by Pandit Sadagopacharya of the Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.
10. KC, 198.
11. The work is being printed by the author at Cocanada.
12. The manuscript is with his son Mr. Kalyanarama Sastri. On the author, see Chapter on Sanskrit drama, post. He lived between 1842-1917.
13. DC, IV 1287.
14. TC, II, 2515.
in five Bimbas or chapters. The author was Purānam Hayagrīvaśastr the first Sanskrit Pandit of the Presidency College, Madras. He was the first editor of the Mahābhārata in South India in Telugu character. He lived in the sixties of the last century. Rāmāyanaḥakathāvimarśa is a short narrative of the Rāmāyana giving the time of occurrence of the leading events. Rāmāyanaśāradipikā is in fragments. Rāmāyanaśārasangraha of Venkatācārya, of Kaundinyagot of Muppuraṇa contains a statement in chronological order of the events of the Rāmāyana and gives a computation of dates. Rāmāyanaśāra Agniveśa is a record of the leading events of the Rāmāyana with the dates and intervals, composed in verse in Sārdula metre and well-known. RāmāyanaṆārāniṇāya sūcikā is a similar work, by anonymous, discussing the date of the birth of Rāma and other incidents of his life. There is a similar work called Rāmakālanirnaya, bodhini by Kovil Kandadai Venkata Sundarācārya of Cocalanda. The date of the birth of Rāma is also discussed in Telugu by Nadathu Ananthalwar Aiyangar, the grandson of the famous Mahāmahopādhyaya Paravastu Venkata Rangacharya of Vizagapatam and the pamphlet is named Rāmāvataarākalanirnaya.

Satyaparākrama is an essay elaborating that aspect of truthfulness in Rāma’s character by K R Visvanatha Sastri, of Kanadukathan. Ram nad Saranagati is an essay treating of that doctrine as expounded in the Rāmāyana by T Śrīnivāsa Rāghavacārya, B A of Conjeeveram.

Rāmāyanaṭāṭparyadhikā is said to have been an exposition of the real meaning and import of the Rāmāyana by Vyāsa made at the request of Dharma-raja. Rāmāyanaṭāṭvadarpāṇa by Nārāyaṇa Var explains the nine truths and significance of the Rāmāyana in long discourses in 15 chapters.

1. DC, IV 1274,
2. TC, II, 1373.
3. DC, I 1288-91
4. TC, II 2060
5. DC, IV 1291, TC, I 85
7. Printed at the Arsha Press, Vizagapatam, 1905
8. TC, II 2079, 2148
9. TC, II 2217
Veṣa Vyāsa, the author of Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, was the son of Parāśara and Saṭyavatī. His name was Kṛṣṇa and he had the appellation Dvapayana, because soon after birth he was abandoned by his unmarried mother in a dvipa (island). He compiled the Vedas and was thence known as Vyāsa. 2 Saṭyavatī married King Saṅtanu. Saṅtanu’s son Viṣṇuṅ Śrīruja had two wives, Ambika and Ambikā. He died issueless and to perpetuate his progeny, Vyāsa procreated three sons, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu, and Viḍura on these childless widows at the behest of his mother Saṭyavatī. 3 Then he betook himself to a life of penance, until after this progeny became old and passed away, he “spoke the Bhāraṭa in this human world.” He composed the Bhāraṭa of 26,000 verses. The learned say that is the extent of the Bhāraṭa without the Upakhyānas. And he compiled a chapter of 150 verses setting out the contents of the several Books of the poem. This of old Vyāsa taught to his son Śuka and then he gave to others of his pupils whom he found apt and promising. Vyāsa composed another poem of 60 lakhs of verses. Of this work 30 lakhs were published in the world of Gods, 15 lakhs in the region of the Pitru, 14 lakhs were given to the Gandharvas, and one lakh was published among men. Nārada recited it to the Gods, Devala to the Pitrus, Śuka to the Gandharvas and other Demons. In this land of man Vasāmpāyana recited, the pupil of Vyāsa, and the best of those learned in the Veda. 4 When Vyāsa was considering how best to transmit it to his disciples, Brahma appeared to him “Then the great glorious Vyāsa, addressing Brahma Paramesthi said: ‘O divine Brahma, by me a poem hath been composed which is greatly respected, the mystery of the Veda, and what other subjects have been explained by me, the various ritual of Upanishadas with the Angas, the compilation of the Purāpas formed by me and named after the three divisions of time, past, present, and future, the determination of the nature of decay, death, fear, disease, existence and non-existence, a description of creeds and of the various modes of life, rules for the four castes, and the important of the Purānas an account of asceticism and of the duties of religion.

1 Mah. I 64.
2 Mah. I. 112.
3 Mah. I 72 et seq.
student, the dimensions of the sun and moon, the planets, constellations and stars, together with the duration of the four ages, the Rik, Sama and Yayur Vedas, also the Adhyatma, the sciences called Nyaya, Orthoepy and Treatment of disease, charity and Pasupata, birth, celestial and human, for particular purposes, also a description of places of pilgrimage and other holy places, of rivers and mountains, forests, the ocean of heavenly cities and the kalpas, the art of war, the different kinds of nations and language, the nature of the manners of the people and the all-pervading spirit-ball, these have been represented. But after all, no writer of this work is to be found on earth."

"Brahma said,—"I esteem thee for thy knowledge of divine mysteries, before the whole body of celebrated Munis distinguished for the sanctity of their lives. I know thou has revealed the divine word, even from its first utterance, in the language of truth. Thou hast called thy present work a poem, wherefore it shall be a poem. There shall be no poets whose works may equal the descriptions of this poem, even as the three other modes called Asrama are ever unequal in merit to the domestic Asrama. Let Ganesa be thought of, O Munis, for the purpose of writing the poem."

Santu said, "Brahma having thus spoken to Vyasa, retired to his abode. Then Vyasa began to call to mind to Ganesa. And Ganesa, obviator of obstacles, ready to fulfill the desires of his votaries, was no sooner thought of, than he repaired to the place where Vyasa was seated. And when he had been saluted, and was seated, Vyasa addressed him thus,—"O guide of the Ganas, be thou the writer of the Bhārata which I have formed in my imagination, and which I am about to repeat."

"Ganesa upon hearing his address thus answered,—I will become the writer of thy work, provided my pen do not for a moment cease writing." And Vyasa said unto that divinity, "wherever there be anything thou does not comprehend, cease to continue writing." Ganesa, having signified his assent, by repeating the word 'Om!' proceeded to write, and Vyasa began, and, by way of diversion, he knit the knots of composition exceeding close, by doing which he dictated this work according to his engagement."

Vaishampayana repeated it to King Janamejaya at his sacrifice and Sauti heard that narration. The Mahābhārata, as we have

---
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it, was given out by Sauți, as he heard it from Vaisampayana, to the assembled sages during Saunata’s sacrifice in the forests of Naimśā.

We have therefore three points at which the Mahābhārata may actually be said to begin. First, from the very beginning of the text as we have it, with the invocation of Nara and Nārāyaṇa, following the invocation we have the conversation, when Sauți and the sages of Saunakas’ hermitage. Second, from the description of the Sarpa Sattrā (serpent sacrifice) of Janamejaya where commences the Āṣṭikā-parvan. Third, from the commencement of the actual narrative of the history of the Bharata race, where begins the Āmsāvatāraṇa parvan. In the course of the narrative as repeated Vaisampayana, it is observed that on some occasions, King Janamejaya asks Vaisampayana for an elaboration of the story or an elucidation of any earlier event alluded with it and Vaisampayana answers Janamejaya. These answers could not have been part of Vyasar’s narration and must be said to be of Vaisampayana’s authorship, just as the earlier Chapters describing the concourse at Saunaka’s sacrifice and the serpent sacrifice of Janamejaya must be ascribed to Sauți, who to us is the publisher of the Mahābhārata. It is however seen that Sauți’s narrative is read and taken as the Mahābhārata. There was a difference of opinion even when Sauți made his narrative. So it was said:

Manvādi Bhāraam ke cit Āṣṭikāṭi taṭhāpāre
Taṭhoplanicarādhyānaye viprās samyag aḍhūyire

“Brahmins have studied the Bhārata sedulously, some from the Chapter about Mann, others from the Chapter about Astikā,’ some from the Chapter about Uparicaravasu.” Sri Maṇḍha in his Tatparyamāṇaya however gives a traditional explanation of this verse: “The meaning of the Bhārata, in so far as it is a relation of the fact and events of which Sri Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas are connected, is called Astikāṭi (historical) That interpretation by which we find lessons on Dharma, Bhakti and other ten qualities, Sruta (sacred study) and righteous practices, character and training, on Brahma and the other

1 Mah. I. 1-11.
2 Mah. I. 12-58.
3 Mah. L. 59.
4 For a critical discussion of the preliminary Chapters, see Notes of a study of the Preliminary Chapters of the Mahabharata by V. Venkatachela Iyer, High Court, Vizagapatnam.
Gods is called Manvādi (religious and moral). Thirdly, the interpretation by which every sentence, word or syllable is shown to be the significant name, or to be the declaration of the glories of the Almighty Ruler of the Universe is called Auparicara (transcendental).

The vast extent of the work was easily the cause of much interpolation. Śrī Madhva found it deplorable. "In some places we find interpolations, in other cases texts are altogether lost, in some others, they have changed the character of the text either by mistake or on purpose. Even those that might be said to be extant are in a state of utter confusion, mostly they are lost. A millionth part of the real text is not available, what could then be said of their meaning hard to be grasped even by the Gods?" If we would not be hypercritical, we may safely take it that Vyāsa's text can be fairly distinguished, if we omit the earlier Chapters related by Sauti ending with the Āstikaparvan texts and the special explanations and narrations of Vasiṣṭhpāyana, in answer to particular questions of King Janamejaya as the narration progressed in the Court of King Janamejaya.

The name Mahābhārata has been significantly explained in the prefatory Chapter. "The Gods all came together of old and weighed the Bhārata in the balance against the four Vedas. As the Bhārata outweighed the four Vedas and all the secrets they contained, from that time forward, it has been known in this world as Mahābhāraṭa, for it being esteemed superior both in substance and gravity of import, is denominated Māhabhārata from such substance and gravity of import."

For the views of a non-Hindu or a sceptic Hindu, we cannot vouchsafe. To the ordinary Hindu in whom the sense of pieté has not yet vanished, the Mahābhārata is a fifth Veda. As Vyāsa said, "By the aid of History and the Purāṇas, Veda may be expounded, but the Veda is afraid of one of little information, lest he should injure it. The learned man who recites to others this Veda of Vyāsa reapeth advantage. It may without doubt destroy even the sin of killing the embryo and the like. He that readeth this holy Chapter at every change of the moon, readeth the whole of the Bhārata, I ween. The man who with reverence daily lisetheneth to this sacred work acquireth long life and renown and ascendeth to heaven," and may this blessing be true for ever!

1. C. V. Vaidya's Mahābhārata (epitome) is an attempt in this direction.
Tradition accepts that Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana or Veda Vyāsa is identical with Bādarāyana author of the Brahma Sūtras. Skandā Purāṇa expressly says that God incarnate as Vyāsa son of Sa śya-vaṭṭi and Parāśara arranged the Vedas and composed the aphorisms Rāma- nuja in his Sūtra Bhāṣya in Upaniṣadambhavādikarana, says Suṭra- kāreṇa Vedāntāyābhidhāyini Sutrāyābhidhāya Vedopabramhāna

I T, 8 Narayana Sastri in his Age of Sankara (p 39 note) expresses a contrary view Bādarāyana in his Vedanta Sutras quotes and refute the doctrines of almost all the other schools of Indian Philosophy including those of the Lokayatikas, Jains and Buddhists and he cannot, therefore, be identical with Krishna Dvai pa yana who was a contemporary of Sri Krishna and the Pandavas and who lived in the interval of time between Dvaparayuga and Kalyyuga, at about 3102 B C. Further Bādarāyana quotes from Patañjali, the renowned author of the Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini’s Vyākaraṇa and he is also accredited as having written the Bhashya on Patañjali’s Yoga Sutras. As Patañjali’s date is fixed between the 10th and 9th Century B C. (Vide ‘Age of Patañjali’ by the late Pandit N. Bhashyacharya) Bādarāyana can, under no circumstances, be placed before the 10th Century B C. Moreover, Bhavavdaṅgita, which forms a portion of the Mahābhārata written by Veda Vyāsa is quoted as an authority by Bādarṣyana in his Vedanta Sutras under the name of Śrīmāṇṭi, but this could hardly be the case if the author of both these works—the Bhavavardgīta and the Vedanta Sutras—were one and the same. Veda Vyāsa’s patronymic name is Kṛṣṇa Dvai pa yana and he is said to be the son of the great sage Parāśara by Ṣātya-vaṭṭi and his hermitage was near Prayāga (Allahabad) between the Ganges and the Jumna. Whereas, Bādarāyana, as the name itself clearly shows, was the son of Bādari and his hermitage was at Bādarakṣarama on the Himalayas. It is possible that Bādarāyana’s father and preceptor was called Bādari after the name of this sacred hermitage, which soon became a great seat of learning for the Vedanta school of Philosophy. The earliest authentic reference to Bādarāyana and Veda Vyāsa is by Śaṅkara himself, and it is clear from his works that he always made a distinction between Krishna Dvai pa yana or Veda Vyāsa, the author of the Bhavavardgīta, and Bādarāyana or Vyāsa, the author of the Vedanta Sutras. In commenting on Bhavavardgīta, Śaṅkara refers to the author in the preface in the following terms—Tām dharmam Bhagavatā Yathopādīstam Vedāvīśas Sarvaṅgo Bhagavān Gitākhyāna saṁtadbhis slokasatah upanītabhāhā (It is this Dharma which was taught by the Lord, that the omniscient and adolable Veda Vyāsa embodied in the seven hundred verses called Gitas ). But in the only place where he names the author of the Vedanta Sutras, Śaṅkara says, as follows:—

Nanvevam saṁ, saṁyāyatraṁ antavāyaṁ āsavāsaṁ yaṁ, jana-aśāśāṁ āśāṁ prasyayetāṁ aṁ aṁ uṭṭaram Bhagavān Bāḍarāyama Aśāśām uṣṭhaṁ? (But from the circumstances of the Lordly power of the released souls not being absolute, it follows that it comes to an end, and then they will have to return from the world of Brahma). To this objection, the reverend Bādarāyana Acharaya replies in the following Sutra. Of them, there is non-return according to scripture; non-return according to scripture. (Vide Śaṅkara’s preface to Vedanta Sutra, IV, 4-23). It is apparent from these two passages that Śaṅkara makes a
ca Bhārata Samhitām śaṣṭasahasrikām kurvaṇā Mahādharman Jñānakānde abhiṣitaṃ So says the author of Śrutapractionkā in his commentary on the Mangalāśloka referring to śrutī, Sahovaca Vyāsah Pārā-aryah In the traditional invocation adopted by readers of the Bhā-īyas, we have Samyugnyāyakalāpena mahaṭā Bhāratena ca, Upabrahmhitā Vedaya namo Vyāsāya Viṣṇave In the benedictory verse commencing the

clear distinction between the author of the Bhagavadgīta and that of the Vedanta Sutras, taking the one as the incarnation of the Omniscient Lord himself, and the other as one of his own respected Acharyas or teachers Further in Sutra III, 3-32 of his Vedanta Darsana, Badarayana himself refers to Krishna Dvaiipayana, as an instance of persons who knew Brahman and yet took on new bodies for the purpose of saving the world In commenting upon this Sutra, Sankara says — "Upāpana śivayam Caṇḍa Brahmanviṣṭamapi Kesamcit īśāsapurāṇayor debantaratọtpattidarsanat Taṇāthu, a pāntāratamā nāma Veḍācāryah purāṇārthi Vismunyogā Kaluḍvāparayos sanḍhau Kṛṣṇa āvaiṣayanām sambhuhveta maranṭi. (There is indeed room for the inquiry proposed, as we know from Idhas and Purana, that some persons although knowing Brahman, yet obtained new bodies Tradition informs us that Apantarataṃs, an ancient Rishi and teacher of the Vedas, was, by the order of Vishnu, born on this earth as Krishna Dvaiipayana at the interval of time between the Dvapara Yuga and Kali Yuga) If Krishna Dvaiipayana was the author of these Sutras, nothing would have been more natural and easier for Sankara than to refer to the author himself as an instance Further it is clear from this passage, that Krishna Dvaiipayana, according to Sankara, lived before the Kaliyuga and he could not be, therefore, identical with Badarayana, the author of the Vedanta Sutras and the reputed commentator of Patanjala's Yoga Sutras Moreover, the Vedanta Sutras are widely known as Badarayana Sutras, but no one has yet called them Krishna Dvaiipayana Sutras Sankarananda, one of the successors of Sankara, and one of the greatest of Sanskrit scholars, makes it clear in his preface to his commentary on the Bhagavadgīta, that these two persons could never be identical In that preface, he refers to the various works ascribed to Krishna Dvaiipayana, but makes no mention of the Vedanta Sutras, as one of his works. No doubt some of the later Acharyas have made a confusion between these two names, but that is no reason why the authors of the Bhagavadgīta but the Vedanta Sutras should be blindly identified and looked upon as one person"

"We are in a position to adduce other passages from the works of Sankaracharya, which strengthen to a greater or less extent, the conclusion derived from the one passage above referred to The twelfth aphorism of the first Pada of the second Adhyaya of the Brahma Sutras says "By this those (doctrines) which are not received by the learned have also been answered" And Sankaracharya, commenting upon this aphorism explains "the learned" to mean "Manu, Vyasa and others" Now is it likely that Sankaracharya would give this explanation, if he thought Vyasa to be the author of the Brahma Sutras? I think it is most unlikely, for otherwise the aphorism, amplified according to Sankara's explanation, would run something like this, "What has been said above furnishes an answer to all those doctrines which such learned men as Manu and
Dvartacārya Jayācīrtha’s commentary, Vyāsa is described as the author of the Sūtras and Mahābhārata and Purāṇas.

Sir Edwin Arnold in his “Indian Idylls” claims for parts of it “an origin anterior to writing, anterior to Puranic theology, anterior to Homer, perhaps old muses” and accepts it as one of the priceless, treasures of East. Dr F. A. Hassler wages eloquent in its praise “The Mahabharata has opened to me, as it were, a new world, and I have been surprised beyond measure at the wisdom, truth, knowledge and love of the right which I have found displayed in its pages not only so, but I have found many of the truths which my own heart heart taught me in regard to the supreme Being and His creations set forth in beautiful, clear language.”

M Williams gives the names of the eighteen sections or Books which constitute the poem, with a brief statement of their contents:

1. Adi-Parvan, introductory Book, describes how the two brothers, Dhritarashtra and Pandu, are brought up by their uncle Bhishma, and how Dhritarashtra, who is blind, has one hundred sons, commonly called the Kuru princes, by his wife Ghandhari, and myself have rejected.” I confess that this seems to me reductio ad absurdum. Again, the forty-seventh aphorism of the third Pada of the second Adhyāya is as follows “And there are Smritis to the same effect,” on which Sankarāchārya had this commentary “And there are Smritis of Vyāsa and others saying that the supreme soul suffers no pain in consequence of any pain suffered by the individual soul” Here we go one step beyond the point at which the previous passage carried us. For if Sankara thought Vyāsa to be the author of the Brahma Sutras, the result of the exposition above set out would be that, in Sankara’s judgment, Vyāsa, in this aphorism was speaking of another work of his own as a Smṛti, and citing it as an authority. Is this probable? Still another passage of a somewhat similar description occurs in the commentary of Sankarāchārya on the fourteenth aphorism of the first Pada of the third Adhyāya. This aphorism is in words the same as the last, and the comment of Sankara runs thus “And there are also Smritis of learned persons such as Manu, Vyāsa, and others. . .” Here we have Vyāsa, on the hypothesis above stated, referring to himself as an author of a Smriti, and quoting himself as an authority, in his own aphorism, and Sankara in his exposition of that aphorism calling him farther a learned person.”

Colebrooke refers to this last quotation. [Colebrooke, I, 327] He and Windischman say they are different personages. So says T. K. Telang a note on [Bhadrapada, the author of the Brahma Stūpas.] Weber [UL, 263] thinks they are identical.
how the two wives, of Pandu, Pritha (Kunti) and Madri, have five sons, called the Pandavas or Pandu princes.

2 Sabha-Parvan describes the great SABHA or ‘assembly of princes’ at Hastinapura, when Yudhishtira, the eldest of the five Pandavas, is persuaded to pay at dice with Sakuni and loses his kingdom. The five Pandavas and Draupadi, their wife, are required to live for twelve years in the woods.

3 Vana-Parvan narrates the life of the Pandavas in the Kamyaka forest. This is one of the longest books, and full of episodes such as the story of Nala and that of the Kuratarjuna.

4 Virata-Parvan describes the thirteenth year of exile and the adventures of the Pandavas while living disguised in the service of king Virata.

5 Udyoga-Parvan In this the preparations for war on the side of both Pandavas and Kauravas are described.

6 Bhishma-Parvan In this both armies join battle on Kurukshetra, a plain north-west of Delhi. The Kauravas are commanded by Bhishma, who falls transfixed with arrows by Arjuna.

7 Drona-Parvan In this the Kuru forces are commanded by Drona, and numerous battles take place. Drona falls in a fight with Dhritrasyumna (son of Drupada).

8 Karna-Parvan In this the Kuru are led by Karna. Other battles are described. Arjuna kills Karna.

9. Salya-Parvan In this Salya is made general of the Kuru army. The concluding battles take place, and only three of the Kuru warriors, with Duryodhana, are left alive. Bhima and Duryodhana then fight with clubs. Duryodhana, chief and eldest of the Kuru, is struck down.

10 Sauphika-Parvan In this three surviving Kuru make a night attack on the Camp of the Pandavas and kill all their army, but not the five Pandavas.

11 Stri-Parvan describes the lamentations of queen Gandhari and the other wives and women over the bodies of the slain heroes.

1. Ind Wis. 373.
12 Santi-Parvan In this Yudhishthira is crowned in Hastinapura. To calm his spirit, troubled with the slaughter of his kindred, Bhishma, still alive, instructs him at great length in the duties of kings (Rajadharma 1995-4778), rules for adversity (Apad Dharma 4779-6445), rules for attaining final emancipation (Moksha Dharma 6456 to end).

13 Anusasana-Parvan In this the instruction in continued by Bhishma, who gives precepts and wise axioms on all subjects, such as the duties of the kings, liberality, fasting, eating &c., mixed up with tales, moral and religious discourses, and metaphysical disquisitions. At the conclusion of his long sermon Bhishma dies.

14. Asvamedhika-Parvan In this Yudhishthira, having assumed the government, performs an Asvamedha or 'horse sacrifice' in token of his supremacy.

15 Asramavasika-Parvan narrates how the old blind king Dhritarashtra, with his queen Gandhari and with Kunti, mother of the Pandavas, retires to a hermitage in the woods. After two years a forest conflagration takes place, and they immolate themselves in the fire to secure heaven and felicity.

16 Mausala-Parvan narrates the death of Krishna and Balarama, their return to heaven, the submergence of Krishna’s city Dvaraka by the sea, and the self-slaughter in a fight with clubs of Krishna’s family, the Yadavas, through the curse of some Brahmans.

17 Mahaprasthamika-Parvan describes the renunciation of their kingdom by Yudhishthira and his four brothers, and their departure towards Indra’s heaven in Mount Meru.

18 Svargarohanika-Parvan narrates the ascent and admission to heaven of the five Pandavas, their wife Draupadi, and kindred.

Supplement or Harivamsa-Parvan, a later addition, recounting the genealogy and birth of Krishna and the details of his early life.

The following SUMMARY OF THE STORY IS TAKEN FROM R. C. DUTT’S CIVILIZATION IN ANCIENT INDIA.

Santana, the old kind of Hastinapura, died, leaving two sons, Bhishma, who had taken a vow of celibacy, and a younger prince who became king. This young prince died in his turn, leaving
two sons, Dhritarashtra, who was blind, and Pandu who ascended the throne. Pandu died, leaving five sons who are the heroes of the epic. Dhritarashtra remained virtually the king during the minority of the five Pandavas and of his own children, while Dhritarashtra’s uncle Bhishma, a renowned warrior, remained the chief councillor and friend of the state. Yudhishthira, the eldest of the Pandavas, never became much of a warrior, but became versed in the religious learning of the age, and is the most righteous character in the epic. Bhima, the second, learnt to use the club, and was renowned for his gigantic size and giant strength, and is indeed the Ajax of the poem. The third, Arjuna, excelled all other princes in the skill of arms, and aroused the jealousy and hatred of the sons of Dhritarashtra, even in their boyhood. Nakula, the fourth, learned to tame horses, and Sahadeva, the fifth, became proficient in astronomy. Duryodhana, the eldest son of Dhritarashtra, was proficient in the use of the club, and was a rival to Bhima.

At last the day came for a public exhibition of the proficiency which the princes had acquired in the use of arms. A spacious area was enclosed. Seats were arranged all round for the accommodation of ancient warriors and chieftains, of ladies and courtiers. The whole population of Kuruland flocked to see the skill of their young princes. The blind king Dhritarashtra was led to his seat, and foremost among the ladies were Gandhari, the queen of Dhritarashtra, and Kunti, the mother of the first three Pandavas. The last two were Pandu’s sons by another wife. There was shooting of arrows at a butt, and there was fighting with swords and bucklers and clubs. Duryodhana and Bhima soon began to fight in earnest, and rushed towards each other like mad elephants. Shouts ascended to the sky, and soon the fight threatened to have a tragic end. At last the infuriated young men were parted and peace was restored.

Then the young Arjuna entered the lists in golden mail with his wondrous bow. His splendid archery surprised his most passionate admirers and thrilled the heart of his mother with joy, while shouts of admiration rose from the multitude like the roar of the ocean. He played with his sword, which flashed like lightning, and also with his sharp-edged quoit or chakra, and never missed his mark. Lastly, he brought down horses and deer to the ground by the noose, and concluded by doing obeissance to his worthy preceptor Drona, amidst the ringing cheers of the assembled multitude.
The dark cloud of jealousy lowered on the brow of Dhrutarashtra’s sons, and soon they brought to the field an unknown warrior, Karna, who was a match for Arjuna in archery. King’s sons could only fight with their peers, like the knights of old, and Dhrutarashtra therefore knighted the unknown warrior, or rather made him a king on the spot so that Arjuna might have no excuse for declining the fight. To awkward questions which were put to him the haughty Karna replied that rulers and warriors knew not of their origin and birth, then prowess was their genealogy. But the Pandavas declined the fight and the haughty Karna retired in silence and in rage Drona now demanded the reward of his tuition. Like doubtful warriors of old he held revenge to be the dearest joy of a warrior, and for his reward he asked the help of the Kurus to be revenged on Drupada, king of the Panchalas, who had insulted him. The demand could not be refused. Drona marched against Drupada, conquered him, and wrested half his kingdom. Drupada swore to be avenged.

Dark clouds now arose on the horizon of Kuruland. The time had come for Dhrutarashtra to name a Yuvaraja, i.e., a prince who would reign during his old age. The claim of Yudhishthira to the throne of his father could not be gainsaid, and he was appointed Yuvaraja. But the proud Duryodhana rebelled against the arrangement, and the old monarch had to yield, and sent the five Pandavas in exile to Varanavita, said to be near modern Allahabad, and then the very frontier of Hindu settlements. The vengeance of Duryodhana pursued them there and the house where the Pandavas lived was burnt to ashes. The Pandavas and their mother escaped by an underground passage, and for a long time roamed about disguised as Brahmins.

Heralds now went from country to country, and proclaimed in all lands that the daughter of Drupada, king of the Panchalas, was to choose for herself a husband among the most skilful warriors of the time. As usual on such occasions of Svyamvara, or choice of a husband by a princess, all the great kings and princes and warriors of the land flocked to the court of Drupada, each hoping to win the lovely bride who had already attained her youth, and was renowned for her beauty. She was to give her hand to the most skilful archer, and the trial ordained was a pretty severe one. A heavy bow of great size was to be wielded, and an arrow was to be shot through a whirling chakra or quoit into the eye of a golden fish, set high on the top of a pole. Not only princes and warriors, but multitudes of spectators flocked from all parts of the country to Kampilya, the capital of the
Panchalas The princes thronged the seats, and Brahmans filled the place with Vedic hymns Then appeared Draupadi with the garland in her hand which she was to offer to the victor of the day By her appeared her brother Dhriishtadyumna, who proclaimed the feat which was to be performed Kings rose and tried to wield the bow, one after another, but in vain The skilful and proud Karna stepped for to do the feat, But was prevented A Brahman suddenly rose and drew the bow, and shot the arrow through the whirling chakra into the eye of the golden fish A shout of acclamation arose And Draupadi the Kshatriva princess, threw the garland round the neck of the brave Brahman, who led her away as bride But murmurs of discontent arose like the sound of troubled waters from the Kshatriva ranks at this victor of a Brahman, and the humiliation of the warriors, and they gathered round the bride's father and threatened violence, The Pandavas now threw off their disguise, and the victor of the day proclaimed himself to be Arjuna, a true-born Kshatriva

Then follows the strange myth that the Pandavas went back to their mother and said, a great prize had been won Their mother, not knowing what the prize was, told her sons to share it among them And as a mother's mandate cannot be disregarded, the five brothers wedded Draupadi as their wife The Pandavas now formed an alliance with the powerful king of the Panchalas, and forced the blind king Dhntarashtra to divide the Kuru country between his sons and the Pandavas The division, however, was unequal; the fertile tract between the Ganges and the Jumna was retained by the sons of Dhntarashtra, while the uncleared jungle in the west was given to the Pandavas The jungle Khandava Prastha was soon cleared by fire, and a new capital called Indraprastha was built, the supposed ruins of which are shown to every modern visitor to Delhi.

Military expeditions were now undertaken by the Pandavas on all sides, but these need not detain us, especially as the accounts of these distant expeditions are modern interpolations When we find in the Mahabharata accounts of expeditions to Ceylon, or to Bengal, we may unhesitatingly put them down as later interpolations. And now

1. Yuñhishṭhara entered Hastināpura when he was 16. He was with Duryodhana for 13 years He was confined in the lac house for 6 months, spent 6 months at Ekacakra, one year in the Pancāla house and 5 years with Duryodhana There it was that Delhi was built Yuñhishṭhara lived 108 years (Mah. I, 134) If he passed away in the beginning of Kali, he must have been born in 3210 B C, and Delhi must have been first built in 3174 B C
Yudhishthira was to celebrate the Rajasuya or coronation ceremony, and all the princes of the land, including his kinsmen of Hastinapura, were invited. The place of honour was given to Krishna, chief of the Yadavas of Gujrat. Sisupala of Chedi violently protested, and Krishna killed him on the spot. Krishna is only a great chief, and not a deity, in the older portions of the Mahabharata, and his story shows the Gujrat was colonised from the banks of the Jumna in the Epic Age. The tumult having subsided, the consecrated water was sprinkled on the newly-created monarch, and Brahmins went away loaded with presents.

But the newly-created king was not long to enjoy his kingdom. With all his righteousness, Yudhishthira had a weakness for gambling like the other chiefs of the time, and the unforgiving and jealous Duryodhana challenged him to a game. Kingdom, wealth, himself and his brothers, and even his wife were staked and lost,—and behold now, the five brothers and Droupadi, the slaves of Duryodhana. The proud Droupadi refused to submit to her position, but Dushasan dragged her to the assembly-room by her hair, and Duryodhana forced her down on his knee in the sight of the stupefied assembly. The blood of the Pandavas was rising, when the old Dharatarashtra was led to the assembly-room and stopped a tumult. It was decided that the Pandavas had lost their kingdom, but should not be slaves. They agreed to go in exile for twelve years, after which they should remain concealed for a year. If the sons of Dharatarashtra failed to discover them during the year, they would get back their kingdom.

Thus the Pandavas again went in exile, and after twelve years of wanderings in various places, disguised themselves in the thirteenth year and took service under the king of Virata. Yudhishthira was to teach the king gambling, Bhima was the head cook, Arjuna was to teach dancing and music to the king's daughter, Nakula and Sahadeva were to be master of horse and master of cattle respectively, and Droupadi was to be the queen's handmaid. A difficulty arose. The queen's brother was enamoured of the new handmaid of superb beauty, and insulted her and was resolved to possess her. Bhima interfered and killed the lover in secret. Cattle-lifting was not uncommon among the princes of those days, and the princes of Hastinapura carried away some cattle from Virata. Arjuna, the dancing master, could stand this no longer; he put on his armour, drove out in chariot and recovered the cattle, but was discovered.
And now the Pandavas sent an envoy to Hastinapura to claim back their kingdom. The claim was refused, and both parties prepared for a war, the like of which had never been seen in India. All the princes of note joined one side or the other, and the battle which was fought in the plains of Kurukshetra, North of Delhi, lasted for eighteen days, and ended in fearful slaughter and carnage.

The long story of the battle with its endless episodes need not detain us. Arjuna killed the ancient Bhishma unfairly after that chief was forced to desist from fighting Drona, with his impenetrable “squares” or phalanxes, killed the old rival Drupada, but Drupada’s son revenged his father’s death and killed Drona unfairly. Bhima met Duhssasana, who had insulted Drupada in the gambling-room, cut off his head, and in fierce vindictiveness drank his blood. Last of all, there was the crowning contest between Karna and Arjuna, who had hated each other through life, and Arjuna killed Karna unfairly when his chariot wheels had sunk in the earth, and he could not move or fight. On the last or eighteenth day, Duryodhana fled from Bhima, but was compelled by taunts and rebukes to turn round and fight, and Bhima by a foul blow (because struck below the waist) smashed the knee on which Duryodhana had once dragged Drupada. And the wounded warrior was left there to die. The bloodshed was not yet over; for Drona’s son made a midnight raid into the enemy’s camp and killed Drupada’s son, and thus an ancient feud was quenched in blood.

The remainder of the story is soon told. The Pandavas went to Hastinapura, and Yudhishthira became king. He is said to have subdued every king in Aryan India, and at last celebrated the Asvamedha ceremony or the great horse-sacrifice. A horse was let loose and wandered at its will for a year, and no king dared to stop it. This was a sign of the submission of all the surrounding kings, and they were then invited to the great horse-sacrifice.

1 The pakṣa in which the war began had only 13 days (Mahābh. VI 3, 11-18; I, XVI, 82. The great European war also began in a pakṣa of 13 days. L. D. Swamikannu would however not attach any evil influence for such a short fort-night.

2 According to the dates given in the text —

Kārtikā sukla dvādasam-Revaśa — (Kṛṣṇa’s) message

Kṛṣṇa pancami (Pusyaṃ) — Mobilisation.

Amāviṣya-Jyeṣṭha — Reaching battle-field

Mārgāśira sukla śravya (mṛγaśira) — War begins

Kṛṣṇa āmāviṣya — War ends.

Māgha sukla pāncami — Death of Bhīma.
Babu Ramgopal Singh Choudhry B L wrote in *The Wisdom of the East* thus "The epoch of the Kalvuga 3102 B.C is usually identified with the era of Yudhishthira, and the date of the Mahabharath War. Two pitched battles were fought between the said parties, the 1st at Berathnagar and the 2nd at Kurukshetra. The battle took place just on the completion of the 13 years Banbas (evile of the Pandavas into the forests) (Vide Berath Parv Adhyaya 30, Slokas 28 and 29. Thereafter Sri Krishna started for Hastinapur on the 1st Karuk, Revathi Nakshatra, Mitra Dasvat Mahoor, to negotiate peace, and if possible prevent the impending civil war that caused the ruin of Ancient India (Udyog Parv, Adhyaya 82, Slokas 6 to 13). On Duryodhan's refusal to come to terms and declining to give even 5 villages for the maintenance and support of the five Pandavas, Sri Krishna on his way back to Berathnagar asked Karna to commence the war that day week, *vals*, on 15th day (Amavasya) of that month (Udyog Parv, Adhyaya 141, Sloka 18). It appears that for some reason or other the war did not commence on that date, for 50 nights after the end of the war Maharaja Yudhishthira paid a second visit to Sri Bhushma who breathed his last on that day (Anusasan Parv, Adhyaya 167, Slokas 5 to 28).

Now the Mahabharath War lasted for 18 days, so he died (50 and 18) 68 days after the commencement of the war. It is well-known that Magh Sudh 8, *i.e.*, the 8th day of the bright side of the moon of the month of Magh is the date on which he went to heaven. It is therefore called Bhishma Astami and tarpan (oblations of water) is given to him on that day. By calculation we find that 68 days backwards from Magh Sudh 8th would fall on Aghan Sudh 1 or 16th Aghan. So the battle commenced on the 16th of Aghan and lasted till the 3rd of Pus. That this is the date of the commencement of the war will also be borne out by the fact that when after spending 50 nights in the city on the termination of the second war, Maharaja Yudhishthira went to Sri Bhushma for the 2nd time, the latter spoke thus (vide Anusason Parv Adhyaya 167)—"Well Yudhishthara, to-day is the bright side of the moon, ¾ of this month have already passed and I have already slept on the points of the arrows for 58 nights." So there remains no room for doubt that the day when Yudhishthara went to him, that is to say, the day Bhushma died, fell on the 23rd of Magh (Aghan Sudh 8). He fought for 10 days and passed 58 nights on the bed of arrows. So by this calculation also it comes out that the battle began on Aghan, Sudh 1st (16th of Aghan), for counting from that day the 68th day would fall on Magh Sudh 8th. It seems that although Sri Krishna proposed
to commence the war on the Dīpaśā day (15th Kartic), the Kuru
could not make necessary arrangements in that short time and the
war commenced a month and 8 days after, instead of 8 days.

Now I give dates of the death of the great warriors who fell in
that battle: Śrī Bhishma fell on Aghan Sudi 8th, i.e., 23rd Aghan, but
died on the 3rd of Paus. Bhag-Dutt was killed on Aghan Sudi 11
Abhimanuya was killed on Aghan Sudi 13. Bhurisaṇa, Jarādarath and
Ghototkuch were killed on Aghan Sudi 14. Dronachārya was killed
on Aghan Sudi 15. Duḥsasana and Karna were killed on Paus Badi 2
Shālyā, Shalloa and Sakunī were killed in the day time on 3rd Pauš
Badi. And on the same date at dusk, Duryodhan's thighs were broken
and he fell down Dhrūṣtadhumāna, Shikhandi, and the 5 sons of Droupadi
were killed in the night on the same day, viz., 3rd Paus. Duryodhan
breathed his last on the same day after midnight but before sunrise."
Srīnandana was the son of Laksmanacarya of Bhāradya Gotra and was known as Mahabhārata Bhattacharya.

Mahabhārata-ṭātparya-nrṣya is an epitome of the Mahabhārata by Sri Madhvacarya, the great teacher of the Dwanta philosophy who flourished in the 12th century A.D. There are commentaries on it by Jñānānandabhatta, Varadarāja, Vādrajā, Vitthalacarva, and Vyāsaśirṣha, and a commentary Sabhyābbhinayavati.

There is a Bhāratatātparyanrṣya by Varadarāja who lived about 1500 A.D. Bhāratatatva-vacanam is a collection of extracts made by Puranam Hayagriva Sastri which support and illustrate the principles of Advaita philosophy. Bālābhāratam and Mahabhārata-Sangraham are compilations of the main thread of the story. There is an abridgement by C V Vaidya. An anonymous work called Vyāsākūṭa is remarkable for its double entendre. Bhāratayuddha-vivāda by Nārāyanalāsa, known as Bhāratācārya, determines the length of time occupied by the Great War Bhāratasāviṭrī is a similar work quoted by commentators and is often extracted in the Kumbakonam edition.

Jāmiṇī-Bhāratam is an elaborate work dealing with the exploits and character of the Pándavas in verse. Only one parvan of this work is extant describing the Aśvamegha of Yudhishthira. Brihat Pândava Purāṇa called also the Mahabhārata is divided into 25 Parvans. It was composed at Sripura in Śākavāya by Śri śubhacandra and revised and rewritten by his disciple Brahma Śripāla: śubhacandra was the head of Jana muth founded by Paḍmananḍi of śrīmulaśaṅgha. He succeeded Viṣṇukirti. He mentions other works of his, Candranāṭhacarita, Paḍmanabhacarita, Jivakacarita, Pārśvanātha kāvya, Candanaṇkathā, Nandīśvarī etc. In the first six Parvans some Jāmiṇī anecdotes are narrated including the life of Śantmātha and the last four

---

1. Macdonell, SL, 290-I.
3. CG, I 440.
4. This is found in the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.
5. Ed Masulipatam TC, III, 3242.
6. TC, III, 2998, 33385, 3849 See also for a similar abridgment, KC, 1971.
Parvans describe the advent of Nemmātha and the attainment of salvation of the Pāndavas. The date of the composition is given as samvat 1608 or 1552 A.D. ²

Pāndavapurāṇa in 18 cantos describes the story of the Mahābhārata as current among the Janaś The author Vādūcandra was the disciple and younger brother of Prabhācandra. The story was first recounted by Varṇdhānā, son of Siddhārtha, to Śreṇīka, king of Kundai, and from him was traditionally transmitted through Nemmātha, Paḍmanandi etc., to Prabhācandra, who was the author's brother. The work was written at Ghanaugha in the Pushyā month of 654 (samvat) ¹

Devaprabhāsūri, the Jain monk, wrote Pāndavacarita ³

Haranāma is a sequel to the Mahābhārata and is held in high esteem. It is also the work of Vyāsa and describes the life and adventures of Kṛṣna. Introductory to his era, it records particulars of the creation of the world and of the patriarchal and regal dynasties. ⁴

Jana Haranāma is a long poem of some historical value in the Puranic form by Jinasena who wrote in Saka 705 ⁵

1 TC, III 3968, PR, IV 156
2 TC, II, 1785. The words used are Veṣā-būti-Sad-anke (ge) varṣe
3 PR, I 98, III 133
4. Ed Bombay Translated by M Langlois
5 IA, X V 141.

On Mahābhārata generally —
Ed by P C Roy (Calcutta), Ed by Education Committee (Calcutta), Ed by S. L. Bhaduri (Calcutta), Ed S Vyasacarya (Kumbakonam). There are other editions in various scripts everywhere.

For contents of the work, see M. Williams' Indian Epic Poetry and Indian Wisdom


Translated into English prose by P C Roy (1894, Calcutta), Translated by R C Dutt (Calcutta), by M N Dutt (Calcutta) Takur Rajendra Singh, Great War of Ancient India (Ind Rev XVI 531), J Dahlman, Genesis Des Mahābhārata (Berlin) says that the work existed in the present form before the 5th century B C Holtzman Das Mahābhārata (Kiel), Buhler, Indian Studies No. II (Trans of Imp. Vienna Academy, 1892), Paper by Winternitz (IRAS,
Theories and dates

Much has been said by oriental scholars on the age of the Mahābhārata and the general tendency of such opinions has been only to bring down the date of the composition to a close proximity to the beginning of the Christian era. Max Müller traces the connection between the Mahabharata and the Vedic literature and attributes the present form of the poem to the redaction of Brahmanical priesthood

1 The war between the Kurus and Pandavas, which forms the principal object of our Mahabharata, is unknown in the Veda. The names of the Kurus and Bharatas are common in the Vedic literature, but the names of the Pandavas has never been met with. It has been observed, that even in Panini's grammar the name Pandu or Pandava does not occur, while the Kurus and Bharatas are frequently mentioned,


This paper gives all references to Mahabharata from Patanjali onwards. There are early inscriptions mentioning Mahabharata names (JBRAS, XVIII, 1, 4, IX. 315). Pargiter on The Nations of India at the battle between Pandavas and Kauravas and the controversy thereon [JRAS, (1908) 602, 309, 831, 837, 1138]. On the Ganesa legend in the Mahabharata [JRAS (1898) 631]

Bhishma, his life and teachings (Datta Boss & Co., Calcutta), Manorayan Ghosh, Date of Sri Krishna (Ind. Rev XV 39), Buhler and Kirste, Contributions to the history of the Mahabhara (Sita, Wien), On the old linguistic form of the epics by Jacob, (ZDMG, XLV 407) and by Rapson, [JRAS, (1904), 435] Gaurangannath Banerji, Hellenism in Ancient India, 225

1 Ancient Sanskrit Literature, 44-48.

2 Weber, I Str, 148, Katyayana, however knows not only Pandu, but his descendants Pandavas.
particularly in rules treating of the formation of patronymics and similar words. If, then, Asvalayana, the immediate successor of Panini, knows not only Pandu, but also his descendants, the Pandavas, can be shown to have been a contemporary, or at least an immediate successor, of Panini, the Bharata which he is speaking of must have been very different from the epic poem which is known to us under the name of the Mahabharata, celebrating the war of the Kurus and Pandavas.

1 The names of the two wives of Pandu, Kunti and Madri, occur in the commentary on Panini (Cf 1 ii 49, iv i 65, iv i 176 (text) for Kunti, and iv i 177, (for Madri) But both these names are geographical appellatives, Kunti signifying a woman for the country of the Kuntas, Madri, a Madra-woman, Pritha, another name of Kunti, stands in the Gana sirvadi As to the proper names of the Pandava princes, we find Yudhisthira, Pan vi i 134, vi 3 9, viii 3 95 (text), Arjuna, Pan iii i 119, iv 3 64, v 4 481, vi, 2 131, Bhuma, Pan, vi i 205, Nakula, Pan vi i 3 75 The name of Sahadeva does not occur, but his descendants, the Sahadevas, are mentioned as belonging to the race of Kuru, together with the Nakulas, Pan. iv i 114. In the same way we find the descendants of Yudhisthira and Arjuna mentioned as members of the eastern Bharatas, Pan ii 4. 66 Draupadi's name does not occur in Panini, but Subhadra, the sister of Krishna and the wife of Arjuna, is distinctly mentioned, Pan iv 2 56. Another passage in the commentary on Panini (iv 3 87) proves even the existence of a poem in praise of Subhadra, which, if we remember the former mention of a war about Subhadra (iv 2 56), seems most likely to have celebrated this very conquest of Subhadra by Arjuna In the Mahabharata this story forms a separate chapter, the Subhadra-harara-parva (Adiparva, p 288), which may be the very work which Panini, according to his commentator, is alluding to. That the chapter in the Mahabharata belongs to the oldest parts of the epic, may be seen from its being mentioned in the Anukramani (1 149) "when I heard that Subhadra, of the race of Madhu, had been forcibly seized in the city of Dvaraka, and carried away by Arjuna, and that the two heroes of the race of Vrisni had repaired to Indraprastha, I then, O Sanjaya, had no hope of success." The Mahabhasha, however, does not explain the former Sutra, (iv 2 56), and for the latter it gives examples for the exceptions only, but not for the rule. The word Grantha, used in the Sutra, (iv 3 87), is also somewhat suspicious. That some of the Sutras which now form part of Panini's grammar, did not proceed from him, is acknowledged by Kavyyata 'cf. iv 3 131, 132) Krishna Vasudeva, who is considered as peculiarly connected with the tradition of the Pandavas, is quoted as Vasudeva, of the race of Vrishni (Pan iv 1 114), as Vasudeva, together with Siva and Aditya (Pan, v 3 99 text), as Vasudeva, together with Arjuna (iv 3 98 text) In the commentary to Pan. iii 3, 156, and iv 3 72, we have proof of Krishna's being worshipped as a god, in 1 4 92 he is mentioned as a hero His residence, Dvaraka, however, does not occur in Panini.

2 That Panini knew the war of Bharatas, has been rendered highly probable by Prof Lassen (Ind. Alterthumskunde, 1 691, 837) The words which called forth Panini's special rule (iv. 2, 56), can scarcely be imagined to have been
“In the form in which we now possess the Mahabharata it shows clear traces that the poets who collected and finished it, breathed an intellectual and religious atmosphere, very different from that in which the heroes of the poem moved. The epic character of the story has throughout been changed and almost obliterated by the didactic tendencies of the latest editors, who were clearly bramhans, brought up in the strict school of the Laws of Manu. But the original traditions of the Pandavas break through now and then, and we can clearly discern that the races among whom the five principal heroes of the Mahabharata were born and fostered, were by no means completely under the influence of brahmical law. How is it, for instance the Pandava, who if we are to believe the poet, were versed in all the sacred literature, grammar, metre, astronomy, and law of the Brahmans, could afterwards have been married to one wife? This is in plain opposition to the Brahmanic law, where it is said, “they are many wives of one man, not many husbands of one wife.” Such a contradiction can only be accounted for by the admission that, in this case, epic tradition in the mouth of the people was too strong to allow this essential and curious feature in the life of its heroes to be changed. However, the Brahmanic editors of the Mahabharata, seeing that they could not alter tradition on this point, have at least endeavoured to excuse and mitigate it.

“Neither does the fact that Pandu is lawfully married to two wives, harmonise with the Brahmanic law. That law does not prohibit polygamy, but it regards no second marriage as legal, and it reserves the privilege of being burnt together with the husband to the eldest and only lawful wife. Such passages in the ancient epics are of the greatest interest. We see in them the tradition of the people too far developed, to allow itself to be remodelled by Brahmanic Diaskeuastes. There can be little doubt that polygamy, as we find it among the early races in their transition from the pastoral to the agricultural life, was customary in India. We read in Herodotus (v 5), that amongst the different from those in the Mahabhashya, viz., Bharata sangramah, Saubhadrah sangramah. It was impossible to teach or to use Panu’s Sutras without examples. These necessarily formed part of the traditional grammatical literature long before the great commentary was written, and are, therefore, of a much higher historical value than is commonly supposed. The coincidences between the examples used in the Pratisakahyas and in Panu show that these examples were by no means selected at random, but that they had long formed part of the traditional teaching. See also Pan. vi 2 38, where the word Mahabharata occurs, but not as the title of a poem.
Thraces it was usual, after the death of a man, to find out who had been the most beloved of his wives, and to sacrifice her upon his tomb. Mela (i. 2) gives the same as the general custom of the Getae, Herodotus (iv. 71) asserts a similar fact of the Scythians, and Pausania (v. 2) of the Greeks, while our own Teutonic mythology is full of instances of the same feeling. And thus the customs of these cognate nations explain what at first seemed to be anomalous in the epic tradition of the Mahabharata, that at the death of Pandu, it is not Kunti, his lawful wife, but Madri, his most beloved wife, in whose arms the old king dies, and who successfully claims the privilege of being burnt with him and following her husband to another life."

"The marked difference between the Vedic and epic poetry of India has been well pointed out by Professor Roth of Tubingen, who for many years has devoted much time and attention to the study of the Veda. According to him, the Mahabharata, even in its first elements, is later than the time of Buddha. "In the epic poems," he says, "the Veda is but imperfectly known, the ceremonial is no longer developing, it is complete. The Vedic legends have been plucked from their native soil, and religion of Agni, Indra, Mitra and Yaruna has been replaced by an altogether different worship. The last fact, he says, "ought to be the most convincing. There is a contradiction running throughout the religious life of India, from the time of Ramayana to the present day. The outer form of the worship is Vedic, and exclusively so, but the eye of religious adoration is turned upon quite different regions. The secondary formation, the religion of Vishnu and Brahma, began with the epic poetry, and remained afterwards as the only living one, but without having the power to break through the walls of the Vedic ceremonial, and take the place of the old ritual."

M. Winternitz thus sums up his views — "If however the Mahabharata already undoubtedly possessed in the 4th century A.D., the later portions, such for example, as the 13th book and 'Harivamsa,' if at that time, the epic had already become a religious and devotional book and if a century later the news of the Mahabharata had already spread up to farther India and was there read in temples, then we can with perfect justification conclude that it must have received the form which

it has to-day, at least one or two centuries earlier, that is, in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. On the other hand, however, it might have received its earliest shape not only after the rise and spread of Buddhism, because it contained so many allusions to it, but also after Alexander's invasion of India because, the Yavanas, i.e., the Indians or Greeks are often alluded to and there are moreover references to stone buildings, whereas before the time of the Greeks only wooden buildings were known in India. The Mahabharata in its present form could not be earlier than the 4th century B.C and later than 4th century A.D."

Macdonell traces the growth of the Mahabharata "There can be little doubt that the original kernel of the epic has as a historical background an ancient conflict between the neighbouring tribes of the Kurus and Panchalas, who finally coalesced into a single people. In the Yajurvedas these two tribes already appear united, and in the Kathaka King Dhritarashtra Vaichitravirya, one of the chief figures of the Mahabharata, is mentioned as a well-known person. Hence the historical germ of the great epic is to be traced to a very early period which cannot well be later than the tenth century B.C. Old songs about the ancient feud and heroes who played a part in it, must have been handed down by word of mouth and recited in popular assemblies or at great public sacrifices. These disconnected battle-songs were, we must assume, worked up by some poetic genius into a comparatively short epic, describing the tragic fate of the Kuru race, who, with justice and virtue on their side, perished through the treachery of the victorious sons of Pandu with Krishna at their head. To the period of this original epic doubtless belong the traces the Mahabharata has preserved unchanged of the heroic spirit and the customs of the ancient times, so different from the later state of things which the Mahabharata as a whole reflects. To this period also belongs the figure of Brahma as the highest God. The evidence of Pali literature shows that Brahma already occupied that position in Buddha's time. We may, then, perhaps assume that the original form of our epic came into being about the 5th century B.C. The oldest evidence we have for the existence of the Mahabharata in some shape or other is to be found in Acvalayana's Grihya Sutra, where a Bharata and Mahabharata are mentioned. This would also point to about the fifth century B.C. To the next stage, in which the epic, handed down by rhapsodists, swelled to a length of about 20,000 dakas, belongs the representation of the victorious Pandus in a favourable light, and the introduction on
a level with Brahma of the two other great gods Civa, and especially Vishnu, of whom Krishna appears as an incarnation. We gather from the account of Megasthenes that about 300 B.C., these two gods were already prominent, and the people were divided into Civaites and Vishnavites. Moreover, the Yavanas or Greeks are mentioned in the Mahabharata as allies of the Kurus, and even the Cakas (Scythians) and Pahlavas (Parthians) are named along with them, Hindu temples are also referred to as well as Buddhist relic mounds. Thus an extension of the original epic must have taken place after 300 B.C. and by the beginning of our era."

Hopkins sums up the result of his discussions—"We may tentatively assume as approximate dates of the whole work in its different stages Bharata (Kuru) lays, perhaps combined into one, but with no evidence of an epic before 400 B.C. A Mahabharata tale with its perhaps justified claim to be considered a branch of the Bharatas, its own later heroes, its cult of anti-Buddhist type, with Pandu heroes, lays and legends combined by the Puranic diasskeuasts, Krishna as a demigod (no evidence of didactic form or of Krishna's divine supremacy), 400-200 B.C. Remaking of the epic with Krishna as all-god, intrusion of masses of didactic matter, addition of puranic material old and new, multiplication of exploits, 200 B.C. to 100-200 A.D. The last books added with the introduction to the first book, the swollen Anucasana separated from Canti and recognised as a separate book, 200 to 400 A.D., and finally 400 A.D. occasional amplifications, the existence of which no one acquainted with Hindu literature would be disposed antecedently to doubt, such as the well-known addition mentioned by Professor Weber, Lectures on Literature, p. 205, and perhaps the episode omitted by Csemendra, Indian Studies, No. ii, p. 52.

"In the case of these dates there is only reasonable probability. They are and must be provisional till we know more than we know. But certain are these four facts:

1. That the Pandu epic as we have it, or even without the masses of didactic material, was composed or compiled after the Greek invasion. 2. That this epic only secondarily developed its present masses of didactic material. 3. That it did not become a specially religious propaganda of Krishnaism (in the accepted sense of that sec

1 Sanskrit Literature, 284-6
2 The Great Epic of India, 397-400
of Vaisnavas) till the first century B C, 4 That the epic was practically completed by 200 A D, 5 That there is no "date of the epic" which will cover all its parts (though handbook-makers may safely assign it in general to the second century B C)

"The question whether the epic is in any degree historical seems to me answerable though not without doubt, and I cannot refrain from expressing an opinion on the point so important As I have remarked above, there is no reflex of Pandu glory in Brahmanic literature before the third or fourth century. It is, further, impossible to suppose that during the triumph of Buddhism such a poem could have been composed for the general public for which it was intended. The metre of the poem shows that its present form is later than the epic form of Panini's epic verses, but this indicates simply recasting; so that a Pandu Mahabharata may have existed previously, as implied by Panini. But while a Buddhist emperor was alive no such Brahmanic emperor as that of the epic could have existed, no such attacks on Buddhism as are in the epic could have been made, and the epic of to-day could not have existed before the Greeks were personally familiar. In other words, granted a history, that history must have been composed at least as late as the history was possible Panini's allusions and those of Buddhist writers show that the Pandus were known as heroes. It is, further, most improbable that the compilers, who made the poem represent Pandu virtues and victories, would have chosen them for this position had they been mythical. In their reassertion of Brahmanism they would have chosen rather the well-known ancient Brahmanic heroes of the older tale, Bharati Katha, yet to appeal to the people something real and near was necessary. But while before the second century the conditions were lacking which could have produced the poem, with the second century they become possible, and there was already the Pandu tribe with its perhaps justified claim to be considered a branch of the Bharatas, its own later heroes, its cult of anti-Buddhistic type.

"In so far, then, as we may discern a historical germ in the midst of poetic extravagance, it would seem that the poem represents an actual legend of a real tribe, and in so far as that legend persists in its adherence to polyandry as an essential part of the legend, a tribe which, like so many others in India, had been brahmanized and perhaps become allied by marriage to the old Bharata tribe, whose legends were thus united with its own."
C V Vaidya fixes the date of the extant epic, at 250 B.C about the time of Asoka and previous to the time of Patanjali, because Don Chrysostom, the Greek orator, of the 1st century A.D refers to the existence of an epic of the present dimensions of the Mahabharata and Dikshit points out that the cycle of Nakshatras beginning with Sravana said in the Mahabharata to have been instituted as a new cycle by Visvantra cannot go beyond 450 B.C.

According to Kern, the Kavi translation of Adiparvan dates from the beginning of the eleventh century.

Among the extravagant fancies of modern orientalists, which are dignified with the respectable appellation of theories, may be mentioned the opinion of Prof. Holtzmann on the nature and origin of the Mahabharata deserves a short review. "The traditional stock of legends were first worked up into a precise shape by some Buddhist poets and this version, showing a decided predilection for the Kururava party as the representation of Buddhist principles, was afterwards revised in a contrary sense at the time of the Brahminical reaction by the votaries of Vishnu, when the Buddhist features were generally modified into Saivite tendencies and prominence was given to the divine nature of Krishna as an incarnation. It is but right that the Brahminical priests should have deemed it desirable to subject the traditional memorials of Kshatrya chivalry and prestige to their own censorship and adapt them to their own canons of religion and civil law." This theory subverts all truth and tradition. Modifications and innovations especially in the religious character of sectarian works are not easily accomplished. The Buddhist records offer no support for this theory. If such a standard work as the Mahabharata were included in the catalogue of the Buddhist literature, Brahminical transformation could never have been possible, so as to entirely erase from the huge mass of the work all traces of the Buddhist coloring. As an exposition of the ethics of the Vedic religion, there is pre-eminently the Mahabharata.

H.H. Wilson thus sums up the opinion of his times. "According to Col. Wilford's Computations (Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX, Chronological table, p. 116) the conclusion of the great war took place in B.C. 1370, Buchanan conjectures it to have occurred in the 18th century B.C. Colebrooke infers from astronomical data that the arrangement of

1 Historical Studies in the Bhagavat Gita, [Ind. Rev (1916), 481]
2 Dikshit's Mahabat History of Indian Astronomy, III
3 Over de Oud Iavannische Vertaling Van't Mahabbhara (Amsterdam)
the Vedas, attributed to Vyasa, took place in the fourteenth century B.C., M Beniley brings the date of Yudhishthira, the chief of the Pandavas to 575 B.C., but the weight of authority is in favour of the thirteenth or fourteenth century B.C. for the war of the Mahabharata and the reputed commencement of the Kali age.

Weber says "Of the Mahabharata in its extant form, only about one-fourth (some 20,000 slokas or so) relates to this conflict and the myths that have been associated with it, and even of this, two-thirds will have to be sifted out as not original, since in the introduction to the work (I. 51) the express intimation is still preserved that it previously consisted of 8,800 slokas only. But as to the period when the final redaction of the entire work in its present shape took place, no approach even to direct conjecture is in the meantime possible, but, at any rate, it must have been some centuries after the commencement of our era."

R.C. Dutt says "The annals of different kingdoms in India allude to this ancient war, and some of these annals are not unreliable. The founder of Buddhism lived in the sixth century B.C. and we learn from the annals of Magadha that thirty-five kings reigned between the Kuru-Panchala War and the time of Buddha. Allowing twenty years to each reign, this would place the war in the thirteenth century B.C. Again, we know from coins that Kanishka ruled in Kashmir in the first century A.D. and his successor Abhimanu probably reigned towards the close of that century. The historian of Kashmir informs us that fifty-two kings reigned for 1266 years from the time of the Kuru-Panchala war to the time of Abhimanu, and this would place the war in the twelfth century B.C." Fergusson places the war in the 13th century B.C.

R Shama Sastry accepts the date ascribed to Chandragupta and assigns the war to the 13th century and says that "Bharata the son of Dushyanta, is stated to have performed in the twelfth Atratra (Arv., Sr. S X, 5, 8). This gives 372×4=1488 Kali Era or 1613 B.C. as the date of Bharata. According to the list of kings given in the Vishnu Purana, Yudhishthira, the hero of the Mahabharata and contemporary of Krishna is the 25th descendant from Bharata, and died in 1250 B.C.

1. Puru Purāṇa, IV 232 In his Intr to Translation to Rig Veda (I 47) he gave the probable date of the epic poem at the 3rd century B.C.
2. Indian Literature, 187-88.
3. Cm. I 10
4. History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, 36.
Accordingly the interval between Bharata and Yudhistira is 247 years, which, if the list is correct gives about 10 years on an average to each of the 25 reigns Parikshit is the grandson of Yudhistira. The interval between him and Nanda is according to the Matsya Purana one thousand years less by one hundred and fifty Nanda lived in 4th century B.C."

Immemorial tradition sanctified by the religious faith of hundreds of generations of people in India assigns the Mahābhārata war to the end of the Dwāpara Yuga, that is, the year 3139 B.C. The Purāṇas and the astronomical Siddhāntas accept the tradition as incontrovertible history and as the starting point of Indian chronology. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa says that "On the same day that Hari departed from the earth the powerful dark-bodied Kāli (age) descended." Hari Kṛṣṇa lived for 125 (105?) years and he was a contemporary of the great war and according to the Mahābhārata the race of Śri Kṛṣṇa was destroyed thirty-six years after the war and the Pandavas departed from their kingdom soon after the beginning of Kaliyuga.

Megasthenes, "who probably quoted from Harivamṣa, not as it exists to-day but as it was in his time, viz., a real dynastic list as its name implies, has recorded a statement that between Dionysos and Chandragupta there were 153 Kings and a period of 6042 years and that Heracles was younger than Dionysos by fifteen generations. Although

1. Gavām Ayana, the Vedic Era, 155
2. Yasmin Kṛṣṇo ṛivam yātaṣ ṛasmin eva ṛaṭāhahani Praṭipannam Kaliyugam V 37
   See also Vāyu, II 37-422, Bhāg, XII ii. 26-32, V 37, Matsya, 221, 52 Mahāprāṣṭhānik Parvaṇ, I 2, 7 Also Wilson's Translation of Viṣṇu Purāṇa, IV 234.
3. According to these passages Kṛṣṇa was born in the year śrimukha, Śravana Bahula Navami-viḍḍha-saptami Viṣabh Lagna and lived for 125 years, 7 months and 8 days dying on the first day of Kaliyuga. According to Bhṛṣṭapūrṇa, the birth would be in the year Pāṛthva and death in Khara.
   According to another view Kṛṣṇa lived for 105 years only and was born in 3208 B.C. in the year Viṣaya, Śravana Kṛṣṇa Aṣṭami, Mangalavāra, Rohuṇī, Viṣabh Lagna.
   Kṛṣṇa's horoscope has thus been cast Guru in Mesha, Rāhu in Mīthuna, Kuṇa and Buḍha in Kātka, Ravi and Sani in Simham, Sukra in Kanyā, and Kaṇu in Ḍhanus and Lagna Viṣabhā.
   On the birth and death of Kṛṣṇa, see Bhāg, X 3, XI. 6, Harivamśa, I 52, IV. 24, V 23
it is not easy to identify Dionysos it is indisputable that Heracles was
none else than Han or Śrī Kṛṣṇa from Megasthenes' record about him
'This Heracles like the Thoeban namesake had married many wives
and was worshipped by the Shouraseni people whose chief towns were
Mathura and Choisobora’. If then between Chandragupta and Śrī
Kṛṣṇa, there were 138 (153-15) generations, taking 20 years for each
generation, there is a period of 2760 years intervening between them,
which gives us 3072 B.C.

According to the Sūrya-Siddhānta Kaliyuga began on midnight,
of Thursday, 17th February, 3102 B.C old style 8 Āryabhaṭa took
this date as granted 8 and computed by the era of Yudhīṣṭhīra.

In the commentary Bhāttādapīkā on this verse it is said Bhārata
Yudhīṣṭhīradayah, Raśyam caratām Yudhīṣṭhīrādīnām, anātyo gurudvavā
dvāparāvasānagata ityarthah Ṭasmin dine Yudhīṣṭhīradayo mahā-
prasthānām gata 1 ti prasiddhāh 4

Iṣṭopuṇḍībhāraṇa tell us that six different eras will flourish one
after another in the Kaliyuga, and the first of them is of Yudhīṣṭhīra
lasting for 3044 years beginning from the first year of Kaliyuga
Śaṅkara knew the tradition that Kṛṣṇa Dvāpāyana flourished between
Kāli and Dvāpāra Yugas 6 It was composed in Vikrama era year 24
expressed to be identical with 3068 the year of Kali.

S P L Narasimha Swami says that after the war was over,
Dhṛtarāṣṭra continued to rule, with Yudhīṣṭhīra as his regent, for
fifteen years and that Yudhīṣṭhīra was crowned king only in the 16th
year after the war, and that Yudhīṣṭhīra ruled for 36 years, so that he
would place the war 50 years before Kāli began, that is, in 3052 B. C.

Kalhana says that in his days the tradition was strong that the
Bhārata war took place at the end of Dvāpāra-yuga. 8

---

1 See C V Vidyā's Epic India, 418
2 Sewell's Indian Calendar, 6.
3 Kāho manavo manuyuga 4kha gaṭhāja ca manuyuga chna ca, Kalpāṭer-
yugapādā, Ga ca gurudvavāt ca bhārataḥ purvam.—Gītākāhā, 3
4 See Colebrooke, Mis Es II 248, Weber, IL. 250. See also Lassen, I A K
II 50, Kern's Preface, 6.
5 For a fuller account see Chapter on Sanskrit Drama, under Kāndāsā
6 Bhāmasūtra Bhāṣya, on Sūtra, III. ii. 32.
7 IA, IV 162 Mah. Asrama Parva, 2-6, and Munsala Parva, 3-13
8 Raj I 15. But Kalhana thought he was deceived by the tradition and
fixed 653 of Kaliyuga as the date of the war. This view is elaborated and
supported in a pamphlet by Kotikalapudi Narasimha Śarma at the instance of
the late Maharaja of Bobbili.
But oriental scholars direct their intuitive faculty of original research and theorisation to a refutation of the tradition, to them tradi-

The following verses from the Rājaṭarangini, Book I are important —

48-49 The kings Gonanda the First and his successors ruled Kashmir during twenty-two hundred and sixty-years in the Kaliyuga. This calculation of the duration of these kings’ reigns has been thought wrong by some authors who were misled by the statement that the Bharata war took place at the end of the Dvapara Yuga.

50 If the years of those kings, the duration of whose reigns is known, are added up, leaving aside the above 2268 years of Gonanda I and his successors, no rest remains from the passed period of the Kaliyuga, as will be seen from the following.

51. When six hundred and fifty-three years of the Kaliyuga had passed away, the Kurus and Pandavas lived on the earth.

52. At present, in the twenty-fourth year of the Laukika era, one thousand and seventy years of the Saka era have passed.

53. On the whole, at this time two thousand three hundred and thirty years have passed since the accession of Gonanda the Third.

54. Twelve hundred and sixty-six years are believed to be comprised in the sum of the reigns of those fifty-two lost kings.

55. On this point a decision is furnished by the words of the author of the Bhārat Samhita who with reference to the fact that the Great Bear moves from one Naksatra to the other in a hundred years, has thus indicated its course.

56. "Whence King Yudhishthira ruled the earth, the Munis (the Great Bear) stood in the Naksatra Magahā. The date of his reign was 2526 years before the Saka era."

Verse 50, says Stein, "gives Kaliyana's reason for accepting the calculation of 2258 years for the reigns contained in Taranga I. Dr. Hultsch, (IA xvii, 99) has shown that if we add up the figures given by K. in Tarangas ii-viii for the reigns from the dethronement of Yudhishthira I. to his own time, we get a rough total of 1328 years (the odd months and days in the totals of the reigns of II and III Tarangas being disregarded). If to this total are added the 2268 years for the I Taranga, and the result deducted from the 4249 years which had elapsed of the Kali era at the time of K.'s composition (see verse 52 below), there remain 653 years. This is exactly the number of years which had elapsed according to the statement accepted by K. (i 51) between the commencement of the Kaliyuga and the date of the Bharata war, i.e. Gonanda I. Thus the whole period of the Kali era up to the author's time is accounted for and 'no rest remains.' The equation of K., as indicated in this verse, is therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of the Kaliyuga elapsed</td>
<td>Reigns of kings from Gonanda I to Yudhishthira I (i 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070 Saka &amp; 3179</td>
<td>2268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4249</td>
<td>Reigns of kings mentioned in Tarangas ii-viii, up to Saka 1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>Kali years passed up Gonanda I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>4249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tion is superstition and cannot be history. In spite of their capacity for discovering new pieces of evidence and novel paths of reasoning, the traditional literature has been too strong in its assertion that the Mahābhārata war synchronised with the end of Dvāparayuga. They therefore resorted to the only other alternative, that is, to postdating the beginning of the Kāhyuga, and thus to postdate this synchronism.

The first step in this attempt was to damn the date 3102 B.C acknowledged to be the beginning of Kāhyuga, as an astronomer's hypothetical point of calculation\(^1\) first fancied by Āryabhata in 499 A.D.\(^2\) This is easily said, for a bold assertion is better than logical reasoning. One cannot perceive why this astronomer thought of fancying the date and how it happened that ancient writings like the Purāṇas thought of taking this hypothetical date in computing their theological history. The next step therefore has often been taken that these passages in the Purāṇas are later interpolations, nay, the Purāṇas themselves are fabrications of a late age. One is tempted to remind the reader of the adage 'lies follow lies.'

We shall now follow the reasoning adopted for fixing the commencement of the Kāhyuga.

In his Bṛhat-Samhitā, Varāhamihira quotes a verse from Vyādha Garga

> आसन्न महासु मुनि
> शासति पृथ्वी युगिहिरे नुपति ।
> पद्मोपवर्षाक्रियः
> शकङ्कलस्तरास्त्रास्म (राज्यस्य) \(॥\)

— Our observations as to the theoretical basis of Kāhāna's early chronology may thus be briefly summed up. We have seen that the starting-point of his and his predecessors' calculations was the supposed date of Gonanda I, obtained by connecting a semi-mythical king of Purāṇa tradition with a purely legendary event of the great Indian epic and its imaginary chronology. We are next asked, without indication of an authority, to accept the figure of 2269 years for the aggregate length of rule of a single dynasty, of which, however, fifty-two kings had already become 'lost' to the tradition of the earlier Chronicles. Lastly, Kāhāna presents us, again without naming his authority, with the figure of 2330 years as the result of an avowedly 'rough' calculation of the aggregate duration of reigns from Gonanda III, to his own date.\(^3\)—Stein. For a criticism of Kāhāna's view, see Hülsch, IA, xvm. 99 et seq. and Pandit Ananda Koul, JASB, vi 195-219 (N S).

1. See Bentley, Historical View of Hindu Astronomy, 85
2. See V. S. Gopala Iyer, Chronology of the Saddhantas, 92.
The

This verse has been relied on by Kalhana as showing that the traditional date was an error and that the date of the Mahābhārata war must be moved forwards to the year 651 Kali or 2448 B.C. It must be noted that Kalhana postulated that Kaliyuga began in 3102 B.C but premises that the synchronism of the tradition between the war and the Kaliyuga was erroneous. But orientalists would not brook this too. For, why should the war and the necessary civilisation of India be put back to an ancient age as 25 centuries? So the attack was planned from the rear. The verse gives the name 'Saka kāla'. Then began the speculation on what was the takakāla meant here.

According to Gopala Iyer, it was the era of Buddha Nirvāṇa, for "Garga lived in the 1st century B.C. and by that time, the Saka era of 78 A.D. could not have been known." The reading sakakāla is a mistake for Sakya kāla and the phrase 'Sad-dvika-pancadvar' means not 2526 but '26 times 25' or 650. The correct interpretation is that 650 years had elapsed from the time of Yudhishthira to the beginning of Sakyakala or the era of Gautama's Nirvana. Gautama Buddha died in 543 B.C. and the addition of 543 and 650 years gives the date of the Mahābhārata War as 1194-3 B.C. Apart from the meaning given to it as translated by Hultzch (IA, XVIII 99), For other similar translations, see Troyer, I 338, II 7 and Wilson's Essays, 97. Regarding the theory that the Saptāras (Great Bear or Ursa Major) move within each lunar mansion for one century, see Brhat Samhita, XIII 4, Alberuni's India, I 391, Cunningham's Indian Eras, II, T.S. Narayanasastri's Age of Sankara, App II.

1. As translated by Hultzch (IA, XVIII 99). For other similar translations, see Troyer, I 338, II 7 and Wilson's Essays, 97. Regarding the theory that the Saptāras (Great Bear or Ursa Major) move within each lunar mansion for one century, see Brhat Samhita, XIII 4, Alberuni's India, I 391, Cunningham's Indian Eras, II, T.S. Narayanasastri's Age of Sankara, App II.

2. V. S. Gopala Iyer's Chronology of Ancient India, 68-77. At 48 he admits that his interpretation is new and original. See also, Rajatarangini (Telugu Translation by K. R. V. Krishna Rao (Cocanada 1903). According to Gopala Iyer, Kaliyuga originally comprised only 1000 years or at the most only 1200 years, it commenced at the winter solstice occurring in the latter part of the year 1177 B.C. "As Megasthenes gives 6451 years for the period between Ishwakuda and Alexander the Great and as 5,600 years were supposed to have expired at the beginning of the Kaliyuga, 6,451-5,600, or a deviation of 85 years must have been the period represented to Megasthenes as having expired since the commencement of the new era. Since Alexander left India in 325 B.C. the Kaliyuga must have commenced, according to the informants of Megasthenes in the year 851+325 or 1176 B.C." (at page 45). See for a full discussion of this T.S. Narayana Sastri's Age of Sankara, 15 note. Tilak (Arctic Home in the Vedas, 422) approves of Gopala Iyer's views on Kaliyuga.
the phrase Saśadvika-panca-duṣ, which offends against the fundamental principles of Sanskrit notation and apart from the uncertainty of the date of the death of Buddha, on which opinion is as varied as on any other question of chronology, there is the detection of the error in the reading of śākā into śākya, for if the word śākya is substituted for the word śaka, the line goes wrong in prosody.

G Thibaut, and Sudhakara Dvivedi assume the ‘śakakāla’ here mentioned to be the same as the Śālivahana śaka which commenced in 78 A.D.

Srisa Chandra Vidyarnava later on reviewed his position and fixed the 1922 B.C. as the year of the Great war. Dhirendranath Pal gives the date of the War as 15th or 16th century B.C and says the story was immediately written.

Other scholars took “the anchor of Indian Chronology, that is the year 315 B.C as the date of Chandragupta Maurya’s accession, as the starting point for computation and by taking the interval of time between the Mahābhārata war and the accession of Chandragupta as variously stated, to be 1604 to 1115 years, place the date of the Mahābhārata war, (and the beginning of the Kalhyuga) between the year 1919 B.C and 1430 B.C, and the year 1415 B.C (which is somehow arrived at by adding 1015 to 315 B.C), for the vernal equinox would be in the Kṛtiṇakas about that date.

Pargiter who originally put the commencement of the Kalhyuga at about 1733 B.C later on arrived at the year 1810 B.C as the date of the Great War This is the reasoning From Somādhi to Ripunjaya there were 22 kings in the Bāhradraśa dynasty who reigned for 920 years The Pradyot as after Ripunjaya were 5 kings who reigned for

---

1 For a refutation of this theory, see T S Narayana Sastri’s Age of Sankara, p 22 note, App II
2 Int to Pāṇca Suddhāntika, lxxi.
3 Int. to Edn. of Matsya Purāṇa, (Sacred Books of the Hindus Series) App II xxiv
4 Int to Śrī Krishna, his life and teachings
5 As to these variations, see T. S. Narayana Sastri’s Kings of Magadha (Madras, 1918), 147 pp
6 As to a complete discussion of the vernal equinox, see V S. Gopala Iyer’s Chronology of Ancient India, Vaidya’s Mahābhārata, and T S. Narayana Sastri’s Age of Sankara, App II
7 See JRAS, (1910)
138 years The Śaśunagas were 10 kings and reigned for 330 years. Adding up the above three figures 920 + 138 + 330, we get 1388 years, which is the interval between the installation of Mahānanda and the birth of Parikṣit or the Great War. Adding 422 B.C. the year of the installation of Mahāpadma Nanda (whose date fixed at 100 years before Chandragupta) who is postulated to have ascended the throne in 322 B.C. we get the year 1810 B.C. as the date of the Great War.

Arguments on astronomical calculations have been based on (1) the reference to the Sāptarṣi cycle and (2) the vernal equinox and the seasons and these are explained by each theorist as supporting his own date.

These astronomical arguments are based on the Parāśara Siddhānta, Garga Siddhānta, Vedāṅga Jyauṭiṣa. And the period of the war has been closely connected with the real determination of the date of the commencement of the Uttarayana in Māgha Śukla Saptami or the then Raṭhasaptami and the death of Bhīṣma in the same month.

परिब्रह्म ति भगवान् सहचरावर्दित्वाकरः।
...
माण्डलस्य समतुष्पाते मासस्तन्त्रो वुज्जिदिर
विसागोष्ट (मात्र:) पक्षोदयस्य शुक्राभितुतमहिति॥४

But the advocates of the orthodox tradition are themselves not wanting in their capacity to interpret these astronomical date as supporting the origin of the Kali Yuga in 3102 B.C and the latest reasoning of T S Narayana Sastri will be of interest.

"Yudhishthira observes the change in the course of the sun, collects all the necessary materials for the cremation of Bhishma, and goes to..."

1 See Dynasties of the Kali Age.
2 For a detailed discussion of these, see V. S Gopala Iyer's Chronology of Ancient India and T S Narayana Sastri's Age of Sankara, App II
3 See Mah. XIII. 273, 27-28
4 Mah. Anu 167, 20-27
5 On this, see Tilak's Orion, 36-7 Lale, Modak, Kelkar and other have tried to determine the date of the war from such references and they hold that the vernal equinox was then in the Kṛttikas. See also Maxmuller, Pref to Rg. Veda, IV XXXI.
6 See also, Sree Kalyanananda Bharati Swamy's Introduction to the Chronology of Sanskrit Literature (Bezwada, 1920).
him with all his relations on the morning of Magha Sukla Ashtami, and Bhishma breathes his last just at noon at about 15 Ghatikas after the sunrise on the same day in the constellation of Rohini. It is stated by the dying Bhishma himself that three-fourths of the month still remained unexpired. It follows from this that at the time of Bhishma's death which took place immediately thereafter 7½ Tithis out of the total number of thirty had already passed away. In other words Bhishma died just in the middle of Ashtami. Now it is also stated that at the time of the death of Bhishma, the moon was in the constellation of Rohini, and according to the calculations of Brahmāsri Varahur Sundaresvara Srauti, the Rohini on that day should have ended at about 32 Ghatikas after sunrise. A perusal of the exact moment when the constellation of Jyestha commences on Kartika Amavasya of the coming year Kalayukti and of the precise moment when the constellation of Rohini ends on Magha Sukla Ashtami of the same year, which we have chosen as a typical year for purposes of comparison, will show at a rough glance that the constellation of Rohini could not have lasted for more than 32 Ghatikas on that particular Magha Sukla Ashtami, when the great Bhishma, of the Mahabharata cast off his body. By the time of the passing away of Bhishma, who died just at mid-day, as 15 Ghatikas had expired, the Rohini Nakshatra lasted only for 17 Ghatikas more after mid-day. Soon the moon was, more definitely speaking, in the 3rd quarter of Rohini at the time when Bhishma actually passed away to Heaven, and even in this 3rd quarter which consists of 15 Ghatikas on the whole, 13 Ghatikas had already passed away, so that there remained only 2 Ghatikas in the 3rd quarter of Rohini when Bhishma actually breathed his last. The third quarter of Rohini commences at 46°-40' of the Ecliptic, and ends with 50°. So, at the exact moment of Bhishma's death, the moon must have been at 46°-40' plus 13/15 (3°-20') or 46°40' plus 2°-53'-20'' equal to 49°-33'-20''.

"As the distance between the Sun and that Moon at the moment was separated by 7½ Tithis or 7½ times 12° or 90° the sun must have been at the moment of Bhishma's death at 49°-33'-20'' minus 90° or 31 9°-33'-20'' or in other words in the 4th quarter Satabhisha As the winter solstice or Uttarayana had already commenced with Ratha- Saptami, which must have ended at about the mid-night on the previous day, there will be a difference of 1½ degrees between the actual commencement of the Uttarayana and the actual moment of Bhishma's death, with the result that the Uttarayana in Bhishma's time or soon after the close of the Mahabharata War, must have commenced when
the sun was in $319^\circ-33'-20" \text{ minus } 1^\circ-30'-0" \text{ or in } 318^\circ-3'-20" \text{ or in other words at about the middle of the fourth Pada of Satabhisha} \text{. Now the Uttarayana commenced in 1917 (as already shown) in the first part of the 3rd Pada of Mula in } 247^\circ-28' \text{. There is a difference of } 318^\circ-3'-20" \text{ minus } 247^\circ-28'-0" \text{ or } 75^\circ-35'-20" \text{ or } 254120" \text{. We thus find that since the time of Bhishma's death, the date of the Winter Solstice or Uttarayana has been thrown back by } 70^\circ-35'-20" \text{ or } 254120" \text{, on account of the precession of the equinoxes.}

"What then is the period of time within which so much change in the date of the Winter solstice may take place? If we take the rate of precession at 50 26" of angle in a year, 254120" will take a period of

$$254120 \times \frac{100}{5026} \text{ or } 5056 \frac{564}{5026}\text{ years, or in round figures 5056 years,}$$

as the measure of time needed for the change. In other words, Bhishma must have died in the year 5056-1917 A.D., or in the year 3139 B.C., just 37 years before the commencement of the Kali Yuga and the Mahabharata War must have commenced on Tuesday corresponding to the last day of the month of Kartika on Amavasya in the constellation of Jyeshtha of the year corresponding to 3140 B.C."

Mahabharata War is mentioned in grants dated in the Gupta Samvat era. Buchanan mentions an inscription in the temple of Madhukesvara at Banavasi in North Canara dated in 168th year of Yudhishthira era and two inscriptions at Belgaum in Mysore dated in the reign of Yudhishthira himself. The Tirthahalhali plates of Mysore State record that King Janamejaya granted to the ascetics of the locality for worship of the God Sitarama some land constituting a property name Munvindaksetra in the place called Vraddockara on the west of the Tungabhadra in the Plavanga year corresponding to year 89 of Yudhishthira Saka (3014 B.C.) In a Siva's temple at Iballi in Dharwar, an inscription is dated 3730 years after the great war and in Saka 506.

---

1. Age of Sankara.
2. Fleet, CII, 120, 124, 129, 134, 139.
4. Ia, XXX 219-20 In Astatic Researches (Vo IX) Ellis notices a copper plate grant of Janamejaya. Gibbons and Airy calculate the date as 7th April 1521 A.D. and Ellis wishes to say that the Mahabharata was composed after that date it (JRAS, X. 81).
In the inscriptions in Cambodia we have "the fragment of an inscription of the beginning of the 7th century which informs us that, as early as that time, both the epics were considered sacred on the border of distant Laos, and that records that king Somasarma presented a temple with copies of the Ramayana, the Puranas and the Bharata complete and had them recited every day".

Latest about the beginning of the Christian era, Perundevanar known as Bharata Padiar, wrote his clasucal work, the Tamil Mahābhārata.

The Atholf Inscription of Pulikesin II, has not yet been correctly read.

In the Indian Antiquary (V 67-71), it was originally published thus —

| सहायदर्शनशुद्धि | गृहवन्देयु | पञ्चाशतसू | कठी कृत्स | पञ्चाशतसू | समासू | समातितात्त्वकानाममपि भूषयाम् | I

Prācinalekhamulā (I 68-72) reads the second line

| सहायदर्शनशुद्धि | गृहवन्देयु | पञ्चाशतसू | कठी कृत्स | पञ्चाशतसू | समासू | समातितात्त्वकानाममपि भूषयाम् | I

Granting that the Śakabhūpaṭikāla here mentioned is the Śaka era commencing in 78 A.D, and not any other Śaka era of 550 B.C, as propounded by T S Narayanasastri, the inscription does not

Ellis relies for this conclusion on the Gawra agraharam grant, translated by Colebrooke in 1806 (see IA, I 377) and pronounced by him to be spurious. On Ellis' correspondence, see Bhandarkar, JBRAS, X 89 For the Iball inscription, see JASB, IV 376, V 725, VI 88, JRAS (N S), I 273, IBRAS, IX 315.

1 IA, XVII 31 M A Barth's review of Inscriptions Sanskrutez Der Com- bodge. (Paris, 1885)

2 A Sangam work on Mahābhārata was undertaken in the 8th century under the patronage of the Pallava king and a third work was written in the 13th century in the reign of Kulottunga III. See M Raghava Iyengar's Lectures in the Madras University, 1929, on Epigraphy and the South Indian Literature.

3 IA, VIII 237

A Sangam work on Mahābhārata was undertaken in the 8th century under the patronage of the Pallava king and a third work was written in the 13th century in the reign of Kulottunga III. See M Raghava Iyengar's Lectures in the Madras University, 1929, on Epigraphy and the South Indian Literature.

For a discussion, see T S Narayanasastri's Age of Sankara, Part I—D, pages 224-8. Macdonell (SL 318) dates this inscription in 634 A.D and R.C Dutt (Civ III 219) in 637 A.D For śaka 556 (=634-5 A.D), see IA, VIII 237, For śaka 507 (=585-6 A.D) see IA, V 67 and Weber's I, 196 For Hiuen Tsang's account of Pulakesin II, see IA, VII 290 See also Hemchandra Roy Choudhry's Political History of India from Parskshi, Journal of the Dept of Letters Calcutta University, Vol IX 1926 For a review of Weber's paper on the influence of the Greeks and Homeric poems on the Mahābhārata see IA, XVII, 302 On the era of Yuḥšadu, see Bhagvat, JBRAS, XX. 150.
militate against the view that the Mahābhārata war occurred somewhere before the beginning of the Kāhyuga in 3102 BC.

In his commentary on the Bṛhaṇṭaka (VII 9), composed in Śaka 888 (≈966 AD) Bhattotpala writes thus:

\[ \text{गतिन साध्यवृत्तेन युक्तायमदेन (ध्वेन) केशा न गताद्वदस्या} \]
\[ \text{काठ शकाला स विक्रेष्य तस्मादतत्तवविच्छिन्नार्थात्पर्} \]
\[ \text{एव स्पुतिष्वज्जत धक्कलादवीक्क (1044) श्रायते} \]

This verse may help to fix the date of Śakakāla and of the astronomer Sphujidhvaja as posterior to it, but its meaning, particularly how the number is arrived at, is not ascertainable.

SECTION IV

The Epics Compared

"While the Ramayana generally represents one-sided and exclusive Brahmanism," says M Williams, "the Mahābhārata reflects the multilateral character of Hinduism, its monotheism and polytheism, its spirituality and materialism, its strictness and laxity, its priestcraft and anti-priestcraft, its hierarchical intolerance and rationalistic philosophy, combined. Not that there was any intentional variety in the original design of the work but that almost every shade of opinion found expression in a compilation formed by a gradual accretion through a long period. In unison with its more secular, popular, and human character, the Mahābhārata has, as a rule, less of mere mythico-allegory, and more of historical probability in its narratives than the Ramayana. The reverse, however, sometimes holds good. For example, in Ramayana IV, xi, we have a simple division of the world into four quarters or regions, whereas in Mahābhārata VI 236, &c., we have the fanciful division (afterwards adopted by the Puranas) into seven circular Dvīpas or continents, viz., 1 Jambu-dvīpa, or the Earth, 2 Plaksha-dvīpa, 3 Salmali-dvīpa, 4 Kusa-dvīpa, 5 Kraunca-dvīpa, 6 Saka-dvīpa, 7 Pushkara-dvīpa, surrounded respectively by seven oceans in concentric belts, viz., 1 the sea of salt water (Lavaca), 2 of sugar-cane juice (Ikṣu), 3 of wine (Sura), 4 of clarified butter (Sārti), 5 of curdled milk (Dādhi), 6 of milk (Dugdha), 7 of fresh water (Jala), the mountain Meru or abode of the gods, being in the
centre of Jambd Dwipa, which again is divided into nine Vrshas or
countries separated by eight ranges of mountains, the Vrsha called
Bharata (India) lying south of the Himavat range.

"Notwithstanding these wild ideas and absurd figments, the Mahabharata contains many more illustrations of real life and of domestic
and social habits and manners than the sister Epic. Its diction, again,
is more varied than that of the Ramayana. The bulk of the latter poem
(notwithstanding interpolations and additions) being by one author, is
written with uniform simplicity of style and metre (See p 335, note 2),
and the antiquity of the greater part is proved by the absence of any
studied elaboration of diction. The Mahabharata, on the other hand,
though generally simple and natural in its language, and free from the
concepts and artificial constructions of later writers, comprehends a
great diversity of composition, rising sometimes (especially when the
Indra-vajra metre is employed) to the higher style and using complex
grammatical forms and from the mixture of ancient legends, occasional
archaisms and Vedic formations."1

"In the Mahabharata (Vana-parvan 15872-16601) the Ramopakhya-
yana is told very nearly as in the Ramayana, but there is no mention of
Valmiki as its author, and no allusion to the existence of the great
sister Epic. Markandeya is made to recount the narrative to Yudhish-
thira, after the recovery of Draupadi (who had been carried off by
Jayadratha, as Sita was by Ravana), in order to show that there were
other examples in ancient times of virtuous people suffering violence at
the hand of wicked men. It is probable (and even Professor Weber
admits it to be possible) that the Mahabharata episode was epitomized
from the Ramayana, and altered here and there to give it an appearance
of originality. There are, however, remarkable differences. The story
in the Mahabharata, although generally treating Rama as a great human
hero only, begins with the circumstances which led to the incarnation
of Vishnu, and gives a detailed account of what is first mentioned in
the Uttarakanda of the Ramayana the early history of Ravana and his
brother. The birth of Rama, his youth, and his father's wish to manag-
erate him as heir-apparent are then briefly recounted Dasaratha's
sacrifice, Rama's education, his winning of Sita and other contents of
the Bala-kanda are omitted. The events of the Ayodhya-kanda and much
of the Aranya Kanda are narrated in about forty verses. A more
detailed narrative begins with the appearance before Ravana of the

1 M. Williams' Indian Wisdom, 413-20.
mutilated Surpanakhä, but many variations occur; for instance, Kabandha is killed, but not restored to life, the story of Sävärì is omitted and there is no mention of the dream sent by Brahma to comfort Sita.

"There are other references to, and brief epitomes of parts of the story of the Ramayana in the Mahabharata, e.g., in Vanaparvan 11177-11219, in Drona parvan 2224-2246, in Santi parvan 944-955, in Harvamsà 2324-2359, 8672-8674, 16232. These and other differences have led Professor Weber to suggest the inquiry whether the Mahabharata version may not be more primitive than that of the Ramayana, and possibly even the original version, out of which the other was developed. 'Or ought we,' he asks, 'to assume only that the Mahabharata contains the epitome of an earlier recension of our text of the Ramayana, or should both texts, the Ramopakhyaña and the Ramayana, be regarded as resting alike upon a common groundwork, but each occupying an independent standpoint'."  

Weber has thus advanced the theory that the composition of the Mahabharata must have preceded that of the Ramayana. So also R.C. Dutt. "We must premise even as a picture of life the Ramayana is long posterior to the Mahabharata. We miss in the Ramayana the fiery valour and the proud self-assertion of the Kshatriyas of the Mahabharata and the subordination of the people to the priestly caste is more complete."

The traditional belief of the orthodox Hindus in the priority of the Rämâyana is apparently shaken by the acceptance of these theories. But there is ample external and internal evidence to falsify the modern theory and corroborate Indian tradition.

There are clear references to the story of the Ramayana in the Mahabharata. Srngiberapura is considered a place of sanctity and pilgrimage because of Räma's visit to it. Not one of the heroes of the Mahabhärata is named in the Ramayana whereas the story of Räma is very frequently referred to in the other. In the Vanaparvan where Rämopäkhyaña is related, some of the verses closely resemble the original, and Vyäsä postulates that the story of Räma was too popular to need any detail.

1. M. Williams' Indian Wisdom, 366-7
2. Vanaparvan, 275-292, 149-75. The Puräñas contain numerous allusions to the Ramäyana. The Agni Puräña has an epitome of the seven Books in seven Chapters. The Paäma and Skända also devote several chapters to the same.
Such direct references must amply prove the priority of the Rāmāyana. But the negativists try to explain it away by the plea that these are later interpolations. What do the orthodox Hindus gain by purposely interpolating unimportant references and arguing the feigned priority of the one epic to the other? If the original of the Mahābhārata did not contain any references to the Rāmāyana, they had no business in such interpolation. The Mahābhārata loses not, nor does the Rāmāyana gain, a particle of belief or regard by a consideration of chronological priority or posteriority, for it is in the inherent nature of the Hindu mind to disregard all questions of history. If the Rāmāyana had really been composed later, how is this fact accounted for—that the Mahābhārata war, the most important incident as it is in the world's history, fails to have the least reference to it in Vālmiki's work? Valmiki's ignorance of the Great War cannot be the answer. Nor can the sanctity or Kurukṣetra be less conspicuous than that of Śrīgubhūtpura, so as to lose mention of it in a religious work as the Rāmāyana. The argument of interpolation has neither purpose nor probability.

Subject The Vignapurāṇa has also a section (IV a) about Rama and in III. ā describes Vālmiki as the Vyāsa of the 24th Dvāpara. The Brahmandapurāṇa has a Rāmāyana Mahāmya and embodies the Adhyātma Rāmāyana. For full account of these references and later Jain and Buddhist modifications, see Int to Uttararāmacarita by S K Belvalkar, HOS, No. 4.

Hopkins (The Great Epic of India 62) says "The individual allusions prove, therefore, nothing in regard to the general priority of Vālmiki as the first epic poet. They prove that the Mahābharata was only not completed before Vālmiki wrote, just as the mention of the Vayu Purana in the Mahābharata shows only that there was a Purana of that name not before the Bharata began, but before its end. They show also no antipathy or wish to suppress Vālmiki's name influenced the Bharata poets, who therefore, had they simply retold or epitomised a poem recognised as Vālmiki's would probably have mentioned his name in connection with the Rama Upakhyaṇa." Apart from VII 143 67, the Mahābharata knows the poet Vālmiki only in the 12th and 13th books; whereas it knows everywhere the Rama tale, a poem called the Ramayana, and a saint known not as a poet but as an ascetic called Vālmiki. It gives the Rama-episode as it gives other ancient tales handed down from Antiquity without having been assigned to a specific author. The Rama Upakhyaṇa stands to the Ramayana, somewhat as the Nāla Upakhyaṇa stands to the Nāla Katha, in that it is an early tale of unknown authorship which a poet made his own. Long before there is any allusion to Vālmiki's Ramayana, the base of the great epic, the substance of the Bharata Katha is recognised in Hindu Literature, while the latest additions to the great epic refers to Vālmiki himself as a man who is to be that is, who is already famous, युस्त्वौरौग्य महिप्यति (VII, 18 49, S Ind. Edn.) Between these extremes lies the Ramayana." For a list of parallel passages in the Epics, see App. A to the book.
The Rāmāyana represents its actors as often moving beyond earthly sphere. The Mahābhārata deals with men and not bears or monkeys. "In the latter" says Weber himself, "human interest everywhere predominates and a number of well-defined personages are introduced, to whom the possibility of historical existence cannot be denied." No scholar can discern any improbability in gambling, loss of kingdom, exile and war. An advanced race of men can place no confidence in the story of a ten-headed monster Kṛṣṇa is represented in the Rāmāyana as a sage ever in solitude and unseen by men or women. He was born of a hind and had a horn on his head. The earlier we peep into the world's history, the world is more simple and credulous. The Rāmāyana must have been composed when India was yet in very early stages of theological evolution.

In the Mahābhārata Ādīparvan a house of combustibles is erected by a Mlecha called Purocana at the bidding of Duryodhana. Agam Viḍura, trying to reveal the conspiracy of the lac house to his friends, the Pāndavas, talks to them in a Mlecha tongue understood by the accompanying populus. The war-portion of the same epic names not less than half a dozen Mlecha Kings taking part in the war itself (Drona Parvam, 26, 93, 119, 122). On the contrary the Rāmāyana makes no such references at all and the only few allusions to the Pāwanas do not prove alien interference in politics. The signification of 'Yavana' is not the same as that of 'Mlecha.' It is therefore safe to deduce that at the time of the Rāmāyana foreign influence was not felt, at any rate not enough to give the foreigners a territorial dominion in the international policy of Indian States.

The geographical account of Vālmiki regarding Southern India denies the existence of any civilized kingdoms there. On the other hand the country south of the Vindhyā range is the haunt of savage demons like Virādha and Kabandha. In the royal invitations at Daśaratha's Court no one King of Southern India has a summons, nor does Rāma in his journey southwards make alliance with a civilized prince. On the other hand the Kings of Southern India have a prominent reception at the Rājaśeṣa sacrifice of Yudhīṣṭhira. The geographical sketch of Bhārata-varṣa as given in the Bhīma-parva shows a very intimate acquaintance with the advanced states of the Dekhan. Hence since the days of the Rāmāyana the country appears from a political point of view to have made a decided advance.

The test of archery at the marriage of Sitā had better be compared with that at Draupadī-Swayamvara. The latter indicates an obvious
advance in the dexterity of the test. Likewise is the improvement in
the art of war. Rāma’s army knows not of varied dispositions, whereas
in the Bhāratā war the plan of Vyūhas or arrays has already been
devised, by means of which a small force can withstand a powerful one.
The ordered supervision of the commandants, the regular signals of
colored standards, the applause of roars of victorious combatants—all
these never miss a detailed delineation in the battles of the Great War.
The complexity in the development of martial tactics shows a sign of a
later age.

The encyclopaedic variety of the contents of the Mahābhārata
together with its vastness of knowledge in every line of science or art
shows a rapid progress from the age of Vālmiku Vīśa notes law and
science reduced to a system, whereas no idea of codification is
discernible in the Ramāyana.

The character of Sītā is advantageously compared with that of
Draupadi. Sītā is simpler and more cowardly. She exalts the
rebellious Rāma to permit her company to the woods. Draupadi
musters her strength to argue the justice of Yudhīsthira’s authority
to pawn his wife when once he has enslaved himself. Sītā belongs to
an age of ignorance and timidity, Draupadi of wisdom and courage.
Draupadi’s religious convictions are looser than the God-fearing instincts
of the daughter of Janaka.

The rigour of patriarchal ties and institutions is palpably visible
in the history of Rāma. The disintegration of the presbyterian respect
enjoined by Hindu canons of conduct has set in by the time of the
Mahābhārata. Rāma is a model son, innocently submissive to paternal
mandate, Bharata, the paragon of a brother, Sugrīva, the standard of
a friend. A sense of sincere duty animates Vālmiki’s characters and
the pivot of Rāma’s victory is the truthfulness of his adherents. The
reverse is the age of the Mahābhārata. Bhīma is ready to revolt against
Yudhīsthira, if only he should consent to a conciliation. He is
impatient to throw off the Kaurava princes, despite their promise of
self-slavery on a failure at dice. Śalya readily takes the side of the
Kurus. Business and self-seeking overrides the feeling of truthful
responsibility. For victory’s sake every crime is readily committed—from
false evidence and forgery to robbery and murder. Duryodhana’s
attempt to poison his own kinsmen or Yudhīsthira’s abetment at Drona’s
murder are sufficient instances. This state of corruption and degeneracy
clearly points to a later sceptic state of society.
Rāvana carries off Sītā by force and she would not allow her to be touched by Hanūman, when he proposes to take her on his back to Rāma's abode. Even after victory she has to pass through an ordeal of fire for admission to the queenship. Similarly in the Kāmyaka forest Javadratha abducts Draupādi by force and is easily received again without any test of good conduct by her husbands. Apparently Rāma's contemporaries had a stricter notion of morality and wifely duty and stronger was the faith in the interposition of Providence. The relaxation in such religious and ethical beliefs proves an advance in the age of the Mahābhārata.

It has been said, "The heroes of the Ramayana are somewhat tame and common place personages, very respectful to priests, very anxious to conform to the rules of decorum and etiquette..." This is a negativist's argument. But that very tameness of heroes and priestly domination is a sign of antiquity, for when people learn to reason and argue, priests can no longer claim predominance.

Regarding the comparative merits of the two great epics, says Aurobindo Ghose,¹ "Valmiki's mind seems nowhere to be familiarised with the stern intellectual gospel of Naskama Dharma, that morality of disinterested passionless activity, promulgated by Krishna of Dwāraka and formulated by the Krishna of the Island, which is one great keynote of the Mahābhārata. Had he known it, I doubt whether the strong leaven of sentimentalism and feminity in his nature would not have rejected it, such temperaments, when they admire strength, admire it manifested and forceful rather than self-contained. Valmiki's characters act from emotional or imaginative enthusiasm, not from intellectual conviction, an enthusiasm of immorality tyrannies over Rāvana. Like all merely moral temperaments, he instinctively insisted on an old established code of morals being universally observed as the only basis of ethical stability, avoided casuistic developments and distasted innovators in metaphysical thought as by their persistent and searching questions dangerous to the established bases of morality, especially to its wholesome ordinariness and everydayness. Valmiki, therefore, the father of our secular poetry, stands for that early and finely moral civilisation which was the true heroic age of the Hindu spirit Vyāsa, following Valmiki, stood still farther on into the era of aristocratic turbulence and disorder. If there is any kernel of truth in the legends about him, he must have contributed powerfully to the

¹ *Age of Kalidasa, Tagore & Co, Madras.*
establishment of those imperial forms of government and society which Vālmīki had idealised. It is that he celebrated and approved the policy of a great aristocratic statesman who aimed at the subjection of his order to the rule of a central imperial power which should typify its best tendencies and control or expel its worst. But while Vālmīki was a soul out of harmony with its surroundings and looking back to an ideal past, Vyāsa was a man of his time profoundly in sympathy with it, full of its tendencies, hopeful of its results and looking forward to an ideal future. The one was a conservative imperialist advocating return to a better but dead model, the other a liberal imperialist looking forward to a better but unborn model. Vyāsa accordingly does not revolt from the aristocratic code of morality, it harmonises with his own proud and strong spirit, he accepts it as a basis for conduct, but purified and transfigured by the illuminating idea of the Nīśākham Dharma. But above all intellectuality is his grand note; he is profoundly interested in ideas, in metaphysics in ethical problems, he subjects morality to casuistic tests from which the more delicate moral tone of Vālmīki's spirit shrank, he boldly erects above ordinary ethics a higher principle of conduct having its springs in intellect and strong character, he treats government and society from the standpoint of a practical and discerning statesmanlike mind, idealising solely for the sake of standard. He touches in fact all subjects, and whatever he touches, he makes fruitful and interesting by originality, penetration and a sane and bold vision. In all this he is the son of the civilisation he has mirrored to us, a civilisation in which both morality and material developments are powerfully intellectualised. Nothing is more remarkable in all the characters of the Mahābhārata than this puissant intellectualism, every action of them seems to be impelled by an immense driving force of mind solidifying in character and therefore conceived and outlined as in stone. This orgiastic force of the intellect is at least as noticeable as the impulse of moral or immoral enthusiasm behind each great action of the Rāmāyana. Throughout the poem the victorious and manifold mental activity of the age is prominent and gives its character to its civilisation. There is far more of thought in action than in the Rāmāyana, far less of thought in repose, the one pictures a time of gigantic ferment and disturbance, the other, as far as humanity is concerned, an age of equipoise, order and tranquility.”
The Puranas constitute an important department of Sanskrit literature in their connection with the later phases of Brahmanism, as exhibited in the doctrines of emanation, incarnation, and triple manifestation (Trāvātī) and are, in real fact, the proper Veda of popular Hinduism, having been designed to convey the esoteric doctrines of the Veda to the lower castes and to women. On this account, indeed, they are sometimes called a fifth Veda. Their name Purana signifies 'old traditional story,' and the eighteen ancient narratives to which the name is applied are said to have been compiled by the ancient sage Vyasa (also called Krishna-dvapāyana and Bādarāyana), the arranger of the Vedas and Mahabharata and the supposed founder of the Vedanta philosophy. They are composed chiefly in the simple Sloka metre (with occasional passages in prose), and are, like the Mahabharata, very encyclopaedical in their range of subjects. They must not, however, be confounded with the Itihāsas, which are properly the histories of heroic men, not Gods, though these men were afterwards deified. The Puranas are properly the history of the gods themselves, interwoven with every variety of legendary tradition on other subjects. Viewing them as a whole, the theology they teach is anything but simple, consistent, or uniform. While nominally tritheistic—to suit the three developments of Hinduism, the religion of the Puranas is practically polytheistic and yet essentially pantheistic. Underlying their whole teaching may be discerned the one grand doctrine which is generally found at the root of Hindu Theology, whether Vedic or Puranic—pure uncompromising pantheism. But interwoven with the radically pantheistic and Vedantic texture of these compositions, tinged as it is with other philosophical ideas (especially the Sankhyan doctrine of Prakṛti), and diversified as it is with endless fanciful mythologies, theogonies, cosmogonies, and mythical genealogies we have a whole body of teaching on nearly every subject of knowledge. The Puranas pretend to give the history of the whole universe from the most remote ages, and claim to be the inspired revealers of scientific as well as theological truth. They dogmatize on physical science, geography, the form of the earth, astronomy, chronology, and even in the case of one or two Puranas, anatomy, medicine, grammar, and the use of military weapons. All this cycle of very questionable omniscience is conveyed in the form
of leading dialogues (connecting numerous subordinate dialogues), in some of which a well-known and supposed divinely inspired sage, like Parāśara, is the principle speaker, and answers the inquiries put to him by his disciples, while in others, Loma-harshaṇa (or Romaharṣana), the pupil of Vyasa, is the narrator being called Sūta, that is, 'Bard' or 'Incomast,' as one of an order of men to whom the reciting of the Itihasas and Puranas were especially interested." This passage taken from the Indian Wisdom of M. Williams may be taken to be a fair description of the Purāṇas.

The origin of the eighteen Purāṇas is thus stated in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa². Accomplished in the purport of the Purāṇas, Vyasa compiled a Purānik Samhitā, consisting of historical and legendary traditions, prayers and hymns and sacred chronology. He had a distinguished disciple Śūta, also termed Romaharṣana, to him the great Munī communicated the Purāṇas. Śūta had six scholars, Sumati, Agnivarca, Maṇreya, Samsapāyana, Aklāvraṭa and Sāvartti. The three last composed three fundamental Samhitās and Romaharṣana himself

1 Viṣṇu Purāṇa, III vi and Wilson’s Translation, III 63-66 See JASB, I. 84. and Burnouf’s Bhagavata purana, preface. For similar accounts.
2 The Atharva Veda (15-16) says, "Itihaśa, Purāṇa, Gāthā, and others &c."  
3 Satapatha Brāhmana (XIV vi-10-6) says: "The Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda, Atharva-Veda, Itihaśa, Purāṇa, Upaṇiṣad, Sutras, ēlokā, their explanations &c.
4 Chandogya Upaṇiṣad (Vii) says "He said, ‘O Exalted one, I am acquainted with the Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda, and the fourth, Atharva-Veda, and the fifth, Itihaśa (history) and purāṇa.’
5 Manu Samhitā (III 232) says, "In Srdh ceremony, the Sastras called the Vedas, the Samhitās, the stories, the histories, the purāṇas and the Khilas should be recited to others.”

The Bhāgavata (X 11, 496) says, Arūni, Kāśyapa, Sāvartti, Aklāvraṭa, Samsapāyana, and Harīṭa are the six Purānikas (learned in the purāṇas). They learnt the purāṇa from my father who was the pupil of Vyāsa. After studying the original (Purāṇa) Samhitā, they each wrote a separate (Purāṇa) Samhitā etc.

Śrīharaswāmun (in commenting on sloka XII-vii, 6) says, "At first Vyāsa wrote six Samhitās and taught them to my father, Romaharṣana. From him Arūṇ and others learnt each one Samhitā. I am their pupil, from me Rūrba has learnt them.”

Agnipurāṇa says, “The Sūta Romaharṣana received the purāṇa from Vyāsa. Sumati, Agnivarca, Maṇreya, Samsapāyana, Aklāvraṭa, and Sāvartti became his pupils. Samsapāyana and others wrote the purāṇa samhitās.”
compiled a fourth, called Romaharsanaika, the substance of which four Samhitās is collected into this (Viṣṇu Purāṇa) The first of all the Purāṇas is entitled the Brahma Those who are acquainted with the Purāṇas enumerate eighteen It will thus appear that an original Samhita of Viṣṇa was expanded by his disciples into eighteen separate works at his direction In Viṣṇu Purāṇa, (VI, iii, 16) it is said Viṣṇa, learned in the Vedas, wrote a purāṇa samhitā with Ākhyāna, Upaṅkhyaṇa, Gāthā, and Kalpaśuddhi The commentator explains these four subjects—“What is seen with one’s own eyes is called Ākhyāna by the learned men, what is heard from different persons is called Upaṅkhyaṇa, songs about the ancestors are called Gāthā, and the treatment of the śrāddha ceremony is called Kalpaśuddhi” Amarāsimha gives the word Pancalakṣaṇa, characterized by five topics, as a synonym of Purāṇa These topics are (i) the creation of universe (Sarga), (ii) its destruction and recreation (Praṭi-Sarga), (iii) the genealogy of gods and patriarchs (Vamśa), (iv) the reigns and periods of the Manus (Manvanṭara) and (v) the history of the solar and lunar race of kings (Vamśānucaṁeti)

The fact that very few Purāṇas now extant answer to the title Pancalakṣaṇa, says M. Williams, “and that abstract given in the Matsya-purāṇa of the contents of all the others does not always agree with the extant works, either in the subjects described or number of verses enumerated, proves that like the Ramayana and Mahabharata, they were preceded by more ancient works" In all probability there were Mula Ramayana and Mula Mahabharata.”

The Purāṇas aim at exalting one of the three members of the Tr-mūrti, Brahma; Viṣṇu, or Śiva, those which relate to Brahma being sometimes called Rājasa Purāṇas (from his own peculiar Guna Rājas), those which exalt Viṣṇu being designated Sāttvika (from his Guna Sāttva); and those which prefer Śiva being styled Tāmasa (from his Guna Tamas)

---

1 For instance, Matsya purana gives the following description of Brahma Vararṣa Purāṇa—The Purāṇa, which is recited before Nārada by Sāvarṇi, and which contains the glory of Kṛṣṇa, the accounts of Radhanātāra Kalpa, and the story of Brahma in eighteen thousand slokas is called Brahma Vararṣa. But the present Brahma-Vararṣa Purāṇa does not mention its recitation by Sāvarṇi before Nārada and does not contain the stories of Brahma Vararṣa and Radhanātāra Kalpa

2 Indian Wisdom, 492-3.
The Purāṇas have been thus classified —

A  Rājasa, or those which relate to Brahma, are
   1 Brahma, 2 Brahmanda, 3 Brahma-Vaivartha + Markandeya, 5 Bhavisya, 6 Vāmanā

B  Sūttvula, or those which exalt Viṣṇu, are
   1 Viṣṇu, 2 Bhāgavata, 3 Naraḍiya, 4 Garuda, 5 Padma, 6 Varāha These six are usually called Vaishnava Purāṇas

C  Tūmasa, or those which glorify Śiva, are
   1 Śiva, 2 Liṅga, 3 Skānda, 4 Agni, 5 Maṭsya, 6 Kūrma These six are usually styled Śaiva Purāṇas

There are eighteen UPA-PURĀNAS or 'secondary Purāṇas,' subordinate to the eighteen MAHA or principal Purāṇas — 1 Sanaṭkumāra, 2 Narasimha or Nṛsimha, 3 Nārādiya or Bhūtanārādiya, 4 Śiva, 5 Dūrvāsasa 6 Kapila, 7 Mānava, 8 Anānasa, 9 Varunā, 10 Kālīka, 11 Śamba, 12 Nandī, 13 Saura, 14, Parāśara, 15 Ādiśya 16 Maheśvara, 17 Bhāgavata (thought to be a misreading for Bhārgava), 18 Vārṣṭha Another list given by Professor H H Wilson varies a little thus — 1 Sanaṭkumāra, 2 Narasimha, 3 Nārāda, 4 Śiva-Dharma, 5 Dūrvāsasa, 6 Bhavisya, 7 Kapila, 8 Mānava, 9, Anānasa, 10 Brahmanda, 11 Varunā, 12 Kālīka 13 Maheśvara, 14 Śamba, 15 Saura, 16 Parāśara, 17 Bhāgavata, 18 Kūrma

It is a matter of controversy whether by Bhāgavata Purāṇa is meant the Śrī Bhāgavata or the Śrī Devi Bhāgavata, that is, a Vaishnava or a Śaiva composition. By the advocates of Śrī Devi Bhāgavata, it is said that Śrī Bhāgavata was composed by Bopaṭeva, son of Keṣava poet of the Court of Hemādri, Raja of Devagiri (1260-71 AD). On the names of the eighteen Purāṇas there are a few variations Kūrma omits the Agni and substitutes Vāyu, Agni omits Śiva and inserts Vāyu, Varāha omits Garuda and Brahmāṇḍa and has Vāyu and Narasimha instead Markandeya, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata omit Vāyu Maṭsya like Agni gives up Śiva Mūlaśambha Purāṇa gives an account of

---
1 For this discussion, see Wilson Preface to Viṣṇu Purana, xxxix and Burnouf’s Int to Bhāgavata Purana I see xvi, xcvii and Int to the Telugu Edition (Madras) see Lyall, As Res VIII 967, Lassen, Ind Ant IV 599, Bhandarkar, System of Sams. Grammar, 104, Bhandarkar, EHD, 89 There is a Jaiminiya Bhāgavata (QML, R No. 3171).
Visvakarma, the divine architect, his human descendants the artisan class and of their customs, rites and ceremonies in 23 Adhyayas.

Prof. Wilson assigns the composition of these works to a period later than the 6th century A.D. "They offer" he says "characteristic peculiarities of a more modern description, in the paramount importance which they assign to individual divinities, in the variety and purport of the rites addressed to them and in the invention of new legends illustrative of the power and graciousness of those divinities and of the efficacy of implicit devotion to them". The Professor further discovers allusions to circumstances, which make the assignment of a comparatively recent date indisputable. As a culminating remark, he adds "they were pious frauds for temporary purposes".

The deductions which occasioned the learned scholar's remarks are based on internal evidence, the authority of which modern research questions on all sides. Sectarianism consists in the exclusive and not merely preferential worship of any divinity. The Puranas as a whole do not prohibit the worship of any god, but the sectarianism goes to the extent of recommending a particular deity in preference to all others. Passages are not rare in the Puranas, where all the deities are described as occupying an equal scale in the Hindu pantheon. Again the Professor seems to have given greater weight to the internal testimony from those passages, which he thinks have a modern appearance, than to that which results from those parts which the Puranas must have contained from their first composition, in order to entitle them to a sacred character and to that reverence with which these works have been regarded by the Hindus. But the fixing of a possible date when the Puranas received their present form is a question of

1 TC, III 4002
On the merit of the Chronology of the Puranas, see introduction.

2 Preface to Translation of Vishnu Purana.
little or no consequence, when it is admitted that there is abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era. They cannot, therefore, be pious frauds in subservience to sectarian imposture. What more conclusive evidence of their antiquity can be required than their containing a correct description of the doctrines and institutions of the Hindu religion, which were prevalent in India centuries before the Christian era? For it is more probable that the present Puranas are the same works as were then extant, than that eighteen persons should have each conceived 1300 years afterwards the design of writing a Purana and should have been able to compile or compose so accurately 18 different works which correspond so exactly in most of their minute particulars. Within the short compass of this work, it is not possible to discuss the Professor’s views in greater detail. Suffice it to say, that Vans Kennedy has, in his letters, which are printed as appendix to the Vth volume of Wilson’s Translation of the Vishnu Purana, demonstrated that Wilson’s remarks are completely erroneous and his reasoning is altogether ineffectual to prove that the Puranas are modern compilations. The reader, if he has any real interest in ancient Indian Literature, is referred to the masterly criticism of Vans Kennedy and he will immensely benefit by its study.

There is a Purana Sarvasva, anonymous, giving a brief sketch of all the Puranas in the library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College. The same library also contains a Purana Suchi being a list of the contents of all Upapuranas and the Mahabharata. Bhuvana Kosa is a collection of passages from the Puranas bearing on the geography of the world. So is Bhugolanimaya by Ramakrishna Yajvani.

1 Cal No 51
2 Ibid No 52
3 Ibid No 106
4 Ibid No 169*
Tantras represent a later phase of the Purānic religion. Tantrika doctrines are inculcated in the Purānas. As distinct books they are of later age but never of an age later than the Christian era. Sakti is the active energising will of a god, personified as his wife. The tantras are numerous and to Saktas, or worshippers of Sakti, they take the place of the Purānas. They embrace much that is said in the Purānas and contain formulas of magic and witchcraft and charms for averting and producing evils. Among Tantras, are Rudra Yāmala, Kālīka, Mahānāma, Kulaṅga, etc.

Tantric literature is usually designated as Vaidika and non-vaidika indicating whether they recognise the supreme authority of the Vedas or not. In the latter class all the Buddhist and Jain tantras are included while the Vaidika tantras are again Śaiva, Śākṣeya, Yāmala, etc. The last of this class are practically encyclopædias of knowledge in all branches of human exertion as developed till the time of their composition. These wonderful and interesting works once existed in the library of Kavindracharya Sarasvatī of Benares. A few of his manuscripts are found scattered all over India and Yāmalāśhtaka, the 31st of the Yāmala Tantras which are altogether 32, found in the Tanjore Palace Library, professes to give the name of the authors, extent and contents of all works before the seventh or eighth century. The vedic rites are analysed and classified according to the subject or the governing deity. Details of the four Upa-vedas and of 32 Yāmala Tantras throw an astonishing light on the extent of perished literature proclaiming man’s utter incapacity against the cruel hand of Time. Arthaveda for an example extends over 30000 slokas and treats of all branches of state politics, industrial development and mineralogy, that is, everything of artha.

---

1 On Tantras, see M Williams, Indian Wisdom, 501-5 and Works of Woodroffe, R C Dutt, Cw, II 212
2 Vide the Kavindracharya’s list published in Gaekwad Sanskrit series.
The term Kāvyā literally and in its widest sense connotes all that is the work of a poet. In that sense Kāvyā is the subject of Classical Sanskrit Literature. The science of poetics, embracing in it dramaturgy, music and dancing, is a concomitant of Kāvyā or Poetry. In the words of Mammata, Kāvyā is thus described:

"Kāvyā is that which touches the inmost cords of the human mind and diffuses itself into the crevices of the heart, working up a lasting sense of delight. It is an expression in the beautiful form and melodious language of the best thoughts and noblest emotions, which is the spectacle of life, awakening the finest souls."

Kāvyā is śrāvaṇa or dṛṣṭa, literally audible or visible; these are respectively Poems or Plays. In its narrower sense the term Kāvyā is used as an equivalent to poem (prose or verse) and the term Rūpakā denotes a play. The different kinds of Rūpakas and their characteristics will be described in a later chapter.

Śrāvaṇa Kāvyā is of two kinds, verse or prose. Thus says Viśva-nāṭha:

Rhetoricians distinguish between the body and embellishments of poetry. The theories of poetical embellishment will be noticed in the Chapter on Poetics. Dandu in his Kavyādarśa says, "The 'body' consists of a series of words calculated to aptly convey a desired meaning. This (body) is adequately divided into just three sorts: metrical, prose, and mixed. The metrical consists of four feet, and this again falls into two classes Vṛttā and Jāti. These are described in the Chapter on Metrics. Gadya or prose romance is treated in a later chapter.

Poetry in verse follows generally the manner of Rāmāvāna. Some call Kāvyas, artificial epics. They are either long or short, called respectively Mahākāvyas and Laghukāvyas or Khandā Kāvyas. Raghuvamsa and Naṣadha are instances of the former and Meghadūta and
Bikātana of the latter Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarpana (VI 315-325) describes the characteristics of a Mahākāvya thus —

Māgāmabhīc mahākāvaṁ tannāśe nāyakaṁ sūcī ||
Mahīśaṁ śṛṅgīṁ kāpiṁ śrīlaṁdubhuṣaṇaṁ śī ||
Ekaṁśamadhā mayaṁ kuṭajaṁ bhūvāṃpatiṁ va ||
Āśāśāraśāraṇaṁtvāni kāmōṣṭhiṁ rasaṁ ēṣyati ||
Abhāñi samsuṣṇipī ṛṣaṁ sambhūthasvabhyām ||
Sahāṣasodāsya kṛtasaṁāśraṁ śakunāśraḥ ||
Svāhārastuḥ suṣṭdānem kaṣṭkātvaṅgasvaḥ ||
Vidvānābhāṣaṁ jātādānaṁ sarāṁ yuganāṁstvam ||
Vikśatmarṣaṁ pataṁśatvāṁvaṁvaḥ ||
Nātīśvaṁ yā naśīdēyāṁ sarāṁ adānāḥkārva ṛṣh ||
Nānavā́tramay bhāpi sarāṁ kṣayam hṛṣyati ||
Nākānti mahāsūkṣmaḥ kāvyaṁ śīlaṁ śvēteva ||
Māyāmōreṇa devapārjavaṁ jñāntvāsaṁ ||
Pātāsthānaṁ gūṇadāsyaśeṣaṁvaṁvaṁvaḥ ||
Suṣṭānāśraṁ purāṇamāṇaṁvaṁvaḥ ||
Rājāṇāṇaṁ kṣaṇitvāvaṁvaṁvaṁvaḥ ||
Svāhaṁ śrīnuṣṭṣvaṁ sāriṅgāvahā ||
Dandin in his Kavyādarśa (I 14-19) says —

Sarīkāthām ca mahākāvyaṁvyātvaḥ tathā ṛṣhvaṁ ||
Nākānti maśāśraṇaṁ kṣaṇitevaṁvaṁvaṁvaḥ ||
Śriṇāsākvalayadūrāhitamātraḥ sarvaśrayam ||
Bhuṣaṇagāmāpate ca yuddhaṁdubhuṣaṇaṁ ||
Nagārāṇīcādānayādānayādānayaṅganeva ||
Udānaśāsanaṁ sānaṁsūtraṁattleva ||
Kāmādānāraṁkāraṇam kāmaṁkāraṇem ||
Māntrāntuṣṭapāṇājīnaṁkāraṇem ||
"Composition-in-Cantos is a long poem (Mahākavya) and its definition is being given [now] Its opening is a benediction, a situation, or a naming of the principal theme, it springs from a historical incident or is otherwise based upon some fact, it turns upon the fruition of the fourfold ends and its hero is clever and noble, by description of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons, and rising of the moon or the sun through sportings in garden or water, and festivities of drinking and love, through sentiments of love in separation and through marriages, by description of the birth and rise of princes, and likewise through state-counsel, embassy, advance, battle, and the hero’s triumph, embellished, not too condensed, and pervaded all through with poetic sentiments and emotions with cantos none too lengthy and having agreeable metres and well-formed joints, and in each case with an ending in a different metre, furnished, such a poem possessing good figures-of-speech wins the people’s heart and endures longer than (even) a Kalpa.”

Shortly stated, a Mahā-Kavya is a writing of considerable length, varying description and elaborate construction, embracing a narrative, theological or historical and is divided into Sargas or Cantos for convenience of narration A poem that falls short of the several particulars that are required to make up a Mahā-Kavya is called a Laghu-Kavya or a Minor Poem Among these Minor Poems many are lyrical or didactic and these are treated in a later chapter. In the following chapters the history of poetry is traced by a chronological mention of writers of Kavya and Rūpaka Poems by women, biographical poems and anthologies have been treated in separate chapters.
MAHĀ-KĀVYA

CHAPTER III

Maḥa-Kāvya

3 Rāmāyana, the Ādi-kāvya, is the first poem. It is a Mahākāvya answering in every detail to the description given by rhetors. The Mahākāvyas are modelled upon Rāmāyana, but the interval between the composition of Rāmāyana and the earliest available poem is so great that it is not possible to explain the void or paucity of such works for long centuries even by imagination. When we find that poetry was practised and appreciated in all ages in India as an art, the loss of those works which must have been many is indeed deplorable. In his Kāvyamīmāṁsā Rājasekhara mentions ancient sages who have written works on poetry and poetics, but beyond the mention of names and stray quotations these works are not now available.

याक, कवि सीतासंपादिये यथोपदेशस्य श्रीकण्ठ परमेष्वाकुष्ठादिन्यात्रू धये शिवेश्ये । सोजिप समवाद वस्मृतिर्न्त्राणस्य स्वतेवासन्य । तेषु सारस्वतीय संगीत स्त्रायामृतद्विवसन्य शूर्यव-स्वाधिसत्यवा सुप्रस्तुते प्रजात्माण्या प्रजापति । काव्यविशारदनाथ्ये प्रतेकुल । सोजिप- दशाविकरणां विशेषम् काव्यविशारदकेन्द्र । आमुर्क्षार । तत कविरिख रहस्याः समान्यानास्य, वाचिकायुक्तायाम्, रीतिनिर्धार लयस्त्राणाम । आस्मानिक अवेरिख, यमकाणि चित्र चित्तवाद । राज्योघ, वाल्लय क्‍षेत्र । वाक्युपि अवेकायन । अविश्वास परातार, अर्थशास्त्र, दलवाल्कारिक कृष्ण, कौन्तिक काव्येव । रूपकनिर्माणीये मरत, रसातिकारिक नवीकरण, रोमचिकित्सक सिद्ध, गुप्तपादस्त्रिकुपमण्ये, अपनिषािक कुमिल्ल श्रीति । (Kāvyamīmāṁsā, I 1)

Yāska speaks of Upamā or Simile and its varieties and he quotes (III 13) Gārgya’s definition of Upamā. Pāṇini came after Yāska and he wrote his aphorisms which are the grammar of Classical Sanskrit. Pāṇini, as we shall see, was himself a great poet and many of his verses, probably from his poem Jambavalihaṭṭaṇam, delight us by their merit. Vararuci or Kāṭyāyana came after him and is said to have written a poem Kaṭṭhābharapaṇam. Pāṇini is more profuse in his references to plays, romances and poems. These grammarians who had before them a current literature of Sanskrit poetry long preceded the Christian era. In the chapter on Rūpaka or drama, we shall see

1 Kṛṣṇa-Lilāsūka in his commentary on Bhoja’s Aṣṭādhyāyī called Kṛṣṇa-Lilāśūka, quotes from Pāṇini’s Jambavatibharapaṇam and in his Puruṣākāra the first verses of the 2nd, 17 & 18th Sargas of the same work.
that far earlier than the beginning of the Christian era, Sanskrit Literature on drama and poems was perfect and abundant

4 **Panini** was the son of Dākṣiṇa and lived at Sālātūra. According to Kaṭhāsaritsāgara, Pāṇini, Vyādi, Kātyāyana and Indraḍaṭṭha studied together under Upadhyāya Upavarsa and being dull, he practised penance and received from God Śiva the *pratyāhāra sūtras*. According to Pancatantra, he was killed by a lion. Pāṇini's age is very uncertain and scholars have varied from thousands of years before the Christian era to 350 B.C."

"Quite on a line with the statement about the 400 years is another traditional statement, reported by Huien Tsang in his story about Pāṇini under his account of Sālātūra, which has been held to place 500 years after the death of Buddha, not simply an alleged contemporary of Kanishka himself. We are told that, 500 years after the death of Buddha, a great Arhat from Kashmir arrived at Sālātūra, and saw a Brahman teacher chastising a young pupil. He explained to the teacher that the boy was Pāṇini, reborn. And he told to the

1 Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, I 75, calls him Dākṣiputra, and so too a verse in praise of Bhavabhūti in *Saduktikarnāmṛta* quoted infra.

2 He is called Sālāturya, (see Ganarāṭnamahodadhī), 81-2 and Bhāmahālakāra, Ch. VI. Sālātūra is identified by Cunningham with the present Lahaur in the Yusufza Valley near Attoc in NW Fr Province.

3 Taranga IV

4 दिनोऽवधारणानि कल्पितररत्नाणां विपुलेऽपातिनि—*Tārānta*, II, 81-33

5 Satyavṛata Sāmārjana in his introduction to Yāska's Nirukta says that Pāṇini lived in 2400 B.C. Goldstucker (*Panini, his place in Sanskrit Literature f 243*) and Belvarkar (*Systems of Sanskrit grammar*), give 700 B.C. Bhandarkar and Pischel (*ZDMG*, XXXIX 95) place him earlier than 500 B.C. Max Muller (*ASL*) makes Pāṇini contemporary of Kātyāyana and gives the date 350 B.C. Macdonell (*SL* 431) gives 350 B.C. Dahlman gives 3rd century B.C. Peterson (*Rep* 188-3), 39) fixed the beginning of the Christian era. B. Liebich, (*Panini*, Leipzig, 1892) says in all probability he came after Buddha and before the Christian era and that he was nearer the earlier than the later limit (see *Review by Grierson, IA*, XXII, 222) Jayawal (*Dates of Panini and Kātyāyana*, IA, XLVII 112, 138,) says Pāṇini lived before Chandragupta and places him 75 B.C. and Kātyāyana below 248 to 200 B.C. For his references to Afghan geography, see *IA*, I 21, for his technical terms, *IA*, VI 107, and for his reference to Buddhist Sramanas, *IA*, L. 82 For a long account of Pāṇini's school see Belvarkar's *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, 12ff.


7 e.g., to quote what is probably the latest instance, by Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, I. 222.
teacher the story of 500 bats, which, in a subsequent birth had as the result of their merit become the 500 wise men whom “in these latter times” (Juhun), “lately” (Beal), “in recent times” (Watters), king Kanishka and the reverend Pārāva had convoked in the “Council,” held in Kashmir, at which there was drawn up the Vībhāṣā-Śāstra. The great Arhat asserted that he himself had been one of the 500 bats. And, having narrated all this, he proved his divine power by instantly disappearing. Having been one of the 500 bats, this great Arhat was necessarily also one of the 500 members of the “Council” of Kanishka. And the story certainly places the great Arhat, at the time when he was telling it, in the 500th year after the death of Buddha. But the plain indication that he was a somewhat miraculous being entitles us to at any rate credit him with a certain amount of longevity, even to the occasional Buddhist extent of 120 years.”

5 Tradition identifies Pāṇini, the grammarian, with Pāṇini, the poet and author of the poem Jāmbavaṭṭjayam. In the Saduktī-Karnāmṛṭa Śrīdharadāsa refers to the poet as Dākṣiputra, and Rājasekhara is more explicit. Aufrecht refers to this verse and says “we may listen to what the sage, bent double over grammar and who had foresworn all worldly joys has to say and sing.” Kösemendra in his Suvṛttaṭilaka says that Pāṇini excelled in Upājita metre Namisādhu in his commentary on Rudrata’s Kavyālankāra (II. 8) quotes a line from “Pāṇini’s Mahākavya Pāṭalavijaya.” This poem Jāmbavaṭṭjayam of Pāṭalavijaya is said to be still extant in a corner of Malabar and my inquiries show that the manuscript may soon be recovered. Jāmbavaṭṭ was the daughter of Jāmbavan, Ṛkṣarāja of Pāṭāla Kṛṣṇa conquered him, got the Śyamanṭakamani and won the hand of Jāmbavaṭṭi. The story of Jāmbavaṭṭi’s marriage with Kṛṣṇa is described in the Mahā-

---

1 Fleet’s Traditional date of Kanishka, [JRAS (1906), 979ff].
2 उलटेन भान्तिन सक्षणयो न रसतेः 
ि डिओहोरा द्वर महातिमदुरा मारकिय तथ ताप्यतमोंद्र कमणि मरधूतिविचारः ||
3 सत्ति पाणिन्य तत्स्मी येन श्रग्रह्यावतः ||
4 PR, I, 5
bhārata, Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The same story is described in a poem called Jāmbavaṭṭi-Parīṣṣayam by Ekāṃraṇātha, and in a drama (Jāmbavaṭṭikalvāna) by Krishnaṇāya of Viṣvanagar.

Of the verses quoted in the anthologies as Pāṇini's, there are many and they are of exquisite beauty. In Kṣṇalīlāsuka's commentary on Bhoja's grammatical treatise, Saravatī-Kantābhārāṇa, Pāṇini's verses are quoted freely as illustrations. It looks therefore as if Pāṇini, who composed his aphorisms for classical Sanskrit, illustrated his aphorisms by a poem of his own composition Rāvanakuta in his commentary on Amarakośa quotes fragments from Pāṇini's poems.

1 Mah Sabha, 57, Bhag X 56, Viṣṇi, IV 13 For Jāmbavaṭṭi's agniprāveśa, see Mah Mausala, VII 74.
2 He composed his poem at the instance of King Ankusa of Rāṇa family. The poem in manuscript is available (DC, XX 7732) where extracts are given, and breaks off in the 5th canto.
3 See Chapter on Sanskrit Drama post
4. For verses of Pāṇini, see Aufrecht, ZDMG, XIV 581, XXVII, 46 XXXIX 365, (where verses are translated into English), Pischell, ZDMG, XXXIX 95, Peterson, IRAS (1891), 3, Rep. IV lxxvi, Int to Subh 54, Bhandarkar, Rep (1883-4), xvii, xxxi, 62 479, Thomas (Int to Kau 51) gives a complete list of the verses in the anthologies Bhandarkar (JBRAS, XVI, 344) does not accept the identity.
5 As instances of Pāṇini's imagery and expression we have,

गोक्तवरीणे परिमन्दन्दः
शरीति यशान्तिः कात्मेषाः ।
अपदयाः वत्साभिवेदनिन्नः
तच्छैरै गौरिव वृक्तारर ॥

उपेदरागृण विभोक्तरक
taśa gṛhoṁ śaśiṇa niśhaśukam ।

यथा समस्त तितिर्हास्ततः
पुरोध्विर रागाधोलित न रक्षितम् ॥

विभूक्ति समेते राग परिभाषाय विकत ।
कृत कृष्णपुरुष भावया न हि नायो विनेवया ॥

अधा।साध्वत्वनिन्नेतेजा
जनस्तूरोभितामुनियति ।

उपविवृद्धबलिविलायथक्यो
वशाहितोययवोदेशस्य ॥

धरार्दि राविनिर्माता विमानाः शोभमातिभध्यन्त विनमिता ।
ज्ञायता े भव उद्वर्णते यत्नयोग्या महासारित ॥
6 Vararuci also called Kātyāyana was the son of Somadatta of Sankṛti gotra. He was born at Kaśīmbī on the Jumna. He studied along with Pāmini and Vyādi under Upavarsa in Pātaliputra and married his daughter Upakṣā. He composed the Vārṣika on Pāmini and the slokas called Bhūjas Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya (1 23) mentions a poem by him (IV 11). According to the Avanṭi-Sundari-Kathāśāra (IV 17) Vararuci was born in the reign of King Mahāpadma, son of King Mahānandi, who ruled at Vaiśālī. According to the Purāṇas, King Mahānandi son of Nandivardhana, ruled for 43 years from 1678 to 1635 B.C. Mahāpadma his son (born of a Sudra woman) known as Nanda, ruled over Magadha for 88 years from 1635 to 1547 B.C. According to the Hindu tradition therefore Kātyāyana must have lived sometime between the 16th and 17th Centuries B.C. To Pāmini’s suṭra (VIII 1 50) Kātyāyana adds a vārṣika to explain the term Nirvāṇa and says it means ‘to blow out’. Patañjali explains this by various illustrations such as ‘the lamp is blown out by the wind etc.’ Nirvāṇa is a well known Buddhistic term, meaning absolute exemption from the cycle of transmigration, state of entire freedom from all forms of existence etc. If Kātyāyana and Patañjali had lived after the advent of Buddhism, they would not have failed to mention the technical use of the term. It is therefore inferred that they must have flourished before the days of Buddha. On the date of the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, there is great divergence of opinion, and according to Chinese chronology it is 944 or 973 B.C. If Patañjali lived before that date and Kātyāyana before Patañjali with an interval of time sufficient for the language to develop and change to an extent that needed Patañjali’s explanations, the Purānic date for Kātyāyana does not appear improbable.

1 This is the account given in Somadeva’s Kathāsartasagara, (Tar I-V) This account is supported by Bhūja In Chapter 27, Dutādhyaśa of Śṛngārarakāśa, Bhūja enumerates various mediators between lovers and among them he mentions as an illustration Upavarsa, Guru of Vararuci, as arranging the marriage of his own daughter Upakośa with Vararuci. According to the Avanṭisundari-kathāśāra (chapter IV) Vararuci was the son of a virgin Kātyāyani, daughter of a brahmin Kalāpi, who became pregnant by contact with Agni and suspected of unchastity she was abandoned and Vararuci was born to her on the banks of the Godavari, when Agni removed her. The poem refers to the association with Vyādi, Indradatta and Upavarsa. For the story of Vararuci see IA, XI 146

2 For Purānic dates, see Introduction and T S Narayana Sastri’s Age of Sankara, App I, 25

3 Beal’s Catena of Chinese Scriptures, 116 note, Max Muller’s ASL, 267

4 Weber (IL 222) says “with regard to the date of Kātyāyana, the state-
Vararuci is mentioned in the well-known verse as one of the nine gems of the Court of King Vikramāditya. In the absence of certainty on the date of that King Vikramāditya, it is not possible to say anything definite about the poet Vararuci of his Court. It is probable he was different from Kātyāyana. Kātyāyana knew of a work dealing with the wars of gods and demons, Danāśuram. Paṭaṭijali mentions a Vārarucam Kāvyam, and the anthologies quote verses under the name of Vararuci. Jalhana in his Sūkṣmamātāvali quotes a verse as Rājasekhara, which gives the name of the work called Kauṭhābhāharanam. It is conjectured that it was a poem with acrostics and alliteration as Vararuci is known to be fond of them. Vararuci's Bhāna Udbhābhisārika shows the beauty of his poetry and the antiquity of the composition and in the colophon to the available manuscript, he is described as muni. A manuscript of Vallabhadheva's Subhāṣītāvali seen in the O Mss Library, Madras, says that the verse printed (1740) as Vararuci's, gives the authentic version of the poem. The fragment of Huan Thsang, to the effect that 300 years after Buddha's death, i.e., in BC 240, "le docteur Kia-to-yan-na" lived at Tamasavana in the Punjab, is by Bohtingk referred to this Kātyāyana, but when we remember that the same traveller assigns to Panmini's second existence a date so late as 500 years after Buddha, such a reference of course becomes highly precarious. Besides, the statement is in itself an extremely indefinite one, the "docteur" in question not being described as a grammarian at all, but simply as a descendant of the Kātyāyana family. Even admitting however, that the reference really is to him, it would still be in conflict with the tradition—in itself, it is true, of no particular authority—of the Kāthāsariṣāgara, which not only represents Kātyāyana as the contemporary of Panmini, but identifies him with Vararuci, a minister of King Nanda, the father of Chandragupta, according to which, of course, he must have flourished about BC 350. As regards the age of the Mahābhāṣya, we have seen that the assertion of the Rājaṭaraṅgini as to its introduction into Kashmir in the reign of Abhimanyu the successor of Kanishka, i.e., between AD 40 and 65, is, for the reasons above assigned, in the meantime discredited. Macdonell (SL 432) gives 3rd century BC, Belvalkar (SSG 29) 500–550 BC, and Bhandarkar and R Mukerji (IA, LVI 21) 350 BC. Goldstucker gives to Panmini 700 BC and says there was a long interval of time between Panmini and Kātyāyana who followed Panmini. See Jayaswal, Dates of Panmini and Kātyāyana (IA, XLVII 112, 138).

1 On this verse, see under Kālidāsa
2 IV ii 191. Goldstucker's Panmini, 146 note; Weber, IST, XIII 450
3 Peterson's Subhāṣītāvali (Int 108–110), Aufrecht, ZDMG, XXXVI 524, Pischel, ZDMG, XXXIX 98
4 यथायथं द्रष्टं नामि बालश्वरः बरस्वरेरि & व्यथायणकारणां वस्सुजागिरियः ||
5 See IA, X. 366.
is from Carumati of Vararuci and Bhojadeva quotes the following verse in his Śṛgārāprakāśa from Carumati as spoken by a pair of Kinnaras before the hero on an amorous embassy:

कन्नुकृष्णकमलधितां क जयवेदनविविधिपयः।
अमराजपुरे बरुच्यया तय यो विमल परित्ययते॥

The editors of Avantisundarīkathā say that Carumati was an akhyātikā (in prose) and Paññalali mentions the existence of Akhyātikā in his days. The name Carumati indicates it might be so.

There is a collection of eight verses called Mārāyajātaka, laudatory of Durga in the terrific pose and the pictures delineated in the verses are very graphic.

According to a tradition in Malabar Vararuci married girls in all 18 castes and consequently he was treated as a śvapach or a chandāla. Bhoja has quoted a verse (Śr Prakāśa XI) probably from the prologue of a drama which confirms the latter part of the tradition,

भृतके श्रवैचकतो वर्णचिर तर्ककवयोद्धि सतः
श्रीवेच चिन्ताचतु च गमितो सहृ यद्यपयेशी।
व्यापोत्सिन्तिः प्रमाकरुद्धेशाच दिनविसित
नवचानांशुमित्ति महता तस्तेर्मचन्द्रचतुष्य॥

Bharī was a Maukha king and teacher of Bānabhaṭṭa Prabhākara, a contemporary of Kumārila, if not his pupil, interpreted Mīmāṃsābhāya antagonistic to Kumārila.

7 Patanjali came after Kātyāyanī. There is no indication of any poetic composition by Patanjali. But he makes numerous references to poems, romances and plays in his Mahābhāṣya. Kielhorn has collected the poetic citations from the Mahābhāṣya and says that they show that the Kavya prospered in Patanjali's times. Many of these verses exhibit metres characteristic of the artificial poetry, such as, Malati, Pramukabhāṣa, Praharshini and Vasantaratāka. These verses as well as many others in the heroic Anushtubha-Slokā agree, in point of contents as well as the mode of expressions, not with epic works but with the Court Kavyas.

1 For Paññalali's date, Bohlingk gives 250 BC, Max Muller (ASL), 200 BC, Weber (II, 224, IA, II 206) 140 to 60 BC, Goldstucker (Panini, 234) 140-120 BC, N Bhāshyacarya, (Age of Patanjali) 10th century BC, Peterson (IA, XII 353) 2nd century AD and Bhandarkar (IA, I 299, LII 21) 144-142 BC. On Patanjali, see IA, I 141, 157, IA, I 909, II 57, 69, 94, 206-10, 238, 362, III 14, 285, IV 247, XIV 40, XV 80-4, ASB LII 269. On a Maurya passage, see XVI 156-172. On his mention of Śivabhāgavatā, see IA, XLI 272.

2 IA, XIV 396 See Mahābhāṣya (Kielborn's Edn) I 426, 435, II, 119, III 143, 338. On Kielborn's Edn, see IA, XVIII, 129.
8 Theory of Renaissance —Max Muller propounded the theory of Renaissance. His main thesis is "that in the middle of 6th century A.D. the reign of a King Vikramaditya of Ujjain, with whom tradition connected the names of Kalidasa and other distinguished authors, was the golden age of Indian Court Poemry. This Renaissance theory is based on Fergusson's ingenious chronological hypothesis that the supposed King Vikramaditya of Ujjain, having expelled the Scythians from India, in commemoration of his victory founded the Vikrama Era in 544 A.D., dating its commencement back 600 years to 56 B.C. Fergusson arrives at the following conclusions: (i) that the Vikramaditya who conquered the Sakas at the battle of Karur was Harsha of Ujjain, (ii) that he died about 550 A.D., (iii) that before 1000 A.D., when the struggle with the Buddhists was over and a new year was opening for Hindu religion, the Hindus sought to establish some new method of marking time to supersede the Buddhist Saka Era of Kanishka, (iv) that the Guptas and Kings of Valabhi having then passed away, in looking for some name for an event of sufficient importance to mark the commencement of a new Era, they hit on the name of Vikramaditya as the most illustrious known to them and his victory at Karur, the most important event of his reign, (v) and that, since the date of victory in 544 A.D., was too recent to be adopted, they antedated the epoch by ten cycles of sixty years thus arriving at 56 B.C., and not content with this they devised another era which they called Harsha Era from the other part of his name the epoch of which was fixed at 456 B.C., by placing it ten even centuries before the date of the battle of Karur." On the basis of these deductions Max Muller asserted that the Indians in consequence of the incursions of the Sakas and other foreigners ceased from literary activity during the first two centuries A.D. and Sanskrit poetry having been dormant for five centuries was revived and flourished in the reign of a King Vikramaditya of Ujjain in the 6th century A.D. *

"The epigraphical researches of Mr. Fleet," says Macdonell,* have destroyed Fergusson's hypothesis. From these researches it results that the Vikrama era of 57 B.C., far from having been founded in 544 A.D had already been in use for more than a century previously under the name of Malava Era (which came to be called the Vikrama Era about 800 A.D.). It further appears that no Sakas (Scythians)

---

1 J.R.A.S. (1880), "On the Saka and Gupta Eras"
2 India, What can it teach us? 281, 284, Weber, IL, 203 note.
3 SL, 323.
could have been driven out of western India in the middle of the sixth century, because that country had already been conquered by the Guptas more than a hundred years before. Lastly, it turns out that though other foreign conquerors, the Hunas, were actually expelled from western India in the first half of the sixth century, they were driven out, not by a Vikramaditya, but by a king named Yasodharman Vishnuvardhana.”

The inscriptions that have been discovered at Krle, and Mandassor by Fleet have completely belied Ferguson’s hypothesis and with it the theory of Renaissance. They have been fully examined by Buhler and his essay has been rendered in English by V. S. Ghaté of Poona. Buhler himself augmented the list of Fleet’s 18 inscriptions by the inclusion of many other documents such as the Meherauli Pillar inscriptions of Emperor Chandra and the postcaulally coloured genealogy of the Maakhari on the Asirgarh Seal. These inscriptions show, says Buhler, that the use of Kāvyā style in the inscriptions, especially in the longer ones, was in vogue during the period from 350-550 A.D. and from this very circumstance it follows that Court poetry was zealously cultivated in India. After dealing with the merits of inscriptions, Buhler proceeds thus to refute the theory of Renaissance.

“His first proposition, that the Indians did not show any literary activity during the first and second centuries of our era, in consequence of the invasions of

1 IA, (1876), 152, see on this Max Muller (c c 286 note), Fleet’s commentary in IA, XII 152, III 293
2 Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, III 65-69, Int 55. मालवानां गणवेशो नाते शरदवुधे! निनवलविषेक्षया नाते हैन्यात्ववन्ते॥

“When by the tribal constitution of the Malavas, four centuries of years, increased by ninety-three, had elapsed, to that season the low thunder of the muttering of clouds is to be welcomed.”

Fleet translated this as “when 493 years had elapsed by the reckoning from the tribal constitution of the Malavas” (Gupta Inscriptions, 79-87) or “in accordance with the reckoning followed by the Malava tribe” [JRAS, (1913) 995, (1914), 745, (1915) 138]. Thomas [JRAS (1914), 413, 1010, (1915), 533] says it means continued existence. See also Jayaswal (Mod Rev 1913, May to September) R C Dutt (Crv II 51) and V S Gopala Iyer, Chronology of Ancient India, 153 JMy, VIII 275 In IA, (1913), 161, Bhandarkar notes the use of the word मालववानानात्.

3 IA, XLII 29, 137 etc. See further on these inscriptions, Apté, Age of Kalidasa, 4, Nandargikar, Int to Raghuvamsa, 48-60, V. Smith, EH 387, Fleet, JBRAS, XVIII 71
the different foreign races, is contradicted by the clear proof provided by the Prāṣasti of the Sudarśana lake and the Nasik-inscription No 18 I think, I must further add that the extinction of the intellectual life of the Indian during the first two centuries by the Scythians and other foreigners is improbable for other reasons also. In the first place, never had the foreigners brought under their sway in the long run more than fifth part of India. To the east of the district of Mathura, no sure indications of their rule have been found, and the reports of the Greeks ascribe to the Indo-Scythian kingdom no further extent in the east or south. In India proper, their kingdom could permanently possess only the Panjab, besides the high valleys of the Himalaya, the extreme west of the North Western Provinces, the Eastern Rajputana, the Central Indian Agency with Gwahor and Malwa, Gujarat with Kathawar, as well as Sindh. No doubt, temporarily these limits are further extended in several cases, as the inscriptions from the reign of Nahapana prove for the western border of the Deccan, and several traces of war might present themselves in further removed districts. The rulers of such a kingdom could indeed have exerted a considerable influence on the east of India, but they would never have been able to suppress the literary and scientific life of the Indians. Secondly, however,—and this is the most important point—the very will to show a hostile attitude towards the Indian culture, was wanting in the foreign kings of the time, as the sayings and authentic documents inform us. They themselves, as well as their comrades of the same race, were far inferior to the Indian, in point of civilization and culture and the natural result was that they could not escape the influence of the Indian civilization, but were themselves Hindused. Their willingness to appropriate the culture of their subjects is shown by the very fact that the descendants or successors of the foreign conquerors immediately began to bear Indian names, even in the second generation. Havinsha's successor is indeed a Shah, but he is named Vasudeva. Nahapana's daughter is named Dakshamatra and his son-in-law the son of Dimika, a Saka, is named Ushavadata or Usabhadata, i.e., Rishabhadatta. The son of Chashtana is Jayadaman. The leaning of these kings to the Indian systems of religion is equally indisputable. According to the Buddhist tradition, Kanishka is one of the greatest patrons of Buddhism and even a Buddhist himself. The latter fact is now shown to be improbable by the inscriptions on his coins. On the other hand, there is no doubt that he built a Stupa and a Vihara at Purushapura, Peshawar. So also it is proved from the inscriptions that Huvishka had
founded a Vihara in Mathura. Ushavadata and his consort, according to the Nasik and Karle inscriptions, made grants to Buddhists and Brahmanas without distinction, and the former, just like a pious Indian, carried out numerous works of public utility, for the sake of merit. The Mathura inscriptions further show that under Kamshka and his successors, by the side of Buddhism, many other systems of religion also, like Jainism, were not only tolerated, but enjoyed a high prosperity. These inscriptions, as well as numerous archaeological finds also prove that the national Indian architecture and sculptures in Mathura were on a high level, and one of the newest discoveries of D. Fuhrer permits us to conclude that even the dramatic art was cultivated in the city of gods. The inscription No. 1b, out of the collection prepared by me for the next number of the Epigraphia Indica, says that 'the sons of the actors of Mathura (Māthuraṇām Saṅīlakāṇām), who were known as Chandaka brothers, dedicated a stone-slab, for the redemption of their parents, at the holy place of the adorable Naga-prince, Dadhukarna.' If Mathura had its company of actors, then it would not have been in want of dramas. All these circumstances make it impossible in my opinion to look upon the times of the Indian popular migration as a period of wild barbarism. The conditions appear to be in no way essentially different from those of the times when there were national rulers. The Indians of the north-west and the west had indeed to obey foreign suzerains and to pay them tributes and taxes, in return for which, however, they had the triumph of exerting sway on their suzerigators, through their high culture and of assimilating the same with themselves. The conditions necessary for literary activity must have been in existence, when Ushavadata noted his great deeds in a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit itself. He would certainly have lent his ear and opened his purse to bards and Kavis who would glorify him. These considerations appear to be of importance, for the statements in the Girnar Prasasti heighten their significance.

"A second proposition which Professor Max Muller in addition to other scholars advocates,—that the period of the bloom of artificial poetry is to be placed in the middle of the sixth century of the Christ,—is contradicted by the testimony of the Allahabad Prasasti of Harshena, of other compositions of the Gupta period and of the Mandasor Prasasti. These

1 Cunningham, Arch Surv Rep Vol. III, plate XIV, No 14
2 Arch Surv Rep West Ind., IV 99ff
3 Arch Surv Rep West Ind., L.C. No 5 1 3. ff
leave no doubt about the fact that there were not one but several such periods of the bloom of the Kāvya, of which one fell before the time of Samudragupta, and they also make it probable that Kalidasa wrote before 472 A.D. The same conclusion is favoured by the fact that Dr Fergusson’s bold chronological combinations, on which is based the theory of the Indian Renaissance in the sixth century, have been shown to be insupportable by the researches of Mr (Dr) Fleet. The authentic documents going down to the year 533 A.D. know absolutely nothing about the Vikramaditya of Ujjain whose existence is inferred or set up by new interpretations of the different legends, and who is reported to have driven away the Scythians from India and to have founded the Vikrama era in the year 744 A.D., dating it as far backwards as 600 years. On the contrary they prove the following facts concerning western India. Samudragupta-Parākarama, according to (Mr) Fleet’s inscription No. 11, had extended the kingdom of his father, at any rate as far as Eran in the Central-Provinces. His son Chandragupta II Vikramaditya, according to No. III, conquered Malwa, before or in the year 400 and also possessed Mathura. Chandragupta’s son, Kumaragupta-Mahendrāditya, held fast these possessions, because, according to No. XVIII, he was the suzerain of the rulers of Dasapura-Mandasor, in the year 437. His son, Skandagupta-Kramaditya or Vikramaditya, according to No. XIV, ruled over Gujarat and Kathiawar, about 455-457 or 456-458. In his time, the Hunas came forth, against whom he made a successful stand, according to No. XIII. Later on, however, whether it was in his own reign which lasted at least till the year 467 or 468, or under his successors Puragupta and Narasimhagupta, the most western possessions were lost and went over to the foreign race. In Nos. XXXVI and XXXVII, there appear the kings, Toramana and Mihirakula as rulers of Eran and Gwalior, and in No. XXXVII, the latter is said to have reigned for fifteen years.

"The end of the rule of Mihirakula in these districts, is made known to us through Nos. XXXIII, XXXIV and XXXV, according to which, he was defeated by a king Yasodharman-Vishnuvardhana, before the year 533 A.D. These inscriptions represent Yasodharman as a very powerful ruler who had brought under his sway not only Western India from

---

1 See Dr. Hoernle, JBAS, 158, 89, and Mr. Fleet, IA, XIX, p. 224.
2 See also Mr. Fleet’s articles on Mihirakula, IA, XV, p. 245ff and on Toramana, IA, XVIII p. 225. With Dr. Hoernle (p. 96, Note 2) I hold that Vishnuvardhana is a second name of Yasodharman, as is shown by the grammatical construction.
Dasapura-Mandasar down to the ocean, but also large parts in the east and north. In his possessions Malwa was naturally included, whose capital Ujjain lies only something like 70 English miles to the south of Dasapura. In Nos XXV, and in two considerably early inscriptions Nos XVII, and XVIII, the Malava era is used, which is identical with the so-called Vikrama era beginning with 56-57 BC. These exceedingly important discoveries which we owe to Mr Fleet's zeal in collecting and his ingenuity, prove the absolute untenableness of the Fergussonian hypothesis. Because they show (1) that the era of 56-57 BC was not founded in the sixth century, but was in use under the name of the Malava era for more than a century, (2) that at that time, no Sakas could have been driven from Western India. Inasmuch as the country had been conquered by the Guptas more than a hundred years ago, (3) that, on the contrary, other foreign conquerors the Hunas, were driven out of western India in the first half of the sixth century, not, however, by a Vikramaditya, but by Yasodharman-Vishnuvarthdana, and (4) that therefore, there is no room at all in the sixth century for a powerful Vikramaditya of Ujjain, whose exploits called forth such an upheaval in India."

9 These inscriptions are dated either in Gupta-Samvat or in the Malava Samvat or merely in Samvat. There is a wide difference of opinion, which will be referred to in the Introduction, on the meaning and the beginning of these Eras. In some of these inscriptions the names of the Gupta Kings Samudra Gupta, Candra Gupta, Kumara.

---

1. See also IA, Vol. XV, p. 194ff and XIX, p. 56, in which latter place Prof Kielhorn has given the right explanation of difficult expression MALAVANAM or MALAVA-GANASTHITYA.

2. As is quite clear, the Malava era has suffered the same fate as the Saka era and came to be known by another name, as its origin was forgotten. The change of name appears to have come in about 800 AD. The latest known Malava date is the year 795 which appears in the Kanasa inscription, IA, Vol. XIX, 55ff. Apart from the two doubtful documents, the oldest known Vikrama date is found in Dr Hultzsch's Dholpur inscription and corresponds to 16 April 842, as Prof Kielhorn has shown, IA, Vol. XIX, p. 35.

3. If it occurs to any one to conjecture that the Hunas had caused an interruption in the literary activity of India, I bring to his notice the fact that both the inscriptions of the age of Toramana and Miharakula contain no mean composition and that their authors glorify the foreign kings as highly as if they had been the national rulers.

4. For texts of many of these, see Pracnalekhamala (Kavyamala Series) and D R Diskalkar's Selections from Sanskrit Inscriptions (Rajkot).
Gupta, Bhānu Guptā and Skanda Guptā, are mentioned, and the years are in the reigns of these kings. Whether the Guptā dynasty ruled before or after the Christian era, as the opinions differ, these inscriptions disclose a literary composition in prose and in verse of great merit and show that "the use of Kavya style in inscriptions especially in the longer ones, was in vogue and from this very circumstance it follows that court-poetry was zealously cultivated in India." So says Buhler, but he would date this period as 350-550 AD though according to the Purāṇas, Śrī Guptā dynasty ruled between 328 and 83 BC.

10. Yatsabhāttī—The Prāṣāṭi in the Sun Temple in Mandasor² was composed by Yatsabhāttī in Malava Ādhat 529, which according to Buhler equals 473-4 AD. The 44 verses in this Prāṣāṭi or panegyric begin and end with Mangalas or blessings in prose and in the intermediate verses there are exquisite descriptions of the sovereign Kumāra Guptā and his vassals Viśavārman and Bandhuvarman, of the temple then built and of the winter season, in a variety of metres, and it is said that the diction shows many marks which characterise, according to Dandin, the poets of the Eastern School. The whole piece incarnates fluid poetry and the description of the winter is enchanting.³ On this appreciation, Buhler may not agree, but his remarks are interesting.

---

² IA, XLII 32, 137, 146, 175, 244 Fleet’s Guptā Inscriptions, No 18
³ Here the words माहाकाव्याः रणिष्यमि is used. See also IA, XV 194. On Kumāra-gupta see IA, XL 170, and his possible name Candraprākśa see ibid XL 174.
“In the second half of the fourth century in Vatsabhatti’s Prasasti of the sun-temple of Dasapura-Mandasar we see traces of the existence of the school of the Gaudas, the poets of eastern India. This work should be called rather the exercise of a scholar who busied himself with the study of the Kavva literature, than a product of an actual poet. We can see therein that its author had studied the Kavyas and Rhetorics, but that, in spite of all the troubles he took to produce a real Kavva, he possessed little of inborn talent. Small offences against good taste, such as the use of expletives and tautologous words, are more frequently met with. In one place, the author is led to forget one of the most elementary rules of Grammar, by the exigencies of the metre, in another place, in his zeal to form long compounds, he is tempted to disregard the rule, always observed by good writers, according to which, the week pause can never come at the end of a half-verse. In a third place, he jumbles together two ideas in a manner the least permissible, and his attempt to bring out a new comparison between the clouds and the houses leads in no way to a happy result.

“These defects in Vatsabhatti’s Prasasti make it the more important for the historian of literature, inasmuch as they bear testimony to the fact that everything worthy of attention in the Prasasti, is gathered from the literature of his time and compiled into a whole. Thus on

\[ \text{d. रामायणार्थने दर्माकालाः -} \\
\text{क्षेत्रायुप्रमोऽजलकीप
the one hand, we are assured of the fact that about the year* 472 A.D.,
there was a rich Kavya literature in existence, and on the other hand
greater weight is gained by the points of accordance with the works
handed down to us, which the Prasasti presents. It has been already
pointed out about that verse 10 of the Prasasti only repeats, for the
most part, the comparison contained in verse 65 of Meghaduta, with
some points added in a very forced way, while the remaining points
contained in that verse of Kalidasa, find themselves repeated in verse 11
of the Prasasti. Further it is to be noted that Vatsabhatti, like Kalidasa,
shows a special predilection for the word Subhaga, and that while
describing the king Bandhuvaraman, plays upon his name just in the same
way as Kalidasa does with the names of Raghus, whom he describes
in the beginning of Sarga XVIII of Raghuvamsa. These facts make
the conjecture more probable, that Vatsabhatti knew and made use
of the works of Kalidasa. The same view is advocated by Prof.
Keilhorn in a publication¹ just appearing, which reached me after this
treatise was nearly finished. He reads verse 51 of the Prasasti (otherwise)
and shows that the verse sufficiently agrees with Ritusamhara V 2-3, in
both words and thoughts, as there are only two new points added.
Although I am not in a position without examining a good impression
of the inscription, to give a definite opinion regarding the proposed,
and no doubt very interesting alteration of the text, still the truth of
his assertion that verse 51 of the Prasasti is an imitation of Ritusam-
harā, V 2-3, appears to me quite undeniable. If we may believe
in the tradition which ascribes Ritusamhara to the author of Meghaduta,
then the point overlooked by me, which Prof. Keilhorn has made out,
strengthens the probability of the supposition that Kalidasa lived
before 472 A.D., which is very significant. In that case, however, it
will have to be assumed that Vatsabhatti knew the Ritusamhara also.*

11 Harisena’s panegyric of Samudra Guptā² inscribed on the
Allahabad Pillar is undated, and according to Buhler must have been
composed between 375-390 A.D. It has 8 verses with a long prose
passage and a verse in conclusion. Harisena calls it a Kāvyā. Partly
in prose and partly in verse it may be called a Champu. He calls his
patron the Prince of Poets. In describing his greatness, he says in
the 8th verse: “His is the poetic style which is worthy of study and his

1. ‘The Mandasor-inscription of the Malava year 549 (=472 A.D.) and
Kalidasa’s Ritusamhara’ Gottingen 1890, p. 251 ff
2. Fleet Gupta Inscriptions, No. 32. D. B. Daskalark (Selections from Sanskrit
Inscriptions) gives date about 360 A.D.
the poetical verse which multiplies the spiritual treasures of poets” 

On this composition Buhler says, “It naturally follows that, during the reign of Samudragupta, the Kavya literature was in full bloom, and that the conditions at his court were absolutely similar to those which are reported to have prevailed in later times at the courts of Kanauj, Kashmir, Ujjain, Dhara and Kalyani, and which are found to exist even to this day, here and there in India. The cultivators of Sanskrit Poetry, who were called by the name of Kavi or Budha or Vidvat, were not born or self-taught poets, but were professional learned men or pandits who studied in Sastras, i.e., at the least, Vyakaranas, Kosas, Alamkara and Chandas, and who wrote according to the hard and fast rules of poetics, as is shown by the form of Harishena’s little composition. The Sanskrit Kavya, which owed its origin to the court-patronage, and which can exist only by means of the same, was assiduously cultivated at the courts. The King supported and raised to honour such poets, and even he himself, and with him his high officers, too, emulated with their proteges Perhaps he had even a Kaviraja, or a poet-laureate, appointed. At any rate the title as such was in use in the days of Samudragupta—the title which in later times occurs very often in Sanskrit literature, and which, even at present, is given by Indian princes, associated as it is with many benefits. His court could not thus have been the only one which patronized the exertions of the Pandits in the domain of poetry.”

The inscription on Dharmavishnu’s Boar statue at Eran, dated in the year one of King Toramana is also partly in prose and partly in verse of high flight Väsula’s panegyric of King Yasodharman, though undated inscribed on a pillar of Mandasar is spoken of as Śrīloka.

Among earlier inscriptions Buhler selects two, and describes their literary merit; the Nasik inscription dated in the 19th year of Sir Í Pulamayi, and Girnar inscription of the reign of Mahāśatrapa Rudradāman. For these inscriptions Buhler gives dates between

1 निश्चितविद्यविग्रहितानि ज्ञानविद्याकेतायुगश्च विद्यविद्यासंस्कारादिविद्यानां विशेषेष्यानि।

2 Poet’s Gupta Inscriptions No 30.
3 Ibid, No 33 D.B. Diskalkar op. cit gives date about 532 A.D.
4 According to the Purāṇas this king reigned 409–377 B.C. as Pulomayi II of the Andhra dynasty.
5 El, VIII 47. The date is Śaka 72 or 150 A.D. This inscription refers to Maurya Kings Chandragupta and Asoka.
150-170 A.D. In the Girnar inscription the poet praises Rudradāman's skill in poems and expresses the views of the author on the characteristics of good composition. The Nasik inscription shows great affinity with Gāḍva Kāvya.

12 Kalidasa is a name which is the magic wand of India in the world's poetic literature. But as untold time had past, all that surrounded the life and times of that great poet have been forgotten and beyond the name everything connected with him, his age and nativity, is only a matter of vague conjecture. In this respect Kālidāsa may be compared with Homer, while however the tradition is that "Living Homer sought his daily bread" Kālidāsa was in affluence and beloved of Kings. While "seven cities claim the birth of Homer dead," the birth of Kahdasa is claimed by different parts of India, and by Ceylon tradition generally does not lie and it is possible that Kālidāsa was personally known in the several places where he is taken solely as their own. In spite of the prevalence of a vast body of poetic literature as indicated in the early writings it is surprising and not easily accountable that no complete work of poetry has come down to us as prior to Kahdasa beyond dispute. Kālidāsa therefore leads the long list of classical Sanskrit poets like English Caedmon. If Caedmon sang of philosophy and cosmogony, Kālidāsa retold mythical tales of love, and theology. If Caedmon appeared almost at the dawn of the Anglo-Saxon literature, Kālidāsa flourished when the Sanskrit literature was in perfection. As is common in all cases when the truth is forgotten, tales spring up which may or may not have a tinge of reality and to such tales the life of Kālidāsa is not an exception. Many stories of his ready wit, pleasant life and delightful associations with occasions of vicissitudes are found told in various books, for instance, in Ballāla's Bhoja-Prabandha. A tradition is current that though a boor in birth he was by chance wedded to an obstinate princess and when in her

1. सुत्रस्वयमेवचक्रकान्तशब्दसम्योदारालस्तृत्वमपध

2 Haraprabadasastry, Kalidasa, his home [IBOS (1916) 15, IA. xlvii. 264, IR. xi. 292] says his birth place was Dasapura in Malwa. According to A.C. Chatterjee (Kalidasa his poetry and mind, 148) it is Ujjain, according to Bhauj Daji (1 c) it must be Kashmir, and according to Majumdar, Home of Kalidasa, IA. XLVII 264 it was Vidarbha. The following verse in Avantisundarikathā of Dandin supports Majumdar's view —

किंतु मधुबनकुलनयस्य निर्विस्बास गिरे।
तेनेवले वर्ष्ण कालिदासको शनितम्॥

first company, she put him the question अनि करिचुं वाग्यो to ascertain if he was a man of letters. He displayed his ignorance and being ashamed or abandoned, he left her, and devoted himself to the service and worship and contemplation of Goddess Kāli. In time Kāli appeared before him in Divine Form, blessed him with literacy and poesy and made him her own. It is said that this brought him the name of Kālidāsa, his real name being forgotten and for all his life Goddess Kāli was his guardian and protector at his invocation. Having thus become a poet he sought his princess who received him with pleasure and in remembrance of the three words of her question he composed his three Poems Kumārasambhava, Meghadūta, and Raghuvamsa beginning with those words.

13 Kālidāsa's date—Hippolyte Falché considers Kālidāsa a contemporary of the posthumous son of Agnivarna, the last king mentioned in the Raghuvamsa and assigns to him a date about the 8th century B.C.

Lassen assumes that Kālidāsa was a poet of the Court of Samudragupta, chiefly on account of the title “Friend of Poets,” applied to that king in inscriptions, and places him in the commencement of the 3rd century A.D.

Wilford discovers a Vikramaditya in the 5th century A.D., on

1 Collective works of Kālidāsa, Paris, Bhau Day’s Essay on Kālidāsa (Literary Remains, Calcutta) 7, Saturday Review, January, 1860, JBRAS, (1861) 25 S. P. Pandit (Introduction to Raghuvamsa, 27-28) refutes this theory “If Kālidāsa were to be a contemporary of a reigning king his omission to give any history of his own ruler is unaccountable. Besides Raghuvamsa cannot be said to be a complete poem Traditio 1315 that the sequel to the history of Solar kings has been yet unrecovered. The simple fact that Kālidāsa’s account closes there cannot conclusively prove the end of the dynasty itself. The Vishnu Purāna mentions a list of thirty-seven kings after Agnimitra.”

2 IA, II 451, 1158-1160, 16, II 148, 415-417, M. Williams (Indian Wisdom, 494) accepts this date. S. P. Pandit (op cit 66) says that this argument is not conclusive, as many other kings like Śilāditya of Malwa and Harṣavarādhana of Kanouj have similar titles. See also Hall (Introduction to Vasavadatta, 15), Nandargikar (Int to Raghuvamsa, 66), and Bhau Day, op cit 7. Weber (Malavaha and Agnimitra, Berlin) gives date between 2nd and 4th century A.D. T. S. Narayanasastri (Age of Sankara, p. 114) gives to Samudragupta the dates 321-270 B.C. according to the Puranas. On inscriptions of Samudragupta, see paras 8 to 10 supra.

3 AR, IX, 142, 156 See Wilford’s Essay on Vikramaditya and Salivahanas (AS, IX 117) and Nandargikar (op cit 66). S. P. Pandit (op cit 67) and Nandargikar (op cit 66) think that there are many Vikramādiyas and this reference in the Śaṭrumayamāhātmya is not conclusive on the date of Kālidāsa.
the authority of the Śaṭrunjayaṃāhāṭmya² which says that after 466
years of the era are elapsed there would appear the great and
famous Vikramādiśṭa, and his era Wilford understands to be the
Samvat era which began in 356 B.C. In his opinion J PRINCE and
H H Wilson concur

R C DUTT places Kālidāsa between 500 and 556 A.D.³

BHAU DAI identifies Mātrigupta with Kālidāsa and places him in
the reign of King Har-ā Vikramādiśṭa of Kāśmir in the middle of the
6th century A.D.⁴

His data have been thus summarised by Apte⁵ (i) The fact of
Mātrigupta being King of Kāśmir is in accordance with the tradition
that King Vikrama bestowed half of the kingdom on Kālidāsa
(ii) There is no objection on the ground of the names Mātrigupta
and Kālidāsa being different, because names are often titles, and
Mātrigupta may be taken as Kāligupta or Kālidāsa (m) The
author of Rajatarangini mentions other poets, even Bhavabhuti,
but does not mention Kālidāsa (iv) Kālidāsa was in all likelihood
a native of Kāśmir or a neighbouring province, because his illustra-
tions are chiefly derived from the natural history of those pro-
vinces (v) Meghaduta is simply a faithful picture of Kālidāsa’s feel-
ings caused by separation from his dear wife and home a fact related

1. The Śaṭrunjayaṃāhāṭmya was a Jain work by Dhaneśvarasurī. The
work was composed as it says under the patronage of King Ślādiśṭa at Valabhi,
who lived 477 years after Vikramākā, who is placed 470 years after the Vīra-
nurvāṇa. Vīra or Vārāhāmāna relates the legends connected with the mountain
sacred to Rāśabha, the first Jina. The narrator does not confine strictly to Jain
mythology, but includes the stories of the Rāmāyaṇa and Bhārata. The
language is noble, powerful and compares worthily with that of Bhatta Kāvyā
The date of the Vīranurvāṇa is very uncertain. V. Smith (EH, 46) makes Vīra
and Buddha contemporaries with one another and with Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru,
and dates Buddha’s death at 487 B.C. (See IA, II, 139, 193, 363, IX, 158; XI,
245, XIII 279, XX 360, XXI 57, XXIII 169 Merutūga dates Puyamantrā
in the period 323-53 after Mahāvīra (Weber, Sacred Literature of the Jains, 133).
For a full review of the date of Mahāvīra alīs Ālīs Vārāhāmāna, see S.K. Venka-
teswara [JRAS, (1917) 122], T S Narayana Sastri (Age of Sankara, 134 note)
places Vārāhāmāna between 1862-1782 B.C. see M C. Gaens, Life of Mahāvīra
(Allahabad), Jacobi, Introduction to BBE, XXI and XLV; Rockhill, Life of
Buddha, 104

2 Čei II 25

3 Literary Remains, 18 et seq., JBRAS, VII 19, 207 (Bhaù Dājī calls him
the author of Seṭubandha)

4 Date of Kālidāsa, (Central Press, Bombay), 8
also of Matrignupta. (vi) The 252nd verse of Rajatarangini attributed to Matrignupta contains exactly the same sense as is found in nearly the same words in the 11th verse of Meghaduta. When Matrignupta was installed king, with his eyes filled with tears through gratitude he wrote to Vikrama “Thou givest not one sign, thou squanderest no praises, thou dost not even announce thy intention of giving, and nevertheless thou sendest beautiful fruit” (vii) After the death of Vikrama, when Pravarasena came to the throne of Kashmir, Matrignupta retired to Benares, and there is a poem in Prakrit, called Setukayya, which tradition says was composed by Kalidasa at the request of Pravarasena. This poem is praised by Pratapendra and Dandin and Ramashrama as that of Kalidasa. Tradition also says that Pravarasena constructed a well-known bridge of boats across the Vitasta, and that it was in connection with this bridge-poem, Bana, a contemporary of Hiouen Thsang, says in his Haracarita —

कृति प्रवरसेनस प्रवत्ता कुम्भेश्वरालाः ||
सागरस पर पार करिमेने वेतुना ||

(vii) Matrignupta being thus identified with Kalidasa, the latter must be placed in the 6th century A.D. with Pravarasena and Vikrama. Bhau Daji says that Hiouen Thsang was the guest of Pravarasena.

14 Sir William Jones relies on a verse, which records the tradition that nine poets, ‘nine gems’ flourished at the Court of kind Vikramaditya and calls him a poet of the Court of a King who founded the era of Vikrama, or the Samvat era, in

1 Max Muller shows the inconsistency of this, and suggests that it was not Pravarasena but Baiditya who was most likely the host of the Chinese traveller. As Aptc rightly remarked, (op cit 11), Raghavabhata in his commentary on the Sākunīta quotes from Matrignupta and Kālidāsa, as different poets and gives the name of a work by Matrignupta, as a commentary on Bharata. Kṣemendra in his Auchiṭavīcāracarca, also quotes similarly from these poets, as distinct. See Peterson’s Paper on Aush 21 and paper on Patajali, 21 and Int to Subh 89. Here Peterson suggests that Matrignupta was identical with Matrignuptācārya, a writer on Alankāra. For a criticism of Bhau Day’s view, see also S P Pandit (op cit 68-75), Max Muller (India, 133, 314) and Nandargikar (op cit 68-76).

2 भव्यतीर्थराधिपकारिकारिलीपदेवायबाधितकारिकानीवादः ||
स्मायो पराहस्मिहिरो दयते समाया रत्नानि जै वरसनिविन्द विक्ष्मम ||

This verse is found in Jyotirvandbharaṇa, a treatise on astrology, attributed to Kālidāsa. (See JBRAS, VI 25, AR, VIII 242, X 402) The extracts necessary for reference are translated by Bhau Day (p c 10) Verse 21 of Chapter XXII says
that the work was completed in the month of Kartika of the year 3068 of Kali, that is 34 BC Bhan Daji and others say that this is a literary forgery, [Kern (Br Sl n 13, 17), Wilson Int to Vima Pana, viii] Weber (SL, 228), Max Muller (Indica, 327), Apte, (op cit 42] He says “In framing a rule for finding out the avanamsa, we are told in the work that from the number of years after Sakas (the era of śāhīvāhana, 78 AD) 445 years should be subtracted and the remainder divided by 6. This alone proves that the treatise was written at best seven centuries after Vikrama Samvat. Also as Jishnu, the father of Brahmagupta who gives the date of his work as 628 AD is stated to have graced the Court of Vikramaditya in addition to the nine gems, it is clear that the author of the Jyotirvīdamāharaṇa is sufficiently modern to have confounded Harsha Vikrama-
ditya of Ulwan in the 6th century with the founder of the Samvat era”.

There is a commentary on this work by Bhairava. He was the son of Bahlā and Mandana, a disciple of Mahmapābhāsuri of Paunrāmīya gacchha. It was written at Śrīpattana (Srnagar) in Śaka 1633 (1711 AD) See the Prasasti in the Ulwar catalogue, page 182, TC, III 3556

I K G Sankara Iyer (JMy VIII 279) sums up the view that the so-called Samvat era was not connected with the name of Vikramaditya till Inte in the 10th century. In 343 and 371 AD the era was called Kṛta, यात्रेतु चतुर्द्रि भानेदु नाशपतिलेखरपेदु इंकसरेवु (Gupta Ins 75), चतुर्द्रि चतुर्द्रि पश्चिमेनु अश्वाशिवु (Ibid 253) In 404 and 424 AD, it was called both “Kṛita” and “the era traditionally handed down by the Malava tribe” श्रीमाद्धवारांमाते मरस्रे हसस्वीते।एककर्षकिङ्करे माते समाजात्तिकुटुम्बे। (Ibid 87, 158) The earliest inscription of the era being called Vikrama is dated 842 AD (IA, XX 406) and that being connected with a king Vikramaditya is dated 971 AD (UBRAS, XXII, 166) and earliest literary date is 973 AD in Aṃtajati’s Subhāgitaratnasandoha (IA, XX, 406). Fleet collects these dates and says (Im Gas II 4) that the era “was founded by Kānshika in the sense that the opening years of it were the years of his reign, that it was set going as an era by his successor, who continued it and that it was accepted and perpetuated as an era by the Malava people and so was transmitted to posterity by them.” R.D Banerjee (JRAS, 1917) 273-289) tries to prove that in the first century BC, Malava was ruled by Nahapana and not by any king entitled Vikramaditya. See para 8 note supra.

Gopala Iyer (Ind Rev 1910) 505 considers that the era commemorated the consolidation of the tribes of Malwa into the great nation by King Chastana, the founder of the Kshatrapa dynasty in Malwa and Gujarāt. Hornblé (JRAS, 1909) 100] says that Yāfadharman changed the name of the Malwa era into Vikrama era V Smith (ER) and Bhārdarṣa (Ind Rev 1909) 405] say that Chandra-gupta I of the Gupta dynasty first assumed the title of Vikramaditya and changed the name C V Vaidya (Ind Rev 1909) 903] relies on Hāla’s Saptāsāti (V 64) of the 1st century AD praising liberality of Vikramaditya. He draws attention to a tradition rejected by Kalhaṇa II 3) that Pratāpāditya was a relative of Vikramaditya Ṛkṣi and asserts its truth, so that he considers that there were two Vikramadityas connected with Kashmir, the prior of them
Scthans

15 T. S. Narayana Sastri shows that Śri Harṣa Vikramādiṭāya of Kaśmir defeated the Śakas or the Persians and in commemoration of his victory founded the Harṣa era, in the year 457 BC and assigns Kālidāsa to his Court.

Apte inclines to the view of Sir William Jones. He considers that Aśvaghosa's Buddhacarita was modelled on Kālidāsa's Raghuvamsa, and as Aśvaghosa was a contemporary of Kanika, the highest limit for Kālidāsa is placed at 78 AD, on the other side, is mentioned connected with Praṃpadīṭa, being separated from the latter connected with Māryagupta by several centuries. He says "Though the era is mentioned in old documents as the era of the Malwa people or princes, this does not negative the idea of its being started by a particular king, secondly, the idea that any subsequent king utilised this era to commemorate his name is absurd and improbable" thirdly, that the identity of Vikramādiṭāya of the 1st century BC is proved beyond doubt by the mention of his name in Hala's Sapṭasatī, fourthly, that he was in ancient tradition recorded by Kalhana himself, regarded as Sakari and that he must have fought the battle of Karur as mentioned by Alberuni, fifthly, that the Śakas whom he overthrew most probably have been the Saka Šatrāps of Mathura and Taxila, whose disappearance in the 1st century BC has not been otherwise accounted for, sixthly, that the Takht-i-Bahi's inscription must be interpreted as giving the figure 103 in the era of 57 BC as Guduphares is connected by general tradition with the Apostle of St Thomas, and lastly, that this era could not have been founded by Kanushka." In his paper on Pandyas and the date of Kalidasa he refers to the mention of Uragapura in Raghuv, IV, 49 and VI 59-60 and says because Uragapura (Uraiav) was abandoned by Karikala as a Pandya capital in the 1st century A.D., Kalidasa must have known the capital in a flourishing condition, Kālidāsa must have lived earliest.

1 Somadeva in his Kathasantāpāgara (XVIII i) says that Vikramādiṭa destroyed the Mlecchas. For a similar account, see Kalhana's Rāj, III 125-8

नेच्छोद्धादाय कस्चाः हरिभवतिर्निति
शक्यनितिस्य केरिणाय वाकर्षभारो निवेदित ॥

See the discussion by Hultsch, IA, 261 and Stem's notes in his edition of Raj, II 6

2 Srs Harsh, the dramatist (Madras), Age of Sankara, (Madras). Part I, Ch I
24 and Introduction to Harshchandra-Vandgāthaya (Madras, 1917). The Shakas vanquished by the king are said to be the Persian hordes that invaded India from the province of Sace, under their monarch Cyrus the Great in 550 B.C. Narayana Sastri calls this Vikramādiṭa the patron of Bhāsa, so that Kālidāsa is according to him the younger contemporary.
144 B.C., as that of Patanjali, who refers to Pusyamitra. Agnimitra was the son of Pusyamitra and the hero of the Mālavikāgīnimitra.

16 K B Pathak discovers Vikrama in king Skandagupta, the conqueror of the Huns, who flourished about 450 A.D and makes Kālidāsa a contemporary of Kings Kumāragupta and Skandagupta, the latter being Vikramāditya II of the Gupta dynasty.

1 Apte’s Date of Kālidāsa (Bombay) This essay contains an elaborate review of the several opinions held on Kālidāsa. Apte says “Pusyamitra, the Sunga king, put the last Maurya King to death and came to the throne of Magadha in 183 B.C. His son Agnimitra is mentioned in this play as the king of Vidarbha. Mālavikā is the sister of Madhavasena and cousin of Yajnasena, the king of Berara. A quarrel arose between Madhavasena and Yajnasena about the succession to the throne, and the latter for a time took possession of the seals of the kingdom. Madhavasena thus humbled by misfortune, and aware of the danger which threatened him, secretly marched off with Mālavikā and his counsellor Sumati. He was taken prisoner, however, on the frontier, by a general of Yajnasena, though Mālavikā escaped. Now the prime minister of the Maurya king, who was a brother in law of Yajnasena, was kept in custody by Pusyamitra and his son Agnimitra. When Agnimitra demanded the release of Madhavasena, Yajnasena proposed an exchange of prisoners. This provoked Agnimitra to a severe retaliation. He sent an army against the king of Vidarbha and subdued him, and the kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two consuls. From these historical incidents it is clear that Kālidāsa cannot be put as we have seen, before the first king of the Sunga dynasty. Very little is known about these kings from the Puranas and it is probable that these events must be quite fresh in the memory of our poet, as the history of the Peshwais is in the memory of the Marathas of to-day.”

Arguments based on principles of law, medicine and geography are also added. On similar points, see S. P. Pendit (op. cit. 92) Nandargikar (op. cit 201) on a very similar argument places Kālidāsa somewhere between 280 and 100 B.C. Duff’s Indian Chronology gives date 178 B.C. for Pusyamitra and 140 B.C. for Patanjali. On Pusyamitra, see V. Smith (op. cit. 201, 218), Weber (op. cit. 224 note), Goldstucker (Panini, 228-228), IA, I, 299, II, 57, 69, 94, 206, 238, 923, XV 80, XVI 156, 173); JBRAS, XVI 161, 199 Bhandarkar’s Early History of Deccan, 180, IA, (1872) 929.

2 Introduction to Maghadata (Poonam) and IA, XLI 265 Pathak refers to Huns mentioned in Raghu, IV 66 83. He says that Hunas crossed the Oxus (or Vanshak) about A.D. 425 and defeated the Sasanian king Phrae in 484, but their empire was entirely destroyed by Khusrv Anushurvan, grandson of Phrae, between 568 and 567 A.D. The defeat of the Huns by Skandagupta is recorded in Junagad Rock Inscription dated in Gupta Samvat 136 (or A.D. 455 456). V. Smith’s statement that Skandagupta died about 480 A.D. (EH, 810) seems to be contradicted by the inscriptions (IA, XV 143) which show Kumāragupta as reigning in Gupta Samvat 154 (478 A.D.) and Bhuṭḍagupta as reigning in Gupta Samvat 157 (476 A.D.). T. S. Narayana Sastry assigns to Skandagupta B.C. 192 to 167 [Age of Skutara, App I, 125]. Apte (op. cit. 24) and Nandargikar (op. cit. 89) considers that the Hunas referred to in this verse are the Indo-Sythians who established a vast empire on the threshold of ancient India and on the borders of Bactria from the middle of the 3rd century B.C. to the close of the 1st or 2nd century A.D. Jayaswal (IA, XL 265) thinks that the
R. Hoernle accepts thus Har-a Vikramādiśya of Kāśmir and goes further in identifying him with Yāśodharman, King of C. India, as the conqueror of Kāśmir and the Huns about 490-550 A.D. and says that the memory of this great achievement survives in the Indian tradition which changed the name of the Mālava era into that of the Vikrama era.

Hun occupation of Kāśmir was after Mihirakula’s defeat in A.D. 530 and places Kālidaśa therefore about 520 or 550 A.D. On the Huna argument, see also Pathak [JBRAS, XIX 35] and Chakravarti [JBRAS, (1904) 168, (1908) 188], Bloch [ZDMG, (1903) 671], Schreiber (Das Datum Candragomin’s und Kāliidaśa’s, Berlin), Hoernle [JBRAS, (1903) 89, 144], Kennedy [JBRAS (1906), 870], Teleng’s Int to Andraśalesha, Cunningham’s paper on white Hunas in the Tr of the 9th Congress of the Orientalists and G. Huth (Das Zet des Kālaśa, Berlin) Pathak (JBRAS, XIX 35) also brings the time of Kāliidaśa being contemporary of King Kumāra dāsa of Ceylon in support of his date and concludes that Kālīdaśa must be placed in the first half of the 6th century or about 550 A.D. (As to this, see the life of Kumārāntasa post) Panna Lal [Dītes of Sāndagaṭa and his successors, Hindustan Review, (Jan. 1913) JBRAS, (1919) 293] gives to Sāndagaṭa 458-467 A.D. Pathak also relies on the allusion to Dungenā in Meghadūta and assigns him to the 6th century A.D. [V. Smith, op cit 329, JASB, (1905) 227] For a similar opinion, see Macdonell, (SL, 824), 804, Keith [JBRAS, (1909), 438 9] and B. C. Majumdar [JBRAS, (1909) 791]

1 JBRAS, (1903), 549, (1904) 639, (1909), 89; Hoernle’s arguments are summed up by J. J. Modi (Assam Papers, II 343-6) Hoernle relies on inscriptions on two Rana stambhas (columns of victory in war), recorded in CII, 11 147 8 (Inscriptions Nos 33 and 34) wherein the subjugation of kung Mihirakula and other Huna kings is expressly stated. He also refers to the tradition of the “Nine Gems” and infers that Kālīdaśa and Varāhambhura flourished at Yāśodharman’s Court. For this, see also Pathak (JBRAS, XIX 35), V. Smith (HC, 510) cites the authority of Huygen Tsang (Beal’s Records, I 195 72, Waiters, I, 1 288) and says that Yāśodharman’s boast was unfounded and gives the real credit of the defeat of the Huns to Narasmihagupta Balaśīta (485-535 A.D.). M. Chakravarti [JBRAS, (1908), 1857, (1904), 163] assigns the victory over the Huns to Sāndagaṭa; For a summary of Chakravarti’s views and criticism thereon, see J. J. Modi (Assam Papers, I 347) Haraprasada Sastri adds additional arguments to this view —

(i) Kālīdaśa’s limit of geography is Persia and he does not describe the western Empire of Rome. Persia was powerful in the 6th century A.D. and the reference to Persia (Rgīv 11 460) shows that it was powerful at that time.

(ii) The description of Skanda in the Meghadūta (I, 27) is of a statue of Skanda on horseback on Devagiri Hill on the road from Ujjain to Mandasor supposed to be erected by kung Sāndagaṭa.

(iii) Yāśodharman made the Hīmalayas for the first time accessible and Kālīdaśa describes the Hīmalayas.

These arguments about Yāśodharman &c. of Haraprasada Sastru are quoted and refuted in detail by R. G. Sankara Iyer (JMY, VIII 292) and D. Banerji (Ib. X 77 192).
Fergusson started a theory that the Vikramādiṭva of the Samvat era was Harṣa Vikramādiṭva of Ujjain who defeated the Mlechas at Karur in 544 A.D. and to give an air of antiquity to an era of his own started in commemoration of his victory, it was thrown back for 600 years, that is 10 cycles of 60 years, so that the Samvat era was imagined to have begun in 56 B.C. This is known as the Renaissance theory made much of by Max Muller.

Max Muller took up the idea of Fergusson and was ready with other arguments in its support. He refers to the commentary of Mallinātha on a verse in the Meghasaṃdeśa alluding to the poets Dingnāga and Nīcula as contemporaries of Kālidāsa and in fixing the date of Dingnāga as the pupil of Asāṅga gives the date of Kālidāsa as the 6th century A.D. ¹

¹ See para 8 supra
² Max Muller, The Renaissance in India, 1371-1707, pp. 111-1174

From this place, abounding in wet canes, rise into the sky with thy face to the north, avoiding on the way contact with the massive trunks of the quarter elephants, thy movements being watched by the silly wives of the Siddhas with their uplifted faces, full of surprise, as if the wind were carrying away the crest of the mountain.

From that place where stands thy champion Nāhula, ascended, O Muse, the heaven of invention, holding up thy head, and avoiding in the course of thy effort the salient faults indicated by Dingnāga with his hands, while thy flight is admired by good poets and fair women filled with surprise and looking upwards as if the genius of the almighty Dingnāga, were eclipsed by these. Pathak’s Meghaduta, 77.

Pathak (Ins to Prajñānātaka, TSS, No 42 xi, refers to a passage Dakṣināvaraṇa’s commentary on the Sanskrit verses in the Meghaduta. The Sunga era is translated by another of that poet’s verses and says that Kālidāsa was guilty of plagiarism from Bhāsa.

Apte (op cit 7), says that Mallinātha’s commentary is at best based on tradition and cannot at best be placed with the tradition of Kālidāsa, as a poet of kung Vikramādiṭya’s Court in 56 B.C. Seehagri Sastri (I, I, 240) says Nicula wrote a commentary on lexicum Nāhārthañabodaraṇavaḷi written by one Kālidāsa at the Court of King Bhosa (See DC, III 1171-1174) and this must be a different author of a very late age, as this lexicum is not referred to by the author of the Međum, who is particular in enumerating all the names of authors and works on lexicography.

There seems to be much merit in the tradition of an allusion to Dingnāga in this verse and the recent discovery of a work called Ḫastavūla by F W Thomas makes the quotation more interesting. Referring to the above work of which a Tibetan translation
MAHĀ-KĀVYA

18 P V Kane thinks that Kāmandakī in the Nīṣāra appears to criticize the advantages of hunting as depicted by Kālīdāsa and that Varāhamihira took his list of poisoned kings from Kāmandakī. On

now exists (Tantur Aldo, XVII 312, XVIII 21) ascribed generally to Āryadeva, a predecessor of Dingnāga, Thomas conjectures that the commentary on it might be the work of Dingnāga. He says (JRAS (1918) 118), “It might have seemed to Kālīdāsa to deserve the epithet śhūla, ‘coarse,’ or unsuitable the standing epithet which philosophers affix to what they regard as merely prima facie views. And pro tanto, we should have an argument in favour of Mallinatha’s suggestion of a slighting allusion to that philosopher in the very quoted supra. It is certainly noticeable coincidence that Dingnāga should be a reputed author of a work so called and there is a further concurrence with the fact that the fifth of the six Karikas comprising the text appears to the subtle (subhāma) munda, who are to forgive belief in coarse (sthala) things. But unfortunately the Chinese tradition appears to fluctuate regarding the authorship which is sometimes assumed in fact to Āryadeva. I have advanced the suggestion that Āryadeva was author of the text, Dingnāga, who often functions as a commentator, of the commentary. If so the fact has certainly some significance. The Hana treatise, an extremely compendious demonstration of the vijnana or else the sūnyatā doctrine (the latter term is not mentioned) may well have been a familiar as controversial weapon and so have provoked a slighting mention by Kālīdāsa.”

Dingnāga is a celebrated author on Pramana Sastra. See Weber (op cit 209 note); Watantom “On the life of Dingnāga (Japanese Oriental Philosophy (1904) No. 5, Cowell, Preface to Kaumudīja, vii, Hall (op cit 9), JBRAS, XVIII 239, XVII 61, Taranatha, History of Buddhism, 118 S P Pandit (op cit 76 82), Goldschmidt, ZDMG, XXVI 928, Lecou, Das Datum des Kalidasa (Strassburg) 201, 1A, XLI 344 (Huang refers to Dingnāga as later than Vasubandhū and places him between 475 and 525. And Vasubandhū was a contemporary of Candraputra II, and his literary career occupies the first three-quarters of the 6th century. See Maghasandesa vimarśa, page 15, Peterson’s Int to Sub 46.

Pathak (IA, XIV 244) and V Smith (EH 393) and K C Sankara Iyer (Jn 1905 85) place Dingnāga in the 5th century A D. These opinions of Dingnāga’s dates are based on the Tibetan tradition (JASB, (1905), 297) that Dingnāga was a disciple of Vasubandhū. According to Chinese tradition Vasubandhū and his elder brother Asanga lived 900 years after the death of Buddha. Thus starting point, namely Buddha’s death, is so uncertain, that the fabric constructed on such basis must necessarily be unreliable and inconclusive. For instance, Buddha’ Nirvāṇa is placed by Northern Buddhists in 442 BC, Aml Abhis at 1246 BC, Southern Buddhists 548 BC, Rhys Davids 410 BC, Kern, 588 BC, Max Muller, 477 BC, Fleet (JNAS, (1909) 179, 669) 488 BC, Oldenburg and Barth (Ind Rev VIII 551), Gopala Iyer (Ind Rev 1903, 384) 497 BC, Kirtikar (Ind Rev 1903, 101) 500 BC, V Smith (Asokā EH, 473) finds some coincidences and fixes the date 487 BC.

On Vasubandhū’s date, see Paramartha’s Life of Vasubandhū, Madonnell (SL, 828), S C Vidyaabhusan (JASB (1905) 227), N Peri Bull du l’Ecole fr. d’Extreme Orient, XI 369 90, Pathak (IA, (1911), 170, (1912), 244), Hoernle LI, (1911) 964, R Narasamhacharya, (Ind 212) D R Bhandarkar (IA, (1912) 1) Harappasad Sastra (Indb. 15), Watters (I 210), Taikhrus (JNAS, (1905), 44) and Life of Vasubandhū.
this reasoning he says that Kāmandakā being older than Bhavabhūti, Kālidāsa must be earlier than 6th century A.D.¹

19 Kern and Bhandarkar accept the tradition of the "Nine Gems" that Varāhamihira and Kālidāsa were contemporaries and while fixing the date of Varāhamihira's work from a statement of Amoraja about 387 A.D., they say that his friend Kālidāsa must have lived about the latter part of the 6th century A.D.²

Tod says "while Hindu literature survives, the name of Bhoja Paramāra and the nine gems of his Court cannot perish though it is difficult to say who of the three princes of his name is particularly alluded to op cit as they all appear to have been patrons of Science.'

1. (IA, XL 236 note) This conclusion would show that Varāhamihira and Kālidāsa were not contemporaries But A F. Hoernle (IA, XII 156) controverts this view Carlo Formichi in his paper on Kāmandākī's Nātasa before the 15th Congress of Orientalists of Rome argues that Kāmandakā was either a contemporary of or earlier than Varāhamihira who flourished, as he said, between 505 and 587 A.D. Jacobi however in his paper on Indian Philosophy (Sitzungsberichte, XXXV) places Kāmandākā earlier than the 6th century Weber (IX, III 145) and (IL, 271 note) inclines to the same view and says (op cit 325) that the Kavi Translation of the work probably belongs at the earliest to about the same date as the translation of the Mahābhārata. See also Int to the book edited in Truvandrum Sanskrit Series No 14, with the commentary of Sanskarya and Bahl Ind (1849 61) The lists poisoned kings in Kāmandākā was taken from Koutalya's Mathāsara and hence Varāhamihira need not be indebted to Kāmandākā.

2 Kern (Preface to Brāhatāmṛta, 20) Bhandarkar (Early History of the Deccan, 12, JBRAS, XIV 24) Bhau Daji (op cit 45) Amoraja wrote a commentary on the Khanda Khādy of Brahmagupta, who lived in 628 A.D. On these astronomers, see Bhau Daji's (op cit 222-168) Colebrooke (Essays, II 434) assigned Varāhamihira to the end of the 6th century A.D. See also Fleet, OII, III App 145, JASO, VI Art 3, and JBRAS, NS I 407, 392 This opinion, says S P Pandit (op cit 69), also rests on the unreliable authority of the memorial verse on "Nine Gems." On this question see also Apte (op cit 2) M Duff (Ind Chr) gives date 587 A.D. See also The Pandit, NS XIV 13 Kern also relies on an inscription in the Buddhist Temple at Gaya which according to Cunningham shows that that temple was built by Amaradeva, one of the nine gems of Vikrama. Kern also says that Jisnh, the father of Brahmagupta, was a contemporary of Kālidāsa and in 688, Brahmagupta was 80 years of age and Varāhamihira's date, 587 A.D., confirms this tradition See Max Muller, op cit 327, Apte, op cit 2

Bhandarkar (Ind, Rev. (1909) 405) says that Chandragupta II, Vikramādiśa, put an end to the Śaka dynasty ruling over Ujjain and also the Kushana dynasty and he was probably the famous Vikramādiśa Śakān, the patron of the learned poets and fixes his dates 888 412 A.D.

3 Annals of Rajasthan, I 92, Tod gives for the three kings of that time Samvat 831, 721, 1100, that is, 575, 665 and 1044 A.D., respectively. See also Bhau Daji (op cit 8)
BEVTELEY relies on the authority of the Bhojaprabandha and makes Kalidasa a poet of the Court of King Bhoja of Dhar in the 11th century A.D.

20. Of direct references to Kalidasa the Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II is the earliest and it is dated 634 A.D. The famous Mandassor inscription contains an exquisite panegyric by Vatsabhatu and several verses in it have a very close resemblance to some in Kalidasa’s Meghasandesa and R̄tusumhira. This Panegyric was composed in 472 A.D.

21. The theory of the “Nine Gems” of Vikrama’s Court may not be accepted as real history. Jñānavibhārana may be a forgery of a late date or the verse that embodies the story may be an interpolation. But the fact remains that the tradition was current as early as the 7th or 8th century A.D. Subandhu alludes to it and the allusion cannot be easily explained away. The tradition has become so saturated with the Indian sentiment, that it is impossible for any orientalist to shake off the impression. The feeling has become so intuitive that whenever any researcher, sceptic as he is towards anything save bare historical evidence, discovers a King, as the patron of Kalidasa, be he Samudragupta, Kumāragupta or Candragupta, Yaśodharman, Harṣa, Śūdra, of the centuries before or after the era of Grace, the theorist always seeks to trace an association of his name with the appellation of Vikramādiṭṭha. If in fact the tradition is false or unreliable, why should this anxiety be evinced everywhere to connect the name with a Vikramādiṭṭha at all?

1 Annali Researches, VIII 243 Bhan Daji (op cit 6 and JBBAS, VI 23 note) and S.P. Pandit (op cit 63) and Nandargikar (op cit 69) say that Bhoja Prabhanda is a medley and is of little value as history. On this work, see under Bhoja post.

2. वैष्णोधयिनीस्म सदर्मर्थविभागलिकिना विवेकानिबिन्नविन्यास ।
विनविना रिभिविभच कवितासितकालिन्दाससारविभिन्निति ||

IA, VIII 297

3 On this similarity, see Apte (op cit 14) Kielhorn [Got N (1890), 257, IA, XIX 285] S.P. Pandit (op cit 127) and Leibich (Annual Rep of the Sch Ges fur Vaterlandshe Kultur Breslaw, 1908, 6-7) rely on the identity of the verses in R̄tusumhira (V 2 3) and fix Kalidasa’s date before 478 A.D. See Jacobi (VOJ, III, 127) Hoernle [JBBAS, (1909), 41] criticises this view.

4 Fiesl’s CL, III 65 69, see para 10 supra

5 सारस्वतिलिखिता नवका विनविना चरित्रि नो काम ।
सरस्वती कवितासित गतिति नुवै विक्रमादित्ये। ||

Hoernle and Harssprasad Sastri take this verse to refer to Candragupta Vikramādiṭṭha (See IA, XLI 1, 15) who died according to them about 418 A.D., but they ignore the effect of the word navaka, which curiously alludes by the pun on it to the nine gems.
Among the several data that have formed the basis of discussion, it may not be possible to make light of at least a few. The idea that the hero of the Mālavikāgummitra was the king Agnimitra of the Sunga dynasty and the allusion to the successive names of Gupta kings or the reference to the names of Pūrgnāga in his works, are all expressions of material evidence, which must command a serious consideration in the determination of dates. But when an argument as to age is to be invoked on internal evidence, it necessarily follows that the conclusion can hold good only in respect of the particular work that shows the evidence, and it is a mistake to follow an a priori reasoning and to assert that the conclusion is good as the standard for all works, fathered on the name of Kālidāsa.

Of external evidence, there is nothing safe to go by Vikramādiśa or the 'Sun of Valour' is more an appellation than a name and the title has come to be a formal attribute to any ruler in India irrespective of distinction. The literature of the inscriptions abounds in such instances Of Vikramādiśa, was he a reality and if he is, where is his identity? Of the Śakas, were they the Persians or the Indo-Scythians? Of the Huns, were they the marauders of the countries, before or after the Christian era? Of Pūrgnāga, when did he flourish? It is dependent upon Asanga, that on Vasubandhu and that on Buddha, which still hangs in the air. Of Advaghosha, was he a contemporary of Kanaka and when did Kanaka rule over Indian dominions? Of Agnimitra, was he the son of Pusyamitra and if he was referred to in the Mahābhāṣya of Paṇaṇjala, when did Paṇaṇjala flourish? Of Greek astronomy, did Kālidāsa copy from Aryanahata and when was the Greek astronomy brought into India? These are questions that are yet to be answered with unanimity and until then such external evidence can only beget a diversity of conclusion.

1. Kilhorn (IA, XX 409) as summed up by Fleet, (IA, XXX 4), says "The word Vikrama, from which the idea of the King Vikrama or Vikramadhitya was evoked most probably came to be connected with the era by the poets, because the year of reckoning originally began in the autumn and the autumn was the season of commencement of campaigns and was in short the Vikramakāla or war time".


Ksheitraghochandra Chattopadhyaya (All On Studies, II 60 et seq) elaborately discusses the date of Kālidāsa and says Vikramaditya, who was Kālidāsa's patron was son of Gardabhūla. He refers to passages from Kālakācarya Kathānaka, from which extracts are given by Rapson in Cambridge History of India (532 5).
23 In this state of uncertainty the student of research is bewildered and if the arguments advanced by various scholars are all accepted it would be impossible to fast all the works that go by the name of Kālidāsa on one Kālidāsa As early as 8th and 9th century A.D. the existence of three Kālidāsas in the past age appears to have been noticed Devendra author of Kaykālapalatā refers to it and Rāja-sekharā and Abhinanda seem to say so

24 T S Naravana Sastri in his introduction to Haridūmba Vaidagdha, an epitome of Bhāsa’s Madhuvamavāvoga, classifies the works under several Kālidāsas thus

1 Kālidāsa (I) aliases Matrgopīa of the court of King Harṣa Vikramādiśa of Ujjain who lived in the 6th Century B.C. He was the author of the three plays and the Mahākāvya Setubandha

2 Kālidāsa (II), aliases Medharudra of the Court of King Vikramarka of Malwa the founder of the Malava era in 57 B.C. He wrote the three poems Kumārasambhava, Raghuvamśa and Meghadūta and a treatise on astronomy Jvotirvidābharana

---

1 See OO, I 99, Kavyamālā, I 8
2 युक्तसागर सन्तानो न नेतरसि् सुक्तमुक्तावत्
3 हृदयोत्सप्नयो श्रीपालिको नीति रामचरिकोरा
4 In his commentary on this poem King Ramadāsa of Jayapura who lived in the days of King Akbar says

Setubandha or Rārayavadhā in 16 verses describes the story of Rāma, the building of the Seta and the defeat of Rāvana. It is perhaps the best poem in Prakrit literature and may certainly have been the production of Kālidāsa. There are commendations by Ramadāsa, written at the instance of Emperor Akbar in 1595 A.D. and by Kalānātha, Sri Kṛṣṇa Madhavayavan Ed Bombay with Ramadāsa’s commentary Ed Gottingen and translated by Goldschmidt (Strassburg) See Stein Konow’s Int to Karpurmanjan [HOS No 5 194] and S P Pandit [Int to Baghu, 72] Apte, Date of Kālidāsa, 41 Dapin calls it “an ocean of jewels of beautiful sentences” Bāṇa praises Prayacāśana and his poet Setn Vidyānātha calls the poem Mahāprabandha and quotes an śārya from it.

5 This bears date 3063 Kali or 84 B.C. In the Segādhyāya the poet says —

नालिकदशुद्धिप्रदुर्गुरुऽज्जत ततो नमुन्य द्यायात्मकार्यम्

व्यत्पदायितममकालविवाहशाश्व श्रीकालिदाचक्रितस्य हि ततो बंदुः
MAHĀ-KAVYA

III KALIDASA (III), alias KOTTIJA a disciple of Mīka Sankar of Kamakoti Peetam (1397-1430 AD) He wrote Kuśamaara, Śrṅgāra-tīlaka, Śyāmalādandaka, Navaratnamāla and many minor poems and Sruṇtabodha (on prosody)

[These three are said to represent कालिदासचन्द्रि mentioned by Rūpa-khāra]

IV PARIMALA KALIDASĀ (IV), alias PAUMĀGUPTA, contemporary of King Munja of Dhāra and author of Navāsāhasānākacakanta

V KALIDASA (V) known as YAMAKAKAVI, author of the poem Nalodaya

VI NAVĀ KALIDASĀ (VI), author of Champu Bhāgavata

VII KALIDASA ĀBARMATA (VII) contemporary of King Akbar, composed a number of Samasyas

VIII KALIDASA (VIII), author of Lambodara Prahasana

IX ABHINAVA KALIDASĀ, alias MADHVA, author of Sankṣepasānkāravrjayam

25 Raghuvamsa in 19 cantos narrates the history of the race of Raghu and in five cantos, 10 to 15, the story of Rama's life is recounted. Then follows an account of the successors of Rāma until Agnivarna. The last canto presents to us the coronation of his posthumous prince then in embryo and the verse is enchanting. It is said that his object might have been to connect some one of the dynasties of kings existing in his time with the race descended from the Sun and others think that Kalidasa was a contemporary of Agnivarna, with

1 He is quoted by Hari in his Subhāṣitabārāvah. See Thomas, Kav 14

For comparison of verses in Raghuvamsa and other poems of Kālidāsa with Āśvaghoṣa's verses, see references under Āśvaghoṣa. For a historical appreciation of the kings and kingdoms mentioned in Raghuvamsa, see Kshetresa Chandra Chattopadhyaya's Date of Kalidasa, (All Un Studies, II 76 et seq) There he says that the poem was complete and that Agnivarna was probably Devabhumi of the Sunga dynasty who was slaughtered by his indignant Brahmin minister Vāsudava (I, c. 154). S Ray (Int to Sakuntala, 28) says Kāṇḍa can be contemporary of Agnimitra, the hero of Mālavikāgnimitra.

8 तथात्तपर्यन्तनेत्रविविधिर्विविधिलोकः
दृष्टिविर्योतकक्तेऽप्रभायतितस्।
निर्माणित कलकुश्मायुधाविनितन
बबासिखेकविकिर्न शिक्षिरण सम्।। Ragh. XIX 58,
whose death the poem, as it is, ends. Either Kālidāsa did not finish his poem or the rest of the entire poem has not come down to us.

The following 21 Kings are mentioned Čitipā, Raghu, Aja, Dasaratha, Rāma, Kuśa, Arīghi, Nisadha, Nala, Nālīka, Pandūrika, Kṣemadhanva, Devāntika, Ahīmanu, Pārvatīra, Śīla, Unnābbha, Vajraghosa, Sankhana, Vuyyāśva, Visvasaha, Hiranāvalīha, Kamsalya, Brahmuha, Putra, Punva, Dhruvasandhi, Sudarśana, Agnvarna.

5 Pandit examines these lists as given in the Rāmāvana and Vāyu and Vishnu Purānas and concludes, “The list of the kings as given by Kālidāsa in his Raghuvamsa does not at all agree with that given in the Ramayana but it generally agrees with those which are found in the Vāyu Purana and the Vishnu Purana. Some difference of course is observed even between the list of Kālidāsa and those of the Puranas. From these lists of the kings it is clear that Kālidāsa has not adopted the Ramayana as the basis of his Raghuvamsa. It also appears probably that the author of the Raghuvamsa and of the Vāyu Purana had a common source to draw their materials upon which is now beyond the hope of recovery. The Ramayana gives two kings between Čitipā and Raghu and between Raghu and Aja are mentioned eleven kings, while in the Vāyu Purana between Raghu and Čitipā intervenes Dīrghabahu and Aja is mentioned as the son of Raghu. And this statement tallies well with Vishnu Purana.”

26. Kumarasambhava, a poem in 17 cantos, describes the birth of Kumāra, the War God. As antecedent history, the poem narrates the supplication of the Gods to Lord Śiva for the creation of a general for the forces of the Gods, capable of destroying their enemy Tāraka, whose depredations they were then unable to bear. Then follow the birth of Pārvatī as the daughter of Himācal, Śiva’s penance in the Himalayas and his marriage with Pārvatī. With the union of Śiva and Pārvatī, the 8th canto closes and the remaining cantos describe the story of the birth of Kumāra and destruction of Tāraka. Kālidāsa was a great votary of Vālmikī and named his poem after the verse of Rāmāvana.

पुष्च ते राम गङ्गाया • किर्त्तरोकमिहितो मथा ।
कृष्णसंभवैन भवय • पुष्पवत्तेवेव च ॥

Bālakānda, xxxvii, 32

“The birth of the War God,” says Griffith “was either left unfinished

1 Ed. with notes and English translation by M. R. Kale (Cantos 1-8) Translated into English poetry by Griffith (Oriental Tr. Fund Ser.).
or time has robbed us of the conclusion. The latter is the more probable supposition, tradition informing us that the poem originally consisted of 22 cantos. The language of cantos 9 to 17 is inferior to the language of cantos 1 to 8, and commentators have noticed only cantos 1 to 8, it is therefore said that cantos 9 to 17 are not the work of Kālidāsa. There are some who say that cantos 8 in which the amorous pleasures of actual union between Śrīva and Pārvitī are described is also not the work of Kālidāsa, because it is a sacrilege and Кālidāsa would not have been guilty of it. These objections are answered by Narajana Pandita in his commentary Vivarana.

1 B. V. Krishnamacharya (Sah. 165) collects defects of language and expression in cantos 9 to 17 and generally says

Narajana...
There are commentaries on Raghuvamsa by Narayana by

There are commentaries on Raghuvamsa by Narayana by

...
Sūmatiñījaya, by Udayākara, by Hemādri, by Vallabha, by Haradhva, by Cāriñtravadhanā, by Mallinātha, by Dīnakara, by Vījāvagam, by Dharmameti, three anonymous, by Bhāraṭasāra, by Bhīṣapatimitra, by Kṛnapatiśarma, Gunavijayagami, Gopinītha Kauṛīja, Janārdana, Mahēsvara, Nagnadhara, Bhagirathā, Bhāvadevi-mitra, Rāmabhadrā, Kṛnaśrīhatta, Trividākara, Iṣṭotaka, Śrīnātha, Arupagmītha, Rātanacandra, Bhāgavahamsa, Jñānendriya.

1 PR, IV 28, 29, Dec Col No 46, Kash Cat 72. He was a native of Vīrmānpura (Bikaneer?) and composed his work between A.D. 1635-48. He quotes Vallabha and Kṛṇabhāttā. The manuscript contains all the 19 Cantos. S.P. Pandit’s I c 11, Nandargikar I c 24.

2 PR, IV 28, 29.

3 PR, III 295, B, II 100, TO, IV 5574. He refers to commentators Viṣṭarakāra, Daḵṣināvarta, Kṛṣṇa and Vallabha. S.P. Pandit I c 10, Nandargikar I c 12.

4 PR, I 118, II 28, 29. S.P. Pandit I c 10, Nandargikar, I c 10, and Durgaprasad I v, to Raytha 5. He is quoted by Hemādri, Cāriñtravadhanā, Mallinātha, and Sūmatiñījaya.

5 PR, IV 29. He was son of Viṣṇudāsa.

6 PR, II, 189. III 210, IV App 210 xxvii. Kash Cat 72. He was a Jain and wrote at the request of Sādhu Ardakvamalla of Śrīmatsa race. He mentions commentaries by Bhūja, Vallabha, Viṣṭarakāra, Daḵṣināvarta and Kṛṇabhāttā.

7 Ed Bombay, Madras and elsewhere.

8 B, II 100. He was son of Dharmāngada and Kamalā. He wrote his commentary in Samvat 1441 (=1885 A.D.) He was probably a contemporary of Mallinātha and copied Chāriñtravadhanā. He refers to a commentator Prabhākara. For S.P. Pandit’s remarks see I c 17.

9 Dec Col No 44. He was pupil of Rāmavijaya of Tapagaccha. The manuscript is a fragment and breaks off in 16th Canto.


11 The author of one was pupil of Vījaya Nandadasa. See NP, VII 14, Radh, 29, Op 2975.

12 IO, 551, VII 1416, 1420. He was son of GauriKavamalla of Ambajta Vaidya Hanarkhān family and lived in the 18th century. He has commented on other Mahākāvyas also (See CO, II 418).

13 IO, 551, 997, VII 1420.

14 Metra Rep VII, L 2404.

15 L 3060.

16 L 1194.

17 B, II 100.

18 Op 8156, TO, IV 5543.

19 NW 620.

20 L 1421.

21 L 2974.

22 Metra Rep VII, L 2505. He was Nyayalankarā.

23 Rgy 395.

24 Rgy 395.

25 Kash Cat, 71.

26 Cu, 1896.

27 BC, 811, Ed Trichur.

28 Bd, 446.

29 Bd, 447.

PR, IV 28. 84, Dec Col No 46, Kash Cat 72. He was a native of Vikrama-pura (Bikaneer?) and composed his work between A.D. 1635-48. He quotes Vallabha and Kṛṇabhātta. The manuscript contains all the 19 Cantos. S.P. Pandit’s I c 11, Nandargikar I c 24.

PR, IV 28, 29.

PR, III 295, B, II 100, TO, IV 5574. He refers to commentators Viṣṭarakāra, Daḵṣināvarta, Kṛṣṇa and Vallabha. S.P. Pandit I c 10, Nandargikar I c 12.

PR, I 118, II 28, 29. S.P. Pandit I c 10, Nandargikar, I c 10 and Durgaprasad I v, to Raytha 5. He is quoted by Hemādri, Cāriñtravadhanā, Mallinātha, and Sūmatiñījaya.

PR, IV 29. He was son of Viṣṇudāsa.

PR, II, 189. III 210, IV App 210 xxvii. Kash Cat 72. He was a Jain and wrote at the request of Sādhu Ardakvamalla of Śrīmatsa race. He mentions commentaries by Bhūja, Vallabha, Viṣṭarakāra, Daḵṣināvarta and Kṛṇabhāttā.

Ed Bombay, Madras and elsewhere.

B, II 100. He was son of Dharmāngada and Kamalā. He wrote his commentary in Samvat 1441 (=1885 A.D.) He was probably a contemporary of Mallinātha and copied Chāriñtravadhanā. He refers to a commentator Prabhākara. For S.P. Pandit’s remarks see I c 17.

Dec Col No 44. He was pupil of Rāmavijaya of Tapagaccha. The manuscript is a fragment and breaks off in 16th Canto.


The author of one was pupil of Vījaya Nandadasa. See NP, VII 14, Radh, 29, Op 2975.

IO, 551, VII 1416, 1420. He was son of GauriKavamalla of Ambajta Vaidya Hanarkhān family and lived in the 18th century. He has commented on other Mahākāvyas also (See CO, II 418).

IO, 551, 997, VII 1420.

Metra Rep VII, L 2404.

L 3060.

L 1194.

B, II 100.

Op 8156, TO, IV 5543.

NW 620.

L 1421.

L 2974.

Metra Rep VII, L 2505. He was Nyayalankarā.

Rgy 395.

Rgy 395.

Kash Cat, 71.

Cu, 1896.

BC, 811, Ed Trichur.

Bd, 446.

Bd, 447.
There are commentaries on Kumāra-Sambhava by Kṛṣṇapati Śarma, Kṛṣṇamitra, Gopālānanda, Govindarāma, Cāṅtravardhana, Jinabhadrāsūri, Nārāhara, Prabhākara, Bṛha-paṭi, Bharatasaṇa, Bhīmamātra, Vīmaṭrattva, Mahīnātha, Raghunāṭi, Vatsa or Vāśa Vātsa, Anandadeva, Vaiśnavavallabhā, Vaiśnavadeva, Vindhyesvarapraṇāda, Haricaranaḍāsa, Navantarāma, Bharatamallaka, Jayasimha, Lakśmīvallabhā, Dakṣa-vartanātha, Vidvāmādhava, Nandagopa, Sītārama, Nārājana, Haridāsa, Arunagirinātha, Gopālādāsa, Rākalavacapati, Sarasvatitīrtha, Rāma Pūrasav, Ṣīhānanda Vidvāsāgara, Kumārasena and two anonymous.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇapati Śarma</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇamitra</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopālānanda</td>
<td>Govindarāma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāṅtravardhana</td>
<td>Jinabhadrāsūri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārāhara</td>
<td>Prabhākara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛha-paṭi</td>
<td>Bharatasaṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīmamātra</td>
<td>Vīmaṭrattva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīmaṭrattva</td>
<td>Mahīnātha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghunāṭi</td>
<td>Vatsa or Vāśa Vātsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anandadeva</td>
<td>Vaiśnavavallabhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśnavadeva</td>
<td>Vindhyesvarapraṇāda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haricaranaḍāsa</td>
<td>Navantarāma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navantarāma</td>
<td>Bharatamallaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimha</td>
<td>Lakśmīvallabhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakṣa-vartanātha</td>
<td>Vidvāmādhava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandagopa</td>
<td>Sītārama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārājana</td>
<td>Haridāsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunagirinātha</td>
<td>Gopālādāsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rākalavacapati</td>
<td>Sarasvatitīrtha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāma Pūrasav</td>
<td>Ṣīhānanda Vidvāsāgara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārasena</td>
<td>Two anonymous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. BC, 410
2. S P Pandit, *Int. to Ragh 26*
3. IO, 551
4. Ed Calcutta
5. Lah 4
6. Dec Col No 65
7. Manuscript in Madras library
8. Kash Cat 71
9. Ed Benares
10. L 2408, *Vitra Rep VII*

This commentary refers to earlier voluminous commentaries by Jayasimha and Dakṣa-vartanātha now unknown.

11. Oudh X 6
12. IO, 222, AS, 47
13. L, 701
14. Kh 65, Ed Bombay, Benares
15. Lah 4, Ryb 337
16. B 156, De, 171
17. B 2
18. IO, 228, 1073
19. IO, 229
20. Oudh XIX 42
21. PR, II 54
22. Ed everywhere
23. L 1964, on 8 cantos
24. B 2, 78, BP, 17
25. Oudh, XIV 28, PR, I 114
26. PR, I 114, NW, 614
27. NW 840
28. Ed Calcutta
29. AS, 47
30. AS, 47
31. TC, IV 4715, 4719
32. Sah XIX 106
33. TC, III 3833
34. IC, II 2592, *Kup Rep* (1916 10)
35. IO, 228
36. L, 2369, Ed Bombay (Cantos)
37. DO, XX 7720 2, TC, IV 5014, 5643
38. Ed Trivandrum
39. Ed Trivandrum
40. PR, IV 25
41. Ed Calcutta
42. Kash Cat 57
43. Calcutta State Library
44. Ed Calcutta
45. B Or RI, Cat, 46 (9 cantos)
46. Ibid 14–15 (7 and 8 cantos).
R Krishnamāchārīya's Raghunāmsa-vimāraṇa and Kumārasambhavavimāraṇa are running critiques on these poems commenting on their innate excellences. Raghunākṣepa gives a succinct account of Raghunāmaṇa Kumāraśāja, son of Īśvarārva, of Vatsagotra and Kumārodāya, by Koraḍa Ramachandra relate the same story Kumārasambhavasūra in a Jain work.

29 The commentators — Vallabha was the son of Ananda-deva and was a follower of Kashmir ṛṣi. He criticises Hemacandra's opinion expressed in his Sanskrit grammar and is attacked in Ganarātanāmabhodhādi completed in 1141 A.D. Hemacandra lived in Jayasimha's reign (1094-1143 A.D.) K B Pathak therefore says that Vallabha must have finished his commentary on Kumārasambhava about 1120 or a few years before 1141 A.D. S P Pandit says he must have lived long before Dīnakara, that is, 1383 A.D. Durgaprasād identified him with Vallabhadeva, grandfather of Kayyata, who wrote in 977-8 AD and Hultzsch and Peterson agree with him, and the latter says that the verses quoted in Subhāvatāla and Sāngadharapaddhati under Vallabhadeva must have been by the commentator Vallabhadeva. These verses show excellent poetry.

Kayyata was the son of Candradīva and wrote a commentary on Anandavardhana's Devīśataka in 977 A.D. He is different from Kayyata, son Jayyata, author of Bāṣyapradīpa.

---

1 Ed Madras
2 S P Pandit's Int to Ragh, 16 17
3 TC, IV 5618 (4) He is the author of Akhilāndanāyakidānaka (TC, IV 5619)
4 Ed Masulipatam
5 Ed Bombay
6 For a distinction of this author from the anthologist Vallabha, see S K De, JRAS, (1927), 471-7, (1928), 403 and D C Ghatala, JRAS, (1928), 185
7 See for his life, later in this Chapter
8 Int to Megha
9 Int to Ragh, 10
10 Int to Vakroki-pancūkika
11 Int to Megha
12 Int to Subh
13 See for his life, later in this Chapter
14 Int to Vakroki-pancūkika
15 Int to Subh
MAHĀ-KĀVYA

30 HEMADRI, known as Makkibhata was the son of Īśvarasūri. He mentions Mahrāṭa brāhmaṇ and he might therefore have been a Mahrāṭa brāhmaṇ. He came after Vallabha Vāmanācārya in his introduction to Kāvya-prakāśa says that he must have been a resident of Gaṅeṣnagad in Dharwar District. His commentaries are replete with innumerable quotations. He was counsellor of Maha-deva and Ramaṇa, the Yādava kings of Devagiri who ruled from 1271 to 1309 A.D. Bopadeva was his protege.

31 MALLINĀTHA, Telugu brāhmaṇ of Kāśyapa gotra of Kolacala-familv, was the grandson of Mallinātha and son of Kapardī. Pedībhata or Pedīyārā and Kumāraswāmin were his sons. The latter was the commentator on Pratīṣṭhāpradī. Mallinātha had Kanakābhiseka (both in gold and pearls) at the hands of Sarvajñā. Singabhūpāla, evidently of Recharla family, on the occasion of odaśa sacrifice, which he performed with the help of his four brothers, four sons, four sons-in-law and four relatives. He was invited by Devaraja (1) of Vijaynagar to settle some contests about the terms raiśya and vyāpāra in connection with a stone inscription found at Conjeevaram. The manuscript containing his judgment is found in the G O Library, Myśore. This gives him a date of 1400–14 A.D. Mallinātha quotes from Sāhitya-cintāmaṇi, a work of Komaśayana of 1409 A.D.

K B Pathak says “Mallinātha frequently quotes the Saṅgītaratnākara a work composed in the time of Yādava king Singhahaṇa who reigned from Saka 1133–1150. In his commentary on the Kumāra-sambhava (II s 1.) Mallinātha mentions Bopadeva, the author of the Muddhabodha, who was contemporary with the Yādava king Mahadeva and his successor Ramachandra. The last mentioned king reigned from A.D. 1271 to 1309. Another work quoted in Mallinātha’s

1 See S. P. Pandit’s Int. to Baghu 2, 12, EHD, 117, 120, J.R.A.S, V. 1889
2 See Section V, Ch. I, supra
3 Mallinātha father of Narahari alias Sarasa-sītīrtha, who commented on Kāvyaprakāśa, is a different person and is not known to be an author. Narahari says he was born in 1242 A.D. For particulars, see Chapter on Poetics under Mammata, see Vāmanācārya’s Int. to Kāvyaprakāśa, pp. 9
4 Nārāyaṇa in his commentary on Campurāmāyaṇa (DC, XXI 8212) gives the genealogy according to him Kumāraswāmi was the son of Pedīdubhata and Pedīyārā and Mallinātha were brothers. Here the genealogy differs from that given above by Kumāraswāmin himself which must be more authentic. Nārāyaṇa traces his genealogy thus, Kumāraswāmin, Simhib, Bhāskara, Nāgeśvara, Kondubhatta, Nāgeśvara, Nārāyaṇa
5 So says Kumāraswāmin in his commentary on Pratīṣṭhāpradīya.
commentary on the Meghaduta is the Kāvaka of Vidyādhara who frequently speaks of king Vīranarāsimha as having humbled the pride of Hammīra who was contemporary with Sūghana. King Vīranarāsimha reigned up to 1314 A.D. Mallīnātha has also written a commentary on the Ekāvah. His son Kumaraśaṅkum has written a commentary on the Pratāparudra, a treatise on Alankaṭa. The last named work frequently mentions the Kākāṭa king Tratāparūdṛa who invaded the kingdom of the Yadava king Ramāchandra and reigned from A.D. 1295 to 1323. The second verse in Mallīnātha's introduction to his commentaries on the Raghmīkiṣa, Meghaduta and Kumārasambhava is quoted in an inscription dated in Saka 1433 or A.D. 1533. From these facts it is clear that Mallīnātha must have flourished in the latter half of the fourteenth century.

Mallīnātha commented on the six mahākavyas, on Lkāvali of Vidyādhara and on Tārkikaraṇa of Varaṇaḍa and is said to have written the poems Udārakāvyā and Raghuviracarita. Allowed his learning was varied and his commentaries are held everywhere in the highest esteem.

32 Kunteavaradautyā is a poem apparently describing an embassy to the court of Kunṭala. It is expressly ascribed by Kṣemendra to Kālīdāsa Kālīdāsa was himself the ambassador. The king of Kunṭala received him with the honour due to the representative of King Vikramaditya and once by chance when Kālīdāsa squatted on the floor and the king of Kunṭala appeared not to relish it, Kālīdāsa humorously answered that on the floor stood the Great Meru and there

---

1. EHD, 82
2. IA, XXI, 164
3. R.G. Bhandarkar's Int. to Ekāvah
4. IA, V (19)
5. Int to Megha.
6. For works of Mallīnātha, see CO, I, 434
7. B, II, 72. Udārakāvyā was probably mistaken for Udārakāghava of Kavimallamalla who was a different poet.
8. A poem of this name is printed in Travancore (Tr. Sans. Series No. 57). It is in 17 cantos and has good poetry but is anonymous as it is. So is the Manuscript TC, III 8968. The poem begins with the entry of Rāma into Dandaka and relates the whole story of Bāmāyana. Can it be Mallīnātha's?
9. Rangaswami Samānya says it must have been a drama (IMy, XV, 274)
rested the seven Oceans. On returning from the errand, Vikramādītia asked him what the King of Kuntala was doing and Kāṇhāsā gave a facetious answer in indirect praise of his King and parody of King of Kuntala

Kṛṣṇa in his Bharatacarita ascribes Setubandha to a King of Kuntala

In the introduction to Haracakṛta, Bāna thus praises Setubandha

This passage is also quoted in Rājaśekara's Kavyamīmāṃsā and Bhoja's Sarasvatī Kanṭhābharaṇam
It is therefore a safe inference that Pravarasena mentioned in the author of Setubandha was a king of Kuntala. The attribution of his authorship to Kālidāsa by the commentator and the strong tradition in support of it, when considered with the colophon of Kālidāsa to the Court of Kuntala (as described in Kuntesvara-dautā) can only suggest that either the poem written by Kālidāsa at Vikramaditya's direction was dedicated later to Pravarasena, or a poem written by Pravarasena was revised by Kālidāsa and this created a talk that Kālidāsa was really the author of it.

Who was the King of Kuntala? Pravarasena was considered by many scholars as a king of Kashmir, who composed the poem in commemoration of the construction of a bridge on the Vitasaka. This has now come to be doubted, as in some old manuscripts recently acquired for the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, the colophon ascribes the authorship to the Vakataka king Pravarasena, of Kuntala. The Kuntala Kingdom was conquered by Pratihara I, and this Pravarasena, it is said, must be Pravarasena II, who came to the throne about the year 400 A.D.

Speaking of the Chamak plates of Pravarasena, Mleet said "The date of the Vakataka inscriptions is determined by the marriage of Rudrasena II with Prabhavatigupta, the daughter of the paramount sovereign Devagupta, who, it can hardly be doubted, was Devagupta of Magadha, the son of Adityasena mentioned in the Dev Baranark Ins (No. 46, p. 213, Gupta Ins) and belonging to the period of about A.D. 680 to 700. From another set of copper plates, it is seen that Rudrasena married Prabhavatigupta, a daughter of Candragupta II.

1 So says the commentary of Rāmarāja on Setubandha
2 विद्वान् काव्यमर्माचतुरिश्चित्विर्यूपे विकामधिस्वाचा
2 विद्वान् सं भूपालो इद्देशेतुसमस्यं
3 रेयाता तत् अस्वयेन तांत्रिकः सेवकस्तना || Ragu, III 864
4 Kuntala is the country between the rivers Bhima and Vedavati, bounded on the west by the Ghats including Shimoga, Chutalioor, Ballary, Dharwar, byapur, and adjacent parts to the north in Bombay and Nizam's dominions Mysore Gazette, I 289. Kuntala was the empire of the Kadambas, and adjoined the territory of the Vakatakas El, XIII 299. The Kuntala kingdom was conquered by the Vakataka king Pratihara I. See G. J. Dubrueil's Ancient History of Deccan, 72-74. See also Buhler, Lo, XVIII 24.
5 Int. to Gupta Inscriptions
Aśvaghōsa accompanied Kaniska to Kāśmir and was treated by him with great veneration and in Kaniska’s Council, he took a leading part.

As a contemporary of King Kaniska, Aśvaghōsa may have flourished at the latest, in the 1st century A.D. His biography was translated into Chinese under the dynasty of Yao-twme (354-417 A.D.) by Kumarāśva. Tsing mentions him as an old teacher and places him before Nagārjuna and Āryadeva. He praises his poems and collects his hymns, which were used in the Buddhist ritual.

34 His BUDHACĀYA is a Mahākāvya, with 17 cantos now extant, celebrating the history and teachings of Buddha. From the middle of the 14th Canto, the poem diverges widely from the Chinese translation, probably because Cantos 14 to 17 were lost and had to be made up by poet Amṛtānanda, about the year 1800. In

74s, Beal’s Scyu kw I 161, U., Int to Viṣṇeshāka Philosophy, Das Gupta’s History of Indian Philosophy (Calcutta).

1 On Aśvaghōsa being contemporary of Kaniska, see Journal of Buddhist Text Society, III 18, Schieffer’s Tarānath, Oh XII, Watters, I 209, II 104, Baron Staal Holstain, Was there a Kushana race? [JRAS, (1914), 80] Levi, Notes Sur les Indo Scythes, 86, R D Banerji, The Scythian period of Indian History [IA, (1903) 2575], Hoernle, IA, X, 924, V Smith [EB, 255 270] thinks that 78 A.D marks either the accession or coronation of Kaniska. Fleet [JRAS, 1903, 1906, 1913] says that Kaniska founded the era of 55 B.C. Tradition places Kaniska, 700 years after Buddha (Id., XXXII 392). See for date of Kaniska, IA, XLII, 182, and XLVI, 261. Kalapa places Kaniska 150 years after the Nirvāṇa (Ibid. I 168-172). Hsin Tsang (I 181) places Kaniska 950 years after Buddha, and Max Muller (India 306) 400 years after Buddha. According to Nanjandun Prasad [Mod Rev (1920), 389] and to Foncher [L’Art grec·bouddhique, I, 928], Aśvaghōsa lived in 2nd century A.D. So also says Marshall, Director General of Archaeology on the evidence of stratification of the remains of Taxila. Bhandarkar gives date 278 A.D.
The name of Kaniska is discussed in IA, XIII, 58

2 IA, IV 141, Max Muller’s India 312, Narpiyo, V, 1899

3 IA, (1898), 425 Huien Tsang also refers to him (Julien’s Translation, II, 214)

4 Ed by Cowell (Clarendon Press, Oxford). Tr Into Italian by C Formichi, see JRAS, (1914), 105 and ZDMG, XLVI, 517-19 for reviews. I Tsang says that the poem was of considerable length about 3000 Slokas [Takakusu, Rec of Buddhist Religion, (1v1, 181, 183)] For critical notes, by J S Spayer, see JRAS, (1914), 105. There is a commentary on the 8th canto by Jagannath Prasad.

5 The poem was translated by Sanghabharman into Chinese in 414 421 A.D and into Tibetan in the 7th or 8th century A.D and into English (SBS, No 49.) The Chinese translation has 28 chapters.

6 The Cambridge Ms says so অষ্ঠাগধোষাপ্রভাস স্বধারস্ত ন নিরূপম মুন্ত্রানন্দ মসাহার স্তর মাহাকাব্য

Amṛtānanda is mentioned as a poet and author between years 1796 and 1830. See Mitra’s Nepalese Buddhist Literature. In the colophon Aśvaghōsa is called Bhadārapa (venerable)
Soundarananda is an exquisite poem of 18 cantos. It describes the story of the conversion of King Nanda of the Ikṣvaku race and his redemption from the ocean of worldly pleasures in which he was immersed. The company of his consort Sundari Āśvaghosa avows that this poem was intended to teach philosophy by the detectable means of alluring poetry. "The Soundarananda has been somewhat neglected by students of Buddhism in the past, surprisingly perhaps, because apart from its interest as an example of early Buddhist poetry, it is," as Mr. Johnston tells us in his preface, "the earliest work presenting to us a logical and carefully thought-out description of the path to Enlightenment. It enables us to see the force and bearing of technical terms and arguments, which are enunciated in earlier Buddhist literature in a manner liable to cause misconception. Further, as Āśvaghosa is generally agreed to have flourished early in the second century A.D., the indications he gives of developments in doctrine deserve consideration."

35 These two poems supplement each other on the life of Buddha Āśvaghosa’s plays will be referred to in the chapter on Sanskrit Drama. If "to the ordinary critic the fame of Kālidāsa rests on the charm of his similes, Āśvaghosa certainly excels him," his vocabulary is very ancient and several of his words have now become obsolete in their

1 Ed. by Haraprasad Sastri, Bibl Ind (Calcutta), where the introduction gives summary of the poem Ed. by E H. Johnson (Oxford) with critical notes and readings.

2 For verses containing parallel ideas, see S. P. Pandit and Nandangarak’s Introductions to Raghuvamsa, Haraprasad Sastri’s Int to Soundarananda, op. cit. iv vi and Kshetresa Chandra Chattopadhyaya’s Date of Kalidasa (All Un Studies, II. 79). For instance, compare the following

ĀŚVAGHOSA

भाषा वद- स्पर्शेन स्बोधोत
विवाचित बालसंवप्तयान्
पूर्व त स एवावधिकं चकाके
बन्याच सौम्याभिनिरैतिपिनिम्)

Saun. iv 7

KALIDASA

सरस्येण स्पृहाणायोऽम
न वैदिक ब्राह्मणविचारम्
असिद्धार्थ सप्तवधानम्
पत्तु प्रजाना विविधोऽसानिन्यस्

Raghu. vii 14

वाता वद- स्त्रस्यकरतिप्रसेदुः
राजस्रोत्तमो हृदपीयिनयः
वक्तान्यप्रभावितानि तर्को
लौकिकोऽसस्मानं सत

Kum. xi. 37.

Buddha. xiii. 79
peculiar meaning. His philosophy was of a high order. He belonged to a school, probably of Yogacara, which preceded the Mahayana school with its theory of Sunyata propounded by Nagarjuna two generations later. "Asvaghośa," says Cowell, "seems to be entitled to the name of the Ennus of the classical age of Sanskrit poetry. His style is often rough and obscure, but it is full of native strength of beauty, his descriptions are not too much laboured, nor are they purpuree pance, they spring from the narrative growing from it as natural blossoms, not as external appendages."

On the identity of Asvaghosa with Ārya-Sūra and Matṛceta, scholars are not agreed. These names appear on their reading genuinely distinct proper names and not titles which designate different individuals. It seems therefore not easy to assign to Asvaghosa all works, in Sanskrit, Chinese or Tibetan, going under any of these names.

---

ASVAGHOŚA

स हि लगालसन्यासिन्या
दीपमा साक्षरसन्यास
सहीनवरनदवर्णानि
विपोरितमाति दिशागति ||

Buddha 1 32

इद्वानि सर्वसंय सतता-
न्यलमलमश्यति लोके ||

अतोवपि मैण्डश्रोपिति कधिका-
केकात्तु श पुष्प पुष्पियार् ||

Buddha xi 48

KALIDASA

अरिष्टेश्वर्या परिति विसारिणा
सुन्दरतत्त्स निजेन वेंसा ||

राघ 1 15

कलेकानि लघुसुन्दर सु हमेकानितो वा
नायागिर्ययुगिरि च दशा चहकोसियि ||

Megha ii 48

The extreme similarity of the ideas and diction has given rise to a controversy as to the relative priority of Kalidasa and Asvaghosa.

1 For instance, धिष्य मेतासव द्वितसस्व, सत्तव, सरि, and घरसूर्य custom

2 It is pointed out in JRAS (1914) 747 by Vidhusékara Bhattacharya that though Asvaghosa preceded Nāgārjuna, he still refers to the theory of Sunyata in the Sundaśraya.

3 See Album Kern (Leiden) 405-2, IA, (1903), 845-60.

4 Other works directly attributed to Asvaghosa are Gāndh Stotra (Bibh Buddha, No XV St Peterburg, (1913), JRAS, (1914), 732), Pāyrasas (Weber, op cit 205-64). These are in Sanskrit Dādunatkārmamārga Sutra, Mahāyānasūtrā packet (Translated by Suzuki, Chicago) and Sutrālankāra kāśyapa (Translated into French by Huber, Paris). These are in Chinese See Naño's Catalogue of the Buddhist Tripitaka (Oxford). For a full list of the works in the names of Matṛceta and Āryasura, see Thomas Int to Kav (Bibl Ind Calcutta 25 29).
36 "Buddhaghosa was a Brahman born in Jhaton 1 He was an inmate of the Kelása monastary, and in A D, 357 he was deputed to Ceylon by King Thim Gvauing (Dhammapala) in order to bring away a copy of the Buddhist Scriptures At Bassem, he took ship for Tamalittu, the Indian port, and first went to Gava by the Gangeuc route, to obtain drawings of the principal sacred sites He returned by the same route and proceeded to Ceylon where he stayed for three years He composed the Visuddimagga while at Anuradhapura, and on his return to Thaton, brought a complete copy of the Pitakas with their commentaries as well as other works in the Telang characters" 2 This is the account given by James Gray in the Buddhaghosa-upaṭṭhi, but an earlier date is not impossible The name of Buddhaghosa is held in high reverence by the southern Buddhists and he was the proponent of Buddhism as current in the south

His Padyacudamani, a poem in 10 cantos, describes the birth, marriage and other incidents in the life of Buddha The story differs in some details from the narrative in the Lalitavistara and Buḍḍha-cantā The plot of the poem has thus been summarised by Prof. S Kuppuswamy Sastri

"There ruled at Kapila, a king named Buddhodana of the Sakya race, with his queen Mayadevi As he had no issue, he performed penance Meanwhile the Lord of the Tusita world resolved at the instance of the Devas to incarnate in this world for enlightening it and entered the womb of Mayadevi The birth of the son Siddhartha was attended with supernatural phenomena After the due performance of the natal ceremonies, arrangements were made for his bosuḥ sports, and for his education In due time as he grew, he was installed as the heir-apparent, and his marriage was thought of He was formally married to the daughter of the king of the Koliya country Then the

---

1 On Buddhaghosa, see B C Law, Life and work of Buddhaghosa (Calcutta), Foulkes, IA, XIX 105 142 and S Kuppuswamy Sastri, Introduction to Padyacudamana Takakusu, Paramartha's Life of Vasubandhu (JNAS, 1905) says that Samantapāśāda of Buddhaghosa was translated into Chinese by Sangsārabhadra in 488 A D For Esoteric fable in Buddhaghosa, see IA, I 920 For date and legends, see IA, XIX 105

2 T Foulkes (loc cit) gives a summary of the dates assigned to Buddhaghosa and "it is stated that living in the extreme improbable date they extend from 386 to 557 A D and group themselves about the reign of king Mahanama of Ceylon," S Kuppuswamy Sastri says that the consensus of opinion is in favour of assigning the poet to the latter part of the fifth century A D Senavaratne (Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, I Pt II) says Buddhaghosa visited Ceylon in 483 A D
prince with his wife returned to his own city amidst great rejoicings. The king took particular care to make ample provision for his son’s enjoyment in the various seasons of the year. During the autumn the prince practised the use of martial weapons and mastered it in seven days. One day in the spring season when he started for the pleasure garden, he saw on the royal road, as arranged by the Devas, visions of an old man, an afflicted person and a corpse. He was greatly impressed with the sight and questioned the attendants of the chariot. On learning from the charoteer the nature of the ills to which the human body is liable, he desired to return home. On his way back, he perceived some ascetics, who were reported to have found the means of deliverance from the ills of human existence. He again started for the pleasure garden where he spent the day very agreeably in various pastimes. He returned home, where formal rejoicings were conducted. Suddenly he took his resolve to renounce his royal home, travelled 30 yojanas, crossed the river Anavama, dismissed his attendants and put on the ascetic robe. He practised severe austerities and lived by begging his food in the Bimbâsâra city. Failing to attain salvation he thought over the means of securing it. During the night he had five dreams and in the morning after making out the significance of these dreams he decided on the means of attaining Nirvana. Sitting under a banyan tree, he received Pavasa from a woman, proceeded to the Narajâra river and ate the food. After spending the day in the dense sala forest, he went to the Buddha tree in the evening and seated himself there on a miraculously provided seat. The devas eulogised Buddha, and Manmatha, learning the news, resolved to conquer him. Manmatha’s army first delivered the attack but failed to make any advance. Manmatha then made a personal attack which was repulsed. As a last resort he sent his women, who performed dexterous dances before Buddha and tried their utmost to captivate and overpower him. Failing their efforts wholly futile, they ran away. Thus came to be firmly established the supreme sovereignty of the great Siddhartha over the empire of salvation.”

Being a Mahâkâvya, the poet adheres to the canons of poetics in describing the various phenomena of nature, such as courses of sun and moon, the seasons, times, oceans etc. He appears to have studied the works of Kâlidâsa and Âsvaghoṣa and become so familiar with them that his own verses so closely resemble theirs that without fear of detection they could be interpolated in Kumârasambhava or Buddhârâtraita. Budhagôsa is resourceful in finding series of similes and fancies
In description, where the idea is often continuous from verse to verse. In describing the moon, for instance, in the eighth canto all the 22 verses depict the interment of the moon under the sea, the gradual ascent and descent in the horizon and disappearance in the dark fortnight, as an evolution of a child from birth to end. The whole poem reads as a garden of poetic blossoms, where to cull one for show is well nigh impossible.

37 **Mentha** better known as **Bhartṛ Mentha** has been held by rhetoricians in high esteem probably higher than Kālidāsa. The word Mentha means elephant-driver and there is a reference to that

---

1 Read the following —

1. **हुआसनायेन सुधामृण्य कलासम्र करपशङ्क |** सहित्यतीव्र क्षणदानुः यथा कीर्तिकरणाङ्गपरिहारानि**

2. **यदि-दन्तिकान्तरत्रिकादिरुप अविषयत्विभा यथंमंदुलक्षम |** मूर्तिभवंवर्ण्यपुराण गरात्मकम्ब-रुद्ररुपान्तः**

3. **तीलाच्छकोरसनाबधिविस्मान-** 

4. **समाददन्तवहामृण्यादिविजयम्**

5. **तत्तायाचार्यतत्त्वाधिपतिरणांदेशिदिक-**

6. **मालाक्षिणायणक्तनसमादिकामान्**

7. **परस्मायुवायसीरम अयोरित्व तस्य दुखारदिकद् |** सूपिधायंत्वरतचन्वलोका बालाकविम्बधुरणमातानि**

8. **आयोपराम नरपालदुनोरंदालयुण्गमकिरिकेऽनकोहे |** वासिष्ठायमन्नितिलदिवंदित्ताहुरा मेरिस्किन्दतवव |**

9. **रराज तस्य नवरोधाराजारोलसमुखोपाधराम् |** श्रीकार्योनेत्रवचनाध्यमालफ्लते-दीर्घसमाहिकेऽ्**

10. **बीलस्माय विद्वदन्तवहामृणाराचरोप चद्धनिम्बविहितादि |** 

11. **समापारासतत्तस्य सानदभावोल्पति सा चा |** बुद्धाराजेऽप्निरक्षोपाधराम्**

12. **द्वारकारण तपायात्मम पशोद्धालोरापकोकाले |**

13. **नित्याध्यमाणा इव हेरमराजस्माहेंद्रा माति चक्रोपल्यने |**

14. **केभास्माय योधचिललोन्देवैदीको द्वीरसारक्षकादिकाम् |**

---

2 In Aufrecht’s Ms the name is spelt as Bhāṛyāmedra (Peterson, Subh, 98)
sense in a verse of Rājaśekhara quoted by Kalhana in his Sūktimuktāvalī. The anthologies quote the same verse under name Mentha or Hastipaka and some of the extant verses give an exquisite description of wild elephants just caught in pit. This confirms a doubt if Mentha was really engaged in that pursuit. Kalhana mentions him as attached to the court of Mātṛgupta of Ka-mir. If Mātṛgupta’s date is taken as 430 A.D., Mentha must have lived about that date. The well-known verse limpativa tamonguśu which occurs in the Mit chakatīka, in Aommāraka, in Bālacarīta, and in Kārvādanaśa is found quoted in Sārvagadharapaddhati as the joint composition of Vikramādītva and Mentha and this increases the cloud surrounding the authorship of that verse, but it may suggest that Mentha was connected with the court of a King Vikramādītva Mankha in his Srīkantahacarīī mentions him with Subandhu, Bhāravi and Bāna. Rājaśekhara calls him an incarnation of Vālmiki, and Bhavabhūti and himself as his later incarnations. This

1. बहोतहा मेण्टराज्य वहन्या सूफिस्तापाय।
   आविन्दा इन आंचलभी विहारन कविकृत्यहा।

2. ललंगा विक्रमिगरिष्ठ भवन्ति भागतशी माते सेवनं ते ते
   लेहनामक्ष्ययोनिचलितस्ययोदया दलित।
   लक्ष्मीमात्र वर्तिन्त लघुस्य वन्याय दत्त बपु
   तत दूष विपास नदान्ति च क्षित पीठ कठोराकश।

3. वास्तुतुल्यायाम श्रेय श्रीमक्ष रेयस्य करण्यां
   वायुविकारभाग्यानासामाचरं मृत्युर् देवि पश्चातपर्।
   हर्द्रार्तस्वतैति स्वरतावस्तुविशोभान्तर्याया
   रेवाकृमक्ष्कंकुष्मकुसरोज्जुल्लविन्ययुद्ध।

See Max Muller’s Index, 314 note

4. बर्मुव बलभिक्षु गुरु कविं
   तत्र प्रवदेशे श्रविष्टीमेण्टतमु।
   सिद्ध प्रक्रियो महाभारतश्रृङ्ख्या
   स क्लेशा सम्पति राजवेल्हेर।
lends support to the tradition that Mentha wrote a long poem Rimacanṭa in 100 cantos and it is believed a copy of it is still available at Benares.

His poem Ḫaṭagāvi is lost. The first verse of it is quoted by Rājaśekhara in his Kavīarāčya and K-emendra in his Śrīpratālaka, and another by Raghava in his commentary of Bahunṭalā. Many verses are extracted in Bhoja and in the anthologies as Mentha’s or Hastipaka’s and rightly merit their appreciation.

38 Kumaraṭa was a King of Ceylon. He was the son of King Kumāramanī who died on the battle field and on that day Kumaraṭa was born. He was bred up by his two distinguished maternal uncles Śrī Megha and Agrabodhi with paternal affection.

---

1 PR, I 9 Hemacandra in his Ḫaṭagāvusāsana (p 15) mentions it as a poem (BKR, 49) For references, see OC, 754 Troyer thought it was a drama (JBRAS, VII)

2

3

4

5 There are poets by the names Kumara, Kumāraṭa, Kumārabhāṭa and Bhatta Kumāra mentioned in the anthologies. Are these identical?

6 So says he himself in the last four verses of Ḫanakharana (TC, IV 4249 9)
Writers on the Indian literary history now take it for granted that Kumāradāsa whose name as such appears in the colophon to the poem is the same as king Kumāra Dhātusena who ruled over Ceylon according to Mahāvamsa in the year after Buddha’s Nirvāṇa which corresponds, as worked out by European Chronclers, to A.D 515-524. In the last four verses of canto 20 of the poem Kumāradāsa gives his father’s name as Kumaramani and says that on the day his father died in the battle-field he was born and thenceforward he was brought up by his mother’s brothers, Sri Megha and Agrabodhi. In the last verse there is also an indication that as a child he was troubled by disease. What the disease was we are not told, but Rājaśekhara in his Kāya-Mimāṃsā instances Kumāradāsa as a poet born blind. Is it possible that the disease was congenital blindness?

39 The Mahāvamsa thus notices the acts of this celebrated prince — “After his (Moggalana’s) demise, his son, who was known as Kumāra Dhātusena, (both) mighty and godlike, became king. He repaired the temple which had been built by his father, held a convocation of (Dhamma) the Baudda Scriptures, and purified the religion. He pleased the priesthood with the four pachchya, and, having done many meritorious actions, passed away in the ninth year. Kittisena his son then became king.”

This account given in Mahāvamsa shows that the name of the king was Kumāra Dhātusena and not Kumāra Dāsa, that that king’s father was Moggalana and not Kumaramani, that Kumāra Dhātusena

These four verses are found in the above manuscript but not in the other manuscripts. But the last two lines are found in the poem as originally restored by Dharmārāma as the end of the 25th canto which ought to be 30, for there are only 20 cantos in the complete manuscripts now available. This would show that the four verses must have been part of the original poem and not any suspicious later addition.

The colophon in the manuscript is

1 Gāek Ed page 12.
2 Translated by L. C. Wijesinha, 1889.
was a mighty king and ruled well, that he was not incapacitated by any disease or that his father died on the battle field when he was just born, and that there is no mention there of his maternal uncle Sri Megha and Agrabodhi. The latter names occur 40 years later in the list of kings in Chapter 44 of the Mahāvamsa as the 76th king. After his death after a reign of nine years his son Kittisena succeeded him. It will therefore be observed that the account given by the poet of himself in the poem differs in every respect from Mahāvamsa's description of King Kumāra Dhātuseṇa. This name Kumāra Dhātuseṇa when read with his son's name Kittisena shows that the main part of the name was Dhātuseṇa and the word Kumāra was prefixed to it.

The identity therefore of the poet with that particular king cannot possibly be accepted. The language of the poem which in its merit is very akin to that of Kālidāsa and the earliest poets, when read with the tradition that Kālidāsa and Kumāradāsa were friends, suggests the conclusion that Kumāradāsa must have been a far earlier poet than the 5th or 6th century A.D., which is induced by the wrong identification. Even in Ceylon, it is not now generally accepted that the author of the poem was this king of Ceylon.

1. In the chronological table Part II Ch. xvi 1 Wijesinha's Mahawamsa, we have a list of kings and there we find,

   67  Kumara Dhātuseṇa 516 24 A.D
   74  Kittisena 560 1 A.D
   76  Agrabodhi I 554 A.D

2. Mr S Paramartana, Assistant to Archaeological Commissioner, Ceylon, writes to me so and was kind enough to give the following information, which is at best available now. King Kumāradāsa is mentioned in the Mahāvamsa by the epithet of Kumāra Dhātuseṇa (Kumāra Dhātuseṇa) but in Sinhalese historical works this king is always referred to as Kumāradāsa. In the chapter dealing with the history of Ceylon in the Purāṇa a Sinhalese work written about 1265 A.D., it is said that Magellana's son was Kumāradāsa and that he was a great scholar and a contemporary of Kālidāsa, the Indian poet. Other Sinhalese works such as the Nihāya Sāngrakha, Saddhārman Mahānā, Bāvaratānākara, and Rāja Kalappi, also mention the same. The Perakumbu Śraya, a Sinhalese poem composed in the 16th century, attributes to King Kumāradāsa the authorship of the Jāmukiharaṇa. The identification of Kumāradāsa with Kumāradāsa, by Turner and others, is evidently based on these Sinhalese authorities. There is an inscription of King Kumāradāsa at a place called Negurikanda. In this, the king is styled Mahā Kumāradāsa raja, the Sinhalese form of Mahā Kumāradāsa raja. This mention has been published by Muller in his Ancient Descriptions of Ceylon, and Turner in his Sinhalese Inscriptions, but it is somewhat weathered he has not been able to decipher. This inscription of this record will be
40 Tradition makes him a contemporary of Kālidāsa and the following story is current. Kumāradāsa had a fair courtesan and in one of his visits to her he wrote a line: 

"...
and promised a reward for the completion of the verse. Kālidāsa was then on a visit to the royal court and happened to lodge in the same mansion and seeing the incomplete verse added:

On learning this the courtesan made away with the poet and concealed the body and demanded the reward, but the king suspected that the real poet was elsewhere and made her confess the crime. Agrieved by the loss of his friend the king consigned himself, in despair, to the fire on the funeral file of Kālidāsa.²

Peralunha Sinta thus notices both author and work—“King Kumāradāsa, who on the very same day celebrated a three-fold feast in honor of the inauguration of the queen-consort, the installation into office of a number of priests, and the founding of 18 temples and 18 tanks, and who in masterly and elegant strains composed Janakiharana and other (maha kavu) great poems offered his life for the poet Kālidāsa.” Apart from the merit of this story for the purposes of chronology, there can be no doubt that Kumāradāsa was a devout admirer of Kālidāsa and his works.

41 His Janakiharana, a poem in 20 cantos describes the story of Rāma and the abduction of Sītā by Rāvana.³

Published in the Epigraphia Ceylanae at an early date, I attach herewith a transcript in Nagari of the verses dealing with Kumāradatmaṇa in the Mahāvaṃsa.

Mahāvaṃsa, Ch 41, verses 1-3

1 A description of Ceylon by J. Cordmar, (1907), Ceylon, ancient and modern, by an officer of the Ceylon Rifes mentioned in Seihaguri Sastri’s Rep II (1899), 20; Nandargkar’s Int to Ragh 122 This story is attributed also to Kālidāsa’s wife, Kamalā, in Bhan Day’s Literary Remains, 51.

2 On Kumāradāsa and his work, see D’Alwis Des Cat of Sanskrit, Pali and Singhalese Manuscripts (Ceylon), Aufrecht, ZDMG, XXVII, 17 and OC I 110, Peterson PR, 1V 24, JBRAS, XVI 10, and Int to Subh. 24, BR, (1897), xxx. Laumann, Zum Janakiharana des Kumāradāsa (VOI, VII 296-340).
The poem was not available for a long time, when Dharana reclaims 15 cantos from a Sinhalese manuscript \( \text{par} \) Kumaradasa and edited the poem so far. Nandargikar and Hariprasad Sastri brought out other editions, but their editions also extended only to 10 and 14 cantos, respectively. The 16th canto was edited by Barnett for the London School of Oriental Studies recently. There are now manuscripts of the whole poem in tact and they show two recensions of the poem. In the manuscript recently obtained by Mr Ramakrishna Kavi of Madras, the number of verses in each canto is far more than in the manuscript of the Oriental Manuscripts' Library of Madras and in the published editions.

"The first chapter treats of the history of Dasaratha, the second, of the visit of Indra, and the gods, to Vishnu in the Nagaloka, after they were defeated by Ravana, and Vishnu's promise to be born in the human world, the third is on Ritu Varnanan, the fourth, on the worship of Agni, and the birth of Rama in the womb of Kausalya, the Queen of Dasaratha—his education—his departure with Lalshmana on the application of Vasishtha to fight with Rakshasa, etc., the fifth gives a description of, and particulars connected with, the jungle-residence of Vasishtha, the sixth treat of the departure of Rama, etc, to Mithila, where a marriage was concluded for him, the arrival there

Some readings of Janakiharanà, XVI (Bull of School of Or Studies, London, VI, 511 2, Kavikala in Ceylon [JRAS, 1894 397], Kumara Saras [JRAS 1901 678, 288, 158]

Ed by Dharmarama Colombo, (1891), by Hariprasad Sastri (Columbia, 1909), Nandargikar (Bombay, 1907, 10 cantos only). For quotations of Kumaratunga's verses in the anthologies, and in Ujvalada's commentary, see Thomas, Ist to Xav 35 and Peterson, Int to Subh, 25. There is a controversy on the original of the verse, quoted by Kesamendra in his Auntyavanramarà
dhyanamardhana raja nivartamasya vasa \\
abhyasaro'dam eva varte na varatatuh kvaca ||

based on the last line, found in Patanjali's Mahabharata (T. 289) Sesaguru Sastri (Rep. 22 20) says, "The verse is not found in the present edition of Janakiharanà and the full stanza as quoted by Kesamendra is quite different from that quoted in Patanjalai except the last lines which are identical.

apany padaro'dham svahetanā overhead paratā \n\n\n\n\nOn this question, see BR, 1699 64, 56 and JRAS, XVI. 170 199, Nandargikar, Int to Ragih, 196. It seems as if the last line was taken from Patanjali and the rest of the verse was made up by way of samadhā parājaya

1 Cat of Columbia Museum Library, page 11,
of Dasaratha etc., the seventh on Rama's marriage with Sītā, the daughter of king Janaka, the eighth treats of their honeymoon, the ninth, the departure of Dasaratha and the new married couple to Ayodhya—the battle fought during their journey, etc., the tenth relates the circumstances attending Rama's expulsion by the infirm Dasaratha, owing to the application for the throne by Kaikeyī for her own son, the invitation of Bharata to Rama, and the abduction of Sītā by Ravana, the eleventh contains the fight between Garuda and Ravana to prevent Sītā being carried away, the death of Garuda, the flight of Ravana with Sītā to Lanka, and the acts of Rama in connection with the battle of Sugrīva and Vālī, the twelfth gives a description of Autumn or Sarat Varnana, and Sugrīva's visit to Rama, the thirteenth records Rama's lament for the loss of Sītā, gives description of Varsha, or the rainy season, Sugrīva's attempt at consoling Rama etc., the fourteenth mentions the construction of Adam's bridge, and the fifteenth (which is called the twentieth, and which is evidently deficient in matter) gives a glowing picture of the blessing of Barce, as opposed to (the ravages of) war, which is introduced as a message sent by Rama to Ravana. The remaining cantos continue the story of Rāmāyana.

Kumāradāsa follows Kālidāsa in every line of his description and if imitation is not laudable, he is at least a worthy compeer. The poem has been held in high estimation and Jalhana praises him, in the name of Rājasekhara as an adept in relating the story of Rāma, next only to Kālidāsa.

---

1 As summarised by D’Alwis (loc) 194
2 In Suktamukāvali

जनकीहरुण करुण रुपको रसित सति |
कवि कुमारदास रावणक्ष्य यादि श्रम ||

For illustration of his language

बल बाताकर्त्तात बाराकपुष्पायुक्तक्रमं|
रघुवारिणी दूत स्वभावं पदे पदे ॥

उक्तसत्तु ककुद्यु श्लोकम स्थतति परितो हिमालया ॥
सिद्धान्तसंकल्पमा नम स्वरूपं विस्पुता हृ तत्ततिकर्म-द्वार ॥

रितोम्यो न पुसाम्वत्यस्त राज्यन त एव तदाम विन्यूतितेव ॥
तत्ततिकर्मविषयं वा जन्यमात्रेका वेतन न रूप विचारित विचुत ॥

गतानि सदेव परिकृपयत गिर कष्ठा भा परम्परा विन्यिनिपिनः ॥
कुल्लिणे स्वार्तेजस्य परशेन विचित्र भीम परम हि साधनः ॥
Bhatti was the son of Śrīśāmin or Śrīdhārasāmin. Bhatti has been identified with Bhartrhari and Bhatti is said to be a prakritised form of Bhair. The fact that Bhatti and Bhartrhari were both grammarians and the tales that sprang up about their connection with
kingship and King Vikramāditya lent colour to this confusion. But on
the literary evidence now available the identity is uncertain. 1 There

1 Among the commoners, Jayamançala and Bmanbha call him Bhatti, son of
Swamin Śrīlaśminśu कवित्रिमंगलायाः समकथाध्य सत्याक्यं चकर। कंदर्पो विक्रम
varun calls the work Bhatti and author Bhartṛhara अनं तत्तसाहस्राहोपा यार्याशस्वतः
हरिकिंवना जयद्वीपमेद्यीतेऽथ। नरायणोविद्याप्रोको नक्षत्रिय वह वृत्तिको नवविधेयेऽपि नात।
लतशिवान्तेन त मलोष्य हिरन्वितन्य वन्यविद्वेयेनेनवुकामा।
तर्थ राजार्थाकेस चततार्थी स्तुतरित हि सखजन एव शिकले।
परियमतो महुजा महहत्ते विद्वानावार्तविद्वेयमणोन।
विमानस्मी कवित्ति श्रुत्वालय युक्तान्त्वा इव कीपक्य।

Colebrooke (Essay, II 116) says "The author was Bhartrhara, not, as might be
supposed from the name, the celebrated brother of Vikramaditya but a grammarian and
poet who was son of Śrīdhara Swami, as we are informed by one of his scholars, Vidyapraga."
Professor Aufrecht, in his \Boysan Catalogue, (p 176b) speaks of
Bhartrhara, ""\fugus hiber grammaticus, numine vero Bhartṛharyam memoratur," but in his notices of the \Franka\textemdash mānāmā (p 182 b), and of the Sarasvati-kāśāśā,
Bhartraharī, he cites Bhatti, and in the last named work both Bhatti and Bhartrhara have
been separately cited.

Two verses attributed to Bhartrhara in \Subha\textemdash śīvali are shown as Bhatti,
swamin\textemdash or Bhartrharm\textemdash in \Śrīdhara-śaḍāchāṇi. Jayangamala calls the work
Bhartrhara Kāvyya and author Bhartrhara. Aufrecht says Bhatti, called also Bhartrharmswamin
of \Śrīdharaśwamin or Swāmi Bhatta, was the author of Bhatta Kāvyya and was the son of
Śrīdharaśwamin or Śrīswamin Bhatti is said to be a prakritised form of Bhartrhara Mitra (Notices, VI 1 145) says Bhatta is a diminutive of Bhava Kṣemandra and
Vallabhadeva quotes distinctly from Bhatti and Bhartrhara (See Peterson, PR, I 9,
Subh 73 4) Bhan Daji Soscari \Sastri, Hoernle [JRA, (1909) 112] and Kulshor
(IA, III 218) distinguish them B C Mukunidhara [JRA, (1904), 397] and probably
Hoernle [JRA, (1909), 112] identify Bhatti with Vatsaharita of the Inscriptions Bud
Mun udar [JRA, (1909) 762] seems to waver and withdraw. See also Keith [JRA],
(1909) 435, S Ray, Introduction to \Bhās Calcutta, R C Dutt, Os I 26; A B Keith, OSL, 53;
Weber, SL, 196; S. K. De, SP, 50, Jagdh, \Śrīvaśeobhārā, d
are other stories which make Bhatti son of Bhartrihari or brother of Bhartrihari, a minister of Vikrama or Vikramarka. The stories are many (i) A Brahman named Chandragupta had four wives, one of the Brahmin caste, another of the Kshatriya, the third of the Vana, the fourth of the Sudra caste. They were called Brahman, Dhanumai, Bhagvavati and Sindhumati. Each of the four bore him a son. Varnaruci was born of the first wife, Vikramarka of the second, Bhatti of the third and Bhartrihari of the fourth. Vikramarka became King, while Bhatti served him in the capacity of prime-minister (ii) There is yet another version, that Bhattarka, a king of Valabhi, was the real Bhatti and Bhartrihari a poet of his Court, composed his poem Rāvanavadha and let it pass in his patron's name. (iii) Bhartrihari was himself a king. Once a Brahmin brought to him a present of a priceless fruit, he gave it to his queen, and she gave it to her paramour. The discovery of this infidelity made him distrust the world and he left the household and turned an ascetic. It is said this is indicated in his composition of the three Satakas in a verse in his subhaditya.

In the last verse of his Rāvanavadha he mentions his patron King Śri Dharasena of Valabhi:

कायमिव बिनिदति स्या वल्व्विका श्रीरस्षननेवनर्द्रपालितायायः
कौन्तितिर सत्तामो तुप्स स्यामकर क्षितियो यत् ज्ञानाय भा।

"May this poem, written by me in Valabhi, the protected of the Great King Sridharasena, be to the glory of the king, since the king is the well-doer of the people."

Valabhi was the capital of Saurashtra (Gujrat) Kingdom and has been identified with Walleh. There were four Dharasenas, the first

Presschehen Akademie (1922), 216, Anderson, Some account of Bhatta Kavya [JBRAS, III i 20]

On Bhartrihari, see Kothorn, IA, XII 226. K.P. Pathak, Bhartrihars and Kumarsa, JBRAS, XVIII 218. Was Bhartrihar a Buddhist? Inda XVIII 241, and Telang, Int to Satakas, and IA, IX 308. On his Vakypadaya see IA, III 235

1 Bhan Daya, JBRAS (1899) 214
2 Bohlen, Pref to Satakas, 6
3 Seshagiri Sastry, IA I 219
4 M. Suryakravati, History of Indian Poets, Telugu, 35
5 IA, I 196
about Valabhi Samvat 183 and the last 330. Valabhi Samvat appears
to be identical with Gupta Valabhi Samvat and the epoch of the
Cupta era varies according to different scholars, 167, 190, 319 A.D.
It is not possible to say which of these four Dharasenas was the patron
of Bhatti and it is likely Bhatti flourished in the 4th or 5th cen-
tury A.D.

1 See I, XIV 187 and XIII 160, when these terms are used, indicating
identity of meaning.

2 The Gupta era is placed by different writers in different years, (see I A XV 388)
by Cunningham in 167 A.D., by Bayley in 190 A.D. and Albemarle in 319 A.D. For
his Kshatriya grant, see Fleet, CII 134 93 dated Gupta Valabhi 880 which according to
Fleet is 319 20, plus 330 or 649 50 A.D. See also Toll's Rajasthan, I 705, Phan
darkar, EAD 18, Doabar's History of Guzerat, 325, Lassen (See Max Muller,
India, 351) says that Bhatti's patron was Dharasena II [IA, VII 68, VIII 301, XV,
137, dated Val Sam 253.] The name Bhatti is found in two grants of Dhruvasena I
(Sam 221) and Dhruvasena III (Sam 394) as Superintendent of the Kitchen (See
Archaeological Survey of India, 80-96, Trivedi's Int to Edn xxI)

3 The following grants and inscription with dates will be useful for reserch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dhruvasena I</th>
<th>I, V 204</th>
<th>Val S 207</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhasena</td>
<td>VII 266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena I</td>
<td>VI 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena II</td>
<td>XV, 187</td>
<td>Gupta Val S 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII 160</td>
<td>Val S 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII 66,72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII 801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena IV</td>
<td>I 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV 885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena IV</td>
<td>I 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Śrāditya I</td>
<td>XIV 827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrāditya I</td>
<td>IX 287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI 327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhruvasena II</td>
<td>VI 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khangraha II</td>
<td>VII, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrāditya II</td>
<td>XI 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrāditya V</td>
<td>VI 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrāditya III</td>
<td>VII 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dhruvabhaṭṭa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also JBRAS, VII 116, VIII, 290 For the genealogy from Bhatta,
see C V Vaidya's History of Medieval India, I 250 But on the dates given in the
inscriptions, the order of these kings requires reconsideration.

For a discussion regarding Valabhi chronograms, see I A, VII 803
There is a tradition that one day when Bharṭṛhari was lecturing on grammar, an elephant passed between him and his pupils and as a result of the evil omen, the lectures had to be suspended for a year. Bharṭṛhari could not forbear so long and resorted to the device of teaching grammar through the medium of poetry and at the end of the year, the poem was complete. True or untrue, the method so adopted has really served to achieve the end and to this day, a study of Bhatt helps the teaching of language with felicity.

43 **Bhattikavyam** is a work of great renown. In four parts, Prakṛpa, Prasanna, Alankāra and Tinanta, it illustrates the grammatical formations according to the aphorsms of Pāṇini, figures of speech and other rhetorical devices, and often we see verses of real poetic merit. In Canto X, there are illustrations of Alankāras and from their number and their significance, it is conjectured that Bhatti came after Bhāmaha.

---

1 S Ray, *Int to Edn., vui.*
2 Ed Bombay [BSS, 56, 57], Ma’ras and Calcutta. On works ascribed to Bhatti, see *La, XI* 285
3 विरमयी साठवतैः जन्मा चूता दिवं स्थास्तरविविचयमा ||
   वंशक्रंकाते बिदेवताक्ति सुता ददे तत्र सुताय मैथिली ||
   न तत्त्वतः यथा हस्यास्पः न पञ्च यथावचनस्त्रपदः ||
   न च चुक्तोऽध्येण वज्रजय कट न धक्षिण तथा जहार यन्तर ||
   अज्ञए वेदान्तिक्षणयत पितृविन्धासोदा समसत भन्युः ||
   अज्ञेत्त चुधेर्गतिः नैति तस्मातेऽपि न्यायदुर्गीत ||
   पपात राजसो यूमी रत्न ज भक्त्यः ||
   तुतोद गदया चारित द द्रावकारिणय कपि ||
4 For the list of Alankāras illustrated in Canto X, see *JRAI,* (1939), 830 et seq
5 On this question there is a difference of opinion. It mainly turns on the two
   verses
   काव्यान्यायं यदीमानि व्यास्याग्न्यायानि शास्त्रवद्व ||
   उत्सर शुभिवामिच हर्त इमेश्चतो हर्ता ||
   *Bhāmaka,* i. 30,
   and
   व्यास्याग्न्याणमिद काव्यास्तव शुभिवामिच ||
   हर्त इमेश्चरसासिद्धेऽविद्वाचार्यय यस्य ||
   *Bhatti,* xx1. 34
Dasananaavadhakavyam of Yogindranatha Tarkacudamanembraces the same theme.

There are commentaries on Bhatulkavyam by [Kandarpacakravartum Bharatasesa, Narayana Vidyavinoda, Pundarikak-a, Kumudananda, Purvottama, Ramaacandra-vacaspati, Ramana, Hariharacarya].

"Even if these, which, like scientific treatises, can be understood only by commentaries, be poems, it is only a festival to those who have a fine intellect, but alas undone are the dull witted."  

"This poem is explicable by a commentary. It is, however, sufficient that it will be a festival for the intelligent, and it is because I like the wise, that I have not thought much of the dull witted."  

Which of these could be the earlier? Either Bhamaha or Bhatti [Jacob, ZDMG, lxxv, sb der presse & AD (1922), 210 8, Keith, SL, 51] or Bhatti wrote in anticipation of the rhetorical objection as already set out by Bhamaha. The former seems more likely. S K De, [SP, 50]. H.R. Dwekar [JRAS (1924), 880] says "It is not thus a boast, but rather an excuse. If a poet is to boast of his poem as being a hard nut to crack, he will boast that the learned and not the dull witted will find it difficult. To puzzle the dull-witted is not a thing to be proud of, and this is why Bhatti gives vidvatpriya ta as an excuse for that. It will, therefore, be not wrong if it is said that the verse of Bhamaha, whose conception of a poem is अविद्यासाहस्रात्तीतितदननेवानूः, must be the original, and the verse of Bhatti, was also accepts that conception, is based on Bhamaha's words. The word eva which signifies a praśedha (contradiction), and the reason vidvatpriya  put forward makes this position quite clear in the minds of the readers."

For striking resemblances between Bhamaha and Bhatt, compare also

1. लक्षिकामकानातःसुधिधिकिन्तु वचा तबीदते ||
   को तस्यथैरूपरं सप्नाविकारणम प्रति ||

Bhamaha, n 10

and

इति मानो राजसो मूढिकिन्तु नासी विद्धुः ||
   को इत्यथैरुपरिभेदि विवेकदत्तनमवर्तितमुः ||

Bhatti, x 27

II. बृहस्पतिकाण्डमभिध्याम् तन्वी द्यासा लता वधा ||

Bhamaha, II 81

and

रूपसिद्धिराज्यतथा दयिता अनागमिनी ||
   वृहस्पतिकाण्डमभिध्यामा न्योथपारिप्रमणक ||

Bhatti, v 18

1 Ed Calcutta
2 For these commentaries, see IO, 544 5, CC, I 418.
Bharata or Bharatamallika, ¹ Jayamangala, ² Jibāṇandadvīśāgara, ³ Mallinātha, ⁴ Śridhara, ⁵ Sankarācarya ⁶

45 Bhatti’s example has been fruitful in similar compositions In Rāvaṇārjunyām⁷ in 27 cantos, Bhūma or Bhaumaka⁸ relates the story of Kārtavīrya and illustrates almost the whole Aṣṭadhyāvi of Panini He is quoted by Jayādīya in his Kāśika and by Ksemendra in Urvrīstilaka and may have lived about 7th century A.D. In MSS available in Malabar the author’s name is given as Bhosa and the colophon runs as इति श्री बखसीवालतन्यमुदेश्यितिरितिते There is a commentary on it by Parameśwara

Similarly in Lakṣānādarā, Mahāmohopādhyāya Divākara,⁹ narrates in 14 cantos the story of Mahabhārata, with expressions illustrative of grammatical rules of Panini ¹⁰

46 Kāśinātha’s Yadvamsakāvyam, describing the history of Yadus,¹¹ Pānminusṭroḍāharanam, of unknown authorship dealing with the story of Bhagavatam¹² illustrates the aphorisms of Pāṇini So also

---

¹ Ed Calcutta DC, XX 7788 He was the son of Ambrasīha Gaṇātāga Mallika and lived about 1800 He mentions Kavīkālaṇḍuma of Bopadeva See Mebra, VI 144, CO, I 899

² Ed Calcutta Jayamangala’s definitions of Alankāرس in Canto X show him to be older than Mammata (see Trivedi’s Int to Eka) There is a criticism of this commentary, TC, IV 5467

³ Ed Calcutta 4 Ed everywhere 5 DC, XX 7787.

⁶ CO, I 418, quoted in Mādhavaṇya Dvātuvṛtti

⁷ Ed Bombay BKR, 62, Trivedi’s Int (op cit)

⁸ There is an Angada nātaka by Bhūhata (E, II 116; CO, I 4) which seems to be a missake for Subhata Bhūmata (CO, I 413) and Bhūma Kavi (II, XXXI 299) are different The other variants seen in MSS are Bhuma Bhāta, Bhū Bhatta, Bhumabhāta See Peterson, Subh 88, There are verses quoted in Sācangadharapadāti

⁹ TC, IV 5664. Kavinīśācrya, also known as Devakara son of Vaḍyēsvara and Gunavaṭā of Bhādaṇvāja gotra lived in the court of Kṛṣṇaraya of Vizianagar and wrote the poem Bhāvāṣṭāyāṃ in 20 cantos (TC, IV 5502). His brother Mādhava sudana wrote Dhurjacakarābhāna

¹⁰ The following colophon will show the object of the poem.

¹¹ KCR, Clat, II, 320; Oud, II, 55; PB, III, 296. Kāśinātha was son of Śrīkāmaṇa and Rokut.

¹² TC IV, 4543 A commentary ion it by Śrīmadvara at the Court of King Raviyama of Malabar
are Subhadraharanam (in 20 cantos) of Nārāyana, son of Brahmadaṭṭha of Kudalūr-mana of Malabar\(^1\) and Vāsuđevavijayam of Vasūdeva,\(^2\) treating of the marriage of Subhadra and story of Kṝṇa respectively. Nārāyana's Dhātukāvya is a sequel to the latter, in illustration particularly of verbal forms, as dealt with by Bhīmasena's Dhātupālham and Mādhava's Dhātuvṛti.\(^3\) Vākyāvali illustrates in four cantos grammatical peculiarities, figures of speech, prosody and poetical tricks.\(^4\) Śrīchnakāvya in 12 cantos relates the life of Kṝṇa, the first eight cantos were written by Kṝṇaḥāra in illustration of Vararuci's Prakṛtaprakṣa and the rest by his pupil Durgāprasādayati, in illustration of Trividkrama's Prākṛta grammar.\(^5\)

47. Bhattara-Harichandra,\(^6\) is praised by Bana in his Harṣacarita. It is said that he wrote a romance Mālaṭi. He may therefore be assigned to the 5th or 6th century A.D. In Sadukti-Kārṇāmṛta (5139) he is mentioned as an “enchanted poet” and classed with great poets.\(^7\) His verses are quoted in the anthologies.\(^8\)

Harichandra,\(^9\) a Jain poet of the Digambara sect, was the son of Ārdradeva and Rādhā and brother of Lākṣmana of the Kāyaṣṭha Sanomaka family. He bore the title of Sarvasvātiputra.\(^10\) He is mentioned by Rājaśekhara in his Karpūrāmanjari.\(^11\)

---

\(^{1}\) TC, III 8838. There is a commentary by the author himself for 16 cantos.

\(^{2}\) He is different from Nārāyana Bhattāṭṭha, who wrote Nārāyaniyam in 1587 A.D. See JBRAS, (1900), 763 and Int to Nārāyaniyam (Tr Sans Series).

\(^{3}\) Ed Bombay, Kavyamāla Part X. See on this author, post.

\(^{4}\) DC, XX, 7744. There is a commentary probably by the author himself.

\(^{5}\) Kup Rep (1919), 99

\(^{6}\) TC, V B No 4155.

\(^{7}\) Hulsch (JMy, XII, 313) denies and Peterson is not certain about his identity (PR, II 77) with the other Haricandra.

\(^{8}\) SDMG, XXXV 969, Subh 161

\(^{9}\) He is called Harisandra by Lākṣmana in his Commentary in Vādīrāja's Yogōdharacarita (IC, III 8324).

\(^{10}\) A poet Haricandra, son of Raḍmarāṇidī, lived in the court of Bhilama III of Devagudi and composed an inscription in 1025 (Saka ?) (IA, XVII 120, XXIII 129).

Another Haricandra known as Vaidya Haricandra, an ancestor of Mahāyana, author of Vīyakoṣa, was a poet and he is quoted in Subhāṣītyālī, Seán Auf Bod Cal. 167, 887, Sesb Rep II 47-6, Peterson, Subh, 136, Bāna, His predecessors and Contemporaries, (JBRAS, XVI app. II p. 111.)
His Dharmasarmadhaydayam is a poem in 21 cantos describing the life of Dharmanātha, the fifteenth Tīrthankara from his birth to nirvāṇa. The hero was born as the son of Mahāsena of Īkāvaku family and king of Raṇapura by his wife Suvratā. His verse is full of melody and his expression noted for its lucidity.

In his Jīvandharacampu he relates in 13 lambhas the story of a Jaina prince Jīvandhara, son of king Sātyandhara as related by Sudharmā to King Śrenika. The language is charming and takes rank with the best of its kind. T. S. Kuppuswami Sastri mentions a drama, Jīvandhārarātanam by Hāricandra.

48 Bharavi, known also as Dāmodara, was the son of Nārāyana-swāmin of Kausika goṣṭa. His ancestors lived at Ānandapura in N W India and migrated later into the country of Nāsikā (Dekhan). Once accompanying the local prince Viṣṇuvardhana on a hunting expedition, in dire distress, he was obliged to eat meat and he set out on pilgrimage to expiate the sin. On his way he made acquaintance with Durviniṭa (a Ganga prince). Having heard his glory sung by a

---

1. Ed Bombay
2. He himself says so in his concluding verse
5. The word probably means Peninsula. Dandin uses this word in the sense of South India where Kāṇoī is situated.
6. Viṣṇuvardhana here referred to might be Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana of the inscriptions. He was the younger brother of Sāṭyārāya Pulakesin II who ascended the throne in 608 A.D. As a heir under the latter he captured Vengi from the Pallavas and conquered king Harṣavardhana. He was viceroy of a province with the capital at Piṭapura, now Pithapuram in Godavari District. Later, he declared his independence of his brother and founded the dynasty of Eastern Chalukyas. On Pulakesin and Viṣṇuvardhana, see V. Smith, EH 426, 426, Rep of Epigraphy (Madras) G O No 574, 11th July 1906, Keilhorn, EI VIII App 11. For grants of Viṣṇuvardhana I (El. Chalukya) see IA, XIX 308 (583 40 Saka=608-9 A.D.) and XX 15 (632 A.D.) and of Viṣṇuvardhana V, see IA, VII 186 (640 Saka=663-9 A.D.) and VII 191 (681 Saka=699-60 A.D.). JAH, I 86.

6. Durviniṭa was the son of king Avinīṭa of Kongani and daughter's son of Prunamarāja. Durviniṭa was disinherited by his father and in his banishment wandered
Gandharva in a couplet, king Simhavishnu,² of Kanchi invited the author of it and that was Bhāravi there he lived happily in the company of the royal prince Mahendravikrama, the son of Simhavishnu. He had a son Manoraṭha and Dandin, as we shall see, was the son's son of Manoraṭha. This is the account given in the Avanṭisundarākathā.

over distant countries He was a great scholar and wrote a commentary on 16 cantos of Bhāravi's Kirātārjuna a Sanskrit version of the Bharabhaktiḥā and the work called Sadāvajāra. See,

Shāmilokamahārajaśāhīrajaḥ, abhinātanām purokān avīśapatkarēna dharmaśrīni-

nīvadhukākhyena, bharataśāṁkavardamaṇi kākāśūrya prabhūlayam.

[My Arch Rep (1916) 38], also EC (Tumkur) 29, Id., XLII 204

On the genuineness of these inscriptions doubts were expressed but there is no reason to suspect a forgery. There is a learned discussion by R. Namasmhachar Durvīṣṭa is mentioned in Nṛpiṅga’s Khavrajāmārga as a great Kannarese author.

1 Simhavishnu was the Pallava king who ruled between 575 and 600 A.D. at Kāñci. He vanquished the Malaya, Pandya, Chola etc. kings and took possession of the banks of the Kaveri. His son was Miheudavarman or Mahendravikramavarman I (600 635 A.D.) He bore the titles Śrījumalla and Avarī Bhājana. He was the author of the Maṭtavilāsa Prabhaman, a farse known after his own title Maṭtavilāsa (Ed Dr Sanskrit series, No 58). In this play are described the drunken rivalry of a Kāpālika with his female compant, his quarrel with a hypocritical Śākya Bhūksa for alleged theft of a bowl, the mediation by a degenerate Pālpāta and the final recovery of the bowl from a madman.

The genealogy from Simhavishnu is given by V. Venkayya in Mod Rev VIII 165.

In this order—Simhavishṇu—Mahendravarman I—Namasmhavaran—Mahendravarman II—Paramesvaravarman (defeated Chalukya Vikramaditya)—Rajasimha—Mahendra varman II and Paramesvaravarman II—Nandivarman (about 760 A.D.)

In the Mamandoor inscription we find गवद्वजकपत्रिविलासादि and the rest of the inscription is mutilated. If गवद्वजक means संगवजक, the coupling of it with सत्विलास would mean that their author was the same. There is also a broken line in the Avanṭisundari kathā स च तथा गळसागरात्मकानादनमृतस्मि श्रीकर्तृत सस्त्रमाकानात् व...

Śrīvrama is the general name of Pallava kings, used in inscriptions. It is possible that this verse may refer to a work called Gandhamadana by Mahendravikramavarman. See also the following verse of Rajasekhara quoted in Jālhana’s Sukṭāmukṭa vali.

श्र- शास्त्रविदे शास्त्रात्म स ह्यति |
सेवा सक्तलक्ष्मि विदेशे गवद्वजकर्मः ॥

Here the word Sāhasāṅkra may refer to this king.

For relevant inscriptions, see BI, IV 152 and SII, I 29-80, and Venkayya, Inscriptions on the Trichinopoly cave (Arch Surv Annual 1908-9, 270 ff); G. Jones-Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Dravīḍi (Pondicherry), 68, and The Pallavas (Pondicherry), 89, Pallava Antiquities, I Ch 11, T. Ganapati Sastri, Int to Maṭtavilāsa-prabhaman.
There is a doubt whether Bharavi and Damodara were identical, and Bharavi was another name of Damodara. Avantisundarikathā-sāra is a version in verse of Avantisundarikathā in prose and the version is almost a faithful reproduction. In Kathāsāra (123) the verse is

दामोदर इनि श्रीमानादि जावहन्। में सेवावी कविविठ्ठनारिति मस्त्र (अ) गिरान-अनुभवारोनेवेच्ये नरेचे विषयकर्णे।

The corresponding prose passage in Kathā as printed by M. R. Kavi is mutilated and indistinct.

यत कौशिक व पुष्यकर्माणि विषयवर्तनाळये राज्यनाह प्रणयमच्य नानू।

G. Harhara Sastri has made an extract of this passage from another manuscript obtained from the Department of Publication of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Trivandrum.

यत कौशिक कुमारो (दामोदरो) महाशेष महाप्रभु महाशेष मारविनर रंगिनस्तु-रंगुऽय दर्शिण्य इस पुष्यकर्माणि विषयवर्तनाळये राज्यनाह प्रणयमच्य नानू।

That is, this passage reads Bharavi and the adjectives attached to it in the objective declension so that the word becomes an object of the verb anuruddhya. Harhara Sastri says, 'What we learn from the prose and metrical versions is that Bharavi was a savant (mahasava) and great poet (girumpabhadha) attached to the Prince Vrāvacarvadana and that Damodara, who was also endowed with poetical gifts of a high order, secured the friendship of the Prince through the medium of Bharavi."

This does not however affect the date to be assigned to Bharavi. *

Besides these synchronisms, the name of Bharavi is mentioned in the Athoie inscription 8 of Pulekesi II, dated Saka 556 (=A.D. 634) Bharavi may therefore be taken to have lived on either side of the beginning of the 6th century A.D.

---

1 IEQ, III 169
2 S K De, (IEQ, I 31, III 169) concurs in this view. S K De, assigns Bharavi to the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th Century A.D.
3 IA V 67 71 where the whole inscription is published.

येनायोजिः न वेश्य स्तरस्बस्तिची विवेकिना विनेवस्यः।
स विजयतः राविनीिः कवितामितकितादससमाविष्करितः॥

"May this Ravikirti, who has obtained the fame of Kalidāsa and Bharavi who followed the noble path of poetics be victorious! May he flourish for ever, who in his great wisdom had this temple of Jina constructed, as firm as rock itself on a costly and new modal"

For a discussion of this inscription, see page 68 supra, and IA, VI 73, XVI 109; CII, III 79 note.
49 Stories of Bharavi's poverty and affluence are current in a variety of versions Pargankar gives a version

"Bharavi was ground by poverty and being ever immersed in poetic life, was often troubled by the furious remarks of his wife. She once reproached him for his dullness in as much as he did not stir himself about money, and the poet, goaded by necessity and the constant reproaches of his wife, did set out to try his fortune to seek royal support. When he had gone a few miles, he saw a beautiful tank. Fatigued by the labours of the journey, he stopped there and wrote the following verse on a lotus-leaf:

सहस्स विदर्शित न क्रियास्ववेक परसाप्त्र वद्यूः।
कुर्मः हि विद्वाद्वाय सूर्यनरायण लयस्वे सप्तः।—Krata, II 30

The king of the country who happened to be on the very spot as he had left his palace for hunt, was so much delighted with it that he ordered the poet to see him in his palace at a particular time and then galloped off. The poet, mean looking and dressed in rags, found no admittance to the royal presence, and had in despair to go back. The king, however, had the verse painted in gold in his private chamber. A year silently passed, when the king set out with his chosen few to hunt, declaring that he would return after a week. On the second night, however, his camp not being far off, he rode alone to his private chamber and to his extreme wonder and rage, found the queen lying with another person on his bed! Suddenly he drew out his sword and was about to strike both dead, when the verse in golden letters attracted his attention. His rage abated and he resolved to awaken both and tell them of their heinous offence and then to pass the sentence of capital punishment on them. But what was his surprise when, on awakening them, he was told that the youth was no other than his son, who being stolen away by a nurse from cradle, was discovered that very evening! The king, immediately in tears thanked God that he had not rashly murdered his wife and his only son the sole heir to the throne. It need hardly be added that the king afterwards sought out the author of the verse that had so curiously preserved the life of his son, and rewarded him suitably."

1. The verse was so popular that it is frequently quoted in Sastri discussions. Prabhakara in his Bhati (I I) reduces his opponent's want of sense by the 2nd line.

2. For another version, see M Suryanarayana Sastri, Life of Sanskrit Poets (Telugu) Amalapuram, 93-6
**50 Kiratarjuniyam** is his only poem known to us. In eighteen cantos, it describes the fight between Arjuna and Śiva in the garb of a mountaineer. On the advice of Vyāsa to seek celestial arms by penance, Arjuna engages himself in severe penance in the Himalayas. Śiva comes to meet him as a Kirāṭa, wild-hunter, and a mighty boar which came to attack Arjuna is slain. Both Arjuna and the disguised god claim the merit of having slain the animal and a quarrel is picked up and fight ensues. When fighting in the air Arjuna holds the god by the feet and on his appeal, Śiva reveals himself and blesses the warior with the gift of arms with which he was to win back his lost kingdom. The poem bears Lak-mi-pāda-anka. The poem displays a vigour of thought and language and a lofty eloquence of expression rarely equalled in Sanskrit literature. In a well-known verse in Sadukī Karnāmṛta his words are said to possess a natural grace. On account of the beauty of a particular verse, the poet became known as Chatra Bhāravi.

---

1. Ed Bombay, Calcutta and Madras and elsewhere and in Harvard University Series No 15, with a German translation by O Cappeller, [reviewed in JRAS (1917) 869 by F W Thomas] Translated into English (Cantos 1 to 4) by B N Nandi (Calcutta), (cantos 1 to 5) by Subrahmanya Sastri, Madras; (cantos 1 to 10) by L R Pangarkar, Bombay, (cantos 1 to 8) by M R Kale, Bombay. Cantos 1 to 8 by M R Kale with an elaborate introduction, Cantos 1 to 10 by Pangarkar (with an introduction) Abridged in verse in Dutt's *Lays of Ancient India.*


2. R V Krishnamacharya collects such masks or ankas in several poets (Sah, XVIII 928)

3. It was Māgha's ambition to view with Bhāravi and both chose their plots from the *Mahābhārata.* For parallel passages, see O Cappeller, *loc. cit.*

There is this traditional verse

**तावद्रा मार्गैर्मीति याक्षमाचसि चौदयाम् ॥**

**जुमते च पुनःमथि मार्ले मौ स्त्रेनिच ॥**

4. **प्रक्तिमुहुरा कारविपिर**

See the verse quoted *sukra.*

5. **वज्रभन्दन्त्राविनादस्य भाद्राद्रुते रसितव्यवम्प प्रायः ॥**

**वात्सामिविधिति विश्रविचित सम्तादाचेच सन्निवयातपतवश्रीस्य ॥**

*Karāla, V 89.*

See Sah, XVIII 92 for similar titles.

20
His work is compact and meaning-leaden. "He is a hard-thinking poet, in whom we feel at work a certain tension of will".

This poem has been the standard text-book for ages for students of literature. The first three cantos are particularly hard and came therefore to be known as pāṇāṭayam and in the 15th canto, there are verses in a variety of meanings and alliteration.

51 In the richness of a creative fancy, in true tenderness and pathos, says R C Dutt, and even in the sweetness and melody of verse, Kāhḍāsa is incomparably the greatest poet. But nevertheless Bhāravi boasts of a vigour of thought, and of language, and lofty eloquence in expression, which Kāhḍāsa seldom equals. Bhāravi's dramatic expression is the subject of approbation when Sāradātanaya says —

तादात्म्य भावस्योभूतभी सप्तमन्दिरादि।

Mallinātha describes Bhāravi's language as nārikelapāka and says that the sweetness of his poetry is enveloped in a garb of apparent ruggedness. The saying of pandits ranks Kāhḍāsa's smiles along with Bharavi's pregnant expressions.

52 There is a prose abidgment by a Pandit Ayurveda Bhushanam Duraiswami Iyengar. The same story of the fight between Arjuna and Siva is related in the Sankarananda Campū of Gururāma in Pārthaliśa, a poem of unknown authorship and is dramatised in the Kirāṭarjunyāvyāyoga of Rāmavarma, and in Dhananjayāvyāyoga of Kancanācārya.

1 Bhāravi's Āṣṭighoṣam is proverbial Kṛṣṇakavi in his Bharata Carīta (Tr, Sans. Sena) wrote

प्रदशिकृतापि महान्तमयं पदशिर्यन्ती रसमादश्या ||

ता मारे स्तुत्योष्टोक्तर्था क्रिति कैराव नौपजीव्या ||

Colebrooke's Mrs Essays, 84, Manning's Ancient and Mediaeval India, II 184 6

2 नारिकेकश्चतस्वार्थ बचो मारे सपदेत तदद्वृत्ते ||

सादान्तु रसगर्भिभिर्मी सारमस्य दशका यथेन्दितम् ||

एव भुजा कालिदासस्य मातेरस्यगौरवम् ||

3 Ed Madras

4 In the cave temple of Mahabalipuram there is sculpture representing Kūrṇā and Arjuna. See Kalā, I.

5 Ed, XXI 8803

6 Ed Sahridaya, IV

7 Ed Karilyama, Bombay

He was son of Kṛṣṇa-vaiśnavabhātta.

The commentary is very elaborate but embraces only 3 cantos and is therefore called Trasāṅgika. He says that his object was only to show the standard of what a commentary should be and that he did not therefore proceed further. Nothing is known about Cīrabhāṇu, but he is also the author of two poems Bhāsālokottara and Bālālokottara.

There is one Cīrabhāṇu, father of Bāna, but he is a different person.

T. 9

11. BR, (1887). It was composed in 1218 A.D. the reign of Zusamābhi of Kaspum (1423-12 A.D.) Jonaraja is the author of a Bījāṭārāngī. BP, 51, 233.
54 Magha is one of the most popular among Sanskrit poets. Mediaeval tradition has recorded that he was patronised by King Bhoja of Dhar. Pressed by want the poet sent his wife to that king’s court with a verse describing the rising sun but indirectly deploring the sports of chance. Delighted with its merit the king gave her a present of money, but on her way back the generous woman distributed it among the wandering beggars whose needs she thought were worse than her own. So she came home just as she left it, with a further throng of beggars behind her. The poet saw the scene and became desperate. He cursed poverty in a few verses and drooped down dead on the spot. The king heard the story and with great grief himself performed the poet’s funeral ceremonies. To preserve his memory he named the village Bhinnamala.

Magha was the son of Daṭṭa or Dattaka. His grand-father Suprabhādeva was the minister of King Śrī Varmalāga whose capital was the city of Śrīmāla in Guzarat. Magha was a great grammarian and his knowledge of grammar and lexicon is often apparent in his poem. He is mentioned by Somadeva, Rājaśekhara, Ānandavarthdana and by Bhoja. Nṛpatunga who became king in 1814 A.D. refers to Magha in his Kavirājamārga as an author of

1 Bhallāla’s Bhogasūtra, Motuṅgna’s Prabandha Cuntiṇamaṇi and Prabhāsandra’s Prabhāvaka canṭiṇa. For a full account, see Durgaprasad’s Int. to Śisūpālavaṇḍha (Bombay).
2 Kāvyadanaśāhī Śrīmad-vadāṃsakāla, Lajjaśīradya udsūtsaṭaśriitamāḥśākālaḥ: Udayakārīṣṭakārīṣṭa śrīndavatāt hūtāvibhūvāhādaśāhāvibhīdāhavāhVII. XI 64.
3 Probably because Magha was a poet of Malva. There is a vilaage named Bunn Maḷava now known as Bhinnamala on the boundary line between Guzarat and Marwar.
4 Paterson gives the name as Vattaka or Sarvācaya, (Int. to Subh 88).
5 See the description of the poet’s family given by himself at the end of Śisūpālavaṇḍha.
6 Durgaprasad (op cit 8 note) gives the colophon of a manuscript which reads Śrī Bhinnamāḷava-vās avya Daṭṭha sconor mahāvallakaśarantya Māghasya kriṇa,
7. It is a saying nacchāvatē sāyē nac bhaddē n māvē tē.
8. In the Kāyāvimānaśād (composed about 900 A.D.) Gaek Or, Series Int. xxii
9 In his Vāsaṭṭhakānama (composed in 930 A.D.) See DR, 1933-54, 45.
10 Contemporary of Aṇauṭivaman, king of Kashmir (857 to 884 A.D.) See his Dhvanyālōka, 114, 115.
11 In the Sarasvati Kauṭiyābhaṣanā (Sis IX. 6). See CO, I 448.
12 Int to K. B. Paṭek’s Edition, Magha is also referred to in a Canarese inscription ID, V. 66) dated Saka 1102=1180 A.D.
acknowledged excellence and ranks him with the immortal author of Sakuntalā. These references distinctly prove that the tradition of Māgha being a contemporary of Bhūja cannot possibly be true.

In a well-known verse of Śīvapālavadha, 2 Māgha refers to the two grammatical treatises the Kāśīlāvyṛtī and its commentary the Nyāsa. The Kāśīlāvyṛtī was the joint production of Jayādiyā and Vāmana, and according to ITSing Jayādiyā died about 661 A.D. 3 The real difficulty in determining Māgha's date lies in the obscurity of the correct name of the king he refers to in his geneology. It is possible that the correct reading is Varmalāṭa. 4 This king Varmalāṭa is mentioned in an epigraphic record dated Sam 682 (625 A.D.) 5 and in collation with the references to and by the poet aforesaid we may not be wrong in relying on this inscription as giving the real clue to Māgha's age. Māgha was the grandson of Suprabhādeva, the minister of this king. He may therefore be placed in the latter half of the 7th century A.D. 6

1 अश्वसूत्रपदन्यासा सदृश सर्विच-भनना ल

2 Max Muller, What can India teach us?, 346. English Translation of ITSing's work, chap xxxiv, 176. ITSing does not however refer to the commentary Nyāsa and from this silence K. B. Pathak (JBRAS, xx 308) concludes that Jinendra-buddhi did not flourish during the interval of 44 years that elapsed between Jayādiyā's death and that of ITSing's departure from India in A.D. 695. He therefore places the composition of Nyāsa in the first half of the 8th century and consequently assigns Māgha to the latter part of it, but it must be remarked that the argumentum ex silentio cannot be of much merit and to the mind of ITSing the commentary might not have struck as important as the original work. But Kielhorn adds: "An interpretation of this verse to denote the Nyāsa of Jinendra-buddhi is based solely on the outward form of the word and its proximity to the word Vṛṣā and would completely disregard the meaning and context of the poet's interesting and scholarly statement. Jinendra-buddhi had freely copied from Haragaṭṭa's Paḍamani, and this would make Jinendra much later than Magha because that poet is quoted by name more than once in the Paḍamani", JBRAS (1906), 499.

3 The name appears in several forms Dharmanātha, Dharmanāṭa, Dharma-lāṭha, Dharmaśīva, Gharmanāṭa, Carmalāṭa, Varmalāṭa, Varmalāṭhā, and Nirmanāṭa, varying according to the scribe's ingenuity. Prabhāsandera mentions the name as Varmalāṭa.

4 See Kielhorn's article in Gottinger Nachrichten, (1906), Part II, 143 etc., JBRAS, (1906), 728.

5 Prabhāsandera mentions Sūḍhārṣā (chv, 10-16) as the first paternal career of Māgha. Sūḍhārṣā was the author of Upamitiḥṣaṇapanaśakti composed in Sam 962. Relying on this Dr. F. Klett assigns Māgha to the beginning of the 10th century A.D. Durgaprasad refers to Ananda-varāhāna's quotation and dispose of Prabhāvaka-garita as based on pure hearsay and as of no authority. He agrees with
The only work of Māgha that has come down to us is the Sīsupalavadha. A Mahākāyva of 20 cantos, it relates the episode in the Mahābhārata of Kṛśna’s slaying of Sīsupāla. The Rājasūya sacrifice of Yuḍhishthira is described and in it Sīsupāla’s misbehaviour, the immediate cause of the conflict, is well delineated. The last three cantos are devoted to the description of the actual warfare. As a classical poem it has always maintained its popularity and though the thoughts are sometimes voluptuous, a profound learning is everywhere apparent. His ideas reflect his life and the sufferings he had to undergo are often alluded to with a tinge of the consolation of fatalism. The anthologies quote some verses under Māgha’s name. These are not traceable in any known work and it is possible that Sīsupalavadha was not the only poem of his composition.

Some of his fancies are quite original and it was one of them that brought him the name of Ghanā-Māgha. We cannot be certain of the line of his religious persuasion, though the invocation in the

---

1. Bhimasena in his commentary Sudhāśāhaka on Kavyaprakāśa says that Māgha was only the purchaser of the manuscript of the book from some poet whose name has been suppressed. He says Māgha was a Vaisya and gives this work as an illustration of a poem composed for money (arthaśāstra). So Vamanachary’s Int to Kavyaprakāśa (Bombay), Prabhāvakaraṇa also calls Māgha’s uncle Subhān-kara as Sreṣṭhil (xvi 15).

2. He illustrates Sībal iṣṭa in Canto IV, with matul prakāśa of a very complex character.

---

5. The only work of Māgha that has come down to us is the Sīsupalavadha. A Mahākāyva of 20 cantos, it relates the episode in the Mahābhārata of Kṛśna’s slaying of Sīsupāla. The Rājasūya sacrifice of Yuḍhishthira is described and in it Sīsupāla’s misbehaviour, the immediate cause of the conflict, is well delineated. The last three cantos are devoted to the description of the actual warfare. As a classical poem it has always maintained its popularity and though the thoughts are sometimes voluptuous, a profound learning is everywhere apparent. His ideas reflect his life and the sufferings he had to undergo are often alluded to with a tinge of the consolation of fatalism. The anthologies quote some verses under Māgha’s name. These are not traceable in any known work and it is possible that Sīsupalavadha was not the only poem of his composition.

Some of his fancies are quite original and it was one of them that brought him the name of Ghanā-Māgha. We cannot be certain of the line of his religious persuasion, though the invocation in the

---
Siṣupālavadha indicates that he was a votary of Viṣṇu. He must have all the same been much in the company of Buddhists and had a great regard for the teaching of Buddha. He describes his grand-father Suprabhādeva as prime minister to a king "who listened to his advice with as great respect as the enlightened public received the words of the revered Buddha" and with a similar desire he compares Hari with Bodhisatva and the allies of Siṣuṣuṇa with the host of Māra or the Satan of the Buddhist legend. To a certain extent he adopted the style of Bhāravi, but in general merit Māgha takes a higher place.

There are commentaries on Siṣuṣuṇa by Cantravardhana, Pedda Bhatta, Devarāja, Haridasā, Śrīrangadeva, Śrīkantha, Bharatasena, Candrasekhara, Kanvallabha Cakravarṣi, Lakṣmīnātha, Dhavāṇ(b)adatta, Vallabhādeva, Mahēśvarapancāna, Bhagiratha, Jībhānanda Vidyasāgara, Ganuḍa, Anandadevayānī, Divākara, Prhaspū, Rājakunda, Jayasimhācārya, Mallinala, [Śrīrangadeva and Padmanabhādatta, Vrsākara, Rangarāja, Ekanātha, Bharaṇamallika, Gopa]. and one Anonymous.

1 See the concluding verses in cancon II and XV 68.
2 There is a traditional anonymous verse to say so.

Tāvākta mārāyāṁCREATE itching maṁasākṣya nośdya |
śaṁḍiṣe č puṇamāpī mārāyāṁ ṛṇeṛiv ||

2 Tanti Cat. VI, 2506.
3 DC, XX, 7893
4 DC, XV 7892
5 DC, 7888. He was son of Viṣṇudāsa and Muladevi. His grandfather Śaktimitra and the son of Jyeṣtha of Rudra family and of Kāśyapa-goṣṭa and resident of Lābhapura. Haridasā quotes Kāvyadarpana.
6 DC, XX 7885, IO, IV 5588
7 IO, I, 8004, IV 4721. He was Varur by caste and lived in Jayasimhamangala on the banks of Daksinaganga in Malabar. All the members of his family were known by the name of Šrīkantha.
8 IO, 3222 so L, 8276
9. IO, 3239, 32 38, L, 3040
10 IO, 635
11 IO, 173
12 E, 63
13 Rā Kasi Samkunt Somes, Benares, TO, IV 4714, 5649
14 IO 3232 so
15 L, 1682
16 Printed, Calcuta
17 B, 265
18 IO, 924
19 NP, 161
20 IO, 8222
21 Cu, 2287.
22 Cochin State Manuscripts
23 Printed everywhere
24 Sah, XIX 309
25 Tanti, Cat, VI 2510 (7th canto only)
Sivaswamin was a poet of the court of King Avantivarman who ruled over Kashmir between 855 and 884 A.D. He was a follower of Buddha and an ardent admirer of his religion. His only poem KAPPHANABHYUDAYAM opens with an invocation to Buddha. In twenty cantos, it describes the expedition of Kapphana, the king of Dakṣenapātha, against the country of King Prasenajit of Śravasti and in the course of the march through the Malaya mountains several seasons are passed and parties of lovers do not miss pleasant excursions in regions of sylvan beauty. Though successful in his expedition, Kapphana turns philosophical and renouncing his worldly attachments, he becomes a pious follower of Buddha. The poem in general follows the plan of Sūpadāvadham and Kirāṭāryunīyam and verbal beauties of composition such as yamakas and bandhas are not rare.

The following verse illustrates his prolific writings in Sanskrit though most of them have now become extinct.

वात्य च विपरीतादनम् भाषाकायाणि सप्त हस्सवात्
व्यञ्जनानिरिन्तुतिकाश्चात्काश्च चैकादक्ष।
कुःवस नालकाभिकरणपाकामु नवन्याचाहुरः
विषयचालुनापि नातिशिवितर वाणी शिवलाभिन।

1. He is also known as Bhattasivaswamin or Bhatasa Śivaswamin
2. The following verse illustrates his prolific writings in Sanskrit though most of them have now become extinct.

3. For analysis of the poem, see SB, II (1899) 40, see also BR, (1897), xvii., Aufsch., ZDMG, xxvii, 92, CII 551, Peterson’s (Sulī 130) Thomas (Kav. in)
collects all quotations in the anthologies Rayamukuta and Sarvāmanta quote fragments, not traceable in this poem.

For the beauty of his poetry see the following:

दिव व न्यस्तूताग्रिनिद्रम्या वोषेन्नुकासितनर्यूविव हि सहितः चित्तितार्हित चोक्तिति |
जलविजलोक्तारित कक्ष्य न्योतोतलोत स्तिरिधन्तुरर्तीर्निधावसदनिषातीभी हषेवमतिशी ||
वेण्यु स्नेहारम समवा ता कपोलोर्णानिजवादानात।
स्नेहारम स्नेहारमकाव्यानां विलासिती विशेषंरितुप्रयादा।
प्रतिप्रतिश्रीविचित्रप्रिशायदर्शन स्फुटकु हुपायागाम।
स्मृतवारिभये सनाचारकी वद्द्वे नाटकवितिकत्तीनादृ ||
बिनच बिनयरू सितानि प्राप्तंशनानि समवम नवांसति प्रवृत्तव।
प्रायापि बिनुश्रीवितानि कर्कवासवं वद्द्वे सदाव वधवादान ||

 मुदुविदाद विमिंदात युध्यु प्राप्तसम्यो युद्धसरसा भेमसहा युद्धसरसिरा ||
विद्यमणयोपालम्भास युद्धेश्युधा युध सिरिक्रिये विषयंता विषों सिषुनोत्तरय: ||
MAHĀ-KĀVYA 159

57 Jinasena was the pupil of Virācārya and was at the head of those who were proficient in the fragment of the sacred texts left after the time of Subhadra and Lokārya, sages who were conversant with the ācārāngā of the Śvetāmbara Jain religion 1 Virācārya and Jinasena converted the Rāstrakūta king Amoghavāra 2 into Jamism and the king abdicated his throne in favour of his son in 875 A.D. Virācārya was an illustrious mathematician and alludes to the king in the prasasti of Ganṛtasārasangratha 3 Jinasena’s pupil Gunabhadra was the preceptor of king Kṛṣṇa II, Akālavarṣa 4 Among his works Hariyamā 5 was composed in the reign of Kṛṣṇaraja I, 6 grandfather of Amoghavāra, in 793 A.D and Pārśvabhyudaya 7 in 814 A.D Of Ādipurāṇa, 8 42 chapters were written by Jinasena and the last five were completed by his pupil Gunabhadra according to his instructions as Uttarapurānān. This was consecrated by his pupil Lokaśena in the reign of Rāstrakūta king Kṛṣṇa II, Akālavarṣa, on 23rd June 897 (Saka 828)

Pārśvabhyudaya is a poem in imitation of Kālidāsa’s Meghasandesam The last lines of the verses of the latter are taken and the first three lines are added. The poem deals with the story of Pārśvanātha, the 23rd Tīrthankara 8

Jinasena’s poetry is of a high order and often equals if not surpasses the beauty of Kālidāsa’s expressions 10

1 See Padmasūnata’s Kāyamūlābhyudaya, PR, III and IA, XX 849, App. 256 (which contains a prasasti at the end of Harīyamā) See also BB (1893 84) 118, PR, IV 167 177, xii, K B Pāthak, JBRAS, XVIII. 226 6, Bhandarkar, EHD, Sup 1
2 For his inscriptions dated Saka 765, 765, 788, 789 A.D, see IA, XII. 216, XIII 123, 133, 215; See Fleet’s Dynasties of Kanarese Districts, 407, K B Pāthak’s paper in IA, XIV 101 and XV, 141
3 See his Ātmanātāsana, verse 102.
4 For his inscriptions dated Saka 823 and 831, see IA XII. 220, 222, IA, XV 141
5 Printed Bombay
6 For his inscriptions, dated Saka 675, see IA, XII. 233
7 Ed by K B Pāthak, Poona
8 Printed, Indore 1938 Vols There is a doubt if Ādipurāṇa and Harīyamā are by two different Jinasesas
9 For fuller account, see under Meghasandesā in the Chapter on Laghubhāvya post
10 For instance, the following —

एकादशस्वाध्यायश्वाहिनी मिश्रितविषयैः ||
साध्यायामोठिः साध्यायामोठिः ||

कौशिकधार्मिकार्येऽज्ञातित्तिरतिनिः ||
मदुभाहितांदोऽमुखस्मृतं विचित्रभाषा ||

21
58 Ratnakar, was the son of Amṛtahām and descendant of Rajanaka Durgha, who lived at Gangahrada. He began his poetic career in the reign of King Cippala Juśādyā and became famous during the reign of his successor, King Avantivarman, who ruled over Kashmir between 833 and 884 A.D. He bore the title of Vidyāpāti Vāgīśvara. He was praised by Rājasekhara as a poet of vast learning and imagery and is popular with rhetoricians.

His Haravijāva is a long poem of 50 cantos describing the tales relating to Siva. From the beauty of a particular verse he has been known as Tāla-Rāṭuṅkaṇa.

1 Ratnasimha, who wrote Padyumna svāt Mahākavya in Simvatsa 1671, when Hemasoma was chief Svāt of the Tripagā.- is a different person—see PR IV, List of authors, and PR, b, 169.

2 This person is different from the poets Amṛtudī (a court poet of Shaha-buddin of 1350 A.D.) and Amṛtī, vadāna quoted in the Subhāśvah. See Peterson Int. to Subh, 6.

3 He bore the title of Tāla Lṛhaspati and Ratnakara calls himself Bhāspat yanujyvin, "a servant of young Lṛhaspati" (See Rf IV 675). He reigned 832-844 A.D. Between him and Amṛtvarman there were three minor kings of the Karkota dynasty. See Buhler, KR. 42 and Peterson Int. to Subh, 96.

4 As quoted in Haravali and Śuktīmuktačayā

5 Printed, Benares with Alaka's commentary. For a full account of the poem, see Buhler's KR, 42, and Aufrecht, ZDUG, XCVI 378 M. Duff gives date for Rāṭuṅkaṇa as 840 800 A.D.

6—Namājaya, XIX, 5.
There is a commentary on it by Vallabhadeva, an incomplete commentary by Alaka, son of Rajanaka Janak, which stops in the middle of 46th canto. Alaka was a contemporary and pupil of Rajanaka Haravijaya. It was left unfinished by Rajanaka and completed by Ganapati. It is possible therefore from the limit of Alaka's commentary to say that so far Rajanaka wrote too.

Vakrokta-Pancusika is a small poem of fifty verses, being an imaginary dialogue between Siva and Parvati, of ingenious intricacy, and Dhvanigadhapanika is a similar poem.

59 Abhinanda was the son of Satinanda. Soddhala, in the introductory verses to his Udayasundari, praises Abhinanda and Rajasekhara. The sequence, it is very likely, shows that Rajasekhara came after Abhinanda.

Soddhala lived mostly in the first half of the 11th century A.D. Abhinanda mentions his patron King Haravarsha Yuvaraja by whom he was well honored and in appreciation of his talents the King accorded to him a seat on his throne. Abhinanda and Soddhala class King Haravarsha along with famous royal patrons of letters, Vikrama, Haha and Sri Harsha. In the various verses in Ramacaritam, Abhinanda refers to King Haravarsha Yuvarajadeva as the son of Vikramashila, a scion of the house of King Dharmapala of the Pala dynasty.
In the Pāla dynasty of Bengal King Dharmapāla was famous and he had two sons Tribhuvanapāla and Devapāla. In the Monghyr grant, Tribhuvanapāla is mentioned as the Yuvarāja, but Devapāla succeeded his father and became famous in the second half of the 9th century A.D. K S Ramaswami Siromani compares verses in this grant with verses in the Rāmacarita, to show the purity of ideas and expressions relating to King Devapāla and concludes rightly, that King Devapāla was the King Hāravarṣa Yuvarājadeva. He says “The question may be raised as to how a king of the Pala Dynasty, instead of bearing a name ending in Pala, should prefer to the called Hāravarṣa a name quite foreign to the Pala tradition. The reason for this is not difficult to discover. It is well known that Dharmapāla married a Rastrakūta princess known by the name of Kamadevi. Rastrakūta princess were very fond of adopting names ending on “Vara” and it is very probable that King Devapāla during his stay in his maternal uncle’s household was known by the name of Hāravarṣa, while his elder brother Tribhuvanapāla was Yuvarāja in the Court of his father Dharmapāla.” Abhinanda must have therefore lived in the earlier half of the 9th century A.D.

His Rāmacarita is profusely quoted by Bhoja, Mammata and Mahima Bhatta and must have therefore very soon attained high celebrity. It is a long poem relating the story of Rāmāyana. In the Baroda edition recently published the editor says that “These four cantos have two definite recensions, one attributing the authorship to Abhinanda and the other to Bhimakavi a fairly unknown author. But this latter definitely says that Abhinanda left the work incomplete and it fell to his lot to complete the book by adding four more cantos. Most of the 36 cantos which are undoubtedly Abhinanda’s own contain besides the subject-matter of the poem additional verses written obviously in praise of his patron king and describing the morals of his own composition.” The ease of narration, the melody of versification and the grace of poetic fancy are apparent everywhere.

1 IA XXI, 259
2 JOR, III, 57 et seq which contains a learned discussion on this identification
3 Ed by K S Ramaswami Sastri Siromani in Gack Or series. The manuscript in the Madras Oriental Manuscripts Library breaks of in the 60th canto (IX, IV 5871). There is a manuscript with M B Kavi of Madras which stops with the 67th verse in the 50th canto
4 There is a Rāmacarita by Kasiṣṭha (IO, 1184, OC, I 106), and another by Sandhyākāmanandū (Ed by Haraprasad Sastri for Asiatic Society of Bengal)
60 Abhinanda also called Gaudabhinnanda, was the son of Jayanta, whose ancestors lived in the Gauda Country until one of them named Sakti went to Kashmir and married there in the town of Darvābhisāra. Sakti's grandson Saktisvāmin was a minister under King Lalitaditya Muktapida of the Karkota dynasty, who ruled at Kashmir about the year 726 A.D. From Saktisvāmin, Abhinanda was the 5th in descent Jalhana in his Sūlamun tāvāli mentions Abhinanda as a contemporary of Rājasekhara, and Abhīnavaṇgupta quotes him in his Łocana. From these references it appears that this Abhinanda lived in 9th century A.D. But Jayanta, the father of Abhinanda, ridiculing in Nyāyamanjarī, the bhrngā to idea in Kuttunīmaṭa of Damodaragupta incidentally mentions Sāṅkaravarman as the King of Kashmir in his time (Nyā p 279). Sāṅkaravarman ruled from 884 A.D. This allusion brings down Abhinanda to a generation later, to the first half of the 10th century. His Kadambari-Kathāsāra epitomises in 8 cantos the story of Bana's Kadambari in verse. His poetry has been held in high estimation by later rhetoricians.

61 Padmaṇgupta, otherwise known as Parimala Kālidāsa, was the son of Mrgāṅkagupta. He was a poet of the Court of King Munja of the Paramara dynasty, who, among several other titles, bore also the name of Navasāhasāṅka. His literary activity extended through the last and first quarters of the 10th and the 11th centuries. He was a devotee of Śiva. He was an admirer of Kālidāsa and in descriptive imagery, he

---

1 These facts are given by the poet himself in the introduction to his Kādambarakathāsāra.
2 See Kavyamala Edition, p 142 BUT he mentions further Jayanta as the author of the poem.
3 On Abhinanda, see Aufrecht, ZDMG, XXVII, 6, 27, CC, I 24, PB, IV, 7, (1887-91) 21 and F W Thomas, Int. to Kav, 20 22, where all verses quoted in the anthologies are collected.
4 Trivikrama, pupil of Sakala Vidyādharaśakravartin wrote a poem Kādambarakāl travai in 17 cantos in about the 14th century (TO, IV 429). Bāyunukula in his commentary on Amarośa and Kṣemendra in his Suvṛṣṭiśāla quote him and Somavara in his Kṛita-kumāra (I 36) eulogises him.
5 DO, XXI, 85 79, See Burnell's Tan Cat 165, Peterson's Int. to Subh 51.
6 King Munja bore the names, Vākaṭagāya, Sahasāṅka, Sāndhurja, Uṭpala rāja, śrīvallabha, Prajñivalabha, Amoghaśārīṇa. He ruled between 974 994 (977) and was finally defeated and beheaded by Tāla II of the Chalukya dynasty of Kalyan. See Prabandhōdintamaṇe (Tumury's Tr.), V Smith, BD, 80 6, 325, 421, also Buhler, EI, I, 22, 229, 402, F. Fleet, Dynasties of Kanara Districts, 492, Bhandarkar, EBD, 214, Haas, Dasarupa, OUS, xxv, note 4, Elliot, Ouarumadesa Inscriptions, I 370, 415, LA, XII 270, XXI 167, XIX 28, XIV 160. He was himself a great poet and for his verses collected from anthologies, See F W Thomas Int to Kav 103.
was a successful second to him. It is possible that his influence extended through the reign of King Bhoja, the successor of King Munja, and that the poet of the name of Kāhdāsa, so often said to be a friend of that king, is Padmagupta himself, as shown by his nickname Parimala Kāhdāsa. His only poem that has come down to us is *Navasāhasānākacarita*. In 18 cantos it describes the marriage of his king Simhuraja, with the Nāga princess Śaśiprabhā. In one of his hunting excursions he shoots a deer with a golden horn on its neck. The deer escapes. It is a pet of Śaśiprabhā, and from the mark on the arrow, she recognises the name of the king. So in pursuit of the deer, the king in his turn sees a swan on a lake, with a pearl necklace hanging in its neck. And when he takes hold of it, he sees the name of Śaśiprabhā engraved on the pearls. Thus the love-dawns, Śaśiprabhā sends her maiden in search of the necklace and she interviews the king. To get at her the king is asked to invade Nāgada, capture and kill the demon Vajrākuṣa at his capital at Bhogavati and bring the golden lotus from his pleasure pond. Thus the king easily accomplishes and the lovers are married.

Among later references to Padmagupta are some by Bhoja in his *Sarasvatī-Kanṭhābharana*, by Ksemendra in his *Anupājñākhālaka*, by Mammata in his *Kāvyaprabhā*, and by Vardhamāna in his *Ganaratnabhāmaḥodadhi*. Some of the verses quoted there as Padmagupta's are not found in the *Navasāhasānākacarita*. From some of these verses, it is inferred that the theme of another poem must have been that expedition into Gujarat dispatched by Tailaja under a general of the name of Basapa against Mūlarāja, the founder of the Chalukya dynasty at Anhilapattana.

Padmagupta's language is highly embellished and though oftentimes he appears an imitator of Kāhdāsa, whom he holds in high esteem, his expression is original and verse melodious.

### 62 Bilhana

Bilhana was born at Konamukha, near Pravarapura, the capital of Kashmir. He was the son of Jyesthakalasa and Nāgadevi. His

---

1 He reigned between 1019-1033 A.D. See for a fuller account under Bhoja.
2 *Ed. BSS, No. 53*. For an elaborate account of the poem, see Buller *IA*, XXXVI, 149, based on Zacharias's Essay in German, also Macdonell, *St*, 98.
3 See Petreasa's *Int. to Subhā 51-55, Utrecht, ZDMG, XXI, VI, 517.
4 On Mularaja who lived about 973 A.D., see *LI*, X 76, *JR IN*, (1899) 260. He was killed by a Chouhan Raja Vigratarastra II. See *JRAS* (1918) 266, 267, 269, V. Smith *BIZ*, 361.
5 This is the modern village of Khunum 3 miles north-west of Pampur. See Cunnibagh, *AG*, 93, *BKR*, 40 and Stein's *Int. to Raj*. 
grandfather was Rajakalasa and his great-grandfather was Multikalasa. His family belonged to the sect of Madhyadeva brahmins of Kausika gotra. His father wrote a commentary on Mahabhasya. His brothers Kshrama and Ananda were poets. Educated in Kashmir and particularly proficient in grammar and poetics, he commenced a tour. At Mathura he stayed for some time engaged in playful disputations with the learned of Brundavan. He visited Kanouj, Prayag and Benares. He was received well in the Court of King Krishna of Dahala (Bundelkhand) and in that Court probably composed a poem in honour of Rama.

He intended to see Bhoja of Dhar, but he could not. He went to Anhilvad in Gujarat, but he was not heartily welcomed there and he complained of this indifference. He offered his devotions at Somnath and setting out southward, he visited Rameswara. On his way back, he reached the Court of Kalyan, where Vikramaditya VI Tribhuvanamalla (1076-1127 A.D.) admired his learning and made him his Vidyapati, or Director of Instruction, and his parasol when he travelled on elephants through Kausika land, was seen borne aloft before the king. Of the Kings of Kashmir Ananta had been dead and he probably knew Kalasa. He lived to see Harsa (1084-1101 A.D.). From the last verses of Vikramarkadevavacita and some other verses attributed to him, which are really characteristic of his self-conscious spirit, it is conjectured that latterly he fell into disfavour with Vikramaditya and had to leave his territories probably on an order for confiscation of his estates. This may account for the incomplete narrative of Vikrama's history in Bilhana's poem, for it stops with his Chola war and does not refer to the expedition beyond the Narbada in 1088 A.D.

1 So he says
2 Vah, XVIII 97
3 See IA VIII. 10 (Saka 99 0), VIII 21 (Saka 1018), VI 197 (Saka 1018)
X 149 (Saka 1080)
4 Raf, VIII 997
5 Raf, VII 1781 et seq. and JRAS, III 203 11
6 सर्वेश गुरुवार सर्वांगसत्तुपाल जयं संवेश तत्वे श्रम- सौन्दर्यागारसुंदरमेव हृदये जागो त जागरणां सारसतव | रे सर्वास्वस्य महामहोमध्यममात्मानमस्यदिरम् हैलान्दात्मातंतकतत्तस्तक्ष्माकहिं श्रीय ||
7 JRAS, IV. 15.
63 His Vikramankadeva-caritam is a poem in 18 cantos, describing the glory of King Vikramāditya Tribhuvanamallī of Kalyān. The main theme of this laudatory poem is royal wars and royal marriages. The poet begins with a short account of the Chalukya race and the kings of the restored dynasty which begins with Harihara. He dwells at some length upon the exploits of Vikramāditya's father and describes with all customary amplifications, the conquests of Vikramāditya before his accession to the throne, his dethronement of his elder brother Someswara II, his defeat and capture of his younger and his numerous wars with the faithless Cholas.

His Karnasundari, a play in four acts after the manner of Ratnakaravali, must have been composed in the Chalukya Court. It describes the secret intrigues of a Chalukya prince Karnadeva, son of Bhimaśeva, with Vidyādhara princess and their eventual marriage with the consent of the queen.

His Prasūti is a small poem in praise of Śiva.

64 His Caurapancasika, a poem of fifty verses of amatory import, attributed to Bilhana. By itself it describes only the recollections of a lover of the company of his darling princess. But in some manuscripts, there is an introductory part, relating its romantic origin. Bilhana was the tutor of Candralekha or Sasikali, the daughter of King Varnamana of Guzarat. The pupil fell in love with the teacher and the intrigue went on undiscovered. When at last when the secret was out and Bilhana was condemned to death by the incensed father and taken to the place of execution, he repeated these verses in remembrance of the graces of the princess and the joys of her company. The executioners were moved and when they conveyed to the king the last invocation of Bilhana, the King was moved and the result was a pardon and restoration to favour and a formal bestowal of the hand of the princess.

1 For a full account of Bilhana and this poem, see Hubler's Int to Edn and IA, V 817, IA, V 821, IA, X 817 Durgaprasad's Int to Karnasundari (Bombay), Peterson Int to Subba 66, where verses quoted in the anthologies are collected.
2 Ed Bombay (Kavyamala, No 7)
3 OMy, 285 There is a Bilhanaśtavam (TO II, 166) Are those identical?
4 Ed Madras, Bombay and Calcutta and elsewhere. See Colebrooke, Mrs Jf f's II, 95, Coblentz, Introduction to Edn Berlin, B.A.R., 48, O Bod, No 246
5 See Bilharcartattta, TO, II, 1196 2029 Ed by V Venkataramaswami, Madras.

पद्मंत्र तपस्याविं चूलयिकों हंसा सिद्धं शुभ
भास्कर्यम विंशितम श्रद्धार्पिण्यो निर्देशार्थ
तद्यापि प्रतिदैपिकुर्ये व्योतिल्दीयायको।
व्योतिल्दीयायकों भर्म दत्तायुवदेशिनिः
A similar story is told of a poet Caurasundara and in the Bengali version Caurapanchāśikā is attributed to that poet Sundara ¹

It is apprehended that Caura was not identical with Bilhana, though many scholars have fallen into that error² and this suspicion has almost become a certainty when we see that Bhoja quotes two verses from Pancāśikā in his Śṛngārapralāśa and Jakkana, a Telugu poet, in his Vikramārjacarita praised Bilhana and Cora distinctly among several poets

This introductory part is certainly a later compilation, for it contains verses of different authors put together to suit the description, though indeed it is an admirable collection. King Vairūmha of Anhilvād died in 920 A.D., long before Bilhana was born. The name of the hero and the king are given in many manuscripts as Yāmni-puramāṭilakā and Madanābhīrāma, King of Lakṣmīmāndira, capital of Pāncāla. Bilhana himself in his autobiographical passages never alluded to his long sojourn and relationship with any king of Gujarat or Pāncāla.

There are commentaries on Pancāśikā by Ganapatiśarma and Ramōpādhyāya⁴ and by Basaveśvarāya⁵.

65 Vasudeva⁶ was the son of Ravi and disciple of Bhārataguru called also Mahābhārata-Bhattātrī. He lived at Viprasatṣama (Papanathur) in Travancore. Tradition in Malabar gives the following story about his early life: "He used to be particularly interested in listening to the texts of Purāṇas and Śastra-s repeated by the pupils of his master. As he could not for want of education pronounce words distinctly, his associates used to taunt him by calling him Vathu, a lisp ing form of Vasu his correct name. One day, as usual, while he was coming back from a temple at Iruvīlakkāvu, where he had gone to worship, it rained heavily and the ferryboat, on which he was to cross an intervening stream which was in high floods, was on the other shore.

¹ CASE, 64 Ed Kavyasangraha, Calcutta. Bṛṇa's mention in Harṣacarita does not refer to any poet of that name, but only a general abuse of plagiarists.
² See for instance, Peterson, Subli. 66, Durgaprasad's Introduction to Kanṣaśundarī where the whole story is given.
³ See Forbes, Rasmāla, I, 42.
⁴ IOC, VII, 1528.
⁵ TC, II, 1622.
⁶ For other Vasudevas, see Index and article on Rāmabhātha—A Study by K. R. Pisharoti, Bull of Or Studies, V. iv.
Bhattacharya retraced his steps to the temple, where he spent the whole
night. It was raining heavily and he had only one wet cloth on his
waist. In despair he appealed to his favourite deity who gave him
some fuel and fire to warm himself and a bunch of plantain fruits to
appease his hunger with. After eating of the fruits he became by
inspiration a poet of a high order. The sweeper woman who came
early in the morning to the temple learnt from him where he threw
away the mud of the fruits and ate it herself. She also became a
poetess. He eulogises his patrons King Kulaśekhara and King Rāma
and lived in the 9th century A.D.

In Yuddhishtiravijaya, a poem in 8 aśvāsas in ārya metre King
Kulaśekhara is mentioned as the reigning king. It describes the story
of Mahābharata from the hunting sports of Pāṇdu to the coronation of
Yuddhishtira after the war. There is a commentary on it by Sokkanatha,
son of Accamāla and Sudarśana of Sattanur near Sīrangaum.

Saurikathodāyā, and Tripradāyāni mention the name of the
ruling King as Rāma. The former narrates the life of Kṛṣṇa from
birth to the conquest of Dvārakā as related in Harivamsa. There is
a commentary on it by Nīlakantha, son of Issāna of Muktisthali. The
latter describes the story of destruction of the Three Cities by Siva.
There is a commentary on it by one who calls himself son of Nīla aprīya.

1 Travanccole State Manual, II 427
2 This King Kulaśekhara cannot be the author of the Mukundāvī which
must have been the work of a later author, who was the famous Kulaśekharāvīr,
The poet of the Vasantāvas. The patron of Vasudeva must have been the author of the
dramas Subhadraśānavayya and Tapatiśanvārana (Tr Sāv. 600). On several
Kulaśekharas, see article by A S Ramanatha Ayyar, Tr Arch. J. 1 ol. V pt. 2

For detailed information, see under Kulaśekhara in the chapter on Nārada poet.
Tradition gives to the saint 28th Kali, Parabhava Keralakpati mentions Vasudeva
as contemporary of Kulśekhara Perumal, whose death it gives as 383 A.D. For the
identification of Kulaśekhara and Rāma, see A S Ramanatha Ayyar, Nalodaya
and its author (JMY, X1V 302 11)

3 Printed Kavyamāla, Bombay. There the poet and his patron are wrongly said
to have lived in Kashmir
4 DC, XX 7508
5 TO, II 2589
6 DC, XX 7686. This was written during the reign of the Rāmaśāma and
Godāvarma.
7 TO, II 2589
8 TO, III 3873
All these three poems are illustrations of Yamaka composition. It has recently been suspected whether Vasudeva was also the author of the similar composition Nalodaya attributed to Kalidasa.

66 Dhananjaya was son of Vasudeva and Srīdevī. He was a Jain. By his time Dvīsandhāna, or poem of double entendre narrating different tales in the same expression became, as it were, a generic name. Dandin inaugurated it and his poem of that name is mentioned by Bhoja in his Sringāraprakāsa, but it is not now available. Subandhu adapted the device to prose and his Vasavadāttā indicated the heights to which a poet can work upon the innate excellence of Sanskrit vocabulary, to express his imagery in brief punning phrases. Dhananjaya followed and he narrated the story of Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata at a time in his Dvīsandhāna in measures at once fluent and heavy. He is conscious of his merit and deems himself almost a combination of Vālmiki and Vyāsa, who, with Dandin, were in his mind the only three poets. He classes his work as one of the three gems, as unblemished as Akalanka's Nyāyaśāstra and Pujyapāda's Vyākaraṇa. He praises Anandavardhana and Raṇakara, is eulogised by Somadeva and Jalhana and is quoted by Vardhamāna. He must therefore have lived in the 9-10th centuries AD. He also wrote a lexicon Dhananjayanāmamālā.

1. See for instance

1 कीतिमदार तेन स्वरता भारतद्रापदातानेन ||
     जनपदृष्टाय भिता पार्थकया कल्सायपाह सा भविष्य ||

11 बषषुपुरति तमुरे स्वस्थी स्थिति जना ||
     पिनाकितापि वाकिनासमेवि सोदकरिणि ||

2. This view has been elaborately propounded and may very likely be correct by A S Ramanaṭha Ayyar in Nalodaya and its Author, July, XIV 382. In a manuscript of Malabar (DC, XX 7866, R No 3165) all these three poems are found written together.

3. Ed. by Śivādaṭṭha in Kāvyamāla, Bombay with a preface.

4. M. Duets (Chronology) identifies Dhananjaya with Śrutakirti Tratvīdyā and gives him the date 1180 A.D. Śrutakirti is mentioned in an inscription (Id., XIV 14) dated Saka 1015. But this identification seems to be wrong as Pampa says that Śrutakirti's work though embracing the subject of Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata was a Gatapratypāga (read to and fro) poem. In the Introduction to Kavyāvaloka, (Sub. Oar. 4) Śrutakirti is mentioned as the author of a Raghavapāpādīva, this Pampa and Meghadvendra were contemporaries and Meghadvendra's son wrote work in Saka 1076 (Id. XIV 14).

5. S. E V. Veerāraghavachariar (JAHS, II 181) places Dhananjaya between 700-800 A.D and Kavirāja as earlier than Dhananjaya in 850-725 A.D. Bhandarkar [BR (1894) 30] says Dhananjaya borrowed this idea from Kavirāja.

6. Printed, Bombay
67 **Atula**'s **Musikavamsa** is a poem of 15th cantos. About Atula nothing more is known. The poem relates the story of a long line of kings that ruled over the Musika kingdom, which according to Keralotpatti was South Travancore. When Parasurama was slaughtering the Kṣatriyās, a queen of a king, who was killed, hid herself in a mountain cave. One day, a rat as big as an elephant entered the cave and when it threatened to devour the queen, fire arose from her eyes and burnt the rat. The soul of the rat appeared in the form of the Parvaṭarāja, with his attendants and the Parvaṭarāja astonished at his own change said that he had been cursed by sage Musika to become a rat and his curse thus came to an end at her view. The queen continued to live in the cave and brought forth a male child, the Purohit who was all this time helping the queen educated the boy. When Parasurāma was performing a sacrifice and was on the lookout for a Kṣatriya to act at a particular ritual, this boy was taken to him and pleased him, he made him the king of Musika coming under the name of Musika Rāmaghata because he was consecrated with potful of water. He killed Mādhavavarman, the king of Magadha, in battle and married his daughter Bhadravena. He installed the son of Mādhavavarman on the throne of Magadha Rāmaghata had two sons. The elder Vatū was made king of Huḥhaya and the younger Nandana of the Cola kingdom. He returned to forest and spent the rest of his days in retirement. Then follows a long line of kings and their story, ending with Śrīkantha, Valabha and his son. In the time of Śrīkantha the poet lived and composed his poem². In canto 14, it is stated that king Valabha joined the king of Kerala in opposing the advances of Cola King towards Kerala. It is thought likely that the Cola King referred to was Rajendra Choladeva I, who ruled in 1014-1046 A.D. In cantos 12 and 14, the temple of Buddha at Śrīmulavasa is described as on the verge of ruin an account of the inroads of the sea. This temple was in a flourishing condition and had royal grants in 868 A.D.³. It is conjectured that that the poem must have been composed in the 11th century A.D.

68 **Ksemondra**⁴, surnamed Vyāsadāsa, was the son of Prakāśendra and grandson of Sindhu. His father was a great patron of Brahmas.

---

1 Tr Arch Series 87 et seq. In the Mahakula inscription (la, XIX 7) it is stated that King Kirtivaram I (489 to 567) ruled over the kings of Kerala, Musika etc. See JMy, XXI 62
2 BBD I 193 5, II 116
3 On Ksemondra, see Buleu (DKR 46), JBRAS (1877), XII Extra No. JBRAS, XVI 167, PR I 4, 75, JA serie, VII 400, VII 216 M Duff (Ind. Chr.)
and expended three crores in various benefactions. He was himself a devotee of Siva but latterly, under the teachings of Somācārya, it is said he became a Vaishnava Bhāgavata. He studied under Abhinavagupta and was in the court of King Ananṭa of Kashmir (1029–1064 A.D.). He wrote many works, and among them are some independent didactic poems and narrative abstractions of older poems.

His Rājāvāli is a history of Kashmir like Kalhana's Rājārāmāntuṃ Bhāṭkāṭāmanjari, Rāmāyaṇamanjari and Bhāraṭamanjari are epics of Bhāṭkāṭa, Rāmāyana and Māhābhūrata.

Among his works known only by name are Śaśivāmsa-mahākāvyā Amitāranga-kāvyā, Avasarasāra, Mukṭāvali, Lāvanyavāti, Deśopadesa, Pavanapancaśīka, and Paḍvakaḍambhari, and among his known and printed works are, Avādāna-Kalpātā, Niṭṭikalpataru, Lokapракāṣakosa, Sevyasevakopadesa, Niṭilata, Vinayavalli, Darpadalana,
gives the date Loka 12 41 and A D 1097 and notes the dates of some works Brhāṭkāṭāmanjari (Loka 11), Samayamāṭṭakā (Loka 25), Daśāvatāra Ānti (Loka 41) Lunkha era commenced in year 26 Kali or 8075–6 B.C. A Lunkha century commenced in 1095 A.D. See Stein's Int. to Raj, Macdonnel (SL, 290, 376) calls Kṣemendra contemporary of Somadeva.

1 Kṣemendra, the author of Śambaraṇacīkā vivarana says he was a pupil of Abhinavagupta. He may probably be identical with Kṣemendra (I I, 11) But Buhler (BER 46) says otherwise. He identifies him with Kṣemendra, author of Śpadāsurāya Kṣemendra son of Yaḍūsārman of Guzarat and author of Haṣṭgana prakāsa is a different person.

2 The king is referred to in the concluding verses of Suvraṭāpilaka and other poems. He was a contemporary of King Bhoja of Dhar—

The list of his works, see 8 Levi, JA., (1855), 309. Peterson's Int. to Subhā

4 Printed, Bombay DC, XXI 8185. See the paper on it by Levi, JA. (1886), Feb April Buhler (JA, I, 302) fixes Somadeva 1068–82 A.D. and makes Kṣemendra his contemporary. Levi does not agree and says that Kṣemendra's work was anterior to Somadeva's Kaṭhāsantraśāgara and that the latter was written as a direct criticism upon or it is a kind of reply addressed by Somadeva to Kṣemendra. This being assumed, Levi refers to a quotation from Bhāṭkāṭā in the Daśāraṇa and differing from Hall concludes that the latter work is posterior to the Bhāṭkāṭā and anterior to Kaṭhā santraśāgara.

5 Printed, Bombay

6 Printed, Calcutta

7 Printed, Kāvyamāla, Parts I, IV, and VI, Bombay C. Bod 88h and Bodl Cat No 804.
Mummatamimāmsā and Kavikanthābharana. Dasāvatāracarita gives the story of the incarnations and the story of Buddha is related according to the Buddhist works Kalāvilaśa in 10 parts describes several arts with illustrations from traditional tales.

69 Carucarya is a century of moral aphorisms, easily expressed, each with a sanction of the orthodox kind appended, which gives a quaint and pleasing picture of virtue's ways of pleasantness in the Kashmir of his time. Chāturvarga Sangraha is a concise exposition of the four great motives of human activity, duty, wealth, love and salvation.

Suvrītatilaka is a treatise on metres and is valuable in literary history, for its quotations from several works with the names of their authors. In three chapters, it describes the collection of metres, their faults and merits and their proper application. The particular merit of this composition is that the illustrations seem at once to the eye and the ear as a versus memorals both of the character and of the name of the particular metre.

In Samayamatrka, "one of his most original poems which is intended to describe the snares of courtesan," he gives us among other stories an amusing account of the wanderings of his chief heroine, Kankah, through the length and breadth of Kashmir. The numerous places which form the scene of her exploits can all easily enough be traced on the map. More than once curious touches of true local colour impart additional interest to these references. To Kṣemendra's

1. On this work, see S. K. Dv, SP II 201, and T. Schomborg Wion.
2. It contains the story of Mulaṇaśa alias Karnaṇṭa referred to by Bāna and Subandhu. On Mulaṇaśā, see page.
3. Ed Bombay, Kāvyamāla, Part II PB, I, 4, JBRAS, XVI Ex. No 10. For instance there is the version of the proverb, "The early bird catches the worm" in the Śaṅkara's

Mārtaka, Kavamadā, Part II PR, I 5.
6. Among the authors mentioned are Abhavanā, Bhatta Inḍurāya, Utpalatīla, Kalāśa, Kalidāsa, Gāndhikā, Cākṣa, Tūṣṭa (King, Raj II 16), Dāsā, Bhatta Kāṇṭapa, Parāmala, Bāna, Bhārtṛi Mṛtha, Bhārtṛhari, Bhavabhūti, Bhāravi, Muktakāṇṭa, Yācavarnam, Rātmākara, Rājaśekhara, Rāja, Lalita Dītī, Bhatta Vālīta, Virādeva, Bāha, Bhāṭta Śyāmala, Śri Harṣadeva, Bhatt, Bhavamāca.

poem we owe, for instance the earliest mention of the Pr Prantsal Pass (Pancaaladhara) and its hospice (matha). Here, too, we get a glimpse of the ancient salt trade which still follows that route with preference Elsewhere we are taken into an ancient Buddhist convent, the Kryasrama Vihara, where Kanka's conduct as a nun is the cause of no small scandal."

Lokapakasa "supplies us with the earliest list of Kasmir Paraganas Besides this we find there the names of numerous localities inserted in the forms for bonds, HUDsis, contracts, official reports, and the like which form the bulk of Prakasas II and IV. The Pargana list as well as these forms contain local names of undoubtedly ancient date, side by side with comparatively modern ones. Some of the latter in fact belong to places which were only founded during the Muhammadan rule."

By far the most valuable work of Ksemendra is the Aucityavivaracaracarca. It is a book on literary criticisms and treats of rhetorical style. His enunciations of literary canon are accompanied by discussions. He has no regard for individual fame or dignity and he deals out praise and censure as a true critic. His illustrations are sometimes his own and often taken from eminent poets, whose names he gives. These illustrations form as it were an anthology When he gives the date of composition for instance, Samayamārka as the 25th year of the Kashmir Cycle, or 1050 A.D he furnishes a regular landmark in the history of Sanskrit literature.

70 Hemacandra was born at Dhanduka in Samvat 1145 (1088 A.D) and was the son of Chachiga Sresthi and Pahmi. When his father was away, a monk Devendraśri of the Vajra Sākha asked his mother to give away the child then 5 years old, to be brought up in the monastic order. The mother parted with him very willingly and he was initiated under the name of Changdevu His father was put out at the news.

---

1 Ed Kavyamala, Part I, Bombay See also Peterson's paper, JBRAS, XVI, 167 160, S. K. De, SP, II 386 61

2 Among the poets mentioned there are Pradumgupta cītas Parimala, Dharma-kərti, Rājaśkhara, Bhatta Nārāyaṇa, Chandrakau, Medhavirudda, Mālava Kuvalaya, Śyāmala, Mātrgupta, Pravanacena, Muktāpida, Yasovarman, Utpalārja, Amaruka, Kumārādśa Cakrā, brother of Mukṭākaṇa and contemporary of Ratnara, Bhallata, Vamanu, Varāhamihira, Yasovarmanśa, Māgha, Bhatta Tānḍa, Gangaku, Dipaka, P Dévrajaka, Śrī Vakra, Harṣa.

The lost work Kunṭevaramātāya by Kālidāsa referred to. He also refers to three plays by himself, and Chitrabhāna, and Lañtāryānapa.
and discovered the son, when it was too late, all-engrossed in his ascetic serenity. To demonstrate his powers he set his arm in a blazing fire and his father found to his surprise the flaming arm turned into gold. Hence came the appellation Hemacandra. He studied under Devacandraśūrya of Pūrṇamālayagaccha. He was consecrated in Sam 1154 and made a sun in thirteen years later. At the court of Anhilvad in Gujarat he spent many years under the patronage of kings Jayasimha Siddharāja (1094–1143 A.D.) and his successor Kumārapāla. He was in fact a minister at the royal durbar and by his influence Jainism became the state religion. Viharas 1400 in number, were built and laws against consumption of meat and cruelty to animals were enacted. Though a Jain by adoption, his reverence for the brahmin was not anything less. He was a genius of great versatility and his works embrace every field of literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit. He was the originator of a new school of grammar. His works contain 35,000,000 lines in all and he was called the Omniscient of the Kāhyuga. Great soul that he was, he passed away by self-starvation in 1173 A.D.

His Kumārapālacakrīta, a poem of twenty-eight cantos, describes the history of the Anhilvad dynasty, particularly of Kumārapāla. The first twenty cantos are in Sanskrit and the last eight are in Prakrit, and

1 He was the author of Śāntināthaśruti in Prakrit, (See JES CAT 46, PR, I, 65)

2 On Kumārapāla, see Mangol inscription dated Sam 1202 in Iatif of Antiqua

1 sam Romana (Bombay) 180, Tielborn, R.R., (1880) 110 gives the date of a Ma of Kalpācmill as Samvat 1918 as in the time of Kumārapāla. See also Munjangasi's Prabandhachintāmaṇi (Tawney's Translation, Calcutta, V Smith, XII 181) and B. Desabhā, History of Cauar in (Ahamalabu) 39 36 An account of Kumārapāla is contained in the Prakrit Kavya Kumārapāla i raṭhibodha, (Pal Gik. Or series, Baroda) of Somaprabhūkṣaṇa, about whom see note

1 On Hemacandra generally, see Peterson, 5th Rep ; A K Forlow, Ras Māda, I 189 204 (which says that he died in samvat 1259 1174 A.D. in 84th year), Dassen, IAS XII, 567, 1195 IV 893 ff, S K De, SP, I 203 Colebrooke, Ms II 208 ff, Tattavāll's Upāsēṣā Gacchā (mentioned as the contemporary of Sūka Kakā Sura, Sam 1164) Buhler, Uber das Lomb des Jaana Mounches Hemacandra, N Dutt, Chronology, Anteclit CC 768, Bod Cat 170, 179, 180, 185a, ZDMG xlix 845, IA, IV 31, VI 181 BKR 76 Stevenson's Heart of Jainism, 94, 281 Jacob (End of Rel. and Ethics, VI 591) gives Hemacandra's dates as 1096, 1099 1173. R. Shamsastra, JMY, XIII 686 73 and Chandrārāhason's Prabhavakaccharita (Chapter 22) give an account

2 See Peterson, PR IV 6, I, 63 Subh. 189. All works of Hemacandra are preserved in Patan Library. For a list of his works, see Int. to Kavyānumakṣaṇa, (Kavyamala)

3 See Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.
this continuation has given it the name of Dvyaśrayakāvyā. The portion that is in Prakrit was intended to illustrate his aphorisms of Prakrit grammar and comprises the six different dialects of the Prakrit language. Some say that the poem was begun by Hemacandra in 1160 A.D., and left unfinished by his death, and was later completed by Abhayatīlakagāra in 1255 A.D., but the latter says expressly that he is the author of the gloss only.

In Trivastalāikāpurusācānta, a long poem, he describes the lives of Jaina Saints. So is his Sthāvatīvalcarīta. Chandonūśāsana is a work on metrics.

Kāvyānūśāsana with a commentary on it called Alankārācudāmanī, in eight chapters, is a valuable work in literary history. It discusses the poetical theories of Bharata, Lollata, Dandin, Śankuka, Mammata, Bhattanāyaka and refers to several works of which some are not extant.

Among his works on lexicography are Deśināmamāla, Abhidhāna Cintāmanī, and Anekārthhasangraha, and Nighantuśeṣa.

1 Edited, Bombay, BSS, No 60, with an Introduction by S P Pandit. See IA, XVIII. 841. There is a commentary on some chapters by Abhayatīlakagāra (composed in Sam 1812) and on one chapter by Purnakālakagāra (composed in Sam 1907). There is another Kumārapāla-carīta by (Jinasimhasuri?) Jayasimhasuri (see Kurante's Int. and Cat. of Bikaner State Library), Br, (1888 4).

2 On the treatment of Prakrit by Hemacandra, see C D Dalal, Int. to Bhabaśātalāthā (Ganak Or Series), 68, 65. Junamadana, pupil of Somasrāma, wrote Kūmārapālaprabhaedha in prose and verse in Samvat 1432, (PR IV 82).

3 Ed by Jacob, Ebb Ind. PR, V 4. For a summary and extracts, see CSO, (1909), 106 at seq.

4 Printed, Bombay.

5 PR, V 194.

6 Printed, Kāvyamālā, Bombay DC XXII, 5696. See JBRAS, XII.

7 These are Bavaṇavijaya and Harivijaya (Sanskrit poems) Alaghmatama (aparāmsa poem), Bhima kavya (Ganam aparāmsa poem), Lilāvālī (as a Padyasmayi kadhā) Śaḍraka (Sudraka-kadhā?) a parikadhā, Damayantikāṭhā of Trivikrama, and Hayagrīvavadha of Mentha.

At p 97, Hemacandra quotes a conversation between Cītramāya and Bāma as from a drama Unmataraśāghava. This is not traceable in Bhaskara's Unmatāśārāghava, and the work quoted must therefore be a different one.

8 See Int. to Kalpadrūkoṣa (Ganak Or Series).

9 Called also Bhaṭvālī Ed by Pischel, Bombay.

10 PR III App 53, 103 with a commentary by the author (1 C 109, 154), Ed. by Bodklingk and Rieu, St. Petersburg.

11 With a commentary by the author's pupil Mahendrasuri, PR, III 51, App.

12 Ed by Zacharias Vienna.

13 PR, V 28. It is a botanical glossary.
Syādvādamanyā2 and Jñendrāsastra,3 are hymns in praise of Vardhamāna Śabdānuśāsana.4 is a treatise in Sanskrit grammar, of which the Prakrit grammar is in the eighth book Yogasāstra5 is a companion of Jain doctrines. 1ṅgānu-āsana is a treatise on gender.

71. The history of Kumārapāla is narrated by Somaprabhācarya in his Prakrit poem Kumārapāla-prātiṣṭodhā-Mahākavya.6 Somaprabha was a pupil of Vijayasimha and was fifth in descent from Mucandra and Mumadeva in the pontifical line. His father Śrīpāla,7 was a poet and friend of Siddhipāla, a colleague of Hemacandra at the Anhīvud Court. The poem gives an account of Kumārapāla's conversion into the faith of Jina at the teaching of Hemacandra and was composed at Patan in Sam 1241 (1195 A.D.). It ends with a prāsañī in Sanskrit. His other works are Hemakumāracarita,8 and Śrumanāthacarita,9 and Śalāntakāvya.

72. Mankha known also as Mankhaka or Mankhua was born in Kaśmir.10 His father was Viśvāvartha. His brother Alankūra,11 also a

---

1 PR, IV 197, III app 209. Weber, 1st II 340
2 Bhu Day's Int (op. cit.) xviii. A commentary on it is dated 1202 A.D.
3 PR, V, 110.
4 Called also Siddha Hemacandra. Ed by Pischel, Halle. For an account of the work and literature that grew around it, see Peterson, PR, I 14. Weber, 1st II 308 354. Pischel De Gramaticis Praeclaris, Lessen's Institutum Linguarum Praecellentem (Bombay), Bhu Day, JERAS, IV 224.
5 With a commentary by the author PR, II 65. Ed partly by K. Windisch, ZDMG, XXVIII. (1874) 186 ff. Weber ID, 297 note. So is his Prāmāṇyaśāmaśāa, (PR, V 147).
6 Ed by Franke, Gottingen.
7 Of the Culukya dynasty, the prāsañī gives the following kings, Mularāya (Sam 903—1028), Cāmunḍarāya (Sam 1053—1066), Durulabhāya (Sam 1066—1075), Bhimadeva (Sam 1075—1120), Karnadeva (Sam 1120—1150), Siddhārāya alaśa Jayasimha (Sam 1150—1190), and Kumārapāla (Sam 1190 1280).
8 Ed by Muntraṇa Jñanacarita (Gakh Or, Sūtras) PR, IV, V, Index of authors.
9 The author gave it the name Jina-dharmo-prātiṣṭodhī.
10 The poet was honoured by Jayasimha with the title of Kanvara. He is quoted in Sāṃgaḍhārā-Paddhati as Śrīpāla Kavirāja. See PR, V 88.
11 The same story is given in the Śaṅtināthacaritam of Dvāsvari, in Sanskrit verse, PR, I 69.
12 PR, V 34.
13 It describes the life of Sūmapāla, the 5th Tīrthākara and is written mainly in Prakrit. It is preserved in the Bhandar of Patan.
14 On Mankha generally, see Durgaprasad's note in Aññamānita, IIKR, 50 (where an account of the poem is given) and Peterson Sutā 88 and 103. The poem has कणिकारकम्, says Jñarāja.
15 Known also as Lankana and referred to in Rāj. VIII 2055.
poet, was a minister of kings Susala and Jayasimha of Ka-mir. King Jayasimha ruled from 1127 to 1159 A.D. Mankha went to Konkhan as ambassador. His other brother Srngära held the office of Brhaṭṭan-trādhipaṭi. Ruyyaka was his guru. Mankha wrote his poem SRIKANTHACANTIA about 1140 A.D. In 25 cantos it describes the destruction of the Three Cities by Śiva. The last canto is particularly interesting and it gives the names of some poets, predecessors or contemporaries. The whole of the 1st canto is devoted to benediction and every deity has a salutation. Many of the verses have a double meaning and in spite of his wonderful mastery of language he lacks lucidity of expression and is a hard author for the scholar. A commentary on the poem by Jonarāja helps however towards an appreciation. There is a dictionary called Mankha Kośa current in Kashmir.

Alankārasarvasva is a gloss on Ruyyaka's Alankāra aphorisms and is his work. Besides commenting on the Kāṅkās of Ruyyaka, Mankha appears to have himself written some Alankāra Sūtras. In Mankhukasūtradāharaṇa these Sūtras have been illustrated by a pupil of his, probably Samudrabandha, who also commented on Alankārasarvasva. In these illustrations King Ravvarmabhūpa is praised.

73 Sriharsa was the son of Srihira and Māmalladevi. His father was a poet of the court of King Vijayacandra of Kanouj. Disappointed in a poetic competition there with Udayana, Hira retired from public

---

1 See Rāṭ
2 SRIKANTHACARITA, XXV—30
3 Ed Kavyamālā, Bombay. In the colophon he is called Rājānaka Śri Mankha
4. Murāri, Rājaśikha, Jalhana, Kalhaṇa, Bilhaṇa, Aṅkādaṭṭha, Ānanda (son of Śambhu), Padmarāja. Jalhana referred to here is the author of the poem Somapālavilāsa and is different from the author of Sukṭimukṭāvalī of the same name (IBRAS, XVII 57). The latter is called Ācārya Bhaṭṭa Jalhaṇa. See Durgaprasad's note in ŚRIKANTHACARITA, page 347. Śambhu, the father of Ānanda, is the author of Anyokti-mukṭaṭṭa and Rājendrakarṇayuṇa [Kavyamālā, Bombay]. See Ibid., note at page 351.
5 He was a contemporary of king Jamulabhan (1417 to 1467 A.D.) During this reign he composed the second Rājaṭarangini, the continuation of Kalhaṇa's work. He has also written commentaries on Kurāṭṛjunīya and other poems.
6 See Tāvandrum Sanskrit Series with Introduction by T. Ganapathi Satci. In this book the name of the poet is given as Mankuka.
7 He also refers in this work to Vidyacakraṭṭa's commentary on Kavyaprakāsa, TO, IV 4807.
8 The correct name is Śrihira and not Hira, see the last line of the poem ŚRIHIRASUŚRIHI, Kṛiti.
gazed and with a request to his son to avenge the disgrace he soon passed away Śrīhara at once set out to study and with the aid of the Cintāmaṇi-manṭra² kindly communicated to him by a venerable sage he attained the summit of his learning in a few years. He came again to the royal court and was received with distinction there at the request of that king⁶ he wrote his Nārādhya-carita. The work met with wide approval in the various assemblies of Kāmu² and was honoured by the personal appreciation of Saranātī. He was dignified with the title of Narabhiṛata! The jealous queen, who called herself Kalābharaṛī, would not tolerate this presumption. Unable to bear her persecutions, Śrīhara spent the rest of his life in ascetic renunciation on the banks of the Ganges.

This is the account that Rājasēkhara gives in his Prabandhākosa⁴ Jayantacandra, son of Vivaçandra ruled over Kāmu in the latter half of the 12th century A.D.⁵ It is elsewhere said by Rājasēkhara himself casually that the first manuscript of the Nāśadha was brought into Gujarāt by Harbhara during the reign of Vīradhavala and his minister Vāṣupāla made copies of it and gave it a deserved publicity⁶ Candu Pandita in his commentary Dipilā composed in Sam 1373 (1296 A.D.) calls the poem new and refers to the existence of the only commentary of Vivaṣadhara before him⁷ Śrīhara must therefore have flourished in the latter half of the 12th century A.D.⁸

1 Nāśadha, Canto I, concluding verse
2 Rājasēkhara gives the date of composition as about 1174 A.D.
3 Canto XVI, concluding verse
4 Composed in 1844 A.D.
5 IA XV, 11 12 Grant dated Samvat 1225 (A.D. 1169) Various details given as his surname Pañula, contemporary of Kumāmpala, his dynasty destroyed by the Mysalaras & show that Jayantacandra was the same as Jayacandra, who resigned at Kānyakūṭa and Benares between 1168 1194 A.D.
6 See the lives of Somasvata and Vāṣupāla, post Int to Nārādhya-carita (Gaeck Or Senge), vii
7 काल्य नवम्. See Śivadatta's Int. to Nāśadha (Bombay) 15
8 Buhler (JBS 33, XI 279 57, I 1 30), Ram Das Son (IA, III 31), P N Puraniya (I, I, 39) and Śivadatta (op cit 1-15) adopt this view F R Hall and K.T. Telang (IA, 297, 358 and II, 71) and Bhandarker (I, II, 83 note) assign him to the 5th or the 10th century on the ground that verses from Nāśadha are quoted by Bhoja in the Sarvaṣvaṭhānbharana and that Viśeṣapatiṁśa of the 11th century has written a criticism of Śrīhara's Khandanakhandakhādya Śivadatta assures us that there are no such quotations from Nāśadha in the Sarvaṣvaṭhānbharana (see Index of authors quoted Auf CO.) and that the Viśeṣapatiṁśa referred to must be some late author. Aufrecht gives four persons of that name and eight of the same of
The poem as it is now available and has been commented upon stops with the marriage of Nala and Damayanți. The rest of Nala's history, as the name should indicate, is not in it. Nilkamal Bhattacarya shows how the last four verses are spurious and says that Sṛhara finished his poem but the rest of it is lost to us. "If a continuation of the Naṣadha is admitted, we must either say that the sequel is lost, or that the poet could not finish the book. But when we look into two facts it is well nigh clear that the book was finished, one, the mention of the Naṣadha in the Khandanakhandakhādyas and the other, the appreciation of the Naṣadha by scholars in Kashmir (vide the concluding verse of Canto 16). For, by the first, though the priority of the Naṣadha up only to the end of the 21st Canto (which forms the subject of the poem referred to there) is conclusively proved, yet it would be too much to suppose that the author could think of leaving

Vācāspaṭi (See Sivadaṭta op cit 11.19) F S Grouse relies on the order of poets enumerated in Canda's Prthvirajamāna composed in the 12th century, in which Śrīhara is mentioned before Kālidāsa (Ia, II 218) and argues that Rājaśekhara's story is incorrect. He places Śrīhara in the 10th century A D but Telang remarks (Ia, III 81) that Śrīhara alludes to Kālidāsa's works in his Khandanakhandakhādyas. All the particulars necessary to show that Rājaśekhara's account must be true are collected by Śivadaṭta Ram Prasad Chanda (Ia, XLII, 82, 136) says that Rājaśekhara mentions the name as Jayanṭacandra and not Jayacandra and calls him the son and not the grandson of Govindacandra. King of Vāranāsī M Duff (Chronology) gives the date 1150 A D and makes him contemporary of King Jayacandra of Kanouj whose initial date falls between 1168 and 1177 A D and of the Chalukya King Kumārāṇa of Guzerat (1148 1174 A D) Macdonel (SL, 380) and B C Dutt (Ost, II, 294) adopt this date.

1. In canto 17, Kali vows that he would separate Nala and Damayanți but the extant poem stops with the marriage and the pleasures of their conjugal life. Śrīhara says as usual that the 22nd canto was finished and there are four more verses added, in praise of his own work. The last verse appears to be an unnecessary repetition. The four verses must have been later interpolations, the real poem ceasing with the canto enumerating verse. It is therefore not improbable that the rest of the poem is lost to us, unless we imagine that Śrīhara left the work incomplete. In fact many manuscripts do not contain these four verses at all. See DC, XX 7758.

2. तथाइमककथय नैशधचारित्य परस्युद्धश्चतुते लोके ||
book unfinished at an advanced stage reaching up to the close of Canto 22 (up to which it is available) and beginning another so different in character and so stiff and bulky as the Khandanakanda. As for the second, the appreciation of a Mahakavya is not possible when there is only a portion of it (viz. 22 Cantos) there. For besides poesy, it requires character-sketch, correlation of the parts, and many others for consideration. This, therefore, is our final conclusion that the sequel also was written, but is now lost, and this is probable too, for, a good many of our poet's works whose names we find are lost to day. In connection with the above conclusion of mine, I may casually remark, that in my solicitude to learn whether tradition lent any support to my view I referred the matter to many of my friends and acquaintances, and, among them, to Pandit Ramagopal Smritihushana of Benares, whereupon the last gentlemen emphatically supported my view and said that many years back he had witnessed with his own eyes a manuscript of the sequel in Unya character with an Unya pupil of his named either Damodar or Rudranarayan (he did not recollect which). He also quoted two verses (one in full and the other in part) belonging, he said, to the same

1. बदनि चेतन्यमास सुधारस न पीयते तै किश्य नाथिकारस ||
   सुधारणाय सिंहदा जनेन कि रसोर नीरिदनीरुप्यते ||

11. अनुलस्थनपन्तवद्वादसर्व हराबली रोमाली भीतिपथे

The late revered Mahāmahopadhyāya Rākhiladasa Nyāyaratna too is reported to have used to quote a half verse which, he said, belonged to the Naisadha, but is not found in the twenty-two cantos current of the poem

सत्सार न समरमता नियतमृत्त तनामरलमःसःs

It is hoped that it is still lurking in some corner of Bengal and may one day be restored to us.

The ideas though at times far-fetched, are yet fine and true. In fancy and imagery, his descriptions see no limit. His vocabulary is

1. Essays in Samsvriti Bhavana series, Benares, XIII 150. There he argues that Śrīharaṇa was a Bengali

2. नेपाल विद्वानविश्व as a proverbial expression Śrīharaṇa seems to have wantonly made his composition hard अप्यमध्यिरह।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.. This however is one of the four concluding verses which might be an interpolation.
extensive but the language lacks lucidity and the reader can rarely approach the poem with confidence Śriharsa inaugurated a new model of poetic composition. He was a logician, and philosopher and the ideas of those sciences are often imported into his descriptions. He has no particular regard for the artificial precepts of poetics and in many instances rhetoricians discover faults of composition.

75 Śriharṣa mentions several works of his authorship, but his poems have not come down to us. His Vijayapraśasti was a panegyric of king Vijayacandra, father of Jayāntacandra and Chandaprasasti, of King Chandas, the Chinda Chief of Gaya. Gaudoryāsa Kulaapraśasti and SāhasāనधaŚaŚi were probably of similar import. Arnavavarchana is obviously a description of the beauties and traditions of the ocean. His Khandanakhandahādyayā is a destructive critique of the views of Udayana, Śivabhaktisiddhi, a religious work devoted to the worship of Śiva and Śhārivinācānaprağaran, a disquisition on philosophy. Amarakhandana, a critique on Nāmalingānasāana, is also attributed to Śriharṣa. A number of lexicographers are mentioned in it.
76 There are many commentaries on the poem by Ānanda Rājānaka,ī Āśādeva, Udayanacārīya, Gopinātha, Sīnāraja, Nārāhari, Candupandita, Ācāraya, Nārāyanā, Bhagiratha, Bhaiṭamalika or Bharatasesa, Bhavādattī, Mūthurānātha, Mallānātha, Mahādeva, Vidyāvāgīśa, Sēva Rāmacandra, Śrīnātha, Vanīvādana, Vidyādhara, Vidyāranya Yogi, Viśveswara, Sridatta, Sādānanda,

1 Author of Kāvyaprakāśamidrasana see PR, I 21, II 15 IV Index of authors, BKR, 10, Dec, 181
2 Distinct from Udayana, the author of Kūraṇāvali, etc
3 Commentator on Kāvyaprakāśa, Desakumārcarita and Raghuvamsa
4 Also called Jīnāraja Hari (CDBI, Kathawate’s collection, No 459)
5 Ibid, No 483 Nārāhari says he was born in Saka 1998 (1876 AD) and was son of Mallinātha; different from the well known commentator. He became an ascetic and assumed the name of Sarasvatītirthā His father was a native of Trībhuvanagiri in the Cuddapah district, in Madras Presidency See Nandurgākar, Int to Bagh, 3
6 A E Gough’s Records of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, 180 Candupandita was the son of Aliga, a Nagara Brahman of Dholka near Ahmedabad He wrote a commentary on Rigveda. He composed his commentary in Sam 1613 or 1486 AD, during the time of Sanga, Chief of Dholka
7 Ed Nirmaysagara Press, Bombay. He was the son of Nirmihabhatta, who bore a title Vedākara
8 Commentator on other poems and Kāvyādars;
9 OSC, VII 89
10 OSC, X 896 Commentator on Śivasūpālavādhaka
11 Commentator on Uvalayācanda, Sātīśvarāpana, Hārāvali, Prabhodhadandodaya and author of Subhāśītavākkūṭavāll
12 Printed everywhere ‘Vaiśnavamśa sukhānava’ is one of the most interesting works written by Mallināthasuri under the orders of Rājādhirāja Rājasa Paramesvara Virapragaṇa Pradhādevarya of Vijayanagar to determine whether or not the words such as Vaiśya, Nagaravānīk, Vānī, Vānī, Vyāparī, Uruja, Sāvajyabhodaya, Utārāpatha, Nāgaresvara, Devatopasaka, found in an inscription in kanchi (Conjevaram) mean a Vaiśya, as distinguished from one who is called Konati. From this it follows that Mallināthasuri lived at the court of Prandha Pratapa Devarya 1419—1445 AD and that he was one of the judicial officers in the empire of Vijayanagar’ [Mys Arc Hist Rept (1927), 26]
13 Commentator on Ānandaalāhari
14 PR, II 16, 81, IV 27 Tanj Cat 2550 Cat Bod, 206 He belonged to the Śēśa family of Benares and was probably the same as the Śūna of Lakṣminātha. See under Seshakrṣaṃ post
15 Tanj Cat VI 2556 Probably the same as the Telugu poet Śrīnātha who translated Nāsedha into Telugu in the 15th century AD
16 CDBI, Kathawate’s Coll No 454, Jass Cat (GOS), 18, 16
17 TC, III 390, Tanj Cat, 2556
Gadādhara,1 Lakshmanabhatta,2 Govindamisra,3 Premacandra,4 Śrīdhara,5 Paramānanda Cakravarthi,6 Sarvagna Māṭhava,7 Vidyā Śrī-

haradevasūni,8 Peḍḍabhatta,9 Venkata Rangānātha10 Some of these have been mentioned by Aufrecht in his catalogue

77. Story of Nala—The name of Nala, king of Nisadha, goes back to Vedic antiquity 11 The Nalopākhyāna, or the episode of Nala, is related by Bṛhadāsva to Yudhusthara in the Mahābhārata.12 King Bhima or Kundina announced the svayamvara of his daughter Damayanţi Several princes assembled and the Gods themselves were not indifferent. It was however a foregone fact that Damayanţi was enamoured of Nala, king of Nisadha Indra and other guardians of the quarters were anxious to press their suit and they prevailed upon Nala to carry their message of love to Damayanţi, but the errand was in vain. The bridal of Nala and Damayanţi was a joyous affair. They spent some years of pleasant company and the disappointed Gods would not forget the slight. They induced Kali to get hold of Nala and bring him to rum. Possessed by the evil genius, Nala played at dice and lost his all. He wandered out in the woods with his bride, ill-clad and ill-fed and at last unable to suffer the sight of her suffering, he abandoned her while asleep and went his own way. She lamented in vain and after much distress reached the court of her father at Kundina. In trying to rescue a serpent from a wild conflagration, the serpent, no other than Kali himself in that form, bit Nala and he became deformed. He entered the service of the king of Oadh as a charioteer.

1 This commentary is noticed by Bhandakar. Gadādhara gives an account of Śrīharṣa and says that he wrote his Nalagatha in the Court of Govindaandra at Benares and not as Rajasékharas says, in the Court of Jayanācaandra. Gadādhara's account would therefore place Śrīharṣa half a century earlier.

2 PR, IV 27 Kash. Cat 69. He also wrote a poem Paḍyaracana

3 Kash Cat 70

4 TC, IV 4538 He was called Nyāyavāgīsa

5 TC, V 4720

6 DC, 175.

7 He was the son of Nārāyaṇacarya of Vasiṣṭhagoṭra. He seems to be the daughter's son of Kesava, the author of Kāmaprābhṛtya, TC, III 8897, 6900.

8 He was the son of Sāṃjña and Kesava of Vasiṣṭhagoṭra of Warkobhutta family. He and his brother Govinda were poets of the Court of Śāvyamalla. TC, III. 8948.

9. He was the son of Kaparāṇ and grandson of Mallinātha of Kolachala family. See DC, XXI 8212

10. The manuscript is with the Proprietor, Arsha Press, Vizagapatam.

11. It is mentioned in the Vaiṣṇavasī Nambala. See Weber's IL, 192

12. Vana Parvan, chapters 49 70.
and from the story of his skill in his art, Damayanti recognised in him her lost lover. Soon they were united. His deformity disappeared. He played at dice again and regained his kingdom. For the rest all was well. The story is very popular in India and there is not a household where its narration does not serve as a real solace in many a grievous calamity. Tradition has likewise accorded to it a religious sanctity and a recapitulation of Nala's tale destroys sin and ill luck.

78 Nalodaya of Kālidāsa, Nalābhodaya of Vāmanabhatta Bāna, Damayanti-kātha of Trivikrama, Damayanti-pārnāya of Cakrakavi, Raghavana-arṣīya of Haradaṭṭa, Abodhikara of Ghanasīyāma, Kalidambana of Nārāyanasaśtre, Nalacantānataka of Nilakantha and Nala-Hariścandra of unknown authorship are noticed elsewhere.

79 Sahrdayananda is a poem of 15 cantos and covers the whole story of Nala. The author Krśpānanda was a Kayastha of Pun of Kapinjala family and was a Mahapatra or minister probably to the local king. His poetry is very charming and in this respect contrasts very favourably with the work of Śrīharṣa, on which tradition says he wrote also a commentary. He calls himself the master of Vandrābhaṭṭa and is not far wrong in his own estimate. He is mentioned in the Śāhityadarpapa and must therefore have flourished about the 13th century A.D.

80 Uttara-Nāsadhā, a poem of 16 cantos by Vandrābhaṭṭa (or Arur Bhattatīri), describes the later life of Nala, it replaces in a measure the lost portion of Śrīharṣa's poem and must be regarded as a sequel to it. Vandrābhaṭṭa or Vandrādviya Mādhava lived about in the Kollam year 1010 (1825 A.D.) He was the son of Nilakantha and Śrīdevi and a brahman of the aduthiruppādī sect, of the family of Arur in the village of Peruvana. He was educated by the queen Subhadra and was tutor to the then prince of Kotilinga or Cranganore. He was

---

1. See Macdonell's *SL*, 295 Nalagākhyaṇa, ed. with translation by M Williams.
2. कक्षेत्रक्षणात् नायस्य दसप्रेम्य नायक च | कक्षप्रतिष्ठानस्य कार्तिकेयं कङ्कितानाथे ॥
3. There is a drama of this name, (*DO*, XX 7346; XXI, 8879) referred to as the work of King Raghunātha of Tanore, in the prologues to the drama of Raja-cudāmaṇi Dīksita. There is a manuscript *TC*, VI 4787 of a drama of this name complete in 8 acts but the name of the author is not given. It remains to connect it with either Raghunātha or some other author.
patronised by queen Manoramā. He had an initiation into the Bālā-
mantra, a charm, probably as effective in promoting the power of
poesy as the Chintāmanī-mantra of Śrīharva. He came to Cochin and
at the court of the king composed his work. As a mark of appreciation,
the king bestowed on him a munificent pension. For this composition
Śrīharṣa's poem was the model. The closing verses of each canto take
a similar form and indicate the number of the canto that ends there.
There are many instances, where he has adopted the style of Śrīharva,
but it must be said to his credit that his poem is more lucid than the
original he sought to follow.

Kalyāṇa-Naiṣadha celebrates the marriage of Nala and Damayantī
in 7 cantos for the delectation of King Ravivarman. The author's
name is not known.

81 An excellent poetic summary of the Naiṣadha is contained
in the Sārasvatīka of Kṛṣṇa Rāma. There is another summary called
Āryānāsadha by Pandit A V Narasimha Chari. Triluckan, Madras
Pratīnaisādha is a poem by Vidyādharā and Lak-māṇa, composed
in Samvat 1708, during the reign of the Moghul emperor Shah Jahan.

82 The story of Nala has also been dramatised. MANJUL
NAIṢADHA is a drama in seven Acts by Venkata Ranganāthā. The
author was an eminent Sanskrit scholar of Vizagapatam and bore the
title of Mahāmahopādhyāya. He lived between 1822 and 1900 A.D.
He was an exponent of the rational basis of the tales in Indian mythology. Among his several works, must be mentioned a gigantic
Encyclopedia of the Sanskrit Language and Literature which has not
yet found an editor. In a particular scene of this drama, a charmer
is introduced and by the merit of his magic was he presented before
Nala the condition of Damayantī's pining love in the company of her
friends.

83. BHAIMA-PARINAYA is a drama in ten Acts by Rāmaśāṣṭri of
Mandikal. He is the chief Pandit of the court of Mysore. His father

1 TC, IV 4810
2 Naiṣadha-carita Sara is prefixed to Sivadatta's Edition, Kṛṣṇaraṇa was a
Pandit of the court of Jaipur, of great merit. He was the writer of other poems,
Āryānāra ṭāka Chāndaschārītāmāndana, Kacchavāmā, Jayapuraravīlasam
3 BR II (1907)
4 Ed Arsha Press, Vizagapatam, 1896.
5 Among his other works is a small poem, Angalādhiraya Svāgata, Kumbha-
akarnavijaya, two grammatical treatises, a philosophical work, and two incomplete
commentaries on the Naiṣadha and Anargharśāva.
Sri Rāma occupied a similar position during the days of Keśaraja II. The plot of the drama covers the whole story of Nala and in depicting the succession of events, the arrangement of the scenes displays an original talent. To describe the wanderings of Nala after the desertion of Damayanți the author introduces an Antar-Nātikā, and its effect is very impressive.

84. Nālānanda Nātaka of Jṅabahuṣṭha in seven acts relates the story of Nala. Jiva was the son of Koneri, who, though a brahmin, became a ruler. He belonged to the Upādṛast Vamaṇa, the family to which Panditārya Jagannāṭha belonged and lived about the end of the 17th century. A D Nalavilāsa is a similar drama in seven acts by Rāmacandra, a pupil of Hemacandra. Nalacantalanakāta of Nilakantha, Nala Damayanțiya, of Kālpada, Larkācārya of Calcutta, Anarghānala Caritramahānātaka of Suḍarsanācārya of Panacamade, and Nalabhūmi-pālavipaka of unknown authorship emulate the same theme.

85. Damayantikalyāṇa is a drama probably in five acts by Ranganaṭha of which only a fragmentary manuscript is available. It was enacted during the festival of Sri Paramesvara in the town of Sūcītrāma in Travancore on the bank of the Lāmraparni. Another drama of this name in 5 acts by Nallan Cakravarṭi Sathagopācārya was to be staged at the festival of Padmāsahāya, probably by Śrīrangam. Sathagopācārya traces his descent from Uruputhur Achān, one of the seven disciples of Nāḍamūma, the great Vatsāvā Acārya. He was of Vatāgoṭhra and flourished about the end of the 18th century. A D and among his descendants are men of repute and scholarship. Among his other works now extant are Kalyāṇagirinī Mahātya, Śrīnivāsa-वत्ता, and a musical poem in praise of God Śrīnivāsa of Kalyāṇagiri.

---

1 Ed. Government Press, Mysore. His other works are Meghasatismāṇḍada (a sequel to Kālliṣāsa’s Meghasanāṇḍa) and Kumbhābhīṣakāmampu (Sah XXI).
2 BTC, 168, nos. 10625, 5234.
3 Ed. Gask Or Serves, Baroda On this author, see chapter on Sanskrit Drama Post.
4 Printed, Salamanorama Press, Madras.
5 Printed, by Samskrīta Sāhitya Panabat, Calcutta.
6 Printed, Choukamba Office, Benares.
7 CC, III 60.
8 TC, IV 4203.
9 Ed Śrīrāmam with the commentary and prose of Vadhulam Tattal Śrīnivāsacharitar and an English introduction by A. V. Gopalacharār. It is not known whether the drama referred to in CO, I 418 is the same.
10 These works are now with the author’s descendants N C Narasimbhacharar, High Court Vakil, Karur and K. T. Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mitasdar, Valur.
86 Kaviraja was the son of Kirtinārayana and Candramukhi and a brahmin of Gautama Gotra. Kirtinārayana was the generalissimo of the forces of Kadamba kings of Vānavasi, and Kaviraja himself was a poet of the court of king Kamađeva of the Kādamba dynasty. This king was a Mahāmandalesvara and ruled over the provinces of Hangal, Banavāsi and Puligere or Lakshmesvara. He was a feudatory of the Western Calukya king Someśvara IV, and began to rule about the year 1104 Saka. The city of Hangal was besieged by the Hoysala king Vira Ballala II and after some vicissitudes the Kadambas were completely subjugated and their territory annexed. The later history is not traceable. Tradition says that the founder of the Kādamba dynasty, king Īrmeta, was a worshipper of the god Śiva installed at Jayantipura and brought with him 12000 brahmans of 32 gotras from Ahicchatra whom he settled in the Agrahāra of Sthānugūdhapura. From the fact that Banavāsi in the North Canara District is still known as the Jayantikṣetra, and Kaviraja refers to this immigration of the

1. These details are given in his Parajātabhaṁga (R, No. 2960) where he gives his name as Kavirāja only. This is also confirmed by the colophons of the Rāghava-Pandaviya, where it is said कविराजकविरिजक्षतेः. It is therefore seen that Kaviraja was not a cognomen Rajaśkhara in his Kavyamāṁsa uses the name Kaviraja to denote a class of poets, who are good in various languages or in several species of composition. But the term is also used as a proper name. There was a Kaviraja among the ancestors of Rajaśkhara himself (See Bālarāmāyaṇa, i. 18). There was another Kaviraja, friend of Jayadeva (author of Gitāgovinda) who was probably Dhoi, the author of Vivardadu. There was a Kaviraja, probably of the Gajam District, who wrote Kavirajastuti in praise of Kṛṣṇa and Mrgaykampu describing the hunting expeditions of a king named Vistativikrama who ruled at Kalasi in Ganjam, Madras Presidency. (TO, IV 1815, 4784)

2. This dynasty must be distinguished from the Kādamba dynasty, whose capital was Palasika. Among those kings were Sanśivarman, Kakūthavaranam etc. The date of their first king is given by Rice as 538 A.D. They were Jain in religion. See Mys. Arch. Rep. (1928), 96 7, 1926, 15

3. He was also called Tēłābhubaṇamanalā etc. See V. Smith, EH, 487

4. J F Fleet's Dynasties of the Canarese Districts of the Bombay Presidency p 84 ff Inscriptions No 90 in The Pali, Sanscrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions, compiled by J F Fleet (London) gives the same information. Inscriptions No. 105 and 107 are also useful. One of them is dated in the 16th year of king Kamađeva, Nala samvatāra, Saka 1113 (1136-97 A.D.). This gives 1108 Saka (1161 62 A.D.) as his initial date. See Gaz. of Bom. Presy, I, ii 556.

5. P S and O C. Inscriptions (op. cit.) No 232.

6. Mayuravaranam It was probably another name

7. Cunningham identifies it with modern Rannagar, and Lassen with Farokhabad in the United Provinces.
Brahmanas from the Madhyadesa\(^1\) we may safely conclude that the 
Kāmadeva of his eulogy must be of the line of Bānavāsi. Lastly in 
his introduction to the Canarese Pancatāntra,\(^4\) Durgasimha prases 
several Sāṃskṛta poets, of whom all were brahmins, except Dhananjaya, 
the Jain author of another Rāghavapandāviya. This naturally makes us 
assume that if Durgasimha had known Kavirāja and his work he would 
have substituted there his name for Dhananjaya. Durgasimha was the 
minister of war and peace at the court of the Calukya king 
Jagadekamalla II, who reigned between Śīka 1061 and 1072. It is 
therefore probable that Kavirāja flourished after Śīka 1072. All these 
considerations combine to assign Kavirāja around the year 1104 Śīka, 
that is, the latter part of the 12th century A.D.\(^8\)

---

1. See Rāghavapandāviya

2. Published in the Karnatakā kavyamanyāra, 6–7. Durgasimha says that he 
proposes to give to the world a Canarese translation of Vasubhāgā Dhatta’s Sanskrit 
Pancatantra, who extracted five stories from Guṇāḍhya’s Bhāṭikāṭhā in Sanskrit and 
translated them into Sanskrit. He mentions Guṇāḍhya, Vamana, Kālidāsa, Bṛha, 
Mayura, Vīmuna Uḍbhata-bhūma, Bhavahūti, Bhāravi, Dhatti, Mīgha, Saivasmābhūma, 
Kāmandaśi and Dundun Durgasimha also mentions the Canarese poet Kamalāyana 
of whom Abhinava Pampa was a contemporary (adyātana). See Karnāta sādānā 
śastra, Int 83. To Pampa’s contemporaries, there was only one Rāghavapandāviya 
and that the Jain work was known. It is seen to be from the way in which the work 
is referred to in the Pampaśīmāyanāś and the inscription at Sravna Belga.

3. Macdougal (SL, 831) gives the date 600 A.D. Bhārandakar (BR, 1894 20) 
mentions that Kavirāja and Dhananjaya must have flourished between 590 and 1111 
A.D. and Dhananjaya imitated Kavirāja. Weber (IL, 106) places him in any case 
later than Kālidāsa (ISIR I 270). K, B Pathak in his discussion of Kavirāja’s 
date (JBRAS, XXII) says that the real name of Kavirāja was Mādhavabhata. 
In a Kadamba copper plate inscription (EO VII 214) there is a grant by King 
Soma, a grandson of Kāmadeva. This Kāmadeva must be identical with the one of 
that name mentioned above, and the names of the son, father and grand father are the same (See also EO, III 27 and IA, X 252). The grantee is one Kavirāja Mādhava 
bhatta. This grant gives only the cycle year, Vilambi Asadha Amavasya, on which 
an eclipse of the sun occurred. Rice assigns this grant to 1118 A.D. Pathak thinks 
that the date must be incorrect, because he bases his opinion on a stone 
inscription, opines that between 1039 and 1129 A.D., the Banavasi province was governed by the 
Kadamba king Talaḷaka II and not Soma. If Rice has placed his reliance on the 
solar eclipse, I find from a calculation from South Indian Chronological Tables (Madras) 
that Monday, Ashadha Amavāṣāya of Vilamba answered the year 1118 A.D. as well as 
1175 A.D. but not the next cycle 1238 A.D. Either Rice or Fleet must be wrong in 
their enumerations of the dates of Kāmadeva and Somavara, Sawell and Diksht (Indian 
Calendar, 129) give the dates of eclipses as 29 5 1118, 18 0 1175 and 21 3 1178.
87. **Parjñataharana**, a fine poem in 10 cantos, describes the story as told in Bhagavata of the focile removal of the Parjñata tree by Kṛṣṇa from Indra’s garden. Free from the restrictions of double entendre, Kāvīrāja here shows himself in his best. He wrote it to please his father Kṛttimārāyaṇa and was probably his earliest work.

88. By far the work with which his name is gloriously connected is the poem Rāghavaṇa. It describes at once the stories of Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata by a resort to separable compounds and punning expressions. It bears Kāmadēvānaka. In spite of the limitations of the double entendre the language is lucid and melodious. He ranks himself with Subandhu and Bāṇa in the style of vakrōkṣa.

There are commentaries on it by Lakṣmanā, Rāmabhadrā, Śaśadharā, Premacandra Tarkavigīśa, Cāṁtravardhana, Padmanandā, Puspadanta, Viśvanātha. This device of handling different tales in the same poem has been very fruitful in later imitations.

---

1. TO, IV 4295. Bhoja in his Sṛngāraprabhaśa refers to Parjñataharana.
2. This colophon for instance is informog.

---

Some understand घर under the word घरणी making it घरणीय or Kailasa, but it seems to be a mistake for the origin given in inscriptions of the first Kadamba king refers to घर घरणी and not घर.

---

8. For instance, a Sarvaṭīrhaka

---

5. See Ov, I 504.

6. Printed Bombay Tān Cōt VI 2664. K 66. Lakṣmanā was also the author of Sūktāvali or Sūktumukṭāvali (PR, III, Ap 54, IV evnt) and commentary on Vāḍīrāja’s Yodasāharacarita (TO, III 8824).

---

9. OASB, 161. Printed Calcutta. The author was professor of Sanskrit, Sanskrit College, Calcutta.
89 Vidyamadhava in his Parvati-Rukmini, describes the marriages of Siva and Parvati and Kṛṣṇa and Rukmini. He was a poet of the court of the Cukula King Somadeva, very probably Somesvara IV of Kalyän who reigned about 1126-1138 A.D. He was a native of Nīlālaya near Gunavati. He was proficient in all the sciences and the Vedas. He wrote commentaries on Kirśārjunīya and other poems like Kavirāja who says that besides himself Bana and Subandhu were the only poets skilled in Vakrokti, he says that he is the fourth of them besides Bana, Subhandhu and Kavirāja. He was probably a younger contemporary of Kavirāja.

90. Venkatadhvari treated the stories of the Rāmāyana and Bhāgavata together in Yādava-Rāghavīya. He was the famous author of Viśva-gunaḍārāṇa of the first half of 17th century. The language is rendered extremely hard by the introduction of alliterations of an.

---

1. DC, XX 7777

For a typical verse,

नामाकृतिमेश्यतमानवान्ना सा विवस्यं रत्नकृतिविजयं. ||

प्रवेश्तता नाम सुनाक्ष्य बेला पिन्य सम्रतासिद्धेन तेन ||

2. He also bore titles Bhirukamalla and Sarvagna (See V Smith, EH, 481, 487). He wrote Mānasollāsa, a work on all arts in 100 cantos (Tanjore Library). See L. Rice Mysore, I, 880.

There were four Somesvaras of the Cukula dynasty of Kalyän, whose epigraphical dates are known are (I) Āhavamalla and Ārākamalla 1040-1059 A.D. (IA, IX 68); (II) Bhuvanakamalla, 1074 (IA, IV 208); (III) Bhuvakamalla, 1127, 1136, 1141 A.D. (IA, X 131); (IV) Tribhuvanamalla, 1162 A.D. (IA, I, 80). In Mys Arh Rep. (1929) page 591, there is a grant by a feudatory of Tribhuvanamalla whose date is given as 1097 A.D. who is Vikramaditya VI. See V. Smith, EH, 491, 487, Mys Arh Rep (1929) pp 113 B, (1927), app F. The grants in Mys. Arch. Rep. are dated in the Cukula Vikrama era, which is said to have commenced in 1078 A.D. Vikramaditya, patron of Bilaha (para 62 supra) was the brother of Somesvara II and ruled 1076-1127 A.D. The following is the genealogy of the Western Cukulas of Kalyän Tala or Tallapa I (973-997 A.D.)—son Sajyāraya (987-1008 A.D.)—nephew Vikramaditya—brother Jayasimha—Somesvara I (1040-1059 A.D.)—son Somesvara II (1070-1095 A.D.)—brother Vikramaditya (1076-1126 A.D.)—Somesvara III (1126-1189 A.D.)—Jayasimha Jagadisamalla (1189-1150 A.D.)—son Tallapa II—son Somesvara IV. He lost his throne by revolution in 1189 and with him Western Cukula dynasty came to an end. Descendants of Somesvara ruled as petty chiefs in Konkan till 18th century A.D.

3. DC, XX 7799

4. DC, XX 7756, HR, II. as the author see post TO, IV 1049.

5. For instance साक्षेतात्मक व्यायामालोत्सवितासदासिरथिकार इ।

पूर्णानीतिस्याविश्वासाना लोकायाराचा ||
advanced type for which he is an adept and in this respect lacks the beauty of the work of Kavirāja which it seeks to imitate. There is a commentary on it, probably by the author himself².

91 Somesvara was the son of Kṛṣṇasūrya of Vinjamūri family of Gautama gotra. In Rāghavayādaviya, he narrates in 15 cantos the stories of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. He proposes to use words adopted by Kālidāsa and Bhrāvni and only those monosyllabic words used by Amara. The poem is at the same time a work on prosody. There is an anonymous commentary.³ There are works of this name by Raghunāthācārya and Śrīnivāsācārya and by Vāsudeva.⁴ Rasikaranjana of Rāmacandra is a collection of verses with Śrṅgāra and Vairāgya meanings. Rāmacandra was the son of Lāk-manabhatta and wrote his work in 1524 A D.⁵

92 A further development of the device was the use of a treble entendre, relating three stories at a time. Rāghava-yādava-pāndaviya in three cantos describes the tales of Rāma, Mahābhārata and Bhāgavata at a time.⁶ The author Cidambara was the son of Ananta-nārāyana and Venkata, grandson of Sūryanārāyana of Kausika gotra. Śrīnivāsa was his brother Śivasūrya was his maternal uncle. His Bhāgavata Campū relates the story of Kṛṣṇa.⁷ He appears to have been a resident of Mullandram, the place of Dindimas and to have been patronised by King Venkata I (1586-1614 A D) of Vijanagar.⁸ There is a commentary on it by his father Ananta-nārāyaṇa, which interprets every verse thrice to carry the meaning threefold.⁹ In his Pancakalyāṇa Campū he shows further advance in the art and relates at once the story of the marriages of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Visnu, Śiva and Subrahmanya with a commentary by himself.¹⁰

¹ DO, XX 7957 See also TC, I V 6049
² TC, IV 5489.
³ TC, I V 5524, Opp, II 729, 1148, 4118.
⁴ Ed Bombay (Kavyamāla, Part 4) For similar interpretation on Amarkaka, Hamsāsanācāya, Gitagovindā, see notes under those works.
⁵ DO, XX 7829 For a typical verse

There is also another work of the same pattern by Rājaendramāṇi Dīkṣṭā. See Jātaka-Muṇḍarpāna (TSS, No 34)

⁶ Tattat VI 2706, 12707, DO, XXI 8259.
⁷ He composed an inscription of King Venkata I in Saka 1524 see LA, XLVII
⁸ See Vivekapātraṭamāla under Dīpādam, post
⁹ There is also an anonymous commentary, see DO, XX 7909
¹⁰ TC, IV 4257 8
Anantacarya of Udayendrapuram of My-sore wrote a poem Yadava-Raghava-Pandaviya. He was the father of Evinent, the prolific poetess of whom the reader will hear in the coming pages. A similar work Abodhakara by Ghanasāyāma relates the stories of Kṛṣṇa, Nala and Harṣascandra with a commentary on it.

93 Meghavijayagani was a Jaina monk. He was a pupil of Kṛpāvijaya and 5th in hierarchical descent from Hrīvijaya. He was well-versed in grammar, astronomy and logic, and his writings on these branches of learning are now appreciated. As a poet, his greatness is sufficiently proved by his Saptasandhāna, a poem in which seven stories are related at a time narrated, in very felicitous language all the same. In Devanandābhuyudaya, of seven cantos, he relates the life of Vījaya-devasūrī. This was composed in Samvat 1727 (1671 A.D.). In Śīntināthacarita he narrates the life of Śīntinātha. In these two poems, he has taken the lines of Śīṇupālavadha and Naradha, as for Samayā, and constructed his verses to complement them.

In Saptasandhānamabākāya, Meghavijayagani applies each verse to Vīrabhanātha, Śīntinātha, Pārvanātha, Neminātha, Mahāvīrāswāmi, Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva, (known as Rāmacandra). Of these the first five are some of the 24 Jain Tīrthankaras. In nine cantos, the poet narrates these several stories in easy and flowing language and has thus illustrated the potency of expression in Sanskrit literature.

---

1 HR, III x and 66
2 Printed Bombay, with an Introduction by Hargovind Das. See also IA, VIII, 35.
3 For in part in Śīr Vatuvāya Jamagrānthatā.
4. For instance —

तामा भस्ममाइतमोनस्वरकुटम विशालसाहसितिविष शिया सुकुमा ||

निर्माण यथा शितिरिप्रुण प्रथा हरा हराव्यादिवसल बहिःपक्षम ||

प्रेमिरेवस्ति राजस्ययास्या सदा सदानन्दृस्त महत्तो ||

शुद्धसेद निपटतकालाभार्तियत्व व नुष्टु सुधामपि ||

हुतामुना जन्म न तन्म दिन भेदाभ्रो यज्ञतत्वाय यथा ||

5 For a typical verse —

अततपितरसादिस्वने शेषनामिकशास्त्रधार्मिक व. हनाम श्रीयेष ||

बलिविधयंस्य श्रीपुदिदर्शीश्च प्रस्तुतस्मातजस्तास्य शुकुमपस्य || I. 53.
was known to have composed a poem Saptasandhāna, but as it was lost, Meghavijaya proposed to fill up the gap.

Based on Meghasandehā is his similar work Meghaduta-Samsārālakha, being a communication from the poet to the lord of his Gaccha, Vijayaprabhasūri. In his Digvijayamahākavya the life of Vijayaprabhasūri is described in 13 cantos. His Yuktiprabodha is an allegorical drama intended to refute some rival philosophical theories.

94 Somaprabhacarya reached the highest degree of variable interpretation. In his Satārthakāvyā he interpreted a single verse, in a hundred ways. On account of this composition he got the name Satārthika. It was written about 1177 A.D. At the beginning of its commentary, he has written five verses, in which he has given an index to the hundred explanations intended by him. “In the beginning he has given the meanings of the 24 Tirthankaras of the Jain religion, then in the middle he has given the explanations of the Vedic deities, like Brahma, Narada, Vishnu and others and at the end he has brought out references to his contemporaries, like Vādidevasūri and Hema-candracārya, the great religious preceptors of Jainism, Jayasimha-deva, Kumārapāla, Ajayadeva, Mālarāja, the four successive Calūkya kings of Guzerat, poet Siddhapāla, the best citizen of the time and Anita-deva and Vijayasimha, his two preceptors. After this, at the extreme end, he has elucidated references to himself and in the final conclusion he has quoted a short praśasti in five verses written on himself by some disciple of his.” His Pragāravairāgyatārangini is a didactic poem.

95 These poems so far adopted the principle of differentiation in reading to denote the different stories, though the verse was kept in its

1. So he says

2 Ed. Bhavnagar. The last verse says.

3 It was composed in Bham 1747 (1691 A.D.)

4 On Somaprabhācārya, see para 71 supra.

5 Kaviyagatantaravidiśānaṃ[bhāsavāṃ]bhāsavāṃbhāsavাং

6 Muni-raja Jinavijaya’s Int to Kumārapāla-prabodha (Gita’s Or Series VII).

7 OR, III 403. Printed with commentary Kāvyamāla, Bombay.
natural order A further complication was resorted to, which was not only a simultaneous narrative of two different stories, but a feat of verbal ingenuity.

96 NALÀ-HARISCANDRA was a work in this direction but with a slight modification. In its natural order, the verse relates the story of Nala and in the reverse order the story of Hariscandra. The author's name is not known and a commentary is added.

Haradatta's RAGHAVA-NAISADHIYA describes the story of Rama and Nala. Haradatta was the son of Jayasankara of Girgya gotra. In his commentary on the work, he quotes Bhattotp Diksha and a list of lexicographers, Bhattamalla, Kesava, Ramakrsna, Rabhasa and Yadava. It appears to have been composed about the beginning of the 18th century A.D.

ANANTASURYA'S HARIŚCANDRA-DAYA is a poem of 20 cantos on the story of Hariscandra and refers in double entendre to Hariscandra the mythical ruler and a poet's patron of the same name.

RAMAKRISNA-VILOMA-KAVYA is a short poem of 38 verses. If the first half of each verse is read in the reverse order in the second, the former narrates the story of Rama, the latter that of Krishna.

The author Suryakavi or Suryadasa also called Daivagnapundita was the

---

1 TO, II 1716.
   For instance
   मित्रोत्सविनारायणलोकसुन्दरमस्मादि !
   य भिवानस्त्र हन्द्रम नोमानास्वमपरिंध ||
   refers to Nala and in the reverse order to Hariscandra.
   The last verse is all the more interesting in that each pada remains the same though read in the reverse order.

कृष्णकलोकिपक्षवाली लाघी मुखी मुखदुर्गी मुनीख्या !
समायानवनासमस सहास्या तत तथा सहास्य ||

2 KO, xxx 290 The Ms is incomplete containing only 2 cantos.
3 OMY, 261
4 Printed, Calcutta (Kavyasangraha) and Bombay (Kavyamal, XI) DC, XX, 7960 61, Tanj Cat, VI 2339 There is a commentary by the author himself printed there and another by Krishnasaha (B, II 100, CC, I 508)
5 For instance,
   त मुखाधिकृष्णास सत्साहस्य ततो महयस्व द्या श्री !
   श्रीयादश सन्मयस्तोयदेव सत्याक्षराहुकिताविरूद्य ||

6 Probably Suryapandita, the author of AryaRamayana (DO, XX 7909) and Arya Surya, author of Vijayavilrama Vyayoga (TO, II 1751) are different persons.
son of Jnānādhirāja of Bhāradvājāgotra and lived at Pārpāpura. His seventh ancestor Rāma was in the Court of King Rama of Devagiri. As an astronomer he wrote Suryaprakāsa in 1539 and commented on Lilāvati in 1542 A.D. His Nrīśimhacampū in 5 chapters and Bālabodhikā commentary on Devesvara's Kavikalpalata, are available.

97. Another feat of poetic genius is Kankanabandha-Rāmāyaṇa. There is only one verse of 32 letters arranged in a circular form (in the form of a bangle) and by reading them from left to right and right to left, starting from any letter we have 62 verses forming, if rewritten, a regular poem. A commentary interprets these verses so as to describe the whole story of Rāmāyaṇa. The author Kṛṣnamurti was the son of Gauri and Sarvagna of Vasisthagotra, probably of the Circars and lived in the 19th century A.D.

This idea of Kankanabandha was improved by Charla Bhashyakara Sastri in a similar composition. He lives in the Agraharam of Kakaraparti in the Krishna District. In his Kankanabandha Rāmāyaṇam he interprets each verse so formed in two ways, by splitting the compounds, so that, in effect, there results from one single verse a poem of 128 verses in all.

98 Sripala, son of Lakṣmana of Pragvata family, lived at Anhilvid between Sam 1151 and 1210 (1095-1154 A.D.). He was a poet of great renown and received the title Kavirāja and Kavikravaraṇī from King Śīdāharāja Jayasimha of Gujarat. He was blind. In Sam 1181, there was a dispute between the Svetāmbara and Dīgambara Jain sects on some questions of liturgy and in an assembly presided over by the King Kumudacandra of Karnāta represented Dīgambara view and Devācārya of Gujarat the Svetāmbara, and Sripala took a prominent part in the discussion. This dispute is described by Yaśaścandra in his

1. Devagiri (Daulatabad) was the capital of the Yadava kings. Ramacandra was defeated by Allauddin in 1294 A.D.
2. TČ, III 1749, OC, I 87a, III, 19a
3. नेतादेवांचीमांशशाखानांशेनसनेकाळी | मात्रानाशवाण्योजीनां पायादेत रामेशरणा ||
4. TČ, III 2874
5. The verse is this
रामाणाशवाण्योजीनां पायादेत रामेशरणा | भारानाशवाण्योजीनां पायादेत शैतारामा ||
play Mūdākumudacandra.  He wrote a poem VAIROCANAPARAJAYA and several prāśastis printed in Jain Prācīnalaḥkāmāṅga

Śrīpāla’s son Siddhapāla, also a poet, lived till about Sam 1250 (1199 A.D.) Siddhapāla’s son Vījayapāla has been much praised as a poet by Somaprabhasūri. King Kumārapāla was his friend. His patron, King Siddhārja Bhūmadeva of Cālukya dynasty, flourished in 1109-1241 A.D. At his instance he wrote the play DRAUPUDVAYAMVARA in two acts on the wedding of Draupadi. Vījayapāla seems to have lived till about 1244 A.D.

99 Muniratnasuri was the pupil of Samudraghoṣa of the Candra Gaccha. Jīvasimha, his pupil, wrote a prāśasti in praise of his master. He wrote his Amāmasvāmcarit, at the request of Jagaddeva son of Yasodhavala, treasurer of a Cālukya king of the Śrīmālakula at the city of Vāraṇa. He had already distinguished himself as an eminent poet at the court of King Naravarman at Dhrāg. The poem in 30 cantos describes the life of Amāmasvām, in melodious verse. It was composed at Patan in Sam 1252 and read in the temple of Śaṅkunātha in praise of Pūnapāla Vāsahapāla, (1194 A.D.) Mana and Mahānanda. His other poem Munisuvrat uttara of 23 cantos, describes the lives of some of the surs of his clan.

100 Vidyacakravartin in the Court of the Housala kings, flourished the lines of poets, three of whom bore the name of Vidyacakravartin. The poet known as Cakravartin was called as the royal priest to the Court of Virabhadrāla II (1172-1219 A.D.) He was the author of the many poetic inscriptions engraved on stone during the days of his patron. His son Vaidyanātha was in the Court of Virarāman, II (1220-1235 A.D.) Then came Vaidyanātha’s son Vidyacakravartin II.

1 Printed, Bhavnagar Śrīpāla is quoted in Śālangadharavajjāt, 94.
2 See PR, IV, xcv
3 See PR, III, app 95 He was a pupil of Dharmaghoṣasūri and contemporary of Siddhārja, king of Gujarāt.
4 Ibid.
5 Rāṃgāla, 185 In the copperplate grants (V of RAS, I 230 90, Colebrooke’s Mes Ez., 297 814, JAOS, VII, 14, IY, 815) of the ruler of Mūla, genealogy is given as Bhōja—Udayāditya—Naṇavarman—Yasovarman Yasovarman’s grant (IA, XIX 857) is dated Sam 1191 (1186 A.D.)
6 PR, III app 96.
7 PR, III app 144
8 Ṭrivikrama or Viṣṇumadeva, son of Rādārajyā, who wrote the poem Kadambasārasangraham, in 10 cantos, calls himself the pupil of Śakaḷa-vidyā ḍharacakravarti, probably one of these three (TC, IV, 4922 )
the author of the exquisite romance Gadyakarnāmṛta of which we shall know more in the chapter of Sanskrit prose. He calls himself by the titles, Sakala Vidyācakravartī, Kavirajarāja Abhinava-Bhatta-Bāna, Kali-Kāla-Kālidāsa, Kāhala-Kavi-Sārvabhauma and Kālakavikalabha. His son Vāsudeva was called Śrī Vallabha. His son was Vidyācakravartin III. He wrote commentaries on Kāvyaprakāśa and Alankārasarvasva with illustrations here and there in praise of the Hoysala kings. King Ballala III (1291-1342 A.D.) was his patron. His Rukminikāvya4 is a poem in 16 cantos describing the marriage of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Rukmiṇī. In the 1st canto the poem gives the genealogy of the Hoysala Kings5 and a short account of his own family. His melodious poetry justifies his claim to rank with the foremost of poets.

101 Abhayadeva5 was a Jain monk. He was pupil of Vijayakandara and son of Devabhadin, and was fourth in succession from Jina-śekharasuri who flourished in Sam 1204. For his eminence in learning, he was given the title of Vādāsimha by the King of Kāśi. Under him the Rudrapatījagacchā rose to greatness. His Jayantavijaya, a poem in 19 cantos, relates the birth and life of Jayanta,4 and was composed in Sam 1278 (1222 A.D.) It contains elaborate descriptions of the seasons, sunrise, sunset, sports, and expeditions.

102 Viranandi's Candraprabhacārī5 in 18 cantos, begins with a description of King Kanakaprabha and describes the life of

---

1 TC, IV 5425 The following poems embrace the same theme, (i) Rukminīparinaya of Mahāpatra Paramānanda of Orissa (TC, IV 5632) in 11 cantos, (ii) Rukminīparājanam of Govindarathacandra contemporary of King Mukunda of Orissa, of more than 5 cantos (TC, IV 5697), (iii) Rukminikāvya of Rajahādānandacandra Dīkṣita.

2 Hoysala—Eriyana—Vīșnuvardhana [1104 1141 A.D.] He had two brothers Ballala I and Uḍayādiṭṭa]—Narasimha I (1146 1171)—Vīra Ballala II (1172 1212)—Narasimha II (1220-1235)—Somāvara (1234 1254)—Narasimha III (1254 1291)—Vīra Ballala III (1291-1342)—Ballala IV (1349 1348) The dynasty ends here. For inscriptions relating to Hoysala Kings, see Mys Arch Rep 1928 1928. See also S K Iyengar's South India and her Muhammadan invasions, 176 et seq and M R Kavi's Kālakalabhakuva, in Bharata, Feb 1929.

3 Abhayadeva's pupil Devabhadin is mentioned in an inscription dated Sam 1296 L. (1894), 178 a, EI, I 112. For other Abhayadevasura, see U S Tank's Dictionary of Javan Biography.


5 Printed Bombay There is a commentary on it of unknown authorship, TC, III, 8348. Yāṇḍava wrote another poem of the same name in Anhiliwad in Sam 1178 (1123 A.D.) See Jus Cuj 89. There is Candraprabhāyukāvya by Dhananjaya (Opp. II 494) and Candraprabhāyukāvya by Nāgavijaya (CC, I, 131).
Candrprabha, a Jain Ththankara. In the last canto, tenets of Jamism are summarised and the poem ends with Indra's incarnation as Jina Viranandi must have lived not later than the 13th century A D.

103 Manikyacandra or Manikyasuri of Rajagaccha was the pupil of Sagarendu. He describes his genealogy in his commentary Sanlata on Kavyaprakasa, which he completed in Sam 1216 (1160 A D). He wrote his poems Parsvanathacarita and Santunathacarita in Sam 1276 (1220 A D).

104 Purnabhadra was the pupil of Jinapati. He lived at Prahlidanapura. He wrote Daaravrakacarita in Sam 1275 and Dhanya Sahlbhadracarita and Ktipunyacarita in Sam 1285 and Atimukta-carita in Sam 1282.

105 Padmaprabha was the pupil of Vibudhaprabha. He wrote Kunthunathacancita and Munisuvratacarita in Sam 1294. These poets lived at the first half of the 13th century A D.

106 Jinaratna was the pupil of Jinesvara, who was the pupil of Jinapatisuri. He lived in the first half of the 13th century A D. His Nirvatalilavati is a beautiful poem in 21 Utahas bearing Jintaka, being a sanskrit version of the prakrit poem of the same name (not extant) written by Jinesvara in Sam 1095. Jinaratna's pupil Purapakala wrote a commentary on Hemacandra's Dvyasrayakavya.

1. Manikyasuri of Vatagaccha who wrote the poem Nalayana or Kuberspurana in 100 cantos of 10 Skandas, a play Setunataka and a rhetorical work, Sahlityasuri is a different author. [Ibid, PL 226]. One manuscript of Nalayana was put in the Jessalmer Bhandar in Sam 1659.

2. Yagnesvarapandita (in his Aryavedyasudhakara, 226) says that Manikya, pupil of Devasuri, is mentioned by Merutunga in his Prabandhachintamani as having lived at Sripattam, under King Jayasimha about Sam. 1150, and as having composed Sankata. This conflicts with the author's own statement in the work.

3. Jinaratna, author of Parsvanathacarita and BhuvanaDipika is a different author.

4. Ibid., Padmaprabha, author of Parvatsava and BhuvanaDipika is a different author.

5. Ibid, 51. Lallavanakatha by Bhusanabhattatanaya in prakrit poetry relates the story of the loves of King Satalvahana and Lallavati, daughter of King of Limbala. For this work see under Satalvahanacarita post.
107 Laksmi tilaka studied under Jinara na. In Pratyakabuddhacarita, a poem of 17 cantos, he relates the lives of four saints Karakandi, Dvumukha, Nami, Naggati. It was composed in Sam 1311 (1255 AD).

108 Munidevasuri and Satyara j a wrote the poems Santi-nathacarita and Prthvīcandracarita in Sam 1439 (1383 AD) and Sam 1534 (1478 AD), being Sanskrit versions of the Prakrit poems of these names by Devacandra and Sāntisuri written about Sam 1200 and in Sam 1161.

109 Devaprabhasuri, surnamed Maladhārī, was the pupil of Muncandra, and master of Devananda of the Har-apuriya Gaccha. In his Pândavacarita, a long poem of 18 cantos, he describes the story of the Pândavas with the main object of conveying lessons of virtue. He was a contemporary of Udayaprabha, and Naracandra, and lived about the middle of the 13th century AD.

110 Amaracandra, also called Amara, was a resident of the town of Vagata near Anhilvad. He belonged to a hierarchy of Jain priests. He was the disciple of Jinadaśa Sūri. Having been initiated with the Mantra of Siddha-Saraswati he attained eminence by penance and the Goddess Saraswati conferred on him the boon of poetry. Once Viśaladeva, the king of Gujarat, heard of his greatness and sent for him to his Court. Dhavalakkaka, he was there examined by a number of Court

1 Jes Cat 51
2 Vaididevasuri, who wrote Neminnathacarita in Sam. 1285 (Jes Cat No 1) is a different person.
4 Jes Cat 52 Seeing this excellent poem Munibhadrasuri wrote another poem Sāntiscarita in Sam. 1410 PR, III. Ap. 167
5 %b, 52, 54.
6 He gave diksha to Calukya king Anala
7 There is Pândavacaritakavya by Laksñmīdatta, L 2004
8 He was the author, PR, I 98, III. App 131
9 See PR III. app. 19, IV, lxvii. He wrote a commentary on Anangharāghava and Prākritadipikā. See Kielhorn’s Collections (1390 Ms 288, 284) PR III, App 184
10 Amaracandra, author of Kavyāmnāya and Amaracandra author of Vanamālā Nālīkā (Jaina Granthavāra) are different authors. On other Amaracandras, see U. S. Tanc’s Dictionary of Jaina Biography.
11 Author of Vivekavilāsa and Schijnendracarita. See PR, I, Ap 2, IV xxxvi, 115, BR (1893-9), 6, 156 (where date 1265-65 Samvat is given) See the Kaviprasāṣṭī at the end of Bālabhāraja He died at Ajmer in 1145 A.D. See Klatt’s paper on Historical Records of the Jaina, I A (1893, supra)
poets, Someśvara and Nānāka among them, and pleased with his greatness, the king honoured him well. King Visaladeva, son of Viradhavala, ruled between 1243-1262 A.D. and Amaracandra must therefore have flourished about the middle of the 13th century. His description of sunrise brought him the title Venikkṛṣṇa.

Among his works Balabhaṅkara is the most known. It narrates the story of the Mahabharata in the order of the Parvans and is therefore a poetic epitome of it. His poetry is of a high order and placed by the side of the Raghuvamsa, it may not be possible to discern disparity in literary merit.

He wrote treatises on poetics, Kavyakalpalata and Kaviskā, on metrics, Chandorāṇāvah and Muktavāh and in technical subjects, Kalākalapa and the poem Padmānandakāvyā, otherwise known as Śrī Jñendracānta which describes the life of Jīna.

Amaracandra completed the Kavyakalpalata of his friend Arsimha and wrote a gloss on it Kavisikṣānta.

111 Vastupala was the son of Acarāja (Amaracandra) and Kumāradevi of an illustrious family of Pattans. His great-grandfather (handapa

---

1 IA, XI 306-307 (dated Sam 1328), Ibid 102-3 This prāṣṭāti was composed by Kṛṣṇa, son of Raṇa, said to be the author of Kuvvaliya saṅgaṅa. 
2 This account is taken from Rajāśkhara's Prabandhakoṣa and Merutunga's Prabandhakoṇḍaṇa (Tawneys Tr p 167).
3 Sam 1900-1913 See E. Dosabhai's History of Gujarat (Ahmedabad), 45, 47; Mahipatram's Short History of Gujarat 1914, VI 910-912, IA, XI 98-108, BR, (1888-84), 318, 457 Also Someśvara's Sūrṇāṭaṇa, Canto IV
4 द्वितियसनवतिलककोशः विविधंदायमध्ययमानन्तः विविधविविचारान्।
कथपरिवर्तकपरिवर्तकां सत्यमाध्यिक दित्तादिद्वजातिनिविद्यतिसतीनिसतीनम्।
— Bālabhārata, I 1 0

5 Printed Kavyamāla, Bombay. The poem is called Virūka.
6 It may be useful to compare critically this abridgment with the original text of the Bāhāra, and that will give us an idea of the actual recension then used by Amaracandra.
7 BR, II 17
8 Composed in Sam 1297 (1241 A.D.), BR, I 2, 58, IV 8
9 BR, IV, vi. Rajāśkhara in his Prabandhakoṣa says that Arsimha and Amaracandra were fellow students and lived in the time of Visaladeva, before he came to the throne of Pattana, about the middle of the 13th century. See BR, II 6.
10 "Once upon a time, in the august city of Pattana, on the occasion of an exposition, a certain very beautiful widow named Kumāradeva, was looked at again and again by the Reverend Doctor Haribhadra and so attracted the attention of the minister Acarāja, who was present at the ceremony. After the congregation had been dismissed,
was the "sun of assembly of councillors." He had four sons Canda-
prassāda, Sūra, Soma and Aśvārāja. The eldest always had the minis-
ter's seal. The other sons also held high positions in the state. His
wife was the daughter of Ālhus, a Dandapaṭī or commander-in-chief.
He was the prime minister of Viradhavala, Ruler of Dholka. As a
warrior, his prowess was great and he defended with his army the
kingdom against the attacks of the allied forces of the Kings of the
Deccan, the Lata and the Godraha. In Samvat 1277 (1221 A.D.) he
made his memorable pilgrimage to Mount Abu and the temples of that
place with the inscriptions in his praise are monuments of his glory
and philanthropy. He died in 1242 A.D. In his Kirīṭkaumudī,
Someśvara, describes the life of Vastupāla in all detail. He says
"Śrī Someśvaradeva delineates the character of Vastupāla seeing that
that master's devotion to himself is extreme, that his family is illustrious,
his personal appearance splendid, his conduct excellent, his charity
accompanied by courtesy, his elevated position such as humbles his
foes, his talents such as defy those of the Brihaspaṭī, his mercy such as
crushes all germ of fear, his fame an ornament of the earth, his
administration regulated by justice."

Himself a poet, he appreciated poetic merit in others. He
received Haribara at the Court of Dholka in spite of the jealousy of
Someśvara. He established three great libraries, where he collected
valuable manuscripts. He encouraged good writing and the Kāthā-
raṇaśāgara (15 tarangas) of Naracandra Sūri and Alankāramahod-
dadhī (8 chapters) of Narendraprabha were the result of his incentive.
His learning is of a high order. He is called "the God-son of Saras-
valū," besides the titles Kavikunjara and Kavicakravartaṇī. By his

the teacher being questioned by the minister and by a revelation of my favourite deity.
I foresaw that the sun and moon would descend and be consumed in her and therefore I
looked at the macks on her body again and again." The minister, having thus ascert-
tained the truth from the holy man, carried her off and made her his wife. In course
of time, those two heavenly beings descended and were conceived in her, as the two
ministers of Vastupala and Toṣyapāla"—Morey's Prabandhaçūramaṇī (Tawney's Transla-
tion, 155-6)

He was named Vastupāla by Someśvara and others. See Naranarāyaṇāṇa, X VI. 88. This name is adopted in Bilasindra's Vasanṭavilasa.

1 See Kathavata's Intro to Kirīṭkaumudī, viii, app A & B
2 BR, (1887-91), lxix
3 Kirīṭkaumudī, I 43 47.
4 Kirīṭkaumudī, I 29, Naraināyaṇāṇa, XVI 40, Dhamabhīṣya, XV. 64.
patronage he earned the name of Laghu Bhojarāja. Several biographies describe his patronage. Among the poets he patronised were, Someśvara, Aniruddha, Harhara and Nanaka.

In his Naranarayanānanda, a poem of 16 cantos, he describes the friendship of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa who are incarnations of Nara and Nārāyana and their rambles in Mt Girnar and the abduction of Subhadrā by Arjuna. The poem is full of descriptive imagery. It is on the model of Śiśupālavādha, but the language is more easy and melodious. Vastūpāla was fond of stray poetry (Śūlīs) and many of these are collected in his biographies and in Jalhana’s Śūktimuktiivali. His śvaramanoraṇāta Mahākavya is devotional.

112 Udayaprabhasūri was the religious preceptor of Vastūpāla and Tejahpāla. He was great as a poet, theologian and astronomer. His Ārambhasiddhi is an astronomical work and Upadesamāla Karmikā, a commentary on Upadesamala composed in Sam 1299. His Dharmādujaya or Sanghādhapatīcanṭra is a Mahākavya composed on the occasion of Vastūpāla’s pilgrimage to Jain shrines of Western India. Narendraprabha was a collaborator in the poem. His Suktaśāntikalolini is a panegyric in praise of Vastūpāla and Tejahpāla composed on the occasion of their pilgrimage to Śatrunjaya. The latter is of great historical value in that it gives the genealogy of Vastūpāla and describes the Capotkala and Cālukya kings.

113 Jayasimhasūri was the pupil of Vīrasūri and the Ācārya of the shrine Munisuvratā at Broach. He was a Jain Śvetāmbara. Once when Tejahpāla, the brother of Vastūpāla, came to visit the shrine, he recited a poem containing a request for a donation for twenty-five

---

1. Other works that treat of Vastupala's career are - Anantimā's Suktrasamkṛtā, (See JBRAS, X 35), Merutunga's Prabandhaśāntīśa, Rajakha's Prabandhabodhi, Jinasarwa's Vastupalasaddh, Jinasrih's Tirjhalaksa or Vastupalalarasankṛtā is composed in Sam. 1335. Also App to Gos, No. II.
3. Someśvara's Ullāgharāghava, Act VIII.
4. Printed as app to Naraśīryānāma (op. cit.)
5. Pr, I 88, III 81.
6. He was the author of Alakāramahodadhi and Kakuṣṭhakeli (Pr, III 28) and immediate successor of Dvaprabha, author of Tādavvārayana carbon.
7. Printed as app to Hammīcamadāmārāṇa (Gaek Or Series.)
8. Jayasimhasūri of Kṛṣṇarā Gaekha, pupil of Mahendra, who wrote the commentary on Kumārapalacarita in 1865 A.D is a different person. He was the spiritual grand father of Nayaacandra, the author of Hammīcamahākavya and who composed his Kumārapalacarita in Samv. 1492.
golden staffs in Sakur ka Vihara of Ambada and as that request was granted, he composed a panegyric Vastupalaprasasti in praise of the brothers, and with the same object of commemorating the gift he wrote the drama Hammiramadamardana at the instance of Jayantasisma or Janasimha, son of Vastupāla, which was enacted at the festival of Bhīmeśa in Cambay. In five acts, it describes the alliances of Vira-dhavala, the greatnes of Vastupāla as a politician and the repulsion of Mohammedan invasion of Gujarat. His poetry is charming and abounds in choice similes. The earliest manuscript of the work is dated Samvat 1286. Vastupāla became minister of Vira-dhavala in Samvat 1276 and this drama must therefore have been composed between 1220 and 1230 AD. Jayasimha's Vastupalaprasasti gives an account of Calukya genealogy from Mūlarāja I and is of historical value.

114 Naracandrasuri wrote several prasastis in Samvat 1288 (1232 A.D.) preserved in the Girnar inscription in praise of Vastupāla. Naracandra was the pupil of Maladhārī Devaprabhasūri of Harahapuri-yagaccha. He commented on Anargharagha. At Vastupāla's request, he wrote Kathāraṭnasagara and his pupil Nareṇdraprabha wrote Alankāramahodadhi. He revised the poems, Devaprabha's Pāndavacante and Udayaprabha's Dharmabhūdaya.

---

1. This was turned into a mosque after the Muhammadan conquest.
2. This is printed as an appendix in Gaek Or Series No. X and summarised in the introduction.
3. He was patron of Bālacandra, author of Vasantavilāsa. He was Governor of Cambay for Samvat 1279 (See qunar inscriptions) and laterly Governor of Petad (Petadrapura).
4. For instance
   नसती वामतस्वधेशस्वचचवल्लिखित्यां ||
   नृपतीव प्रजायुजेन पुरोष स्ववि चक्षुषिते ||
   देव त्वेयंस्वसुिण सर्वि प्रतिपाशित: ||
   व्याहीव मुख्ताजयादुर्पूवितमृविश ||
5. Printed Gaek Or Series, with a valuable introduction by O D Dalal.
6. Jot, Oat 82.
7. Pr., I 98, III 183. See further para 103 supra, note II.
115 Balacandrāsuri was the pupil of Haribhadrasuri of Candragaccha. He was an admirer of Vāstu-pāla, the great minister of King Viradhavala of Dholka and after his death, at the instance of Vāstu-palas for Jaitresimha he wrote Vasantavilāsa a poem of 14 cantos, describing the like history of the Vāstu-pāla's ministry. Vāstu-pāla died in Samvat 1296, and this poem must have been composed sam 1300. In the 18 cantos, he gives a short account of his life. In the first canto, the poet has given the account of his early life: "In the town of Modheraka (in Kadi District in H H the Gaekwad's territo ries), there was a famous Brahmana, named Dhara-deva. He gave protection to the distressed from all sides and was acquainted with the doctrines of Jainism. The mendicants, coming to his house, always returned with hands full of money given by him. He had a wife named Vidyut. They had a son named Munjala, who, though living in his father's house, looked on the world as an illusion. Having got from Haribhadra Sun religious enlightenment, he took the vow of the Jain mendicant with the permission of his parents. Thinking that he will be gradually full-orbed with all phases of knowledge, Haribhadra Sun made him his pupil with the name of Bālachandra, and at the time of his approaching death, put him in his place Padmāditya, whose feet were emblazoned by the light of the rubies of the crown of the Chaulukya king, and who was the real hereditary abode of learning was his tutor, while Udaya Sun of the Gaccha of Vadi Devadāri gave him the Sarasvata Charm. The Goddess of Learning once appeared to him in his Yogandra (contemplation-sleep) and told him that she was pleased with his meditation and devotion to her from infancy, and that he was her legitimate child like Kālidāsa and other mighty poets of yore." The Prabandha Citiṣimani says that Vāstu-pāla, pleased with the poem composed in his praise by Bālacandra, spent one thousand drama mas for getting installed as Ācārya.

116 Someśvara Deva, or Somaśarman, as the poet at times called himself, was the son of Kumāra and Lakṣmī. His eighth ancestor Sola was enrolled as the State Purohit by King Mularājā, the founder of the Calukya dynasty of Anbhalvid. This office of Purohit was held by the descendants of Sola under the successors of Mularājā. Kumāra was in the Court of Kings Kumārapāla, Ajayapāla and Mūlarājā. Kumāra had three brothers Sarvadeva, Munja, and Ahada. Kumāra was made a

---

1. Ed by O D Dalal, Gaek Or Series with an introduction
2. Sola, Lalla, Munja, Soma, Ama, Kumāra, Sarvadeva, Ama, Kumāra and
generalissimo of the forces by Mularaja II and he vanquished King Vindhyavarman of Dhār

Someśvara was a friend of Vastupāla. An account of Someśvara's sojourn in the courts of King Viradhavala (1219-1239 A.D.) and Visaladeva (1243-1271 A.D.) is given in Rājasekhara's Prabandha-kosa. Someśvara seems therefore to have flourished about 1179 A.D. and 1262 A.D. The poets Harhara,¹ and Subhata² were Someśvara's friends and they praised his poetry in his Kṛtkāmaudṛi⁴ and Suraśāhu.

Someśvara was a friend of Vastupāla. An account of Someśvara's sojourn in the courts of King Viradhavala (1219-1239 A.D.) and Visaladeva (1243-1271 A.D.) is given in Rājasekhara's Prabandha-kosa. Someśvara seems therefore to have flourished about 1179 A.D. and 1262 A.D. The poets Harhara,¹ and Subhata² were Someśvara's friends and they praised his poetry in his Kṛtkāmaudṛi⁴ and Suraśāhu.

Someśvara were in order the Purulalata of the King Mularaja. Mularaja's genealogy is there given in C V Vaidya's History of Mediaeval Hindu India (III 209)

Mularaja, son of Raj (961 996 A.D.)

Cāmunda (997 1009)

Vallabha (1009) Durlabha (1009 1031) Nāgarāja

Bhima I (1021 1068)

Karna (1068 1098) Itu 1019 Kṣemarāja

Jayasimha Siddharāja (1098 1143) Haripāla

Tribhuvanapāla

Mahipala Kumaraśāla (1143 1178)

Ajayapāla (1178 1176)

Mularaja II (1176 1178) Bhima II (1178 1241)

Tribhuvanapāla 1249

For Mularaja, see It, VI 107, XI 219, For Jayasimha, see JBRAS, (1849), 819, It, X 156, XV 255, For Kamālapāla, see E3, VIII, For Ajayapāla, see It, XVIII 50, 544, For Bhima II, see It, XI 71, 220, VI 250, For Tribhuvanapāla, see It, VI 209. For an account of their dynasty, see Bombay Gazeter, Vol I, Part II Hemacandra's Dvīpāśaya Kāvya and Meruṭunga's Visāraśāram

Mularaja II (1176 1178) Bhima II (1178 1241)

Tribhuvanapāla 1249

For Mularaja, see It, VI 107, XI 219, For Jayasimha, see JBRAS, (1849), 819, It, X 156, XV 255, For Kamālapāla, see E3, VIII, For Ajayapāla, see It, XVIII 50, 544, For Bhima II, see It, XI 71, 220, VI 250, For Tribhuvanapāla, see It, VI 209. For an account of their dynasty, see Bombay Gazeter, Vol I, Part II Hemacandra's Dvīpāśaya Kāvya and Meruṭunga's Visāraśāram

¹ Harhara's works are not available. His father Mokshaśāta was mentioned in a pesu of Mahakaldeva, Forbundhor State dated Sam 1820. Vyāsa Mokshaśāta, author of Bhimaparacakarya vyayoga composed in Sam 1835. [Boi. Cat. 278 and in Baroda Library] was pupil of Harhara and son of Bhima. This Harhara is different from the author of Bhartṛbhārmurveda who was a Mythila.

² Subhata was the author of the play Dvāṅga (Printed, Bombay)

³ वादेवा वादशतान् क्रिये: श्रीतोमर्यम् | चिनोति चिन्हातान्यस्वरूपी साहित्यास्त्रोतिंश्च शुद्ध ||

⁴ Printed, Calcutta

Suraśāhu, I, 46

Printed, Calcutta
sava, a campū and poem, he sang the glories of his patrons. In the latter in 15 cantos he narrates the life of Suratha of Caitra race and description of the Himalayas is superb. In Ullāgharāghava he dramatized the story of Rāma. In Surathostava he eulogised Yuvarāja Prahlādana author of the play Pārthaśarīkrama. His Rāmasaṅkrama is devoted to Rāma. He wrote Kavyādarāsa, and gloss of Kavyaprakāsa.

117 Arisimha was son of Lavanāsimha. He was a protegé of Minister Vastupāla. He had the appellation Thakkura. Amaracandra was his friend and coworker in literature. It is said Amaracandra got Śiḍḍhasarasvati charm from Arisimha. They jointly composed Kavi-kalpalatā sutras. Arisimha wrote Kaviṭārahasya. In his Sukrātasan-kirtana, a poem in 11 cantos, he describes the glorious Life of Vastupāla. In the first canto, he gives the genealogy of Chapolkata Kings beginning from Vanarāja who founded the City of Anahilla Pattana, in the same manner as is given in Uḍāyaprabha's Sukṛtakalolāni. In the second canto, the reigns of Calukya Kings from Mularāja to Bhimaḍeva II are described, leading to the advent of Vastupāla and Tejahpāla. The remaining poem narrates the pilgrimages and charitable works of Vastupāla. At the end of every canto, Amarasimha added four verses of his own. The poem mentions the niche of Mallinātha built in Sam 1278 and as the inscriptions of Mt Abu are dated Sam 1287, the poem must have been written in the interval.

118 Nayacandra was the spiritual grandson of Jayasimhasūtra who lived at the time of Vastupāla. He was a poet in six languages. He wrote a poem on Kumāranāpāti, that is, Kumārapāla. His poem

1. Printed Bombay
2. The manuscript is in Baroda Library.
4. Kh 85
5. Birl Akad (1874), 282
6. Jalahaṇa in his Suktmuktiśāvalī quotes four verses under Arasi Thakkura, who is probably identical with Arisimha. Two of these are very fine.
7. जगत्विभुजल कर्मकाल रहस्ति करपात्रमुन्मुक्षक्षया।
   तदपि हि निजीद्वृत्ते करतत्त्वशरणे वह॥
   मन्येन तदा विविधं काळानं परवानं कान्तिकुर्वसान॥
   तस्य सत्तनस्तंत्राविवेक कवयिः गजानं कुमिति सिद्धिः॥
Hammiramahakavya in 14 cantos is the result of a revelation imparted to him in a dream by King Hammira himself, of the Chohaa race of Rapasambhapura. Born in the noble house, Hammira tried to uphold the independance of his race and was for a time well successful. In the 3rd year of his reign Allauddin demanded the extradition of a Mughal nobleman who had taken refuge with Hammira, but it was refused. The capital was besieged and in defending the capital the king fell and his women perished on the funeral pile. The poem describes the heroic deeds of Hammira and the advice of King Jaipurasimha to his son Hammira on politics is very informing. Hammira was the last of the Chohans. He ascended the throne in Sam 1330 (1283 A.D.) and died in July 1301 A.D. Nayacandra says he was invited to composition at the behest of King Toramā Virama’s couriers that no new poem could be as good as the old. King Torama Virama lived 70 years before Emperor Akbar.

119 Merutanga’s Prabandhacintāmaṇī is a work of great historical importance. It was finished at a Wadwan on the Vaisakha full moon of Sam. 1362 (1306 A.D.). It is divided into five prakāśas, and each prakāśa into prabandhas. Each prabandha relates a story. It begins with the story of Vikramādiṭṭya, the traditional founder of the samvat-era. Then follows a short story of a previous birth of Sātavāhana. Then comes a long history of the Calukya kings of Anivnd and in their connection King Bhoja and Munja are noticed. Then comes a detailed account of the Vaghela king Lavanaprasāda and Viraḍhavaḷa with their minister Vastupāḷa and Tejāpāḷa. The last chapter is miscellaneous of which the tales of Lak-manasaṇa and Umāpaṭṭa and Bhartṛhari may be of interest. His Mahāpurusacarita gives an account of some Jain saints.

1 PRINTED BOMBAY For an abstract, see Ia VIII 55.
2 For an account of death of Hammira, see Ia, VIII 234.
Another work called Hammiramanuḍana is referred to by Buhler in his introduction to Bihaya’s Vikramādiṭṭya. Tod in his Rajasthan mentions Hammirakavya and Hammura Rasa by Sārngaṭhara, who himself admits that his grandfather Raṇhunāṭha was that prince’s guru. In his Paṭḍhaṭṭ he quotes some verses relating to Hammira not found in this book. So does Appayya Dikṣita in his Kuvalayāṇanda (e.g. Atistaṭkā Alankara) not found in this work. These works may be different.

The colophon in a manuscript reads “The present copy was made for the purpose of reading by Nayaḥamsa, a pupil of Jayasūravard, at Firuzpur in Sam 1542”.
(1486 A.D.)
3 Ed Bombay See for an account, PR, II 87 Translated into English by Tawney. See JBRAS (1887), Extra No.
120 Venkatanatha was the son of Anantasura and Totaramma. He was born at Tippal near Kanchi in Kali 4371 (1268 A.D.). He is said to be an incarnation of the great bell (Ghanta) of God Venkatasa at Tirupati. He studied under his maternal uncle Atreya Ramana. His ability in composition and disputation brought him the name of Kavitarkikasimha. His exposition of Vedanta made him known as Vedanta Desika. His versatility of his learning gave him the title Sarvatrantra-svatantra. Many are the tales related about him and his supernatural powers. He was born poor and he was pleased to be poor and when he was offered riches, he refused them quite poetically.

He lived for some time at Tirumahindrapuram near Cuddalur and at Srirangam. He visited the Court of Srivagna Singha. During the invasions of Malikaufer he escaped to Mysore and on the eve of his flight composed his Abhishika. He passed away on Kartika-Purnima in November 1369 A.D. Vedanta Desika is the founder of the Sri-Vaisnava sect of Vadagaals, by whom he is now worshipped as a Saint and his image is installed in almost every Vishnu temple in South India. His life was one of unceasing literary activity. His collected works numbered 121, on various subjects, of which many are on Visistadvaita philosophy. To him goes the credit of preserving the commentary Sruupapakasha.

121 To vie with Meghasandesa, Raghuvamsa, Kumarsambhava, Bhāravi and Madhva, he is said to have composed Hamsaandesa, Yaduvamsa (or Yadavabhuydya), Marasambhava, Bhāravi and Phāliguna, but only the first two are now available. Yadavabhuydya is a long poem in 21 cantos on the life of Śrīkṛṣṇa and the history of Yadu race.

Pādukāsahasra is a thousand verses in praise of Kama's sandals composed in a single night in a competitive literary duel.

Sankalpasūryodaya is an allegorical drama in the manner of Prabodhacandrodaya.

1. He said:

माति पितानागित किनित्र न मथा किनित्सागित्र ।
वासिते हृस्वशीलमेव कल्सू पैलामिहिं धर्म ॥

2. DC, XXI 7807. It is partly in Nagari and partly in Grantha (Madras and Srirangam). There is a commentary on it by Appayadikuta. DC, XX 7803.


4. Ed. Madras, Srirangam, Bombay and Bobbili. Translated into English by Narayana, son of Hastigurusha of Śrīvaṣṭa family (OML, No. 14609) and others.
Acyutaśatāka is a Prakrit poem in praise of Visnu. Among his minor poems are Hayagrīvastotra, Devarājapancāsaṭ, Gopālavimśati, Dehalīṣṭūṭi, Yathoktākārṣṭotra, Astabhujāṣṭāka, Paramārthāṣṭūṭi, Bhagavadīhyānasopāna, Daśāvātārastotra, Abhilīṣṭava, Nyūyasasaka, Nyūyasavimśati, Nyūyasātalaka, Śrīṣṭūti, Būṣṭūti, Niśāṣṭūti, Śodārāṇaśatāka, Śodasāyudhāṣṭūti, Garudapancaka, Yat- rājasaptati, DhāṬāpancaka, Vairagyapancaka. His Raghuviragadāya and Garudidandaka are prose pieces in praise of Rāma and Garuda.

Subhāṣītānūvī is a didactic poem of wise sayings like Bhāṛṭihari's Niśāṣṭāka.

122 In Acaravijayacampī, Kavītārākīlasimha Veṇḍāntācārya, son of Venkatācārya of Knusaka Gotra describes in exquisite prose and verse the advent and life of Venkatānātha. There are other poems and works dealing with the life and work of Veṇkatānātha Nigamantacārya, Veṇḍāntadēṣikagadā Veṇḍāntadēṣikacārya and Veṇḍāntadesikamangalāśāsana.

His son Varada or Nayanaśārya was born in Kali 4418 (1316 A.D.). He was a great scholar and wrote two poems Kokilasandēsa and Sūkasandēsa.

Anonymous (DO, XXI 8546 49), ons by a disciple of Śrīnivāsa of Kuṇikagotra (DO, XX 7977) For a learned comparison between this and Maghaśandesa by A V Gopalācārya see articles headed Sandesadvayasaṣṭasūtram in Udyanapati, Tiruvadi, and K Krishnamacarya, Hamsasandesa, a study, JMy, XVIII 246.

1 Ed Madras
2 On Veṇḍāntadesika, generally see Guruparamparāprabhāva, Mysore, 114 et seqs where all works are named T Rajagopalacarya, Vashnavaste Reformers of India (Madras) discusses on the date of his death See Udyanapati, (Trivadi) II 8, 87.
3 These Śūttas are all collected in the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras and have been edited by R V Krishnamacarya at Kumbakonam and elsewhere. There are commentaries on Śrīṣṭūti, Gopālavimśati, Daśāvātāraśṭotra by A V Gopalācārya and on Yatrãojasapti and Dayaśatāka by Rāmānuja, TC, I 814, 864
4 Printed Kavyamala, Part VIII Bombay There is an unfinished commentary by Śrīnivāsa Taṭṭācārya of Conjevaram who lived in 1860-1904
5 Printed, Madras (in Telugu) This work shows exquisite composition in prose and poetry DC, XXI, 8390.
6 DC, XXI, 8129
7 DC, XXI 8408, TC, I 922.
8 TC, III 8059.
9 TC, I 699. This is by his son Varadārya
10 For his other works, see Guruparamparāprabhāva (Mysore) 199.
CHAPTER IV

Mahakavya (cont’d)

124 With the advent of the Empire of Vijayanagar came a revival of Sanskrit literature in South India. About the year 1330 A.D., the brothers Bukka and Hanhara founded the City of Vijayanagar, Madhava Vidyāranya was their minister. At the instance of Bukka, a commission of learned men was constituted under Madhava and Sāyana to collect comment and preserve all works bearing on the Vedic religion. Hanhara died in 1343 and Bukka continued the work of consolidation and within a decade his sovereigns extended to the eastern and western oceans and he became the acknowledged Emperor of Karnāta. Bukka I ruled till 1374 A.D. and was succeeded by Hanhara II (1379-1404 A.D.). Hanhara extended his sovereignty to Mysore and to the banks of the Kaveri to Trichinopoly. After Hanhara II came his two sons Bukka II (1404-1406 A.D.) and Devarāya I (1406-1419 A.D.) one after another. Then came his son Vijaya (1419-1421 A.D.) and Vijaya’s son Devarāya II (1422-1448 A.D.). Devaraya had two sons Mallikārjuna and Virūpāksha and their sons were Virupaksha and Praudhadevarāya. These ruled from 1448 to 1486 A.D. Here ended Sangama dynasty.

It was in the year 1486 A.D. that Saluva Narasimha, a feudatory ruler of Candragurṇa, deposed the last lingering ruler of Vijayanagar and proclaimed himself the Emperor. He died in 1392 A.D. His son and successor Immadi Narasimha was killed by his general Narasa Nayaka in 1505 A.D. This ended the short-lived Saluva dynasty.

Narāsa Nayaka assumed sovereignty and lived for a year. He had three wives and sons by them Viranarasimha, Kṛṣṇadevarāya and Acyuta. These ruled in order 1506-9, 1509-1529, and 1539-1542 A.D. Acyuta had a brother Ranga. Ranga’s son Sadāśiva succeeded him and was the last of the Tuluva Dynasty.

19 Gangādevī writes तन्त्राचार्यिकीया नाम विजयाणितस्तपद \| Here the name of City is given as Vijaya. It is also called by poets Vidyānagara. 2. His brother Virupāksha was the author of the play Nārāyaṇa-vilāsa (SVH, 58).
Aliya Rama Raya, who married Tirumalāmbi, daughter of Kṛṣṇadevarāya, was practically the ruler of the State during the days of Emperor Sadāśiva. During his time there was the war with the Muhammadan Sultans headed by the Sultan of Bijapur and at the battle of Talikola in 1565 A.D., Aliya Rama Raya was killed. Vijayanagar was pillaged and Sadāśiva fled away with Rama Raya's brother Tirumala to Penugonda. Some time later Tirumala proclaimed himself the Emperor and started the Arāvindu dynasty.

Tirumala ruled from 1570-1593 A.D. He was succeeded by his sons Srirangā I (1573-1585 A.D) and then by Venkata I, whose name is remembered in religious and literary history. His successors lost that position and continued to be Rajas of Cilappatikār, from one of whom the East India Company received the grant of Madras in 1639 A.D.

These emperors were themselves poets or patrons of poets. Saluva Narasimha and Kṛṣṇadevarāya have composed poems and plays of merit and they will be noticed in the coming pages. In the courts of these emperors, flourished many men of lore and it is their works that adorn the field of Sanskrit literature for a period of four centuries. For convenience of reference the dates of these emperors are given below.

**FMPIRI OF VIJAYANAGAR**

**I SANGAMA DYNASTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harihara and his brothers</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bukka I</td>
<td>1343-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harihara II</td>
<td>1379-1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bukka II</td>
<td>1404-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deva Raya I</td>
<td>1406-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vīra Vijaya</td>
<td>1419-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deva Raya II</td>
<td>1422-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>Mallikarjuna Virupaksya Praudhadeva Raya</td>
<td>1448-86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II SALUVA DYNASTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Narsinga Saluva</td>
<td>1486-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Immadi Narsinga</td>
<td>1492-1505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See History of India, Part 2 by Garrett and Sivaram, Chapter IX.
MAHÄ-KÄVYA

III TULUYA DYNASTY

13 Narsa Nayaka 1505-6
14 Vira Narsinga 1506-9
15 Krishnadeva Raya 1509-29
16 Achyuta Raya 1529-42
17 Sadasiva 1542-70

IV ARAVIDU DYNASTY

18 Tirumala 1570-73
19 Ranga 1573-85
20 Venkata 1585

125 Vidyaranya was the name assumed by Mādhava, when he became the head of Śringeri Mut. He was almost the founder of the kingdom of Vidyānagar (Vijayanagar) Kings Bukka and Harihara were his favourite disciples whom he was helping with his counsel in the administration. So he was called Karnātaka-simhāsana-sthāpanā- cārya. He was the son of Sāyana and Śrīmaṭi of Bhāradvāja-gotra. His works on law and philosophy are too well-known for enumeration. His commentaries on the Vedas are a unique production. His Devyaparāhasotra, a lyric in praise of Pārvatī, testifies to his poetic genius. His Sankaravijaya relates the history of Sankara. He lived 85 years and died about 1387 A.D.

His brother, Sāyana, was minister of Kings Bukka I and Harihara II of Vijayanagar. He had three sons, Kampana, a musician, Māyaṇa, a poet and Śingana, a Vedic scholar. He died in 1378 A.D. He commented on the Vedas. His Subhāśitasudhāṃdhī is an anthology and Alankārasudhāṃdhī in 10 Unmesas is a work on poetics.

His other brother Bhoganātha was a companion of King Sangama II. He was an excellent poet and among his works are Ramollāsa, Ṭīpuravijaya, Śrīngāramanjarī, Udāharanamālā, Mahāganapatīstotra and Gaurināṭhasotra.

1 For an account of Vidyarāṇya by S Venkatādri, see Andhrapatika, Annual Number (1921-22) 189 9. See Taylor’s Oriental Historical Manuscripts (Madras), 92 Ia, XLIV 1 and Sources of Vijayanagar History 47 51.
2 SVZ, 50
3 Printed Madras
4 CO 771
5' SB, II, 75 50
6 IA, XLV, 21 See for instance
Agastya was a poet of the court of King Prataparudra Deva of Warangal (1294–1325 AD) and was probably patronised by King Sangama and Bukka I of Vijayanagar. His Balabhakata, a poem in 20 cantos relates the whole story of the Mahabharata, beginning with the origin of the Kuru line of kings from the Moon. His poetry is highly musical and the felicity of expression is remarkable. His name was admired by Rajacudamanji Dikshita.

As the master of literary art, Gangadevi mentions him as the author of 74 Kavyas, and as a poet of great erudition. His learning brought him the name Vidyanatha and under that name he wrote his Prajaparudrayasobhusana.

There is a commentary on this poem called Manoharba by Sāluva Timma Dandanātha, the famous minister of Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya, king of Vijayanagar (1509–1530 AD).

His Kṛṣṇacarita is a prose work on the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. His Nalakālidānaumudī is a poem on Nala’s story available only in 2 cantos.

1. TC, II 2228, DO, XX 7784 Tang Cat, VI 2589. It is not a Campi as said by Burnell (Tang Cat) or by S. Krishnaswami Iyengar (SVH, 115).
2. जागाशायानाः हृदय जगला वसोदवाणाहिता ममादद् ||
   स एव सारसतससंवेदै विमाहि भौतिको विद्वानस्यस्य ||
   Rukmīkālīyāya, I, 18
3. चतुर्तसातातिमार्गोतित्वतवैद्युत्स्यस्यपदे ||
   अग्गलाय जगलसिन् दृष्टेऽक्तो न कौन्ते ||
   Madhusūrdvīyaya, I 14
4. This identity is seen from the following verse.
   तत्त्वं कर्मचित्रं विद्वेष्यं यदि व ज्ञेयमन्त्रमानाय तत्त्वं
   ज्ञेयस्य तस्माद् नामात्मनि नावेद्यमिति नामात्मनि नावेद्यमिति
   Tattva-Bhāgavatā, I 57

For this work, see chapter on Alankāra post Prataparudrādeva wrote Yayājīcarita, a play in seven Acts on the secret loves of Yayāji and Śarmukha and their ultimate union with the consent of Queen Devayānī. See chapter on Drama post.
5. DO, XX 7784 5, Tang Cat VI 2606
6. SVH, 115 His mother's son Nāduḍil Côpa Mantra was the author of the commentary on Prabodhakāndodāya (see Ibid, 114). See S V Narasimha Rao, Krishnadēvaraya and his times (Ind Rev VII 888) and Andhra Pātrika, Anna, numbers (1917), 205, (1914), 191, 195.
7. BTC, No 10203
8. The manuscript is with Pandyal Subramania Sastri.
Among his other works are Lakšmīṭotra, Sivāstva,4 Lakṣāsahasrańama, Maniparikā, Sivasamhiṭ and Sakalāḥikāra

127 Gangadevi was consort of Kampaṇa or Kampaṇāya the second son of Bukka I2 (1843-1879 A D) who predeceased his father by two years In Madhrāunjaya or Virakmaparāyacarita,5 a poem, now extant only as a fragment, she narrates in melodious verses the exploits of her husband and narrates the history of his expedition to the south The city of Vijayānagar with its temple and suburbs are described with all magnificence Then comes the moving army and its relays on its way to Kānci, where it is quartered for the winter Inspired by the exhortation of a Goddess in his dream to expelate the Musalmans and to restore the country to its ancient glory, he advances to the South, kills the Sultan of Madura and commemorates his victory by munificent grants to the temples of the country.4

128. Vamanabhātta Bana was the son of Komatiyajvan and grandson of Varadāgniṣṭ of Vaṭsa Goṭra He was the pupil of Vidyrāranya In his early days he was at Vijayānagar and saw the glory of Harīhara's reign There he wrote Śīngārabhāsa Bhāna enacted at the festival of Virūpākṣa. In narrating the amours of Vilāsaśekhara, he describes the advanced state of civic life there in melodious verses and fanciful imagery.5 When about thirty years old, he migrated to the court of Peda Komai, Vemabhūpāla, ruler of Konadvī (1403-1420 A D).6

Among his poems are Nalāḥbyudaya,7 in 8 cantos, Raghunāthacarmā, in 30 cantos,8 dealing with the lives of Nala and Rāma, and Hamsasandesa an imitation of Meghasandesā

Pārvatīparṇāya,9 a drama in 5 acts, describing the marriage of Pārvatī and Śiva is now believed by many to be his composition. In

1 OC, I 1, DO, XIX 7416
2 EO, Mysore, Dt No 46 and see also EI XII 162 But Sewell (Forgotten Empires, 23) gives to Bukka reign, 1843-1879 A D See also TO III, 7986
3 Ed by Harīharaśastra, Trivandrum, with a historical introduction by T. A. Gopinatha Row TC, III 7985
4 For an account of this poem see Sources of Vijayanagar History.
5 Ed Kāvyāmālā, Bombay and Madras OC, III 137
6 The name of Vāmanā is mentioned in a copper plate grant dated Saka 1464 (1441 A D) On Vāmanabhātta, see Prabhakara Sastri's Śīvārṇa Śīvāstha, 78, R V Krishnamacharya, Introduction to Pārvatīparṇāya (Srirangam).
7 Ed by T Ganapatī Sastri, T. S. Series The manuscript breaks off with the 3rd verse of canto 9
8 Tarj, Cat VI, 2634, CAL, II. 27
9 Ed Arhaṇa press, Visagapatam by K T Telang, Bombay; by Raimam Iyer, Kumbakonam, by R. V Krishnamacharya, Srirangam For critical studies, see
his Kanakalekha, in 4 acts, he describes the marriage of Kanakalekha, the daughter of Viravarman with Vyāsavarman, both of whom were Vidyādharas, born in human world, on the curse of a sage

Of his Brhatkathamanjari, only the portion of it, dealing with the story of Kādambari, is now available.

He also composed two lexicons Śādācandrika and Saṅdaraṭṭāhīri.

His learning was versatile and his poetry was admired. These brought him the titles sadbhāvavallabha and Kavi-Ārvabhauma. His ambition was to emulate Bāna of Kādambarī fame in the field of romance and as he says, his resolve was to remove the deep-rooted ill fame that after Bāna there was no poet capable of a fine writing in prose. Bāna was of the Vatsa gotra and in that same gotra, Vāmana was born. He thought he had a quasi hereditary claim to gain a name in the same field. He thought he was Bana incarnate and called himself Abhimava Bhatta Bāna. Bāna glorified his patron Harsha in his Haracancita, and this suggested to Vama the theme, that is, the life of his patron, Vemabhūpāla, known also as Viranarayana. Thus came Viranārādaprakṛti or Vemabhūpālacancita. Of this the reader will hear more in a later chapter.

129 Lolambaraja To Haranaha’s court belonged Lolambaraja, son of Divākara, a descendant of Sūryapandita. In Harvīlāsa, in 5 cantos, and in Sundara Dāmodara, he describes the history of Kṛṣṇa, ending with the death of Kamsa. He was a great physician and his works on medicine, written in excellent poetry, are much admired.

---

K T Telang, IA, III 219 See R V Krishnamacharya’s The Authorship of Partap Parvāy (Kumbakonam), where views to the contrary are answered. In the English Introduction a play Uṣāharaṇa is also given as Vamanas’s. But it is not known where the manuscript is available. See also Sohuyier, Bebl 26.

1. See Kuppurwami Sastri’s Rep (1910), 41-2
2. The manuscript is in the Adyar Library, Madras. OAL, II 4. At the end it is said that it was this story that was expanded by Bāna in his romance of Kādambarī. The story was written by Bāna, but there is no evidence of the Sādācandrika story as the Bhātakathamanjari story must have been written by Bāna, not the author of Kādambarī. The story does not find a parallel in Kṣemendra’s Bhātakathamanjari.

3. CMy, 609
4. TC, III 3380, CMy, 609
5. OAL, II, 16
6. Printed Kavyamala, Bombay, Tanj Cat VI 2814, CC, I 760.
7. OAL, II 16
8. CC, I 546.
130 Virupakṣa known as Udayagiri Virupanna Udayar I was the grandson of Bukka and son of Harivarāṇa. His mother was Mūladevi and mother's father Somabhūpa. He appears to have been Viceroy at Marakatipura about 1384 AD in his Nārāyaṇavilāsa, a play in 5 acts, he calls himself the Governor of Karnata, Cola and Pandya mandalas and claimed to have planted a pillar of victory in Simhalā. In his play Ummattā Raghava, in one act, he describes the lamentations of Rāma on the loss of Sīta.

Mādhava was poet of the Court of King Virupākṣa of Vijayanagara and was patronised by his minister, also called Virūpākṣa. His Narakāsurasurāvijaya, the poem of which 9 cantos are now extant, describes the story of conquest of Narakaśura by Kṛṣṇa. The language is terse and his appreciation of poets is a specimen of his melodious poetry.

1 Harivarāṇa ruled between 1309-1401 AD. Taylor, (Or His Mos, II, 92) places Harivarāṇa in 1386-1429 AD and Sewell (Forg Emp 404) says that Virupakṣa was son of Harivarāṇa and gives their dates 1470 and 1879 respectively. In Mys. Arch. Rep. (1927) Ms No 139, 155 Virupanna is called son of Bukka.

2 EI, III 226, where he is called Virupākṣa. For a list of his inscriptions, see EI, VI 923. In His Aniyar grant (IA, XXXVIII, 12) it is dated Saka 1312 (1890 AD). The other Virupakṣa, the last of the Sangama dynasty lived about 1480. See his inscription dates Saka 1392 (1471 AD) IA, XXI 921. On the ancestry of Virupakṣa, see IA, XXXIV 19.

3. SR, I 6, 90, CO, III 63, SVH, 53 Schuylers (Boll) gives date 1350 AD.

4 OAL, II, 27. In the Tanjore Palace Library, the following books are found under the name of Virupaṅka, but his identity is not clear, Śāladāvāravīli (a commentary on Candrālokā), Colacampu, Virupakṣacampu. See Trin Ot VI, 1831.

5 For his inscription dated 1470 AD, see IA, XXI, 922, SVH, 6, 67.

6 Mādhava and Mādhavapuri, poets quoted in Padyavalli, Mādhava of Talhānagara, author of Uḍḍhavauduṭa (printed in Haberdin, 243), Mādhava author of Subhadraśāstra Śāgadiṭa (printed, Bombay) and Pragaymadhavacampu (PR, III, 395), Mādhava, son of Lākṣmana, author of Dānalakāvya (printed, Bombay) and Mādhavasena, poets quoted in Skm are different persons.

7 Trin Ot VI 2772 Virupakṣa the minister wrote Catuvmaṣayakalpavalli in which he says he was the minister of king Virupakṣa.

8. जगद्धन्दनन्दनी जयसंयाज्ञकोमलम् | कविता काविनिर्माणस्वरूपविलासम् ||
   कथ विचित्रकोरणार्थतिस्मव्यापारम् | समू धेशविद्यन्तस्त कविताकौद्गदिबिमस् ||
   विकिरणसन्तोत्तो जाणक सांगितिष्कम् | कथ न प्रेमबोध्यया कार्बाणा तं हराभेद त ||
   श्रीपर्वेष वेर्म्यांतात्विक्षितानिवोरता | भवज्यन्तितिसदन्तलपरितिंतक जगय ||
   प्रभुवतश्रीकृष्णे मुद्द्दितिप्रत्यासरम् | मारवेशसर्व सूक्ती भाक्कम्बे हुद्दर ||
131 Saluva Narasimha was a king of Vijayanagar of the second dynasty who ruled in 1456-1486 A.D. His father was Gunda, grandfather Gauta (Gautamara) and great-grandfather Saluva Magi. His mother was Mallambika. He married Sriyudanabha. He died in 1493 A.D. Gauta was the chief of Kalyana and his descent has been traced to the Moon Magi was a friend of prince Kampana, son of Emperor Bukka, and accompanied him in his expeditions to the south. He made extensive gifts to the shrine of Sriyudanabha. He was for a long time commander of the forces under king Mallikarjuna and his successors of the first (rungama) dynasty and appears to have proclaimed himself king late in his life. His mother Mallambika had no issue for a long time. Gunda and Mallambika retired to Ahobilam for performing penance near God Narasimha of that place. “Pleased with their devotion the God appeared before the king in a dream, and expressing his satisfaction at their devotion, promised them a son possessed of all virtues and ordained to rule the whole world. The king awoke from his dream and communicated it to his wife. After a short time a son was born to them to whom they called Narasimha, after the God. The military genius and excellent qualities of Narasimha are then described at length. He is said to have ruled over the territory comprising the Kalyana, Kanchi, Kataka, Kuntala, Chola and Pandraka. The poets and scholars of his court one day, after extolling his great qualities, requested him to display his scholarship by the composition of a poem (Kavya) on the life of Rama.” Thus he came to compose his poem RAMADHIYUDAYA in 24 cantos. In the colophon to the 5th canto, however, it is said that the author was Scandramatha, son of Abhirama and Kajanatha and the work is called Mahanataka-agrarajayukavya.

132 Krishna Deva Raja was the son of Narasa and Nagambha and brother of Virnarasimha, of the Iruva dynasty of Vijayanagar. He ascended the throne, in succession to his brother, in A.D. 1509 and after a glorious reign of 21 years passed away in 1529 A.D., leaving his name behind him in Indian History as ‘the king’. He was a fine sportsman, graceful artist and versatile scholar. All South India was

---

1 Trav Oot Ill 12 For notes and extracts, see SVH, 7, 10, 82, 83, 86. See also Hallock SII, 181-2 Sewell’s For’g Empires, 108, Taylor’s Hist Malaya orepts, II 99 There are Ramyudayanithaka Kavya (Op 1556), anonymous, Ramyudayas Kavya in 30 cantos by Vankalessa (2IC, 161 with commentary) and Ramyudayanithaka by Yasovarman, quoted in Dhvanyaloka and by Vyasa Sri Ramachoya, (CC, I 528)

2 Taylor (op. cit) gives the date 1509 1539. See also EL, I, 352; IA, I, 78
under his sway and under him were his feudatory chiefs, dispersed throughout his territories. Of his military exploits in wars against Adilshah, we have glorious accounts in contemporary chronicles.

His father had two other wives Tippambā, and Obamamba Viranarasimha was son of Tippambā and Acyuta son of Obamamba. His father's father Īsvara was a companion of Saluva Narasimha in his expeditions. He had a son Iruumala and a daughter Iruumalamba who married Aliya Rama Rāya. He was an ideal king, a great poet and a generous patron of letters. The Telugu poet Namdi Timmayya called him Śrī Kṛṣṇa incarnate.

He had three queens of whom Tukkā was the daughter of Pratāparudra Gaṇapati of Orissa, but the marriage seems to have not been happy. A virtuous lady that she was she resigned herself to her fate and sang a few verses on her forlorn, perhaps, undeserved condition. Of the works of Kīnadeva Rāya, Uṉappamāya is a drama on the marriage of U-a, and Jambavatī Kalyāṇa is a drama in five acts, enacted at the Chaitra festival of Virūpākṣa, the tutelary deity of his Empire. It describes the story of the recovery of Śyamaṇṭaka jewel by Kṛṣṇa, his victory over Jambavanta and his marriage with his daughter Jambavati. Other works are mentioned in his Telugu poem Āmukāmālāyādā, are Madālāsācanṭra, Satyāvadhū-sāntvana, Sakalakathāsārasangraha, Rasamanjari and Jñānacintāmaṇi. Rasamanjari, a work on poetics, contains illustrations in praise of Kīnadevarāya.

1 For an account of his reign, see Bewell’s Forgotten Empires (London, 1900) 190 164 and the appendices containing the Chronology of Pesc and Nuns in Commentaries of Alonso D’Albuquerque (Ed Hakluyt) Bellary Di Manual and Madras Christian College Magazine (1886 Dec) and articles in Andhra Patrika annual numbers V 151, 152, X 187, 235
2 For his inscriptions, See ET, 1856, 898 IV 9, 266 IA, XXIV 205, JBRAS, XII 286, Holteeh, XII, 132
3 SVH, 6 and extracts 39 to 40 from Telugu poems
4 He was practically ruler between 1643 1855 A D and he fell in the battle of Tālkota. His brother Tirumala became king and removed his capital to Penukonda and his son Venkatapati to Chandragiri.
5 See his Amukāmālāyādā, SVH, 133
6 See the Introduction to Nāṭiudla Gopa’s commentary on Prabodhacandrodaya, SVH, 144
7 SVH, 143. But these verses do not seem to be her composition. One verse is found in Mukula’s Abhidhāvyṛṣṭimatika.
8 The manuscript is said to be in the library of Vanzapati, Hyderabad State.
9 There are other plays of the same name by Śrīvādēśacakrā (Rsc, 256), by Rudraśe, (Tani Cat, VIII 8849), analysed in Mura Notices, (III 129) and Uṣāmāna by Harpatthima, (Co, I 71) and poems, Uṣāmāpannayaman by Kṛṣṇa Ravi (DO, XXI 815, Opp, II 3091) and Uṣāharana by Truvikrama (BTC, 157) and Uṣāṛuddha in prakrit (TC, III 4036).
10 SVH, 142, CO, I 203
11 For the same theme, see Tukkā’s Jambavatharana supra
it is therefore conjectured that it was not his own work but of a poet of his Court

133 Tirumalamba's literary achievements were the subject of universal admiration. She began under King Kṛṣṇa Devarāya and continued to the days of Acyuṭarāya of the Iuluva dynasty of Vījanagar.

The only extant work of hers, Varādāmbikaparṇaṇa,² is a pleasant prose-poetic composition. It begins with a short genealogical history and describes the exploits of Narsa, his marriage of Obāmamba, and the birth of the son Acyuṭa³. Then follows the marriage of Acyuṭa and Varādāmba, a princess of Salaga, and ends with the installation of their boy China Venkatādri, as the Yuvaraja.

134 Dindimas Connected with the Court of Vījanagar are the poets of the Dindima family. Their history is recorded in a work called Vībhagaraṭnamāla or Vivekaṇṭramāla,⁴ composed about 200 years ago. The author's name is unknown. The following account is given there. Originally resident at Mandāra, a village on the Ganges, eight Brahmns of Saiva sect of different Gotras were taken by a Cola king from Benares to his country, and were settled at the village of Mettāpadī (Tālpaṇḍi), in North Arcot District, Madras. In that village was installed the deity Rājanāthā after whom the image was named Rājanāṭhapuram. They became divided into 21 families and gradually expanded into seventy at the date of that work. Then the story follows how Aruṇagṛmnātha in whose time it appears this work was written was refused the grant of a garden ground by Praudhadevarāya or Devarāja II (1422–1448 A.D.), how in displeasure he went to Delhi and having pleased the King there Surataṇḍa by his erudition, he brought a letter to Praudhadevarāya and as a result of it the garden ground was donated to him as an Agraḥāram.⁵ From the family of Aruṇagṛmnātha came poets of the Court of Vījanagar under successive kings and composed their edicts recorded in inscriptions.

---

1 Tanti Cat VII 3244 For a full account, see paper by Lakshman Samp in Proceedings of Fourth Oriental Conference II 181
2 Acyuṭa ascended the throne in 1530 A.D.
3 SVH, 170
4 TO, II 2462 Edited with translation and notes by T Gopinatharow, 14, XLVII 83, 84, 84 135. For a short account, see Vetum Prabhākara Śāstra's Śṛṅgāra Nāḍāda, Chapter V
5 Prakāśāvallabha of Kāyapa gotra, Bhāskara of Gauṭama gotra, Rājanāṭha of Sāvartya gotra, Subrahmanya of Śāṃḍilya gotra, Jatādharṣa of Śrīvaṭsa gotra; Nukāratha of Bhādavaṇja gotra Somanāṭha of Gauṭama (Samaṇa) gotra and Mālli kaṇuma of Śunkṛṭi gotra. From the first family came Īyagarāja.
On a collation of the dates of inscriptions and of the prologue to the play of Sphulinga, this genealogy is evolved

From the prologue to Somavalliyogānanda, it appears that Arunagrinātha was the daughter's son of Dindumaprabhu and sister's son of Sabhāpati and son's son of Śrikavi prabhu and from Śalībhūyudaya that Śrikavi prabhu was Nattarāja. This shows Abhirāmāmbikā mother of Arnuagiri, was wrongly given in Vibhargapāramāla as the daughter of Guruswāmi and Somanātha is also wrongly stated to be Arunagrinātha's mother's brother, because a statement by the poet himself is entitled to better credence that a work written three centuries later from memory and tradition
135 Arunagirinatha I was the son of Rajanatha I and Abhirumimbika of Gautam igotra of Sūmasūkha. His mother’s father Abhirama was a scholar in Śrīkanthāgama and was known as Dindumiprabhu (Dindima I). Sabhāpaṇi was his mother’s brother, and Nṛttarāja, his father’s father, known also Śrīkavi was the head of Ērendra-agrahārām, a poet in eight languages and a victor of the poet Nāgana. He married Yagnāmbikā. His fame was always proclaimed by his son dindum and he was therefore called Dindumakavīśaṣvakhauna (Dindima II). He graciously the court of Pratihādevarājya or Devarājya II of Vījanagar (1422–1448 A.D.) He vanquished Kāvumilla in dispute. His Somavalliyaōgūnda is a prahāsana replete with humour, ridiculing the amorous overtures of an ascetic to a fallen married woman.

136 Rajanatha II was Arunagirinatha’s son. He was also known as Dindumakavīśaṣvakhauna (Dindima II). His fame was even greater than that of his father and extended to the kingdoms of Sora, Cola and Pāṇḍya when he received honours of precedence. He married Durgā. His proficiency in histrionics, languages and philosophy brought him new titles. He was a favourite of Śiśa Narāvyah, generalissimo of kings of Vījanagar, whose activities as such began in 1436 A.D as the first of the Śiśa dynasty.

In grateful regard for his patron, he wrote Saivāvahivudaya, a poem in 13 cantos, describing the achievements of his ancestors and himself. Śalva invaded Kalinga and Dvārakā and conquered the Bhammi Sultan Mohammad. He then proceeded northward conquering the Gajapaṇi kings and having visited Benares, he came back to Candragiri which he made his residence for the worship of Viṣṇu at

1 This information is taken from the prologue to Somavalliyaōgūnda, when Nṛttarāja is also described as Bhājāraṇyaṣṭakaviniśaśāyakṣeṣṭapade.
2 Bhājāraṇyaṣṭakaviniśaśāyakṣeṣṭapade.
3 Śrīkavi, see PSOC, I No 153, 257, SII, 29, 79, 53, 52, 107. Sowell’s Forgotten Empire, IV, Virabhadraya’s Anuḥrulacarītam, III 386. Anuḥrulacarītam Annual Number VIII 105. In Mys. Arch. Reps. (1897), 90, dates for Pratihā Pratāpa Devaraya are given as 1419–1446 A.D and Mallinatha is said to have lived in his court.
4 Č. N. 2276
5 See EL VII 74 (edited by J Ramayya Pantulu), Virabhadraya’s Anuḥrulacarītam, III 410.
6 Printed, Madras. For a short account, see SVII, xii, 30, 90. For extract, see DC, XX. 7997
There he ruled in all glory and greatness and there is a benediction that he may rule the world for all time.

The poem makes no mention of Narasimha's rule at Vijayanagar. For many years he was only commander of the forces of Vijayanagar under Mallikarjuna and his successors and it was probably because the last of the Sangama dynasty died issueless or became powerless that he assumed the reigns of Government and proclaimed himself king. It appears therefore that this poem was composed about 1480 A.D., while yet Narasimha was only a viceroy with his seat of Government at Candragiri.

137. Sivasurya Abhirama's son Sabhapati had a son Swayambhu and a daughter Kamakoti or Abhiramakāmākṣī. Swayambhu married the daughter of Dindima II and his descendant was Sivasūrya of Śrīvatsagotra. He wrote Pāṇḍavabhuyudaya, a poem in 8 cantos, on the story of Mahābāraṭa. His son Bhaskara was preceptor of King Halaghatti and wrote Vallīparīṇayā, a play in five acts, staged at Jambunātha's festival at Sṛrangam. Abhirama-kāmākṣī had two sons Kṛṣṇa and Rāma. In her Abhinava-Rāmābhuyudaya, a poem in 24 cantos, she relates in exquisite verse the story of Rāma.*

138 Arunagirinatha II, Kumara Dindima or Dindima IV, was son of Rajanatha II. He lived at Parendra-agraharam and was patronised by Viranarasimha of Vidyānagar (1505-1509 A.D.) and Kṛṣṇadevarāya (1509-1530 A.D.). He was versed in many languages and bore the title Dindimakavīśaārvabhauma and Kavirajāraja. His Virabhadravijaya, a duma, describes the creation of Virabhadra and the destruction of Dak-a's sacrifice and was enacted at the festival of Rājanātha at Bhāpatirāyapuram.

139 Rajanatha III was Kumāradindima's son. His Bhāgavatācampaṇi was composed at the instance of king Acyutarāya of Vidyānagar.*

---

1 These particulars are furnished by Vībhāgaratnamālā sukra.
2 TO IV 5919
3 DO XXI 5889 Bhāskara, author of Unmaṭṭa Raghava, was a contemporary of Vidyānāya.
4. TO, IV 5202
5. TO, III 2882
6 Kṛṣṇadevarāya's conquests were recited by Kumāradindima in the presence of the king and Dhurjati embodied the recital in his Telugu poem Kṛṣṇarāyavijayam.
7 DO, XXI 8256 For extracts, see SVH, 176.
(1530-1542 A.D.) and describes the life of Kṛṣṇa. His Acyuta-
Ravabhuyadaya is a poem in twelve cantos. It begins with a short
sketch of the reign of the earlier kings of the Tuluva (third) dynasty
of Vijayanagar tracing their descent from the Moon and rapidly traces
the lives of Narsa and his sons Virānarasimha and Kṛṣṇadevaraya.
On the death of the latter in 1530 A.D. Acyutarāja, his step-brother
and son of Narsa, by his third wife Obalamba became king. The
main theme of the poem is a description of Acyutarāya's South Indian
expedition, the object of which was the restoration of the Pāndya ruler
to his dominions whence he was driven away to the King of Cera.
The king visited several places of pilgrimage, Īrūrapati, Kalabasti,
Kanchi and Madura and made a tour through Travancore and the
West Coast. The poem closes with the siege of Bijapur and the victory
over the Sultan and the king's triumphal entry into his
capital.

140 Kumāradindima's daughter was married to Mallikārjuna or
Sphulinga Kavi He was the son of Lakṣmana and Sāvitrī of Bhāra-
dvājagotra. His father's father was Somanātha and was the disciple
of Sabhapaṭidesika. His Sāvyahamanaparṇayā in five acts describes
the marriage of Kṛṣṇa and Satyabhāma and was enacted at the festival
at Mulanda.

141. Besides the son Kumāradindima, Rājanātha II had a
daughter who married Swayambhū, daughter's son of Rājanātha I and son
of Ṭīyāgarāja of Kāsyapagotra. Swayambhū had two sons Swayambhū-
nātha and Gururāma. Swayambhunātha or Guru Swayambhūnātha
wrote Sankarānanda-campū on the fight between Siva and Arjuna as
described by Bhāravi and a poem Kṛṣṇavilāsa in 114 cantos on the life
of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Among his distinguished ancestors, Gururāma mentions
Aghoraśivādesīka, Prāśadavallabha, Dhakāssabhāpaṭi and Bhāskara

---

1 IA IV, 328, 330, V, 19, XXII, 120, P S O C, I No. 130, 182, EI, I, 893, IV, 8, III, 147, 151, BC, Part I, 176, As Rs XX, 25. For an account
of his reign see Sewell's Forgotten Empire, Ch XIII.
2 For a full summary of its contents, see S V H, 103, 153. For the extant
inscription, see DC, XX 7687 Elf (the first six cantos). Srunagam with an
introduction by K. Bhilsabrahmanaya Iyer and a commentary by R V Krishnam-
carya. See IA, XXXVI, 862.
3 TC, III 2938, where the poet's genealogy is also given. There is another
play of the same name by Kṛṣṇa of Garbhapura (TC, III 2987) at
Utrecht (GOJ, I, 899) mentions a play of that name by Kṛṣṇakaviṇḍra.
4 DC, XXI, 8898.
5 TC, III 2925.
who wrote a Prasannakāvyya. His Subhadra-Dhananjaya in five acts relates the story of Subhadra’s marriage and Raṇesvaraprassādana, play in five acts celebrates the marriage of Ratnacūda, with Raṇavāh, daughter of Gandharva Vasubhūti, brought about by the good graces of God Raṇesvara of Benares, whom the maiden propitiated by her devotion Madanagopālavilāsa is a bhana on the loves of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Harīcandrasacanṭa-campu narrates the story of Harīscandra. This work was written as he says on Monday in Tula of Nala of the Cycle after Kali 4709.

142 Appayya Diksita was born at Adyapalam near Kānci in the Kanyā month of Kali 4654 (1554 A.D.). He was the son of Rangarāja of Bhāradvāja Goṛa. For many years he lived at Vellore under the patronage of Chenna Bomma Bhūpāla by whom he was honoured with a shower of gold. Later on he was invited to the Court of Penukonda by Emperor Venkatadeva of Vijayanagar (1586-1613 A.D.). In the last year of his life he visited the Pandya country at the invitation of Tirumala Naik to settle some sectarian disputes at

---

1. DC, XXI 3556  
2. DC, XXI. 8482  
3. DC, XXI 8440  
4. TC, III 2316  
5. See T. S. Kuppusami Sastri’s Introduction to Gaṇavyāpaṇa (Zayamalād, No. 78, Bombay), Śivānanda Yogi’s Diksitaścana and P. S. S. Sastri’s Life of Appayya Diksita (Madras).

6. In the introduction to Alankāra Candukā (Venkateswar Press, Bombay) it is said that Appayya Diksita was the grandfather of Venkataśvara, the author of Viṣṇugūḍarāja. This mistake originated in the similarity of the names Venkataśvara’s grandfather was also called Appayya. This error received an apparent support from the circumstance that Venkataśvara was the nephew of Taṭārya, who was a contemporary of Appayya Diksita. Venkataśvara was of Āṭruya Goṛa and Appayya Diksita was of Bhāradvāja Goṛa. In the same introduction (ie) the olephon says श्रीभक्तिसाराजाधिकारिविनिः (See DC, XXII 3642)

7. See grants dated Saka 1439, 1471 (A.D. 1566, 1599). Hultzsch VII, I 69, 84 and grant dated Saka 1528 [IA XIII 127 (notes, 17)]. This Chenna Bomma was the son of Chinnā Vīra and father of Langa Sugamanyaka. This Chenna Bomma of Velur must be distinguished from another of the same name, who was the son of Nalabomma, the minister of Chokkanāṭha and the author of the Prakṛtyāmaṇḍipikā and Sangīta-rāgahava (ETO 61a).

8. On the valuable presents made by that king to Appayya Diksita, see Samarapungava’s Tīrtheśvaraśprabandha Campus (DC, XXI 3236) and SVH, 250.
Sadura. He was the tutor in Vedanta to the famous Bhottna Dikṣṭa. He was the first scholar that placed the Siṅkantha school of philosophy on a firm basis. He was best in the Pūrva and Uttara Mīmāṃsa. With his eleven sons well read and alive at his death, he passed away with pleasure at Cidambaram in 1626 A.D. at the age of seventy-two. He is the reputed author of 104 works the range of which covers poetry, poetics, dialectics, philosophy etc.

143 Among his poetical works are Ātmārpanatūṭi or Śivapancaśikā, Āryāsatāka, Daśakumāracaritraśangraha, Pancarūtastava, Śivakarṇamārt̐a, Vairāgyasatāka, Bhaktamarastava, Sāntītavā.

1 "In the year S S 1544, in Dundubhi year, the 17th of Masi month Mūhān Tirurulai Nāvērī came to Madura in order to be anointed (or installed) to receive the sceptre and other ensigns of royal authority. Having thus arranged the plan, the work was thus begun to be carried into execution at once on the 10th of Vyas month, of Aśkāhaya year during the increase of the moon. From that time forward as the master came dually to inspect the work, it was carried on with great care. As they were preceding first in excavating the Teppakkulam they dug up from the middle a Ganapathi (or image of Ganesa) and caused the same to consecrate to dwell in a temple built for the purpose. As they were placing the sculptured pillar of the Vasanatamandapam and were about to fix the one which bore the representation of Yekapada murthi they were opposed by the Vysnavas. Hence a dispute arose between them and the Salvas, which lasted for six months and was carried in the presence of the Sovereign. Two arbitrators were appointed Appa Dikshitar on the part of Salvas, and Ayya Dikshitar or Ayyan on the part of the Vysnavas. They consulted Sārṣkrit authorities and made the Sāstras agree, after which the pillar of Yekapada murthi was fixed in its place." [Taylor's Oriental Historical Manuscripts, II, 149, 153].

2 See his Śīḍhāṅgaṇīpaka.

3. His commentary Śīrāṃkamanidipika has a place equal to the Bhāṣya of Rāmānuja or Śāṅkara.

4. It is said he uttered this last verse on his deathbed,

चित्रशास्त्रिन्दुरुप कमलप्रथमपुत्र संस्करणे निरुपयोध्नया

वायति सम सतेनसिनी नैव सन्ये स्वर्ग न किन्निवद्वसिध्येश विश्व विद्धे परम्

5. So says Nilakantha in his Śivallārpava (I 6). For his works, see CC, I. 22, 11. 5, SKC, 865, HR II 146.

6. BTC 165.

7. CC, II, 5.

8. Printed Kavyamala I, Bombay, 91


10. HR, III 1724.


12. TO, III 2903, HR, III, 1728, 1924 There is a Bhaktamarastotra of Māṇḍūkya [PR, VI List of authors] Printed, Kavyamala, Bombay.

MAHĀ-KĀVYA

Rāmāyanatīpatramāraṇa, Rāmāyanatīpatparyasaṅgraha, Bharatastava, Rāmāyanasāraṇaṅgṛahā, Rāmāyanasārāvatva, Varadarāja-stava or Varadarājāstaka, Ādātyatotratraṇa, Sivākāmīstavaraṇa, Sivamahimākalikāstava.

He has written commentaries on Vedāntadesāka’s poems, on Govinda Dīkṣṭha’s Harivamsārācasānta, on Kṛnāmīśra’s Prabodharandrādaya and a play Vasumāṅcitrasenāvilāsa.

His Cīrāmināmsa is a disquisition on the nature of Alankāra and runs to the end of Atibāyokti. His Vṛttivārtaka is a treatise on the three modes of signification. His Kuvalayananda is a standard work on the subject of the figures of speech and is designed as a commentary.

1 Opp., II 4884, HR II 1019
2 Opp., II 5411 9879, 10355, HR, II 1009
3 HR II 1010
4 Opp., II. 7266, HR, II 1982
5 CC, II 22
6 HR, III 1783
7 HR, II 3037, III 2815
8 HR, II 1025
9 CC, I 22
10 Taylor, I, 222, Opp., II 2070, 8712
11 Mys 1
12 Ed Bombay, Kavyamala No 39 This was criticised by Jagannātha, in his Cīrāmināmsākhandana. There is a commentary on the Cīrāminåmsa called Saṅghā by Dharānnda, son of Ramabhūla of Vasista gotra, born at Bharatpur probably of the 18th century. He also wrote a commentary on the Māṭopakatika. See DC, XXII, 8668
13 Ed Bombay, Kavyamala.
14 Ed Bombay, Kavyamala. For translation into English, see Saḥ VIII 5 VII 67 The colophon says that the work was written at the direction of King Venkatapati of Penukonda. There are commentaries on it —
   (i) Alankāraśāntikā by Vādyanātha, son of Tattāl Rama-bhatta (t. c.) Bombay. He was a Desasta brāhmaṇ of Varula in the Maharastra country—probably of the 18th century. DC, XXII, 8616 He wrote also a commentary on Kāvyapradīpa of Govinda, DC, XXII 8621.
   (ii) Rasakarṇāyaṇa by Gangādharaṅdhwarin. He says that Appaya Dīkṣṭha wrote more than a hundred works. This commentator is referred to by Appākavi, in his Śyāgrāmāṇjanā Sāhājīyaṃ, composed in the reign of the Tamōra King Shahji (1694 1711) and probably was his contemporary.
   (iii) Omaṅkārā Candrāṅkā by Chalakamaraśa Tr usurālōcārīya, son of Rāmānūja-cārya of Ramsārītha village near Kotipalli in Godavarī District (TC, II 2696). He has also composed a commentary on the Praṭāpa-raṇḍaśra (Ibid 2661).
   (iv) Alankāraśāntika of Nagoji Bhatta (X, 98, 104).
   (v) Kāvyamāṇjarī of Nyāyavāgīsa Bhattācārya, (NP, II 132, B, 342).
Alankārasudhāndhi is attributed to Vidyāranya. On the identity of Vidyāranya with Mādhava, there appears a doubt, for there is an indication of a contrary view that Sāyana and Mādhava composed Vedabhāṣya and other works at the behest of Vidyāranya. The following passage [Mys Arch Rep 1932, pp. 103-7] from Vidyāranyakalājnāna is instructive.

"(Praise of the sage Vyasa) I bow to Vidyatilaka, the Mahēsvara whose breath is the Vedas and who created the whole Universe from the Vedas I, Vidyāranya by name, am telling briefly what happened to me while I was in the Vindhyā mountain. May all people listen attentively. O guru, lord of gods, my master, I am going to Benares to clear my doubts in the commentaries on the four Vedas. May you be pleased.

One morning, while dwelling in the Vindhyā mountain, I met a Brahmarakṣasā named Sṛṅgīn of Pṛṣṇi-gotra suffering from thirst and hunger and emaciated. I asked him who he was and where he was and why he was wandering in the forest alone and why he was so emaciated. He explained that it was due to his having received a gift called Tūlapurūsha from Rāma in the age of Treta and not having performed the requisite penance. I however pleaded my inability to help him with food since I was an ascetic. Sṛṅgīn replied that he would enable me to meet the sage Vyasa from whom I could get all the necessary miraculous powers. I followed the directions of Sṛṅgīn and met Vyasa in the disguise of a hunter (kirata) leading four dogs (which were really the Vedas) and proceeding to...

---

1 Mys Arch Rep (1908), 27.
2 See para 195 supra.
3 Mys Arch Rep (1982), 108-7 According to this the foundation of the City was in Saka 1556, Dhaiṭri Vaisakha Suddha Septami, Makha Nakshatra Owing to faulty transcription, the readings differ here and there, but the following verse seems to be in order.

दिक्षरदीयसल्लोके शककोऽदुस्माहिति |
शालवंद सितासपत्त्यां वैशालेव भाति मात्रेऽके |
शुलभं श्रमन्त्रं महाराजे च विशेष ||

"In Guruvamakāvyā, the same date is given, but the week day is added as Sunday. In an inscription quoted by Mr B Suryanarayana in his History of Vijayanagara the week day is read as Šaunyasāvāra (Wednesday). But in the year, month and tithi, all concur. On a collation of the constellation and tithi, it appears that Vaisakha maśi Bhaṅkara indicates that it was Vaisakha (solar, not lunar), meaning Vṛṣabha month. This is equivalent to Friday, the 17th May 1336 A.D."
Benares I told him that I knew who he was through Srngin Vyasa took me with Srngin to Badari and taught me how to acquire the siddhas like Anima (miraculous powers attributed to yogis in India) He also instructed me in the knowledge of all srutis, smritis, puranas, itihasas, arthasastras, kamasstra (erotic science), and the 64 samhitas of Siva and enabled me to understand the events of the past, to know what is going on at present and to foretell what would happen in the future To enable Srngin to be fed to his heart's content the sage Vyasa directed me, after mutraung me into the mystic lore of Srchakra, to construct a city as had been done by Maya and Visvakarma for the Devi after she killed Bhandasura and to set up a throne there.

After the sage disappeared I went in the company of Srngin to Kishkindha and worshipped god Virupaksha on the bank of the Tungabhadra The god bade me re-build in accordance with the taattas the city named Vijaya (Vijayanagar) which was once one of the eight great cities and measured two yojanas in circumference and in the middle of which lay the hill Matanga and which had disappeared in the course of time Hearing this, I stopped for a time in a cave of the Matanga hill

During this time, two persons named Sayana and Mayana came to me and begged me to bless them with offspring But I told them that they were not destined to get children At this they became sad and begged me to make use of the large sums of money earned by them for performing Dharma (charities) and enable them to attain on death the regions reserved for those who have sons Thus entreated I made them my disciples and I composed and got composed by them works named Sayanya and Madhaviya dealing with various sastras

"Vidyaranya was a disciple of Vidyasankara called also Vidyabirtha He calls himself a follower of Sankaracharya He was the author of numerous works on various sastras which are attributed to the brothers Sayana and Madhava, including Vedabhashya He was given to much travelling and went to Benares to meet the sage Vyasa to get his Vedabhashya revised On the way, he met Srngin, a Brahmarakshasa in the Vindhya Mountain From Vyasas, Vidyaranya learnt all the mystic lore and on going to Hampe to pay his respects

1 Details about Srchakra are given in pp 4-19 (ibid).
to god Virupaksha he was bidden to revive the ancient city of Vijayanagar which had disappeared and to set up a kingdom there. This would enable the god Virupaksha to receive proper worship and offerings and help Sringiri to be fed to his heart's content. We find a temple for Sringiri called Malayala-brahma set up near the Matt in Sringeri and it is said that without propitiating him no entertainment or feast could be organised at Sringeri. Vidyaranya accordingly stopped at Hampe where he met later Hanhara and Bukka, who had been defeated by the Ballala king. With his blessings they attained success. The spot for the construction of a capital city was indicated by a hare turning on hounds during a royal hunt south of the Tungabhadra. Vidyaranya after careful study and calculations built a city there and installed Hanhara on the throne there. He also foretold the history of that city and kingdom, its rise, fall, and revival under Vira Vasanta to Hanhara and this account was compiled under his orders by the ascetic Bharatikrishna. The first three Kings at Vijayanagar ruled with his favour. The first thirteen Kings were devotees of god Virupaksha and had deep reverence for Vidyaranya and his disciple Knyasakti.

We may note here that the story of Vidyaranya's meeting with Vyasa is also found in a Sanskrit poem called Guruvamsa composed about 1740 A.D giving a history of the Sringeri Matt. There Vyasa is said to have assumed the disguise of a Swapacha (low caste man). The story of Sringeri and of Madhava and Sayana is also given in the same work. They are called ministers there. But it has to be remembered that Sayana and Madhava only acknowledge Vidyatirtha and not Vidyaranya as their guru. Moreover, Sayana had several sons as stated in Alankarasudhamdhii. That Madhava was different from

1 Mys. Arch Rep (1916), 16
2 राजाराजसूर अर्थात् दशरथ सब्जीवाणी तत्रात् दूतम्
कियायान्त्यायाखम विद्याकार स्वस्ति आलकिन विलापकारमातार वानोदन्त नैरृश्या

"Kriyasakti was a Salva teacher of the Kalamukha School. Madhava-mantri, Governor of Chandragutta, etc., speaks of him as his guru in 1847, Mys Arch Rep, (1929), p 172. Inscriptions down to Dandapalli plates of 1410, E I XIV speak of Kriyasakti as the guru of Hanhara II, Mudadaddesa, Vishana Vodayar and Vijaya- birupaka, etc. Apparently there must have been two gurus of the same name at this period."

3 Mys. Arch Rep (1928), 15
4 Guruvamsa, v 44.
5 Mys. Arch, Rep (1908), 27
Vidyaranya and that Bharatikrishna was a disciple or junior of Vidyaranya and Vidyaranya was the disciple not of Bharatikrishna but of Vidyatirtha and that he was already an ascetic before the foundation of the Vijayanagar kingdom are facts of great interest to be gleaned from Vidyaranyakalajnana. The poem Guruvamsa makes Bharatikrishna, a younger brother of Vidyaranya before he became a sanyasi, but he is said to have become a sanyasi earlier. The journey of Vidyaranya to Benares and his sojourn there, not before 1336 but very much later is referred to in a Kadita inscription in the Sringeri Matt of 1380. Inscriptions recognising Vidyaranya as the head of the Sringeri Matt are dated between 1375 and 1386.

As regards Vidyatirtha or Vidyasankara he is called Vidyatirtha in inscriptions and the works of Sayana and Madhava. Vidyasankara was the name of the linga set up over his tomb and hence that of the temple at Sringeri enshrining the linga. However in later literature, he is called Vidyasankara. Vidyatirtha seems to have been different from a Vidyasankara who died about 1388, while Vidyatirtha must have died about 1356, long before the accession of Vidyaranya at Sringeri about 1375. What relation he had to Vidyasankara who was the guru of Naraharmanantn, governor of Goa in 1391, cannot be determined. Probably he was different.

Bharatikrishnatirtha is called Bharatikrishna in inscriptions and contemporary literature. He seems to have set up the Vidyasankara temple at Sringeri in memory of his guru Vidyatirtha before 1380. He is said to have died in 1374. The first inscription of his successor in the Sringeri Matt (Vidyaranya) so far discovered is that at Kudupu, South Canara District, dated 1375. But though Vidyaranya succeeded him to the pontificate at Sringeri he seems to have been a junior to Vidyaranya as indicated in the Sringeri copper plate grant of 1386 A D and the Kadita of 1380.

---

1. Guruvamsa, IV 22
4. EC, X Mulbagal 11
5. Ep Ind XXI p 17 Chaudala grant
7. Mys. Arch. Rep, (1916), No 460
8. Madras Epigraphical Report (1929), No. 460
CHAPTER V

Mahakavyas—(contd)

145 The Naik Kings of Tanjore* Chinna Cheva, son of Chinna, was a great warrior. He married Murtiambā, younger sister of Tirumalāmā, the queen of Emperor Acyutarāya of Vijianagar (1530-1542 A.D.) It is said that the province of Tanjore was granted free to Murtiambā as a wedding gift by the Emperor. This Chinnacheva Naik became the first ruler of Tanjore. He ruled about 1549-1572 A.D. He built the big gopuram and tank at Tiruvannamalai, the Dhvaja-śṭambha at Vriddhācalam and compound wall and steps to the temple of Śrīśailam.

Chinna Cheva's son was Acyuta or Acyujappa Naik. He ruled about 1572-1614 A.D. He married Murtiambā and by her had a son Raghunātha. Raghunātha Naik was installed on the throne during the lifetime of his father about 1614 A.D. Raghunātha married Kalāvaṭī and his son Vijayarāghava succeeded him and ruled till 1662 A.D. Vijayarāghava describes his ancestors in his Telugu poem Raghunāṭha bhyudaya.²

Chokkanatha Naik, the ruler of Madura, applied to Vijayarāghava for the hand of one of the daughters and as the request was refused, Chokkanatha went to war and in that war Vijayarāghava and his elder son were killed. One of his queens managed to hand her little son Cengamaladas to a nurse with all her jewels and the young prince was removed and secretly brought up by a wealthy brahmī at Negapatam. The Sultan of Bijapur was requested for help and he sent Ekoji, the son of his minister Shahaji, to march against Tanjore, which was then under Alagiri. Alagiri was defeated and Chengamala Das was restored to the throne of his father. In the meantime the Sultan of Bijapur was killed in battle by Aurangzeb. By the enemies of Chengamala, Ekoji was induced to capture Tanjore and as Ekoji advanced Chenga-

---

1. See the Telugu work, History of Tanjore Andhra Kings extracted in SVH, 819, 696. For the genealogy, see SVH, 254. See also T S Kuppuswami Sastrī’s Tamil pamphlet Naik Krones of Tanjore, Tanjore District Manual, 560, Naik Kingdom of Madura (I.A., XLIII XLVI); Danver’s Portuguese in India, IX Ch. viii. The genealogy is given in Rayanadāmānī’s Rukmini kalyana (DO, XX 7845).

2. For extracts, see SVH, 254, 266.
mala fled away and was no more heard of. Thus came in the Maharatta Kingdom of Tanjore

146 Raghunatha was the greatest of the Naik Kings of Tanjore. He ruled between 1614 to 1662. He was a great scholar and patron of letters. He constructed many temples and granted new Aghararas. His minister Govinda Dikshit was a scholar and politician. His preceptor was Kumāraṭātīcārya of Kanci. His queen Rāmabhadrāmāhà considered him Rāma incarnate and wrote a poem Raghunāthā-bhūyadaya in his glory.

He was a poet and musician and discovered a new type of Vina called after his name. His Sangītāsudha is a comprehensive work on music, including instrumental music and dancing. In the introductory verses, there is much useful historical information.

His Bhāratīsudhā embraced dancing. Among his other works are Pārjātāharana, Valmikīlantī, Acyutandrābhūyadaya, Gajendra-moksa, *Nalābhūyadaya and Rukmini-Kṛṣṇa-vīvāha, Yāk agāna, Rāmāyaṇasūrāsangraha.*

Kṛṣṇakavi, who in his rhetorical work, Raghunāthābhūyāhiy, in eight chapters has illustrations in praise of Raghunātha.

147 Madhuravani, whose real name is not known, flourished in the Court of the King Raghunātha Naik of Tanjore who came to the throne about 1614 A.D. His son Vijaya Rāghava Naik ruled till 1662 A.D. In 14 cantos she wrote a poem on the story of Rāmāyaṇa in measures as graceful as the author's extant name. Her description

---

1 See SVH, 319 and Introduction Danver's Portuguese in India, II Oh VIII Tanjore District Manual, 750 SVH, 267
2 See Govinda Dikshita's Sāhītya Sudhā.
3 He was the son of Venkataśārya, of the famous family of Kanci. He wrote the Pārjātānātaka, a drama in five acts, the plot of which is based on the story of the bringing of the Pārjāta flower from Indra's garden, by Kṛṣṇa to please his beloved Saṭyabhāmā (TO, III 2874). His life in Desonbad in a poem by Nūgasami Tāṭācārya (Printed, Kumbakonam).
4 Tanj Cat, IV, 2699
5 TO, IV 4599 There is a Sangītāsudhā by Bāṁsa Narendra, Oudh X 13
6 These are given in Govinda Dikṣīṭas Sāhītya Sudhā, see SVH, 267, BO, XXI, 8879.
7 Tanj Cat, VI 2634
8 TO, I 896 There is a commentary on it by Sudhindrayatī, pupil of Vīrāṇḍraśīrṣha, written at the instance of King Raghunātha (TO, III, 4087)
of good poetry is lovely. In the 1st canto she thus describes the circumstances under which the poem came to be composed. Once when the Prince Raghunatha-Bhupa was seated on his throne surrounded by the accomplished court-ladies, one of them sang verses from the beautiful Andhra-Rāmāyana composed by the Prince himself, while another complimented him for his unflinching devotion to God Śrī Rama. This set the Prince thinking on Śrī Rama, and he considered within himself as follows: "Many are the stories of Viṣṇu, and amongst them, it is Rāma’s story that serves as nectar to me. Though enjoyed thousands of times, it seems to me ever fresh and pleases me most. Hundreds of ladies are assembled here, who are skilled in composing original Sanskrit and Telugu works. Who amongst these could best render my Andhra Ramayana into Sanskrit verse? With such thoughts, the Prince retired from the Court. God Śrī Rama appeared to him that night in a vision and said—"I understand what is now uppermost in your mind. Give up all anxiety in the matter. Know that the lady, whom you have honoured with the title Madhura Vani, is the ablest of all the Court-ladies." Next day when the Court assembled, he called Madhura Vani to his side and related to her the vision he had the previous night, and directed her to bring out an excellent work on Śrī Rama, which shall be replete with beautiful alankaras (figures of speech) and rasas (emotions) in language that is charming and melodious." She replied—"With the aid of one (yourself) that always has Śrī Rama at heart, I can say the work is achieved." About the end of the 1st canto, there is a lively description of her royal patron and his splendid court.

148. Govinda Diksita was a brahmin of Vāsistha Gotra. Nāgāmbē was his wife. Yagnanārāyaṇa and Venkatamakhin were his sons. He lived mostly at Tirunagesvaram and Pattesvaram. He was the prime minister of the Tanjore Kings, Chevvappa (1549-1572 A.D.), Acyuta (1577-1614 A.D.) and Raghunātha (1614 A.D.) At Pattesvaram.

1. सहस्यविवर्त्तवां वर्षपद्धार्यांमिस्कर्मनिश्चितवटीवां सेवकविता कवितायात्।
कर्मपूर्वकाः जनकस्यानां प्रोक्तविखिनतात्त्वा दुष्कोव्व दीयेते॥

मंदस्मणाःसिद्धवचिर्तिहि शस्वारम्या यथा विभगुकामाः।
कर्मं तद्विधाय कमथं तदनावेचार्मणा शपतं नातास।॥

2. See Mys. OML, Sup 10. There is a brief account of it, by Narasimbiengar in the Indian Review.

the images of his wife and himself in his state garh are seen still standing, to whom the ardent devotee pays his regard. At home his life as a brahmin was pious and simple and in office his greatness as a statesman and administrator has become proverbial in South India. The worthy friends, Raghunatha and Govinda, King and Minisler, have been well described thus:

शाखे शाखे च निपुष बाहुगुण हेमु च ||

He was proficient in Advaiti and was known Advaitārya Himself a scholar and author, he was a patron of letters. He admired Appayya Dikṣṭa and requested him to write a commentary on Kalpaṭāru. Numberless are grants of agraharams made by his kings at his instance and the several mandapas and bathing ghats visible along the Kaveri banks are monuments of his administration.

Govinda had eight sons and a daughter. There is a tradition that his daughter died of Rajadṛṣṭi (the look of the king). One day when the king paid a visit to the Great Minisler at his residence, Govinda Dikṣṭa's accomplished daughter took the harathi to the king, as is the custom on such an occasion. The king was naturally pleased with the accomplished lady, but unfortunately she died, it is said, afterwards by the evil effect of the look of the king. It is said also that one of his sons was an expert player on Vina. The king, it is stated, gave away all his royal ornaments to that young son, but a few hours afterwards he died of the effect of Rajadṛṣṭi. Tradition says that it was then that Govinda Dikṣṭa pronounced a curse on his clan, that wealth and beauty should not adorn his children at any time and the members of the Dikṣṭa's clan still believe in the curse. His religious devotion has left several institutions in the land which are bound to keep his name and fame green in our memories for ages to come. One story is enough to show how Govinda Dikṣṭa was ever ready to help all to the best of his ability—one day while he was taking a walk he saw a young man uttering a sloka and ardently praying to the Sun for his grace. The Dikṣṭa approached the young man and heard him uttering a śringara sloka (a piece of poetry containing śringara rasa or element of love) and not a song of devotion as he thought it was. On asking the young man, the Dikṣṭa was told that the young man, desiring to be married and well established in life, had appraised a guru of his desire, that that guru had given him that sloka for prayer to the Sun, and that he has
since then been continually praying to the sun with that sloka, not knowing anything as to what it meant. The Dikshita heard him and was amused. Seeing the young man's ardent devotion and sincerity, the Dikshita took the young man with him and got him married and well established in life. In social matters Govinda Dikshita appears to have been a permanent court of arbitration. One description at Patteswaram shows how the class of weavers known as Patunulkara always went to him to settle all family disputes among them. Even now, when difficulties arise among this class of people they go to Patteswaram and in the presence of the image of Govinda Dikshita settle their differences. Govinda Dikshita was an authority in Dharma Sastra. He was a true Brahmin and performed all the sacrifices enjoined in the Vedas. He was a master of politics and he steered the ship of state very successfully and gloriously for nearly three quarters of a century. At the end he gave up all his estate, palace etc. to God and resigned all Karma-phala (the fruit of his actions) and had for his Vibhava or wealth only his Advaita Vidya and realised his Atma. He gave up all and in the last days of his life, he retired and spent his time in Thapas in the Saunadhi of Mangalamabika at Kumbakonam as is popularly believed and left the mortal coil to evolve from the prison house of mortal life and join the great Rishis of Aryavarta in the regions of immortality. Thus passed out of sight this illustrious sage of the sixteenth century. Govinda Dikshita was a true hero while he lived and became a God after his death. As has been said at the outset, Govinda Dikshita is now worshipped as a God in the form of Linga at Kumbakonam and at Tiruvadi and as an image at Patteswaram. He has beside him at Patteswaram his consort, his Dharma Patni Nagamba, the two standing there today as if to illustrate the famous line of Milton. He for god only, she for god in him.

149. Among Govinda's works are Sāhityasudhā which describes in exquisite poetry the history of his masters Acyuta and Raghunātha. Venkatamakhī in his Caturdandaprakāsikā says that his father wrote a work on music Sangītasudhānīdhi and a commentary on Sāndara-kānda of Rāmāyaṇa.

1. N. K Venkatesan, l.c. 240
2. Govindamentram of Sāndilyagotra, who wrote the poem Harivamsā-daracarita was in the Kondavidu court and was a different author. There is a commentary on it by Appayya Dīḍīṭa (Tanj. Cat., VI 2086)
3. SVH, 307
150. Govinda has two sons Yagnanarayana and Venkatesvara or Venkatamakhi. Venkatamakhi was tutor to Nilakantha and author of Sāhityasāmāryāyāva, Caṇḍandiprakāśī, and Vārṭṭkābharana.

The other son Yagnanarayana was an all round scholar and of special fame in poetry. He was patronised also by Raghunātha of Tanjore (under whom he also studied) and was presented with many jewels as a mark of his appreciation. His Sāhityaratnakara, a poem of which 13 cantos are now recovered, and Raghunāthavilāśa, a play in 5 acts, and Raghunāthabhābhpavijaya, a poem, describe the greatness of the Tanjore Nyāya family and of the Raghunātha's conquest over an island near Ceylon. He wrote a commentary on Venkatesvara's Citrabandharamāyana.

151. Śrīnivasa Dīksita (Ratnakēta) was the son of Śrī Bhavaswāmī and grandson of Kṛṣṇa. He was fifth in descent from Śrī Bhavaswāmī, the author of the Bhāya, and of Viśvāmitra Gotra. He had three sons Keśava, Arjhanārśvara and Rājacudāmani. Pleased with his description of an evening horizon, the king of Chola (Nair of Ging) called him Ratnakēta and so he is known to this day. He was a contemporary of Appayya Dīksita and Govinda Dīksita. He bore the titles Sadbhāyacaṭura and Advaitāvidyācārya, Abhinava-Bhavabhūti, and Dāntidūṭidāvātpadipa. He was a prolific writer and of versatile learning. Besides his works on philosophy and other sciences, he is

---

1 See Int. to Gagāvajārāya (10)
2 On this work, see chapter of a Bhagīṣa (music) post
3 The identification of this author with Yagnesvara, author of Alankāratāgīva and Alankāra-sārūnyodaya (BTO, 54) is wrong.
4. SVH, 269 (where a summary is given) See Sāhityaratnakāsa of Dharmaṇātha is a different work on rhetoric.
5 Tanj Cat., VIII 8489 Pruned Sah, XX
6 Rāghavendravijaya of Nārāyana (a poem in 4 cantos) says that Venkatānātha alias Rāghavendrāntītha defeated Yagunārāyaṇa in disputation and made him undergo sakrankēpa (SVH 269).
7 BTO, 165
8 Also known as Lakṣmi Bhavaswāmī: See DC, XXII 8017 His name is also given as Lakṣmīdharana in DC, XXII, 3265
9 Āthaśastraśāstraśासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासाष्ट्रासा
said to have composed 18 dramas and 60 poems. Sūkanthavijaya is a poem describing the deeds of Śiva. Bhaimpannaya is a drama describing the marriage of Damayanti. Bhar-miparinda is a campi on the marriage of Rukmini. Sāhityasankhyati, Bhavodheda and Rasārnava, Alankarakamstulaka, Kavyadarpana Kavyasārasangraha, Sāhityasūk-masaran are works on rhetoric. Bhāvanāpuruṣottama, composed at the instance of Surappa, the Naik king of Gingi, is an allegorical play.

152 Rajacudamani Dikṣita was the son of Ratanakheta Srinivasa and Kāmākhy Arthanārīśvara (Se-adriskhara) and Kesava were his step brothers. He was patronised by King Raghunātha of Tanjore on whom he wrote a poem Raghunāhabhūpavijaya. He was the worthy son of his father in literary merit. Besides works on Mimamsa and other sciences, he wrote poems and plays and on poetics. His Tantrāśikāhāmadī a commentary on Jamini’s aphorisms was composed in 1636 A.D. His Ruknumilāyā is a poem in 10 cantos on the marriage of Rukmini and Sankarañjhyudaya, of which only 6 cantos are available, describes the life of Jagadguru Sanka. Among other poems are Bhāratacampu, Kamsavadha, Vṛttarāṇāvali, (in imitation of Sankara’s Tārāvali), Sāhityasāmbāryam and Cītramānjarī and Rāmakathā. He wrote a Yamaka poem Ratanakhetavijaya on the life of...
of his father, a poem with treble meaning on the stories of Rama, Kṛṣṇa and Pāṇḍava (Rāghava-Yādava-Pāṇḍavīya) and a work (in prose?) Manjubhaiṣṭi with pratyakṣavarāsena, on the story of Rāma, and Yuddhakānda of Bhoja’s Rāmāyaṇacampū in a day.

Among his plays are Śṛngārasarvasva, a dhāna, Nandaragha in 5 acts, on the whole story of Rāma from marriage to coronation, and Kamalimikalahamsa, in 4 acts, on the marriage of Kalahamsa with Kamalī, daughter of Kamalākara, who was rescued from a stork. These plays are stated to have been staged at the Court of Raghunātha at Tanjore and during his visit to Cidambara.

In his Kāvyadārupaṇa, a treatise on rhetoric, he cites his Alankāra-cudāmaṇī.

153. To the Court of Raghunātha belonged Kṛṣṇadhavareṇī or Kṛṣṇadik-ṭīta or Ayyādik-ṭīta. In his Nāradhapāṇīṭa he related the stories of Nala and Pāṇḍāṭarāṇa at a time and in his Raghunātha-bhūpāliya, he wrote on poetics, with illustrations in praise of his patron.

Mrtyunjaya was the son of Ayya Dikṣita and was daughter’s son of Raṭnakheta Śrīnivāsa Dikṣita. His son Rajacūdāmana Dikṣita was his Guru. In his Pradyumṇottaracantā in 11 cantos he relates the story of Pradyumna’s marriage with the daughter of demon King of Vajrapurī. Mrtyunjaya’s son Anantaṇārāvana wrote Gītasāṅkara, a musical poem like Gitagovinda.

154 Nilakantha was the son of Nārāyana and Bhūmidevi and grandson of Accāṭik-ṭīta, brother of Appayya Dikṣita. He was known as

1 Edited IHQ, VI No. 4 by T. R Chintamani
2 This is quoted in his Kāvyadārupaṇa. There is another Bhāṣa of this name by Svāmin Śāstri, brother of Subrahmanya and son of Anantaṇārāyana, staged at the festival of Matiphūtaśvam at Trichinopoly (DO, XXI 8542) and a third by Kauṭika Nallabuḍha (BO 173 CC, I 681.)
3 DO, XXI 8372, CC, I 48. The prologue gives the genealogy of the author and the names of Raghunātha’s works Pāṇḍāṭarahana, Nallābyundaya etc.
4 Printed, Madras, DO, XXI 8392; HR, II, 1500.
5 DO, XXI, 8615, BTC 54, CC, I, 101. Printed Madras. There is a commentary on it by Ravipandita.
6 BTC.
7 CC I, 486, Rsc, 964
8 Tanj Cat, VI, 2571
9 BTC, 81.
Ayyādikṣita. He studied under Venkatesvaramahit, son of Govinda Dikṣita. He commented on Kayata. He was best in Sikantha philosophy and wrote Sivaṇṭṭvarahasya. His four brothers were also poets. His Nilaṅkanti, a popular campus on the story of the churning of the ocean, was composed in Kali 4738 (1637 A.D.). His Sivalāmava is a poem in 22 cantos, comprehending in it the legends of 64 līlās of Hālasyanātha the form of Siva as worshipped at Madura. His Gangavatarana, a poem in 8 cantos, describes the descent of the Ganges from regions celestial. Among his minor poems are Khalidambana, Sūbhāraṇa, Anyāpadesasatāka, Sānṭavilāsa, Varṇagasaṭṭaka and Anandasāgarastava.

In his Citramimāṃsāsadhikāra he answered the criticisms such as those of Jagannātha Panditarāja and justifies the views of his grand-uncle Appaya Dikṣita. Nalacāntanītaka in 7 acts describes the story of Nala.

As a poet Nilakantha is much appreciated. His fancies are imaginative, his sentiments lofty and his language natural.

Nilakantha's third son Girvāpendra wrote Śrīgarakosabhāna and Anyāpadesasatāka. Nilakantha had four brothers, all poets. Of

1 Nilakantha, author of the play Kalyānasuṅgamāhika (TO III 8840) and Kavyolāsa (TO, IV 8843) is a different author. So is Nilakantha author of Cimantarāta, B, II 182.
2 HR, II 1011.
3 Ed Madras with commentary. For commentary Pāṭaṁka, see HR III 1654 and by Ghanākhyāma, see HR, III 2041.
4 Ed TSS Tāṇḍ Cat 2678 Śrīvarāta of Kavyādikṣikhara is on the same theme (Mys OML, Supp 12).
5 Ed Kayyamāla, Bombay, with a valuable introduction on South Indian poets by T S Kuppusami Sastri. The same story is found in Bhāgavatāsāmappu of Aycūṭtarman, son of Nārāyaṇa, of the family of Madaka of Nāsik. It was composed in 1814 A.D. and is printed in Bombay.
7 HR, II 1211.
8 Printed, Bombay, TO, II, 1669 Opp II 8869. In the prologue it is said that he wrote a poem Mukundavilāsa and his father wrote Māhāvīracarita and a commentary on Sāmīṣaravākara and his uncle Appaya Dikṣita was the author of Rukminiśparīgaya. Guruṣāvakavi is said there to have been a contemporary of Aṭṭādikṣita, grand father of Nilakantha. There is a Nalacāntakāvya (Opp 2885, 3799).
9 Tāṇḍ Cat, VIII 8596. There is another bhāṣa of that name by Abhinava Kālīdāsa, (TO, VIII 8594) probably of Kāncl.
10 DO, XX 8019. Aṭṭādikṣita, a member of the family of Appayadikṣita wrote Anyoktimala (DO, XX 8030).
11 ETC, 168,
155 Cakrakāvi was the son of Lokanātha and Ambā and brother of Rāmacandra and Pātanājī. He appears to have been appreciated by Pandya and Chera Kings and he mentions Nilakantha Adhvarṇa as one of his admirers. It is likely that this latter was the same as the famous Nilakantha, grandson of Appayya Dīkasita and he must have therefore lived in 17th century A.D. He wrote flowing poetry on the marriage of Rukmani, Jitāki, Gauti, Drupadi. Of these Jānakiparīnaya is a poem in 8 cantos describing the story of Rākṣasāndrakaṇḍa of Rāmayana from the birth of Rāma to his marriage at Mithilā. The other works are of the class of Campus with mixed prose and poetry. His Cītaratākaṇāra, in six parts, is a poem of humorous verses of enigmatical composition, the first half of the verses asking a question, the second half giving the answer.

156 Venkatesa was the son of śrīnivāsa and grandson of Venkatesa of Atreyā Gōtra. He was born in Kali 4697 (1796 A.D.) at Arasanipalai near Kānci. In Rāmayamaṅkarnava and Rāmacandradaya, he relates the story of Rāma the former in the Amarā style.

Sūryanārayana was the son of Yaguesvara and Guṇāṇābhā. He belonged to the Alur family of Brahmans who did variosts of sacrifices.

---

1 Tanj Cat., VIII 8978
2 See prologue to same
3 Caturākāra
4 DC, XXI 788
5 These are other works of this name by Venkatākṛtya, son of Nāyanaśārya of Praśādībhyavantara family (TC, III, 3690)
6 There are other works on the same theme by Punnita Venkatākṛtya (TC, III, 8091), by Kandaburu Ramaśvara (TC, III 4105) of the Gauras, and by Bhatīnārāyaṇa (Mys. OML. Sup. I).
7 Printed Saḥ XXII DC, XXI 8386
8 EA Tr., Sans. Series
9 Tanj Cat., VI 2081
10 Yanakarṇava was composed in Saka 1678 (1656 A.D.)
11 This long poem of about 80 cantos was composed in Kali 1786 (1655 A.D.).
12 This work was composed in Kali 1786 (1655 A.D.).
13 Sūryanāraṇya Sūmāti, son of Viṣṇuśārtha Sūmāti, who wrote Prāṣaṇbhāraṭa is a different person. [Tanj Cat., VI 2731] His descendants are still living at Trinckelly.
In the court of Lingaya Prabhu (1601 A.D.), he swore to compose a poem in a day and that was Ekadina-prabandha in four cantos on the story of Mahābhārata.

Malaya was the son of Rāmanātha of Bhāradvāja Gotra. He lived in Madura District. In Mīnāśipanḍaya in 18 cantos he describes the story of Sundaresa's marriage with Mīnāśi, Goddess of Madura, as told in the Hālasya-māhātmya.

In Pārvatīpanḍaya, in 8 cantos, Īśvarasumati celebrates the marriage of Pārvatī after the style of Kumārasambhava.

1. Lāngai or Veluri Lāngai was the son of Chenna Bomma, the patron of Appayya Dikshita and was the donor of Vilāpākam Grant (SVH, IV No 39) of King Venkata II (1601 A.D.). Lāngai was killed and his capital taken possession of by Damarla Chenna who granted Madras to East India Company. "The capture of the place was possibly the immediate cause of the change of capital from Chandragiri to Vellore by Venkata Raja." [SVH 21, 251, 305]
2. Tanj Cat, VI 2698
3. Tanj Cat, VI 2619
4. Tanj Cat, VI 2565
CHAPTER VI

Mahakavya (contd)

157 Mahratta Kings of Tanjore. Ekoji, whose earlier name was Venkoji was the brother of the famous Sivaji. They were the sons of Shahaji. Ekoji's three sons Shahaji (1687-1711 AD), Sarabhoji (1712-1727 AD) and Tukkoji (1728-1735 AD) succeeded him one after another. Tukkoji had five sons: (1) Bava Saheb, (2) Saryaji, (3) Anna Saheb, (4) Nana Saheb, and (5) Pratapsing. And of these the first two were legitimate and the last three illegitimate. Pratapsing died in 1763 and was succeeded by his son Tulzaji. He died in 1787 after a reign by no means peaceful or prosperous, which excluding the two or three years during which he was kept a prisoner in his own palace, extended over a period of about twenty-one years. He had no son, but adopted one before his death, and this was Rajasarabhoji. This prince, however, was at the time set aside, and Amarsing, half-brother of Tulzaji (being son of Pratapsing by a sword wife) succeeded him, with the sanction of the Honourable East India Company who had now the direction of the affairs of Southern India.

Sarabhoji was a child nine years old at the time of his adoption. He remained under the protection of Raja Amarsing until 1792. On account of complaint of ill-treatment he and his adoptive mother were sent to Madras where in 1798 he was recognised as the rightful heir to the throne. "After he was placed on the munnad, Raja Sarabhoji consented to resign the Government of the country wholly into the hands of the Company, provided they made a suitable provision for the maintenance of his rank and dignity, and the treaty dated 25th October 1799 was the result. Under this treaty Tanjore became a British province and the Raja had ensured to him a fixed annual allowance of one lakh of pagodas or three and a half lakh of Rupees with a fifth of the net revenues of the country. Raja Sarabhoji enjoyed his rank and dignity with the pecuniary benefits attached to it, for thirty-four years, and on his death in 1832 the same honours and privileges were continued to his son Sivaji until his death in 1855."

2. Ibid, 818-4
3. Ibid, 824.
The following genealogy shows the line of King Ekoji of Tanjore

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shahji (1687-1711)</td>
<td>Sarabhoji (1712-1727)</td>
<td>Tukoji (1728-1735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illegitimate son Pratapsing (1740-1763)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tulzaji (1764-1787)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarabhoji II (1793-1827)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivaji (1838-1855) (died 1865)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

158 The life of Sivaji, the founder of the Bhosala dynasty, is a matter of history. In 31 chapters Paramananda describes his exploits in his Shvabhara.¹ His expedition and capture of the fortress of Parnalaparvata is described by Jayarama in 5 ullasas in Parnalaparvatagrabakhyana.² The life of Sivaji's son Rajaram is sketched in Rajaramacarita, a poem of 5 cantos,³ by Kesavapandita where the struggle for Marwatta independence in the Carnatic is well depicted.

In the court of King Ekoji (1675-1686 A.D.), Jagannatha, son of minister Bhalakarna, wrote the play Ratimanmatha⁴ and Srisaila, son of Anandayavan, another minister, wrote Tripuravijayacampu.⁵

King Shahaji wrote the play Candrasekharavilasa.⁶ In Kumara-sambhavacampu, King Sarabhoji narrates the story of the birth of the War God.⁷ King Sarabhoji compiled an anthology.⁸ King Tulzaji wrote Sangitasarampta.⁹

159 King Sarabhoji (Sarfoji), the second son of Ekaji, is remembered as a preserver of Sanskrit literature. To him belongs the glory of the collection and preservation of Sanskrit manuscripts in an

1. Puneed, Poona Tanaj Cat., VII 325f. See also Shvabhara (BTC, 162).
2. Tanaj Cat., VII 3262
3. Tanaj Cat., VII 3268
4. HB, III 1601; Tanaj Cat., VIII 3490.
5. HB, III 1605; Tanaj Cat., VIII 3044
6. Tanaj Cat., VIII, 3396.
7. Tanaj Cat., VII, 3038.
8. See JBRAS, (n.s.) I. 252
9. BTC, 60.
organised library in the palace of Fanjore, rightly named Sarasvatimahal. The library bears the name Fanjore Maharaja Sarabhoji's Sarasvatimahal library and is a monument of that benevolent King's reign.

To King Sarabhoji is attributed the poem RAGHAVACARILMD in 12 cantos on the story of Rāma, also called Sangraharamāyana. In the colophon to the 2nd canto in one of the manuscripts it is said 

तित वाचकदिर राष्ट्रवरिते द्वितैय स्त्री This may indicate that the real author was Pancaratna and the work was put in the name of the poet's patron Anantanārayayana, a poet of the court of King Sarabhoji was called Pancaratna and Anantanārayayana was the father of the poet Cidambaram and also wrote Anandavalli stotra.

160 Ramabhadra Dīkṣita was born in the family of Caturvediyayanas in the village of Kandramanukyam near Kumbhakonam. His father Yagnarāma Dīkṣita was a specialist in grammar and his brother Rāmacandra was a humorous poet. He studied literature and philosophy under the ascetic Bālakṛṣṇa and under Cokkanātha, whose daughter he married. He was an admirer of the poet Nilakantha and was invariably in his literary assemblage. It was Nilakantha's poetry that infused the poetic spirit in Ramabhadra early in his years and his name reached the ears of King Shahaji of Fanjore (1684-1711 AD). The munificent king bestowed upon Rāmacandra and others the agraharam of Shahapa-rajapura (Tiruvasanallur) and there the poet settled in comfort and serenity. He was much loved by his disciples and was called Ayya or Ayya Dīkṣita. His devotion to Rāma was unequalled. He passed away about the first decade of the 18th century.

His Pātañjali-carita, a poem in 8 cantos describes the incarnation of Aśvēsa in the womb of Gonika as Pātañjali, his lectures on the Mahābhāya from behind a screen, his curse on one of his pupils to be a Rāksasa for transgression of his order, and the limitation of the curse.

---

1 For an account of this library, see Tanj Cat, VI Introduction by P. P S Sastri
2 Tanj Cat, VI 2641, Utrecht (CO, I 15) names the author as Anantanārayayana
3 BTO, 200, Opp, II 8716, CO, I 15
4 He wrote Keralābharaṇa, a campu on the lines of Visvagunādaratha (Tanj Cat, VII 8035) Rāmacandra, son of Janarjana and author of Rādhāvīnoda-Kavya (Tanj. Cat, VI 2848) is a different poet of the Ganjam District
5 For an account of his life, see V S Ramasami Sastri, Sāh XXII, 180 and 1A, XXXIII 128
6 Ed Bombay and Madras
to the appearance of one Candragupta. The demon meets Candragupta and teaches him the lecture. The latter records them in the leaves of a banyan tree, but while out to drink water, a goat eats away some of the leaves. These lost passages are still known as *ajabhahita* (goat-eaten) Candragupta went to Ujjain and there transcribed the lectures, which are extant today as a monument of literary merit. Candragupta married three wives, of whom were born Vararuci Vikramārka and Bhartṛhari. The poem closes with the advent of Śankara and his and final return to Kānci.¹

By the drama Jñānākīparipāyana,² which will be noticed later, he is well-known Śrīngāratulaka or Ayyābhāna describes the amorous adventures of Bhujangasekhara of Madhura,³ written rival Vasantaṭilakabhaṇa or Aṃmālbhaṇa of his friend Varadācārya known as Aṃmālācārya.⁴

Among Ramabhadrā’s other works⁵ the Rāmabāpastava, Rāmacapastava, and Ramātprāsa, Prāsasthava Vishnugarbhasṭava, Paryāyokuntayanda, I śrīraṣṭava, Rāmabhadrāsaṭakā

161 Cokkanatha,⁶ was the son of Tippādhvari and Narasāmba of Bhāradwaja Gotra. He had five brothers of whom one was Yagnesvara. He was the teacher of Rāmabhadrā and a friend of Nilakantha. He lived in Tanjore under the patronage of King Shahaji. He travelled to South Canara to the Court of King Basava.⁷ His Sevanṭikāparinaya,⁸ a

---

1. For an account see *SuSt* XXII 167-8
2. Ed. Bombay Madras. See *Sak* XXII for a critical account.
5. Varadacārya known as Ghaṭikācāḍa Aṃmal of Śrīvatsagoṭra was the son of Sudarśana, fifth in descent from the Varada or Varadadesaka or Nāḍādur Aṃmul, who was the guru’s guru of Vaiḍūryaśāstra (see *DO*, XVIII 7362 a for verses in his praise). Besides this bhāna, he wrote Vaiḍūryaśāstra a play on the incidents of Rāmānāma’s history (*DO*, XXV 8530). There are other Varadacāryas who wrote Colabhaṇa (*PR*, I 269), Anangabrahmavilasabhāṇa (CC, I 549), Anangajyanabhāṇa (*BTJ*, 167) and Rukminiṃparṇa (*BTC*, 172).
7. It is stated in *Trav. Arch. Rep.*, V 18, that this was different from the father in law of Rāmabhadrā, but no reasons are given. The dates appear to make them identical. Chokkanātha, son of Sudarśana of Bhāradvaja Gotra who is the author of a commentary on Vaiṣṇava’s Yuddhiṣṭhuravijaya is a different person.
8. He may be Basavappa Nayak of Ikken (1697-1714) or Basavarājendra of 1700 A.D. see *JMy*, X 267.
drama, describes the marriage of Basavaraja and Sevantika, the daughter of Miṅavarman, a prince of Malabar, when the latter having fought with Godavarman of Cochin and was defeated, was imprisoned in the temple of Mūkāmbā, north of Udiπi. Then they were received kindly by Basava by the gift of a new palace and presents. His Kāntimati-parṇaya, a drama, describes the marriage of King Shahāja and Kāntimati. His Rasavilāsa is a bhāna of an amorous nature.

His son Sadāśivamakhīn wrote a rhetorical work, Rāmavarma-yasobhūsana during the reign of King Rāmavarma of Travancore (1758–1798 AD).

Among the illustrious disciples of Rāmahadra were Venkatēsvara and Bhūmāthā. Venkatēsvara wrote a commentary on the Paṇṭalalacarita. Bhūmāthā known as Nallā Dīkṣita composed Dharmanvijayacampū on the life and history of King Shahāja whom he called the modern Bhoja.

Among his worthy contemporaries were Venkatakr̥ṣna, Śrīdhara Venkatesa, Appa Dīkṣita and Mahādeva.

Venkatakr̥ṣna was the son of Venkaṭendri and Mangāmba of Vādhūla Goṣṭra. He wrote his Natesavijaya in 7 cantos, describing the story of Śiva’s vanquishment of Kāli at Cidambaram by his triumphant cosmic dance, under the patronage of Gopāla, a Governor of Śivajī’s provinces, near Cidambaram. Uttaracampūrāmāyaṇa is said to be a sequel to the work of Bhoja and Lakṣmāṇa. Rāmacandraśaya relates the whole story of Rāmāyaṇa, and Kuvalavijayanātaka describes the conflict of Rāma with his sons Kusa and Lava and the final restoration of Śiṭa to Rāma.

Śrīdhara Venkatesa, known as Ayyāval, is celebrated in South India for his piety and devotion. Besides his religious lyrics, Dayāsataka Māṭbhūṭaśataka, lārāvalīsataka and Ārthīhara-pottra, he wrote Sāhonidra-

1. Tany Oat VIII 3857
2. CC, II 116
3. See Tr Arch Serres, V 18.
4. Tany Oat VII, 3269
5. DO, XX, 7747.
6. DO, XXI, 8169
7. CC, II, 25.
8. Probably the same work as is described in DO, XX, 7814 (where the author’s name is doubtfully given as Kavivalla). It breaks off in the 96th Canto.
MĀHĀ-KĀVYA

vīlāsa, a poem in 8 cantos, describing the exploits of his patron, King Shahāji and is of great historical interest in the annals of Hindu dominion in Tanjore. Appā Dīkṣita or Appāsastrī or Peria Appā Sastrī was the son of Cādambara Dīkṣita anās Annan Sastrī and brother of Visvanātha of Nṛivatsa Gacātra. He lived in Kilayur near Tanjore. His father vanquished Kāmadeva in a controversy at the court of King Venkatapati for which he was rewarded with a golden palanquin and an agraharam Frakaran. He was the pupil of Kṛpānanda and received from him the title of Kavijātārakikāsarvabhauma, for proficiency in dialectics and poetics. He was a favourite of King Shahāji of Tanjore. His Śrīvātikālārāmājanārīsāhājīya, is a drama describing the life and history of King Shahāji and staged at the Chatra festival at Tiruvaiyar (Tiruvadi). His other works are Madanabhū-anabhāna, and Gaurimāyūracampū.

In his play Adbhutādarpana in 10 acts, Mahādeva, son of Kṛpāsūri, says that the sentiment of Adbhuta reigns supreme and illustrates his theory by the incidents of the Rāmāyana.

163 In the Court of Kings Shahāji and Sarabhoji flourished other famous poets. Sumatindra Bīkṣu was a poet of King Shahāji's court. He was the pupil of Venkatanārāyaṇa and Surindrarāṣṭhā. He wrote a poem Sumatindrayayagho-ṣāna on his patron and a commentary on Ṣrīvikrama's Usāharaṇa. Besides Shāhavilāsa on music and a poem Abhinavakādambari, Dhundiraja Vyāsayavan, son of Lakṣmīmaṇa composed his commentary on Mudrārālkasā in 1713 A.D., probably at the direction of King Sarabhoji who wrote his own gloss on the play. To him goes the credit of preserving the allegorical poem of 8 cantos, Jñānavilāsa of Jagannātha, son of Nārāyana and Alkā, who was probably the same as the author of Sarabharājāvilāsa.

---

1 Tanj Cat VII 3263
2 See JOB. III
3 TC, III, 2575, CC, II 168
4 Tanj Cat, VIII 3592
5 Tanj Cat VII 4085
6 Md Kavyamala, Bombay, Tanj Cat, VIII, 8584 Mahādeva Kaviśācāra Sarasvatī, author of Dānakell Kaumudī (bhānakā) (GC, I 249), Mahādeva or Mahēsvara, author of Dhurjāvamulambanaprahasana (GC I, 272) and Mahādeva Sastrī, author of Umātīrāgāhava (GC, I 66) are different poets.
7 Tanj Cat, VII 3262
8 Ibid, VI 2695
9 CC, I 215.
10 Opp II 3921
11 Tanj Cat, VIII 3474
12 Ibid, VII, 2758
In Kosala-Bhosalīyam, Sesācalapati describes in 6 cantos the reign of King Shahājī along with the story of Rāmāyana in double entendre. In Bhosalavamsavali, a campū, Venkatesa of Naḍhravakāśyapa Gotra describes the ancestors of King Sarabhoji and particularly the glorious reign of that King. Similar is the poem Sarabharājavilasa composed in Kali 4822 (1722 A.D.) by Jagannātha, son of Śrīnivasa of Kāvale family, a minister of that King's Court, who also wrote Anangavijayabhana, and Śrīnaratārangini.

Vancevāra was a descendant of Govindā Dīkṣita. He was of the family of Bhosala and was minister of King Ṭukkāji of Ianjore (1728-1735 A.D.). His Mahāsātaka is a marvellous and pleasant poem, in which he mingled praise and censure, indicating by puns that the King was a buffalo.

During the days of King Sarabhoji II (1798-1832 A.D.) the poet Sadāji composed the poetical work Śāhityamānjanā in 1823 A.D. in praise of the House of Śivāji.

In the time of King Śivāji (1833-1853 A.D.) Virārāghava, son of Īśvara, wrote the play Vallīparīnaya.

To this house of Fkoji, belongs the credit of continuing the progress of Sanskrit literature in S. India, so well inaugurated by the Naik Kings. These kings were themselves poets and it was a happy chance that their ministers came successively from a family of illustrious Brahmins of learning descended from Tṛyambaka. The following list of the kings and the genealogy of Tṛyambaka given in Dhundhirāja's commentary on Mudrarāksasa and Appadikata's Ācāranavanītha will show their relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tryambaka (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangādhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛṣimha (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tṛyambaka (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛṣimha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Tanj Cat., VII, 3275.  
2. Ibid. VII, 3287.  
3. Ibid., VII, 3291.  
4. HR, III, 1776.  
5. Printed Bombay HR III 1579. In Tanj Cat., VII, 3155 there is a commentary by the author's great grandson Vaneśvara, son of Nṛṣimha, son of Mādhava (BTC, 164, HR, II, 1528).  
6. Tanj Cat., VII, 3293.  
7. DO, XXI, 8491. Virārāghava son of Śrīśāla who wrote Indīrāparīṣaya (HR III 1749) is a different author.
KINGS

1 Ekal
(1674—1687)

11 Shabān
(1697—1711)

11 Saradhājī
(1712—1727)

17 Turkān
(1728—1735)

MINISTERS

Gangādhara (1) and
Ndīmā (2)

Tryambaka (3)

Tryambaka (3) and
Ananda (4)

Ananda (4)

(and Ghanasyāma)

165 In Bhosalavamsāvali, Gangādhara wrote the story of the
Bhosalas.³ Tryambaka (II) wrote Dharmākuta, commentary on Rāmā-
yana. Bhagavanta wrote Mukundavīlasakāya, a poem in 10 cantos,
on the story of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and a play Raghavābhyaudaya.

Bhagavanta was the son of Gangādharmādhvarām and younger
brother of Tryambaka. In his Mukundaviśa, in 10 cantos, he relates
the story of Kṛṣṇa and Uttaracampū, the story of Uttararāmāyaṇa.

Ananda or Anandarāyamakhī wrote the plays Vidvāpannuya, and
Jvānanda, allegorical like Prabodhacandrodaya. In the former, for
instance, the plot is the marriage of Jvāman or individual soul and
Vidyā or spiritual knowledge.

Ananda’s son Ndīmā wrote Tripuravijayācampaṇī.

1 Tanj Cat VII 2972
Gangādhara a post of the Court of Karpa of Dāhala vanquished by Dilhana (Pāk
yvī 95), Ganga in Cūh and Subā (OC, I 187), Ganga in Vājapeyin, author of Rāmkaranjī (Opp I 2246, 4805 II 2514, 3772, 5297), Gangādhara (Śaśtri), author of Kṛṣṇarāja-campaṇī (BTO 246), Gangādhara, author of meters (OC, I 138), Gangādhara
author of Vasuṣṭiṭasena Kāyya (Opp, 4714), Gangādhara, author of commentary
on Sangiṭarāja-nākara (BTO, 59) and on Suryaśāntaka (Hali’s Int to Vāsavaṅgatta, 7)
are different persons. [See OC I, 187-9]

2 See pages 82 supra
3 Tanj, Cat VI, 2527
4 BTO, 172, Opp II 4872 (In the prologue his parentage is given)
5 Tanj, Cat VI, 2537
6 Ibd VII, 8082
7 Printed, Kāyyanāla, Bombay
8 Tanj, Cat VII, 8044, HB, III 11005
Ghanasyama, originally known as Aiyaka, was the son of Kamalā and Kuśa Mahādeva of Mauna Bhārgava family. He had a brother Īśa who became an ascetic and under the name of Īdambaramaguru settled in Devipattanan. His father's father was Caundo Bālīp. His mother's father Jimmāji Biḷgī of Kaundinya gotra was called Sakambhār Paramahamsa. He had two wives Sundara and Kamalā. They were equally learned and composed another commentary on the Viddhasālabhanjaka, as he did one himself in three hours. Besides his prolixity in literature, he was great in politics and was the minister of King Pulköjak of Tanjore (1728-1755 AD).

In his 26th year he wrote the Bhuma Madanasanjīvina and in his twenty-second year Navagrahacarita a Sattaka in Prakrit. He composed in a single night of Sīramanavani a commentary on the Uttarārāmacarita and wrote also an allegorical drama Pracandarādhādaya like Prabodhacandradaya. He wrote 64 works in Sanskrit, 30 in Prakrit and 25 in other dialects. Among his poems, are Bhāgavatpādacarita, Venkatesacarita, Prasāndilīlāmāyana, Sammanimandana and Anyāpadesasātaka and five Stalamāhāṭivas Ālodbhākara is a poem with three meanings, namely, the story of Nala, Kīna and Hariscandha. Kālidāsa is a poem which is at once Sanskrit and Prakrit.

In his twelfth year he made up the Yuddhakānda for Bhojacampū. Among his dramas of many classes are Ganeśacarita, Madanasanjīvina, Kumāravyaya Anubhavacintamani and Ānanda-sundarī, and last two acts for Mahāviracarita which apparently were then missing.

In rhetoric he wrote the Rasārnava. He wrote commentaries on Śakuntala, Uttarāramacarita, Prabodhacandradaya, Candakausika, Mahāviracarita, Venīsamhāra, Hālasapṭasyāti, Vīkramorvāsī, Bhoja-

1 He himself made a pun on his name.  

"If he is Ghanasyama, he is not black in color, but he is a poet of poets because he is himself a cuckoo which sings beautiful poetry. Why kill ourselves in vain with jealousy?"

2 H.R., III 1076  9 Tamil Cat., VII 2000
3 H.R., III, 1577  10 H.R., III 1681
4 Tanjore District Manual, 764  11 Ibid. 1082
5 H.R., III 1879  12 Ibid. 2143
6 Ibid. 1871.  13 Ibid. 1666
7 Ibid. 1675  14 Ibid. 1000, Printed Bombay.
8 See H.R., III ix xi.
CHAPTER VII

Mahakavyas (contd)

168 Manavikrama and Eighteen and Half Poets In the Court of Zamorn Mānavikrama flourished what has been known as eighteen and half poets in the beginning of the 15th century A.D. The Zamorn was a scholar and patron of literature. Eight brothers of Payyur Patten family and a son, five brahmns of Tiruvapara and Tiruvegapara, Mulleppili Patten, Chennasu Narayana Nambudri, Kakkasseri Nambudri and Uddanda were the eighteen poets and Punnattu Nambudri was the half poet, for his poetry was mixed Malayalam and Sanskrit. The eldest of the Payyur family was famous as Maharsi, versed in Mīmāmsa, the fifth brother was Narayana Patteri. Two other brothers were Sankara and Bhāvādēsa. Maharsi's son Paramesvara is quoted by Uddanda in his Mallikāmaruṭa and Maharsi is mentioned with reverence by him in his Kokilasandesa as Mīmāmsāśrayakulaguru. Works on Mīmāmsa written by the brothers are found everywhere in Malabar. One poet of Tiruvapara wrote Lakṣma-Manavidacampū and another Nārāyana, son of Brahmadatta, wrote the poem Subhaṛā-haraṇa kāvyā.

Chennasu Nārāyana wrote Tantrarasamuccaya, a work for artisans. Verses satirising kings composed by him and Kakkasseri Nambudri are quoted in Malabar, for which it is said they were punished by the Zamorn by novel methods of religious degradation. Kakkasseri Dāmocāran Patteri was Uddanda's rival and wrote the play Ināmaṭi-Rāghava. Mānavikrama himself wrote a commentary on Anargharaṅghava. Simbhasiva, son of Kanakasabhupati, of Śrīvaṭṭagotra, resident of the village of Gopālasamudra, wrote Singāravilāsahāna to please Mānavikrama.

169 Uddanda was the son of Ranganātha and Rangūmbā of

---

1 Sahityam (in Malayalam,) Truchur.
2 TO, IV 8888. See para 46 supra.
3 TO, IV. 4778.
4 TO, II 2880, IV. 6618.
5 TO, IV 4295.
6 He was known as Uddanda Sastri Jīvānanda Vidyasagara (1820-1891 A.D.) in his Calcutta Ed. mistook Uddanda for Dandin and made the latter the author of Mallikāmaruṭa Schuyler (Babi, 80) calls him Uddandun (wrongly).
Vadhulagotra  He lived in the village of Lātapura near Kānci ¹ Passing his literary career at the various seats of learning in South India, he went to Malabar in search of fame and there in the courts of kings overcame his opponents Mānavikrama, the strong Zamorin, was his patron  His success evoked much jealousy, and tradition says² that a pandit's wife vowed to beget an adversary and that she did with the help of prayers and enchantments of the many learned men of Malabar  The son was Kakkasen Bhaṭṭāṭiri  As a boy of twelve he vanquished Uddanda in open competition and composed a Malayalam drama Vasmatī-Vikrama and a Sanskrit drama Indumati-Rāghava ³ His Koklasandesa⁴ is the message of a lover to his beloved at Calicut and is a very fine imitation of Meghasandesa of Kālidāsa  This poem is said to have been written in response to a similar poem named Bhṛangasandesa sent to the author by Vāsuđeva, a poet in the Court of Rāvivarma and Godāvarma, who ruled at Calicut ⁵ His Mallikā-Māruṭa, a prakarana in ten acts,⁶ follows in all details the plot of the Malati-Madhava  The plot relates the affections of two sets of lovers, Mallikā and Māruṭa, and Ramayantikā and Kalakantha Mandākini answers to Kamanḍakī and Kālidī resembles Avalokīṭa  Uddanda has sometimes improved on his original His language is attractive and verse melodious  The speeches abound in apt illustration and proverbial generalisation

Sākṣara Marar was Uddanda's friend  They met at the temple at Guruvayoor and Sākṣara completed a verse then begun by Uḍḍanda  He wrote the poem Śrī Kṛ-ṇavijaya ⁷

Sukumara or Prabhākara was Uddanda's younger contemporary His Kṛ-ṇavilāsa Kavya⁸ is as good as his name

¹ It is said in Nallākāri's Subhadrāparinaya (TO, I 1040) that Uddanda was a native of the village of Kandaramāṭikka (Tanjore District) in Cola country, and Uḍḍanda's father Rāganātha the natives of that village was a great writer and among his works are Kṛṣṇasaṅgīyam Pravasaṭṭam (DC, II No 1169, TO, I 888) and commentaries on the Paṇḍāmanjarī and Kaṇmuḍī  It is therefore probable that Uḍḍanda was born at Kandaramāṭikka and later in his life settled at Lātapura near Kānci

² Trancanore State Manual 488
³ TO IV 4713 Only two acts are available  Indumatiṃghaṇaya (Opp, II 6539) is a different play
⁴ Ed. Trichur (with introduction)
⁵ DC, XX 7942 See para 170 post
⁶ Ed Calcutta and Mysore with commentary DC, XXI 8446
⁷ Ed. Trichur
⁸ Ed (4 cantos only) at Palghat with the commentary of Rāmapāṇivēṣa
170 Vasudeva was the son of Maharsi and Gopali. Maharsi was the famous scholar of the Payyar Bhatta Mana of Malabar, which became famous as a cartre of learning about the end of the 15th century. Maharsi had nine sons, well versed in various branches of Sanskrit learning and a daughter. The daughter's son was a grammarian. Vasudeva was the friend of the dramatist Uddanda and therefore lived about 1423 AD. The famous Maanaavikrama, Zamorna of Calcutt, was his patron. In reply to Kokilasandesa of Uddanda he wrote Bhinnasandesa or Bhramaraduta. Laterly he was in the court of Kings Ravi Varma and Godavarma. His Vasudevavyja is a poem in illustration of the grammatical aphorisms of Panini. It was left unfinished and completed by Narayana, very likely his sister's son, under the name Dhapat-Kavya.

1c Devicarita, a poem in Yamaka style in 6 Asvasas, describes the story of Goddess Gopali Devi worshipped in Veduranyam or Kunnangolam, as the eighth child of Devaki and sister of Sri Karna. In his Satyaatapakatha, he relates in three Asvasas the story of Satyataapa, also called Maharsi, one of the ancestors of the author who made penance at Veduranya and on the banks of the Nili river now called Bharatappola. In Sivodaya the poet gives a history of himself and his eight brothers. In his Acjutakhila, a poem in Yamaka form, he describes God Acjuta worshipped at Veduranyam. Gajendramoksa appears to be his work.

171 Pandavacarita, a poem of which 13 cantos are available, does not mention the name of the author, but the poet salutes a Vasudevakavi who wrote a Yamaka poem on "ParfhakaMa," Arjuna's story.

1 DO, XX, 7942; CC, 507 For the alternative names see also JRAS, (1884), 452.
2 Vasudeva, pupil of Karanakara alias Silhityamalla who commented on Vidhyasahabmanjika is another author.
TC, III 3873.
3 Printed Kavyamala, Bombay DO, XX, 7745. The commentator called this Vasudeva, a resident of Puruvana.
4. Ibid DO, XX 7745. In the colophon the whole poem is called Vasudeva vijayam (TC, III 4056). इसी नाथायणकुटी वाहुदेवविजये कतवचमग्न प्रथमसन्नी
5. TC, IV 4528. 8 TC, IV 4538.
6. TC, IV 4539. 9. TC, IV 5885.
7. TC, IV 4590. 10 TC, IV 5062.
11 तस्मै नमोः सुवै वाहुदेवाय धीमते ||
येन परम्प्रक्ष्या रस्या यन्ति रूपपयाबनी ||
It is not known what this Pārthakathā was. Similarly Arjuna-Rāvaniya, a poem in 17 cantos describing the fight between Rāvana and Kārttā-vīra, in illustration of the Astādhyāyi of Panini There is a commentary by Vāsudeva. The manuscript is again found in the same place in Malabar as Pāndavacarita. The author’s name is not given there. It is probable that these two poems were composed by members of the Maharā’s family.

172 Vāsudeva, the author of Rāmakatha was the son of Umā and Nārāyana and wrote that prose work at the Court of King Aditya-varma, King Sri Vira Kodai Aditya Varma of Kilapperur, Jayasimhanad, about 1472 and 1484 A D. Under the patronage of King Ravivarman, he wrote Govindacaritram and Sanksepārāṇāyanam and it is probable that this Nārāyana was the eighth son of Maharā, or Nārāyana, daughter’s son of Maharā, more likely the latter.

1 TC, IV 4281
2 Painted Madras
3 DO, XX 7919
4 DO XXI 3324 (with commentaries), TC, IV 4175 There it is said K R Pashaotu identifies this King as King of Perkasa or Vettat in South Malabar (Bull Or., Studies, V 797 9)
5 TC, III 4305
6 K R Pashaotu (op cit) identifies this Vāsudeva with Vāsudeva son of Maharā. The Travancore State Manual (I 277 8) give the following account. There was on the 1st of Kumbhomb 647 M.E (1472 A D) a king by the name of Sri Kodai Aditya Varma of Kilapperur, Jayasimhanad, the Senior Thuvadi of Siraivoy according to the temple chronicles of Sri Padmanabhaswamy. But beyond this bare fact nothing could be ascertained except that he might have been one of the regents at the time. There is another inscription to prove that Aditya Varma, the Senior Thuvadi of Jayasimhanad, as well as his younger brother named Rama Varma, the Senior Thuvadi of Siraivoy, reigned on the 14th Kumbhomb 659 M.E (1484 A D). This latter may be identical with Sri Vira Kodai Aditya Varma who flourished in Venad in 1572 A D. But he is mentioned in the temple chronicles as the Senior Turnvadi of Siraivoy while Aditya Varma of 1484 A D is closely referred to in the inscription as the Senior Turnvadi of Jayasimhanad, Kilapperur. On this basis the reign of Sri Vira Kodai Aditya Varma may be taken as having lasted up to the year 1484 A D. His younger brother Rama Varma was probably his co-regent under the title of the Senior Turnvadi of Siraivoy. Sri Vira Ravi Varma, the Senior Turnvadi of Tirupapur, ruled over Venad for a period of thirty two years from 654 to 686 M.E (1479 1512 A D), for the first five years of which he ruled probably as co-regent. The temple chronicle records that on the 3rd Karkadagam 679 M.E (1498 A D) Sri Vira Ravi Varma made a gift of twelve silver pots and granite images as an atonement for sin committed in a fight which took place at the northern entrance of Sri Padmanabhaswamy temple, and that he granted some lands adjoining the tank of Viraarayanseri to the aggrieved parties. It states also that on the 24th Medam 675 M.E. (1500 A D) he gave 5,000 fanams as
173 Narayana Bhattatiri (Bhattapada) was a Nambudri brahmin born at Melputur near Chandanakkavu Deviksetra, which is Kurumpattur desa of Ponnani taluk in Malabar Of that Devi, Narayana was a devotee His father Madardatta was a great scholar His mother came from the Payyur Patter family. He lived between 1560–1646 A.D. He was until late in his life unlearned, and after his marriage in a Pisathiti family of Trilkanthiyur, he studied under a Acyuta Pisathiti, a learned member of the family. Acyuta was not qualified to teach the Veda, but as he did teach Narayana the Vedas, he committed a sin and was attacked by a Vataroga. Narayana got the disease transferred by his mesmeric power to himself and by the singing of the Narayapiya, a panegyric of Sriksa of Guruvayoor the disease disappeared and he attained Ayuragronakhyam, longevity, health and happiness. This expression in arithmetical terminology denotes 1712–210 days of Kali as the date of the completion of the work which indicates 760 Kollam, Vrchaka 13th day or 1585 A.D. This poem is one of the finest specimens of devotional poetry.

"The fame of Bhattatiri travelled outside Kerala even in his own days, and the renowned Bhatopu Dikshita of Benares, the author of Siddhanta Kaumudi and the greatest grammatian of his age, was so much impressed with the profundity of Bhattatiri’s learning in that branch of knowledge that he proceeded to South India to see Bhattatiri and converse with him. Learning, however, to his regret that Bhattatiri had passed away in the meantime, the Dikshita is known to have gone back observing that he had no other men to see in Dakshinapatha. Bhattatiri was also known to the great Pandit of the Court of Raghunatha Naik of Tanjore, such as Yanananarayana Dikshita, his minister, and the author of Sahitya Ramakara and other works, with whom he used to hold correspondence. Bhattatiri appears to have visited the courts of the Zamorin of Calicut the Maharaja of

garuvakalitha together with a silver vessel to the temple of Sri Padmanabhaswamy to expiate the sin of having destroyed several villages at that time. Ravi Varma having killed several people during the fights that took place in the year 682 M.E. (1507 A.D.) made another gift of twenty seven silver vessels to the same temple together with the grant of lands at Vembanadu Kaladi and Kupprukal. It appears from these gifts that at this period several small battles were fought between the years 673 and 682 M.E. (1498–1507 A.D) during which many people were killed. The inscription also makes mention of several princes at the time. Of these Aditya Varna and Udaya Manthanda Varma were reigning sovereigns Jayasimha Deva (afterwards Jayasimha II) and Sakalakalal (Servangamatha) Marthanda Varma were probably their co-regents."

Cochin and the Rajas of Chempakasseri and Vatakunur, and numerous verses have now been discovered which are the composition of Bhattatin in praise of Virakerala, the then ruler of Cochin, as also of Devanarayana of Ampalapuzha and Godavarma of Vatakunur. Devanarayana is a common name for all the rulers of Chempakasseri and all that is known of the ruler of that country at that time was that he was born under the star Puratam. It may be stated in this connection that Virakerala of Cochin was a great patron of letters and that several poets flourished under him. The Raja of Chempakasseri was also a distinguished patron of learning and several works particularly on Vyakarana appear to have been composed under his special direction. Bhattatin did not proceed to Travancore possibly because Travancore and Chempakasseri were not then on friendly terms. There is a verse in the Matsyavatara Champu of Bhattatin from which it may be inferred that Ravivarman the ruler of Travancore at that time, who was consolidating his position in the south after the reverses that the country had suffered as a result of its conquest by Achyuta Raja of Vijayanagar, had even incurred the envy of the Raja of Chempakasseri.

Bhattatin has written numerous works, on diverse subjects. Stotra

174 Narayantiyam is the greatest of his stotra kavyas. "It contains more than a thousand verses, divided into a hundred parts of ten or more verses each and is a succinct and soul-stirring summary of Srimat Bhagavata. Every verse is addressed to the presiding Deity of Guruvayur direct, and easily reaches the high water mark of perfection in sound and sense. Almost every astika in Kerala recite some verses of this great poem every day, and there is no human heart which it cannot melt and mend. The merits of Krishna worship have been dilated upon by the poet in a masterly manner in more places than one. Bhattatin points out than even Sankaracharya, the expounder of the Advaita Philosophy, found consolation in composing Bhashyas on Vishnu Sahasranama and Bhagavatgita and composing Vaishnavite hymns such as Vishnupadadiksesa. He takes to task the Nambudri

1 On Narayana and his works see Malayala Rajyam, Annual number. Many of these are still unprinted and manuscript copies are found in Travancore Maharaja's Library and throughout Malabar with the Sutkhyama Article by Ullur S Parameswara Ayyar in Cochin Maharaja's College Magazine, Vol XII, No 9

2 Printed, Travancore Sanskrit Series, and at Trichur with an introduction by K Vasudeva Moosad. The poet Unnayi Varlikar at a later date imitated Bhattatin in his Ramapanasahati in praise of the Dolty of Innalakkuda.
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Brahmins of his time who were proud of their birth, but who were not devoted to the worship of Krishna.

The whole of Bhamāśāti had been beautifully summarised in a single verse which runs as follows:

जिनो त हृदपति वृद्ध समरपुर्व वन्यथ दशाव्यः।
शिक्षा त वीर्य वीर किषिदस्यि सः निस्पके भास्यमात्रा॥
कोंबध कोषस्वता तद्धिर वधमय मोहक्षय समयितात्मा॥

वर्त्म युध्च चैरति प्रक्रियस्यया दशैश्वरवितरुपस्व॥

175 He wrote a number of prabhandhas, a variety of campūs, on several themes Rājasūya, Dātvānikya, Pāncālīsrayamvara, Draupadiparipāya, Subhadrāharana, Kārata, Bhūratayudha, Svargārohana, Matyāvatāra, Nīgamoksa, Gajendramoksa, Samantaka, Kuchelavrita, Ahalyāmoksa, Niranunāsika, Dakṣayagna, Parvatiśrayamvara, Astamicampū, Gosthinagaravarnana, Kañcasalavarnana, Sūryanabhairalāpa, Nalāyanīcānta and Rāmakatha. Rājasūya reveals Bhattatīra's profound knowledge of Veda and Mimāma. Those campūs were written by Bhattatīra mainly for the use of Śākkiyars. Many well-known previous works such as Bālābhārata of Agastya, Bharata-campū of Anantabhatta, Veṇīsamhāra of Bhatīnārāyana and Tripālāvadha of Māgha have been freely quoted from, though the best portions are Bhattatīra's composition Kötviraha and Svāhāśudhākara are fine specimens of his poetry.¹

His son Krṣṇakavi wrote the poem Tūrasārāṅka.²

176 Manaveda or Ḍārpatī Raja, a zamorin of Calicut, was an admirer of Nārāyaṇa and he imbibed his devotion by ardent study of his works, and his language displays the similarity. He lived in the 17th century AD. He wrote his Krṣṇagīti or Krṣṇamālaka on Kali day 173661² and his Mānavedacampūbhāraṭi on Kali day 173311¹ besides a commentary on Campūrāmāyana.³ Rudrādaśa describes the marriage of Candraleka and Mānavedarāja in his Sattaka Candralekha or Mānavedacarita.⁴

¹ Printed, Kavyamāla, Bombay
² Printed, Kavyamāla, Bombay
³ Printed, Trichur, with an introduction TC, III 4082, the date given is 173661
⁴ TC, II 2580, DC, XXI, 8267 There is a commentary by Krṣṇa, TC, II 2595
⁵ TC, III, 4020 The date given is 173311
⁶ TC, IV 4762
177 Ramapaninada or Rama whose popular name was Kunjunni Nambyar was born of the Wariar caste near Kunnankulam, Cochin State, and lived about the middle of 18th century. He was a pupil of Nārāyanaabrhatta. He is one of the best poets of Malabar in Sanskrit and Prakrit. For some time he was with the Zamorin of Calicut and latterly settled at Kottulga (Cranganore) where he was performing service as drummer in the temple there. In Viṣṇuvilāsa, a poem in 8 cantos, he describes the deeds of Viṣṇu in the nine incarnations. In Mukundastava, he sings the praise of Mukunda at the instance of King Rāmavarma of Srikantha family. While he was living at Sendamangalam he wrote the poem Raghavija in two parts purva and uttara in 20 cantos on the whole story of Rāmāvama. Lalitārāghaviya and Pūdikā-pūrūṭbhi-eka are plays on the same theme. His Candrika is a Veethi said to have been enacted in 1rvandrum in the time of King Vancimartanda and Madanaketeśaratna is a prahasana. Besides various works on other Sastras he composed in Prakrit the poems Uṣanruddha, and Kamsavaho. He commented on Sukumara’s Kṛṣṇavilāsa, Kṛṣṇalīlāsuka’s Govindabhi-eka, and Nārāyiṇa’s Dhātukāvya.

Rāmavarma of Cranganore was the junior prince, Yuvarāja. He lived about 1800. His Rāmacarita is a poem in 12 cantos on the story of Rāma, and Rasasadanabhāṇa, a fine play. Some of his ideas are very fanciful.

178 Sri (Svati) Rāmavarma. Kulaśekhara, Maharaja of Travancore lived in 1813-1897 A.D. He was the son of Lakṣmi Rāni and inherited the throne in the womb. His father was Rājarājavarman of Chengannasser. He was a linguist and his proficiency in Sanskrit was

\[1\] TO IV 5136
\[2\] TO, IV 5077 There is a commentary by a fellow pupil
\[3\] DO, XX 7838, TO, IV, 5977, with commentary, TO, IV, 5035
\[4\] DO, XXI 8542
\[5\] The manuscript is in Kalakīth Iḷom in Malabar.
\[6\] Printed, Trichur
\[7\] DO, XX 7745, TO, IV, 5411
\[8\] Printed, Poona, DO, XX 7845
\[9\] Ed Kāvyamāla, Bombay
\[10\] For instance

राक हउलेन दशमी च कपोलकांत्या
पालेन पचमतिथि गृहितचलाएँ
पीता हड्डरी कच्चमकरेण धरे
त्त्वसम्मतित्विक्षुहुमाजनत्वे
admirable. Besides his poems Padmanābhasatāka, Ajāmīlopalākhyāna, Kucelopākhyāna and Bhaktimanjarī; he wrote the prabandhas, Utsavavarna and Śyānādīrapuravarṇa. In the latter, he described the incarnation and stories relating to God Padmanābha of Travandrum.

179 Keralavarma (Valia Kovil Jambiran) was the consort of Maharani Lakshmi Bavi of Travancore. He was one of the greatest of modern poets, and was held in high esteem. He lived between 1845–1910. He has been called Kerala Kālidāsa. Of his Sanskrit works, we have the Visākharājamahākāvya, Kamsavadhaṃpa, Śingāramanjarī, Guruvayupurasasāstra, Vījaṅgālayesasatika, Sonadīhasatāka and Kṛṣṇapanasahasra.

180 Manavikrama Īttan Jambiran, the Zamorn, died about 1920. He was an extempore poet and wrote several small poems. A R Rajaraja Varma (Kovil Jambiran) was the superintendent of Sanskrit Studies in Travancore. Besides an original commentary on Pāñci, he wrote Āṅgalasamrājya Mahākāvya and a poem Vitavibhāvari. He lived in 1863–1918 A.D.


The poetess Manorama died a hundred years ago. Lakṣmī Rāmi, a princess of Kadathanadi Edavalath palace wrote Sanjānagopālakāvya and died about 12 years ago. Subhaḍrā, princess of Cochin, who died in 1921, wrote Saubhadrāsātava.

1 Ed Tr Sans Series.
2 Ed Tr Sans Series, with commentary.
3 Trav State Manual, II. 488.
4 Printed, Travancore.
5 The manuscript is in Travancore.
CHAPPIER VIII

Mahakavyas (contd)

181 Parvatiyamsavali gives a list of rulers of Nepal with the lengths of their reigns and an occasional reference to dates of accession. It dates back from 1768 A.D. to seven or eight centuries before Kaliyuga. It consists of several dynasties of kings, and Bhumivarman, the first king of the 5th of the Suryamasya dynasty, is distinctly described as having been crowned in Kali 1389 (1712 B.C.) and Siva-devavarman the 27th king of this Suryamasya dynasty is placed about 338 B.C. For, it will be seen that Amsuvarman, the 1st king of the 5th or the Surya dynasty, is distinctly described as having been crowned in Kali 3000 (101 B.C.) and reigned 68 years from 101 B.C. to 30 B.C. and in his time, Vikramaditya came to Nepal and established his Era of 57 B.C. There Amsuvarman is described as the son-in-law of Visvadevarman, the 3rd and last king of the 5th or the Suryamasya dynasty who reigned for 51 years from 152 B.C. to 101 B.C. whom he succeeded. Similarly, the 30th king Visnudevarvarman, the predecessor of Visivadevarvarman reigned for 47 years from 199 to 152 B.C. His predecessor Bhimadevarvarman, the 29th king, reigned for 36 years from 235 to 299 B.C. the 28th king, Narendravarman reigned for 42 years from 277 to 235 B.C. and lastly the 27th king Siva-devavarman abovenamed reigned for 61 years from 338 to 277 B.C.

"But a good deal of confusion has been introduced into the chronology of the dynasties of kings that ruled at Nepal by Dr. Fleet, and other orientalists by mistaking the Harṣa Era given in some of the copper plates as referring to an era supposed to have originated with Harṣavarṇhana Silāditya of Kānyakubja (Kanouj) who is ascertained to have lived (or reigned) from 606 or 607 A.D. Thus in a Charter of Paramabhātiaraka Mahārajadhārja Śivadevarvarman, the 27th king of the 5th or the Suryamasya dynasty of the Nepal kings above referred to (who according to Nepalese Chronology ruled from 338 B.C. to 277 B.C. for 61 years), the date of his accession to the throne is given as Harṣa Samvat 119. These orientalists at once assume the Harṣa Samvat to be an era founded by Harsavarṇhana, the patron of Bāna and contemporary of Huen Tsang, the Chinese traveller who travelled..."
in India from 629 to 645 A.D. On this assumption they take the Harsa Samvat 119 given in Sivadevavarman's charter as equivalent to 119-606 or 607 A.D. (the initial date of Harśabhadhana Silāditya) or 725 or 726 A.D. and at once concluded that the Nepali VamsaVah which places Sivadevavarman's accession about 338 B.C. calculated according to the dates given in Kaliyuga, must be a mistake, and that accordingly he should be placed about 725 or 726 A.D.

Taking this wrong assumption as true the whole of the Vamsavah of the Nepal Kings has been mercilessly meddled with and altered according to this new theory, in disregard of all the specific dates given there. There is no tradition or record that Harśabhadhana Silāditya of Kanouj inaugurated any era of his own. If Harśabhadhana, or King Harśa as he is usually called, had really founded any such era corresponding to 606 or 607 A.D., it must have been dated from the accession of that famous king, it is unlikely that if such an era had been founded by Harśabhadhana, the contemporary admirers of the Kmg Bāna Bhatta and Hiuen Tsang, would have failed to notice it in their works.

How, then, is this difficulty to be solved? What does the Harsa Samvat in Sivadevavarman’s charter denote? The answer is this. In the Harsa Era which dates 400 years before the Samvat or the Vikrama era, founded by Vikramāditya of Malava. The era of Sri Harsha or the Harṣa Samvat may be taken to indicate the luminus ad quem of the suzerainty of Sri Harṣa Vikramāditya of Ujjain, the contemporary of Hrtyana Matagupta and Pravarasena II, the 3rd, 4th and 5th Kings of of the Third Goanda Dynasty, described in Kalhana's Rajatarangini. It dates from 457 B.C just 400 years before the Vikrama era of 57 B.C. Alberuni, the celebrated Muhamadan historian speaks of the existence of a Harṣa era in Nepal and other Northern countries in his time and according to him, it falls exactly about 457 B.C just 400 years before the Samvat or the Vikrama Era.

Now if we take the Harṣa Samvat as referring to the Harṣa Era spoken to by Alberuni Sivadevavarman of the Nepalese Charter in question will have to be placed B.C. 457, 119 or 338 B.C. which exactly tallies with the original date assigned to the said king in the Nepal and the objection raised by these authenticity of the Vamsavah have no foundation.

1. Alberuni's India, translated and published by Dr. Edward O. Sachau, Vol. II, Ch XI I X, p 7
182. **Vardhamana** was pupil of Govindasur, a Śvetāmbara. He was in the Court of Siddharāja 1094–1143. He composed his Gantarātanāmadhodadi in Sam 1197, in which His Kriyaguptaka (where the predicate is concealed in the verses) and his Siddharājan varana describing the history of his royal patron are quoted.

183. **Sambhu** was a devotee of Siva and a poet of the court of King Harṣa (1078–1101 A.D.). His son Ānanda, also a poet, was one of the assembly of distinguished persons that heard the first reading of Śrikanthacarita by Mankha at the house of Alankara, minister of King Jayasimha (1129–1159 A.D.). His verses are quoted in Subhāṣītāvali by Vallabhādeva. He appears to have travelled all over India and frequently refers to Malabar and South India. He admires fluency of diction.

His Rājendrakarnapūra is a eulogy of King Harṣa, his patron, in the form of an address and Ayoktimuktāt is a collection of ingenious verses on various topics indicating an indirect meaning.

184. **Kalhana** was the son of Campaka. Campaka was minister of King Harṣa of Kāśmir (1089–1101 A.D.). When that king fell into trouble and was finally assassinated he was faithful to him and kept away from politics. Campaka had a brother Kanaka to whom King Harṣa taught music. Kalyāṇa or Alakadatja was his patron. Kalhana was well-versed in all legendary lore and was by nature well-fitted for historical investigation. His ambition was to write a chronicle of the kings of Kāśmir. After Sussala’s son Jayasimha (1127–1159 A.D.) came to the throne and he was in his Court, he began his work in 1149.
A.D., and completed his Raṣṭaṭarangini in a year with the prevailing sentiment Śánta.

Kalhana was at once a poet and chronicler. He did not forget his poetry in the course of his narration. His was a Mahākāvya in every sense of the term, with śánta as the prevailing sentiment. The turbulent times of his boyhood and the pathetic story of King Har-a to whom his father adhered must have made him pessimistic and there is a vein of satire everywhere. He was very god-fearing and his devotion to Śiva was extreme and Him he praised in his Ardhanārisvarastotra. It appears as if his motive in writing the History of Kings was not merely to record a story of events mundane, to which he attached little importance, but to illustrate the unreality of human fortunes and the vicissitudes of pompous royalty. Just as Vālmiki did, Kalhana realised that the doctrine of fate was the sensible solution of life.

Before proceeding to attempt the poem he rightly realised his duty and when he said

श्राद्धस्त एव यष्ठ कलनय रागदेशविभिन्नता |
भूतार्थस्थन यथ स्थेयकेव सरस्वती ||—I 7

and he kept up this ideal unaffected by the events of his chronicle.

According to Kashmir tradition, he wrote a poem Jayāṃśhālaḥhyudaya, apparently a history of the achievements of King Jayasimha.

185. Kalhana mentions previous writers—"Suvrata," whose work, he says, was made difficult by misplaced learning, Kshomendra who drew up a list of kings, Nīpāraha, of which, however, he says, no part...
was free from mistakes, Nilamuni, who wrote the *Nilamata Purana* Heilaraja, who composed a list of kings in twelve thousand verses, and Srimhara or Padmamhara, and the author of the *Rajakathas*. His own work, he tells us, was based on eleven collections of *Rajakathas* or stories about kings and on the works of Nilamuni." He verified the traditional dates by reference to grants, inscriptions, manuscripts etc.

---


In the introduction to *Rajakathas*, Stein says "The oldest extant text, which deals in detail with Kasmirian Tirthas, is the *Nilamata Purana*. This work which Kalhana used as one of his sources of information, claims to give the sacred legends regarding the origin of the country, and the special ordinances which Nila, the lord of Kasmir Naga, had revealed for the worship and rites to be observed in it. It is unnecessary to refer here to the legends which are related at the commencement of the work, and to 'the rites proclaimed by Nila' which are next detailed; and with the former occupy about two thirds of the extant text. These parts have been fully discussed by Prof. Buhler in his index analysis of the *Nilamata*. The remaining portions, however, deserve special notice for, to use Prof. Buhler's words, "they form a real mine of information regarding the sacred places of Kasmir and their legends."

In the first place we find there a list of the principal Naga or sacred springs of Kasmir (vy 900 975). This is followed by the interesting legend regarding the *Maha padma* lake, the present Volur, which is supposed to occupy the place of the submerged city of Candrapura (vy 976 1008). The Purana then proceeds to an enumeration of miscellaneous Tirthas chiefly connected with Siva's worship (vy 1009-16). To this is attached a very detailed account, designated a *Bhuteswaramahatmya* of the legends connected with the numerous lakes and sites on Mount Haramukha sacred to Siva and Parvati (vy 1019 1148). Of a similar Mahatmya relating to the *Kapotasvana* Tirtha, the present Kother, only a fragment is found in our extant text (vy 1149 69). The list of Vishnu Tirthas which succeeds it (vy 1169 1248), is comparatively short, as indeed the position of this god is a secondary one in the popular worship of Kasmir.

After a miscellaneous list of sacred *Sangamats* or river confluences, Naga and Lakes (vy 1219 75), we are treated to a somewhat more detailed synopsis of the chief Tirthas of Kasmir (vy 1271 1871). This is of special interest, because an attempt is made here to describe these Tirthas in something like topographical order, and to group with them such localities as are visited along with them on the same pilgrimage. It is thus possible to determine, with more certainty than in the case of other Tirthas lists, the particular holy sites really intended by the author. This synopsis starts in the east with the fountain of the *Nilanaga* (Veraiga), and follows with more or less accuracy the course of the *Vitasta* and its tributaries down to the gorge of *Vashishnand*. A short *Vitastamahatmya*, describing the original and miraculous powers of this holiest of Kasmir rivers (vy 1371 1401) closes the text of the *Nilamata*, such as it is found in our manuscripts."
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He used the Laukika era in his computation "The 24th year of the Laukika corresponds with the year 1070 of Sakakula."

186 Book I treats of Gonanda dynasty Book II brings us to a new line of Kings and Book III mentions the restoration of Gonanda line under Meghavahana Book IV begins in Karkota Dynasty The dynasty was overthrown by Avantivarman, grandson of Utpala Book V narrates the history of the Utpala dynasty The Lohara dynasty succeeds peacefully in Book VI and Book VII concludes with the assassination of King Harna In Book VIII there is a long account of the country of

1. लौकिकादेचतुर्विशेषयक्ताप्राप्तसमाप्तम्

सप्तसहस्यायिकयात्सहस्यपरिलक्षम्

"Laukika era is placed on Caitra Suddha I of Kali year 25 (expired) or the year 8070 75 B.C Laukika year is counted at present in Kashmir from the first day of the bright half of the lunar solar month Caitra Kalhana follows the identical reckoning. In Reg VII 511 Kalhana says that Uccala was murdered on 6th Pausa Suddha of Laukika 4187 and the debarment of his successor who 3 months and 27 days later, that is, 3rd Vaishakh Suddha of Laukika 4188 The months are reckoned by his Purnima as it is to day in Kashmir. For a full discussion of the Laukika era, see Buhler's Rep. 59 et seq and Cunningham's Indian Eras of the omission of the centuries in giving Laukika dates is an ancient custom".

"The Lok-bal, or "common era," called also the Sapt Rishikal, or "era of the seven Rishis," is a cycle of 2700 years divided into twenty-seven centenary periods, a new reckoning being started at the beginning of each century. The theory of the cycle is, that the seven Rishis, or stars of Ursa Major remain for one century in each of the twenty-seven nakshatras, or lunar mansions. All authorities agree in making Asvina the first of the Nakshatras, and in stating that the Mahabharata took place when the Rishis were in the lunar constellation Magha, the tenth of the series. The Puranas, and the practice of all the people who still use this cycle, excepting only the Kashmiris, agree in making the era of Yudhishthira the same as the Kali yuga. All, however, agree in stating that, at the time of the Mahabharata, the seven Rishis had already passed 25 years in Magha. But as Varaha places the Great war 653 years after the beginning of the Kali yuga, or in 3419, B.C., that year should have been the 76th of the tenth Nakshatra, and the 076th year of the cycle. This would fix the first year of each centenary period to the 25th year of each century B.C., and to the 76th year of each century A.D. But to prevent the confusion that would thus have arisen, Varaha simply ignored the generally accepted belief that the Rishis had spent 76 years in Magha when the Mahabharata took place and retained the initial points of the Saptashati centunes only bringing Magha down from B.C. 8117 (or 8103 & 78) to B.C. 2477. Accordingly, Varaha's followers placed the initial point of the Vrishapati Chakra in 3377 B.C. in Asvina so that each century begins in the 20th year of each century of the Kali yuga exactly as Mr. Buhler observed. This also accords with the statement of my Kashmiri informant that the Rishis had completed three revolutions less 25 years in the Dwapara yuga before the Kali yuga began, that is, their Chakra preceded the Kali yuga by 275 years, equivalent to B.C. 3377, or 8103+275 years."—Cunningham.
forty years from the accession of Uccala. The book mentions Jayasimha, son of Sussala, as the reigning sovereign, and concludes by an apt simile comparing the seven parts of his chronicle with the seven branches of the Godāvari.

187 Kalhana criticises the view that Mahābhārata was fought about beginning of Kali Yuga and fixes it as 653 years later. He equates the 24th year of Laukika era 1070 years of Saka era and places the first King Gonanda in the year 653 Kali. There he was in error and his attempt to go against the tradition landed him in a misapprehension.

1 In all, the books treat of the dynasties of (i) Gonanda (1st and 2nd) (ii) Karkota (Dwalaabhravdhana to Anangāpida 601 655 A.D) (iii) Utpala (Avantivarman to Sankatavarman and Parītha 855 to 999 A.D) (iv) Viradva (Yasaskaadhava) and Sugiāmadvā 940 to 949 A.D (v) Divina (Parvagupta to Bhumia 950 to 1003 A.D, (vi) Lohara (Sangrāsumāja to Jayasimha 1004 to 1158 A.D.) For genealogy, see O V Vaidya’s History of Med India, I 292-94.

2 गोदावरी सरिदिवस्युक्तेऽवलोकनाये
कैसौक्त तपाय सरसिरापवतनति
श्रीकान्तराजविवुलाधिनाशिचरमे
विश्वानाथे विश्वति राजर्विश्वीवयु

3 In the Introduction to Rājajaramni, Stem says “Kalhana takes as the starting point of the chronological calculations the traditional date indicated by Varahamihira’s Brhadastambha for the coronation of Yudhishtira, the Pandava hero of the epic, via the year 653 of the Kali era. The date of this legendary event is accepted by him also for the accession of Gonanda I, the first of the ‘lost’ kings of Kashmir, whose name, as we are told, was recovered by the Chronomer (or his predecessors) from the Nilamata Purana. The exact reason for the equation of these dates is nowhere given. But it appears that the story as contained in the earlier version of the Nilamata which Kalhana had before him, represented Gonanda I in a general way as a contemporary of the ‘Kaursavas and Pandavas.’

Kalhana next assumes a period of 2263 years as the aggregate length of the reigns of Gonanda I and his successors as detailed in Book I. For this statement Kalhana does not adduce his authority, though it is one of the main bases of his chronology. But the importance which he attaches to it, is evident from the trouble he takes to prove its correctness. He does this by showing that if to the figure of 2263 years are added the 653 years from the commencement of the Kali era to Gonanda I’s accession, as well as the years (1928) representing the rough total of the reigns described in Books II-VIII, we arrive at an aggregate of 4240 years which corresponds exactly to the 4240 years of the Kali Yuga elapsed in Saka 1070, the date when Kalhana wrote his introduction.

Kalhana himself tells us that the calculation of a total of 2261 years for the regnal period of the first Gonanda dynasty had been “thought wrong by some authors.” As the ground of their objection he indicates the belief (according to him, erroneous) which placed the ‘Great War’ of the Kuras and the Pandavas at the close of the Dvapara Yuga, i.e. at the commencement of the Kali era. From this remark it is evident that
Kalhana's Rājatarangini was followed by Jñānāraja and Śrīvatsa. Jñānāraja wrote the history from King Jayasimha to Sultan

Kalhana was not the first to propose the above figure for the aggregate length of the reigns of Gonanda and his descendants, and, further, that the connection of Gonanda I's date with the legendary date of the Bharata war was generally assumed by writers on Kashmir history Kalhana's reticence does not allow us to go beyond this. We know neither the source from which he obtained that base of his chronological system, nor by what figure the Uṣūla he alludes to were prepared to replace it.

Kalhana's Introduction furnishes us only with two more chronological statements of a general character. One is that at the time of Kalhana's writing or in Saka Samvat 1070, "on the whole 2330 years had passed since the accession of Gonanda III," and the other that 1236 years were "believed to be comprised in the sum of the reigns of fifty two lost kings." 

In explanation of the first statement it has to be noted that it is only from Gonanda III onwards that Kalhana is able to indicate the length of individual reigns. With this ruler begins in fact the continuous list of kings which Kalhana professedly obtained from the works of earlier chroniclers. We have already seen that a 'rough calculation,' as implied by Kalhana's expression (m̐ayah, 'on the whole') of the aggregate duration of those reigns actually gives us the total of 2330 years. Kalhana does not tell us distinctly whether he took the figures for individual reigns summed up in this 'rough' total, also from the "works of former scholars" which supplied the dynastic names from Gonanda III onwards. It is hence a priori not certain whether these earlier sources already knew the date of Gonanda III's accession as indicated by Kalhana's calculation, viz. 1019 B.C. or 1139 B.C.

As regards the second statement, allotting 1236 years to the whole of the reigns of the 'lost' kings who preceded Gonanda III, it is evident that this figure could easily be computed either from the traditional sum of 2266 years for the whole period of the first Gonanda dynasty or from the rough total of 2330 years just discussed. Kalhana's words, in fact, seem to imply that this computation had been made by himself.

Period from the death of Upātika Jayapala, Ėruvikā Samvat 39 (iv. 703), to the date of Kalhana's Introduction, Ėruvikā Samvat 92 (159) — 395 0 0.

The exact total of these figures would be 1560 years, 9 months and 26 days. But if we disregard the odd months and days found in the aggregate of Books ii and iii, the result will be again 1236 years. We are all the more justified in adopting this manner of calculation as Kalhana's words (159) distinctly imply that he himself had arrived at the figure of 2330 years for the total from Gonanda III to his own time by a similar 'rough' reckoning.

Total of reigns of the first Gonanda dynasty
Deduct for reigns from Gonanda dynasty, to Yullāhithira I

2266
1002

Results a total of 'lost' kings' years
The same result is obtained by deducting from
the number of Kali years elapsed in Saka Samvat 1070
the aggregate number of years of known reigns.
& the number of Kali years passed before Gonanda I

2330
4269
2263
053

1883
1286
Jainahdin (1417-1467 A.D.) His pupil Srimaa continued the history from 1419 to 1486 A.D. The story of a few more years till the annexation of Kasmir by Akbar was told by Prājyabhātta and his pupil Suka in Rājāvalipatāka 1

The following calculation shows that the year in which Kalhana wrote his introduction, was Laukika samvat 4224 —

Distance between Kali 25 (initial date of Laukika era) and the initial date of the Saka era 3154
Distance between Salnasamvat 1 and Kalhana’s time 1070

Total of Saptarasī years 4224

We are led by two calculations to the total of 1828 years as Kalhana’s aggregate of the reigns from the close of the first Gonanda dynasty to Kalhana’s time. Deducting from the total of 2268 years for the reigns comprised in Book I, these 1266 years which Kalhana allows “for the sum of the reigns of the fifty-two lost kings” (154), there remain 1002 years for the aggregate rule of the kings the length of whose reigns is specified in Book I, (from Gonanda III. to Narendraditya I.), and of Yudhisthira, the last king of Book I, the duration of whose reign Kalhana has omitted to indicate. If we deduct those 1003 years from the rough total of 2260 years which Kalhana mentions as having elapsed from the accession of Gonanda III to his own time (158), we get result of 1288 years as the aggregate length of the reigns in Books ii viii.

The other calculation we may follow is to add up the figures given in the seven later Books. These are, according to the text, adopted for our translation as follow —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total of reigns of Book ii</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Durlabhavarthana to Cippata Jayapada</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P.L. Namassivhaswam says (ID, XL 182) “The fallacy of Kalhana’s calculation will be evident on a little consideration. He says that 2268 years have elapsed between Gonanda III and himself, and 1266 years between Gonanda II and Gonanda III. Therefore (2268 266) 2596 years must have elapsed between Gonanda II and himself, who lived in 1070 Saka. This assigns a date (866 4 1070) 2526 years before the Saka era to Gonanda II. But from older authorities, Kalhana learns the fact that king Gonanda II was too young at the time of the Great Battle to take part in it. According to the old view, the Battle of Mahabharata took place 8179 years before the Saka era (i.e. at the beginning of the Kaliyuga), while Kalhana’s calculation makes the time of Gonanda II (a contemporary of Pandhavas) to 2526 years before Saka era. So to get over this difficulty, Kalhana brings down the Pandhavas to 685 (8179 2526) Kali. This is the explanation of Kalhana’s calculation. The author’s real mistake lies in the statement that 1266 years have elapsed between Gonanda II and Gonanda III. For he says in his own book प्राक्तिक महाभारतम् मन्नतिकालिकैर् Thirty-five Kings were drowned in the ocean of forgetfulness Such mistakes in his chronology led him to his wrong conclusion.

1. These are printed along with Kalhana’s work in Bombay.
Jonarāja was son of Nonanlja and grandson of ovlaraja. He wrote commentaries on Kirataxjumya, Puthviraj avya, and Sikanthacarita. Shīvāra also wrote Subhāstīvala, Junarāja parangin, and Kathā-kautuka in verse, a history of Yusuf and Zulika translated from the original Persian poem of Jami.

189 Sandhyākarananandin, son of Prajāpatsinandin, describes the history of King Rāmapāla of Bengal, who regained his ancestral kingdom which had been usurped by Bhima and ruled in 1104-1130 A.D., in the poem Rāmapalacarita.

190 Jalhana is mentioned by Mankha with admiration as a minister at the Court of Rājapuri the capital of King Somapāla, son of Sangrāmapāla. When Sussala was preferred to his eldest brother Uccala to the throne of Kashmir, he went away displeased to Rājapuri. On the history of that king he wrote a poem Somapālavilasa on which Rājanaka Rucaka commented. His Mugdhopadesa is ethical.

---

1. CC, I. 203, see Peterson Int to Subh 43
2. Composed in 1149 A.D.
3. BKR, 101 x, xiii, CC, I. 667, BR, (1883 4), 51
4. Printed (foreign) with a translation by Rich, Schmidt
5. Ed. by Haraprasad Sastri, Mem ASB, III. See BI, I. 831
6. He is different from Ārahaka Bhagadatta Jalhana, author of Subhāsidvala (JBRAS, XVII 57), on which see under Subhāsidvala post
7. See para 72 supra. Peterson, Subh, 41 2.
8. This is quoted by Rajapakṣa in Sūtikusumāṇjtali. See CC, I. 203. There is a verse of the poem preserved in Kavyapāṭha sūtrasamucaya.
191 Jayadratha,² (Rājānaka) was the son of Śrṅgararath,³ and brother of Jayaratna of Kashmir. He was a pupil of Subhadatta and Sankhadhara. He says in his Taṇṭrāloka-viveka that his great grand-father's brother Sivaratha was minister of King Uccala of Kashmir (1101–1111 A.D.)³ Jayadratha quotes from Prthvirājāvayava composed in about 1190 A.D. and must therefore have lived about the beginning of 13th century A.D.⁴ In poetics he wrote Alankāravimarsin,⁵ and Aśṭakrodāharana.⁶

His poem Haracaritacintamani⁷ relates in thirty-two cantos as many legends connected with Siva and his various Avataras. Eight of these legends are localized at well-known Kasmirian Tirthas, and give the author ample opportunity of mentioning sacred sites of Kasmir directly or indirectly connected with the former. Jayadratha's detailed exposition helps to fix clearly the form which the legends regarding some of the most popular of Kasmirian Tirthas had assumed in the time immediately following Kalhana. The local names as recorded by Jayadratha, agree closely with those of the Rajatarangini. They prove clearly that the forms employed by Kalhana must have been those generally current in the Sanskrit usage of the period. For the interpretation of the Nilamata's brief notices the Haracaritacintamani is of great value. Its plain and authentic narrative of the various local legends enables us often to trace the numerous modifications which the latter as well as the names of localities connected with them have undergone in the extant Mahatmyas. Jayadratha has well earned the honour unwittingly bestowed upon him by those who brought his fourteenth canto which deals with the story of Kapatesvara, into general circulation as the authoritative Mahatmya of that Tirtha at the present day.⁸

---

1 The published texts have the name Jayaratna. In Stein's Kasmir Catalogue, the name Jayaratna is given as author of Alankāravimarsin and Jayaratna and Jayadratha are treated as identical. Aufricht (OC, I 200, 201, 754, II, 157, 754) treats them as brothers and makes Jayadratha author of these works given above, and Jayaratna as author of Taṇṭrāloka-viveka and relies on Peterson's manuscript of Ratiyakana's Sārasamuccaya.

2 Śrṅgāra's verses are quoted in Skm, V 25

3 Raj, VIII 111

4 Jacobi identifies Jayadratha's father's patron Rājārāja with Rājadeva who ruled at Saṭisaras in 1203–1225 A.D. (See Jeyaraja's Rajatarangini, 73)

5 This is a commentary on Ruyanka's Alankārasarasvataya. Printed, Bombay

6 S.K.C, 59 (where the name is found as Jayaratna)

7 Ed. by Sivadatta and Parab, Bombay OC, I. 754' BKR, XIV 61, PR, II 18

8 Stein's Int to Raj
192 Prthvirajavijaya is an epic by Chandakavi on the life of Prthviraja, the Chahaman king of Ajmeer. He defeated Sultan Shahabuddin Ghor in 1191 A.D., but was however overcome and killed later on. Soon after the victory the poem seems to have been begun and was left unfinished probably owing to his adversity. Janaraja had commented on it.

193 Vasudevaratha, son of Govinda of Atravagotra, flourished in the court of Purusottama (Anangabhima) of Kaitak about 1423 A.D. His father’s father Srimvāsa wrote a poem in 20 cantos Lalitarāghava.

In his Gangayamansucarita, in prose and poetry, he describes the dynastic history of the Ganga princes who ruled over Kalinga. It is mostly in the form of dialogue between Vidyārava and his wife Līlavati who seem to have previously visited the Magadh and the Karnāta countries. “He at first goes to a minority Andara King. He then visits Sri Kurma and thence proceeds to Purī. The car festival of the place is described and the history of Purusottama, the traveller’s chief patron, is described at length. Anangabhima, an early Ganga prince, is said to have founded Padmanabapura as an agrahara for South Indian Brahmī. Bhamapura was likewise constructed and called after his name. Ananga’s great-grandson bore his name and conquered the princes of Kaitak in 1193 A.D. His twelfth descendant established Kapilendra of the throne. The Ganges left the Oriya country and settled at Gudarikatāla. In the eighth Parshodha, there is given a detailed genealogy of the Ganges down to Purusottamadeva. His third ancestor Padmanabha is said to have killed one Mallīk, a Muhammadan general sent by the Emperor of Delhi, at a place called Nandapur. A more detailed examination of the work will furnish the historian with much useful material for his purpose.

I Ed BI, by S K Belvalkar with Janaraja’s commentary CC, I 345 See Harbilas Sarde, JRAS, (1913), 260 There is a Prthv. Ijcarity (pruned, Bombay). One Prthviraja has written a poem Rukmanikāpyavali in prose, CC, I 527
2 TC, IV 4415
3 For Ganga dynasty, see IA, XII, III, XII, 167

For inscriptions of Dvivedavarman, see IA, X 243, XVI, 204, XVIII 148, of Indravarman, IA, X 243, XII 110, 124, XVI 131, Satyavarman, IA, X 243, XIV 10, Nandaprabhanavarman, LL, X 243, XIII 48, Anantavarman, LL, XVIII, 161, dated Saka 1008, 1040 and 1087.

For a short sketch of history of Kalugas by S Krishnasami Iyengar, see API, I, 111.

On Indravarman plates by R, Subhacar, see API, I, 189.
Vrajasundara was the son of Balabhadra of Caitanya school. He was a poet of the Court of King Anangabhima. In his poem Sulocanamadhava he describes the story of the marriage of Prince Madbava, son of Vikrama, king of Taladharaja with Sulocana daughter of Guaphara, King of Divyantin Plaksadipa.

194 Virupaksa's Colacampu contains a fictitious account of the Cola King Kulottunga and his son Devacola. This is said to be contrary to epigraphical evidence. Siva came as a Brahmin to him and pleased with his devotion gave him sovereignty. He refused it but consented on condition of repairing all Siva temples. Siva revealed himself and went away. Kubera then appeared, related the story of Janasura who obtained salvation through the favour of Anandavalli at Samivan (ancient site of Tanjore) and crowned Kulottunga at Tanjore. He repaired several temples, crowned his son and went to heaven.

Sadaksaridhya, the well-known Canarese poet, lived at Dhanugoor in Mysore. He was a pupil of Uddandadeva who flourished at the beginning of the 15th century. In his Kavikarnarasayana or Mahacola-rajya he describes in 10 cantos the history of a Cola King.

195 Udayaraja was the son of Prayagadasa and pupil of Ramadasa. His Rajavinoda celebrates the life and doings of Sultan Mahommad. He calls him Rajanyacudamani and says that he surpasses Karna in liberality and in his footsteps attend Sri and Saraswati. In seven cantos, he describes the genealogy of Mahomad from Myzaffar Khan, his Durbar hall and amusements and his exploits in war. This eulogy by a Hindu Brahmin writer leads us to doubt whether all that is said in our published Indian Histories about the cruelty and persecutions of Sultan Mahommad may not after all be true.

196 P G Ramarya narrates the life Ghazni Muhammad in Gayn Mahamadacanta.

Birudavali is an alliterative poem in praise of Emperor Jehangir.

1 TC, IV 5665 (breaks off in 14th canto)
2 HR, IX 2031 His Saraqasvar is a commentary on Candra-loka (Ibid 1617)
3 CMy, 248 (only two cantos are available). He praises Pahakuri Somartha. There is a commentary by Vengana, Telugu poet of Madura
4. See A E Gough, Records of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, I, 191
5. Sah, XVIII
6 CSO, (1903), 96 There are other works of the same name by Falyana and Baghudeva (Ibid, 96, 97).
AKHARNAMAH is a Sanskrit translation of the Persian work of that name relating the history of Emperor Akbar. There is the poem Jodarmallakāvyya on the life of Todarmal, his financial minister. Kālidāsa Vidyāvinoda wrote Sivājicanta.

LAKSIJIPATI was the son of Visvārūpa, son of Jayadeva. He wrote Avajullacaritā on the life of king-maker Abdulla who lived in 18th century. The poem is not divided into cantos or chapters and contains many Persian terms.

197 Keladi Basavabhupala was the son of Somasekhara and Cennāmbi. The family of Keladi to which he belonged traces its descent from Basava whose son Counda distinguished himself as a great warrior and was made the Governor of Pulladesa by the King of the country. His son Sadāsiva fought under Emperor Rāma Rāya of Vijayanagar. Under his successors the viceroyalty was augmented by presents conquered territories by the Emperor. During Basava’s minority, Cennāmbi acted as regent and once vanquished the forces of the general of Emperor Aurangazeb. Basava was proficient in the Sivadvaipya and worshipped Śiva in the form of Virabhadra. He had the titles Rajadūraja, Kotikolūkala and Parayādavamurari.

His Sivaratvaramakara is a unique encyclopaedia, said to incorporate the essence of all arts and sciences treated in the Vedas and the Agamas. The work was completed in Saka Candragnayyapat-mā (1631) that is 1709-10 AD. Apart from the valuable information it collects on different topics, it gives a history of the House of Keladi and a legendary account of the foundation of the City of Vijayanagar by Vidyāranya and a history of the emperors that ruled there. The work is divided into Tarangas and Kallolas after the manner of Kālhasanat-sāgara.

Rājakālāvīnaya of Vidyāraṇya, gives a history of kings of Vijayanagar from its foundation. It is said that Hanhara and Bukka were guardians of the treasury of Virarudra and after him of Suritrāṇa.

1. OSO, (1904), No. 5
2. OMy, OMS, 634
3. Jl. of Sam. Sph. Parishat, XI
4. OSO, (1904), No 5
5. Printed in Madras. For extracts see SVII, 174, 337-364
6. DC, XX, 8597. On Vidyāranya, see para 125 supra.
Rudra was the son of Ananta and grandson of Kesava. He belonged to the Deccan and appears to have gone abroad to Courts of Northern India. In Mayuragiri, he was patronised by King Narayana Shah and his son Pratapa Shah. In his Rstraudhavans, a poem of 20 cantos he describes the history of the Bagulas of Mayuragiri, from the first King of the dynasty, Rastraudha, King of Kanouj. This poem was composed in 1596 A.D. Later he wrote a work in prose, divided into Ullases, Jangir Shah Charita. Fragments of this work have been discovered in Nasik. The poet thus gives a mythical origin to the dynasty. "Once Siva was playing at dice with Parvati on the peaks of Mt. Kailasa. One of the dice accidentally struck the moon in Siva's crest and a boy of eleven sprang from the moon. Pleased with his prayer, Siva granted him the kingship of Kanyakubja. At this time Latana, who seems to be the tutelary goddess of the kings of Kanyakubja, requested that the boy should be given to her for the throne of Kanouj. Siva granted her request. Virabhadra presented him with a sword of victory. Latana then took the boy and gave him to the king Narayana of Kanouj of solar race, who was praying God for a son. The goddess remaining invisible, told the king that the boy will be known as Rashtraudha as he would support both his kingdom and the family." The poem describes in later cantos the expeditions of King Narayana Shah and his son Pratapashah, the last of which was directed against Balapura in the Virata country." Rudra's poetry is enchanting and many of his fancies are rare and original.

199. Jñarācanārodaya of Vaiḍyanātha (Maithila) given in 20 cantos the history of King Tārācandra. Candrasekhara was the son of Candrasekhara. For instance see Chapter of Alankara post.

1 He is different from the post and rhetorician Rudra or Rudrata, for whom see Chapter of Alankara post.

2 Ed by Embar Krishnamacharya, with summary of poem and an elaborate historical introduction by C D Dalai in Gaek. Or. Series.

3. For instances see.

4 CO, I 289, IBRAS, XII. The manuscript is dated Sam. 1793.
Jinamitra of Gujara country His Rajasuryanarittra in 20 cantos describes the life of his patron of King Sürjana.

Visvanatika was the son of Nārāyana of the Vaidya family. He was patronised by Kings Kāmadeva and his son Jagatśimha of the Rānaka race and in their praise wrote his Jagatprakhānākavya in 14 cantos. Among his other works are Satrusalyakāvyā and Kōnakalpataru.

Mallabhatta Harvallabha describes the history of Jeypoor State in Jayanagarapancaranga.

Mayuravarmacaritra in prose and verse in 8 parts is a history of King Mayūravarman, the founder of the Kādamba dynasty of Jayantipura (Banavasi). Jāmānāviya, a poem in 7 cantos, on the history of Jama dynasty of Kaccha and Navagara was composed by Vāsinātha about the end of 16th century A.D. Vamsalaṭā of Uḍayanācārya contains genealogies of Kings, historical and mythological. Ratnasenakulaprasasti of Bhāvaḍāṭṭa contains a genealogical account of the Sena dynasty of Bengal. Yacaprabandha by Tīrparāntaka is a biography of Kings Yaca of Venkatagiri, who was an ancestor of Sarvajnamsagabhāpāla. Rāmacandraśaprabandha by Govinḍabhatta is in praise of King Rāmacandra of Bikaneer. Devarājcaritacampana is biographical. Vellapuraviyagadaya is a prose account of Yellore and in praise of its ruler Kesavesaraja.

200 Itihāsatanomamani gives an account of the conquest of India by the English and was composed in 1813 A.D. Angarajacandrīka by Vīnāyakabhatta composed in 1801 deals with the British Dominion in India. Rajangaimakodyana of Rāmaswāmī Rāja, Āngalasūmārya
of Rājarājavarman and An̄glikādhīrījāvavāgata of Paravastu Rangācārya describe the history of British rule in India. Vidyālankāra Bhattācārya describes the reign of Queen Victoria in Vijayamālīkīvya Srinivasa Vidyālankāra describes Delhi Darbar in Dehli Darbarjvātasa Kāvya G V Padmanabha, author of Pavanadīṭa, describes the life of King George V in his Jārjidevacanta.

The greatness of Maharaja Kṛṣṇarāja Odayar of Mysore has been depicted by Bhagavata Rjīna in Kṛṣṇarājābhyudaya, by Srinivasa Kavi in Kṛṣṇarāja-prabhāvodaya, by Trīvakrama Sastrin in Kṛṣṇarāja-guṇā-loka, and by Gītācārya in Sri Kṛṣṇarājodayacāmpū.

201. Rājasēkharasūrī was the pupil of Tilakasūrī. He was a Jain. He wrote Praband'ākosa, a collection of 24 stories in prose at Delhi under the patronage of Mahanasimha, in Sam 1405 (1348 A.D.) Of the stories related in the Prabandhakosa, ten refer to teachers (ṣuri), four to poets, seven to kings, and three to laymen in royal service. The four poets are Śrīhārsa, Harihara, Amarakandra and Dīgambara-Madanakīrti. Among the seven kings are Lakṣmanascna and Madanavarman. A manuscript ends with a list of thirty-seven Chahamana kings down to Hammiradeva, who is stated to have ruled from Sam 1342 to 1358, and his ancestor Prta.ijia from Sam 1226 to 1248. The list also mentions the names of the Sultans with whom some of the Chahamana kings were at war.

202. Vikramodāya is a series of metrical tales on Vikramāditya of which the extant manuscript ends in 28th canto which treats of Sālīvāhana. Viracaritā is a heroic poem in 30 adhyayas by Ananśa. It narrates the events supposed to have taken place at Pratiśṭhana (Paitha) on the Godāvarī in connection with Salivāhana, the conqueror of Vikramaditya of Ujjain and his son Saṭṭi Kumāra. The leading features of the narrative are the heroic achievements of Suḍraka, the

1 Printed within the last fifty years.
2 Printed, Madras
3 Printed Bangalore
4 Printed Madras
5 Mys OML He is the father of Chakravarti, author of the romance Salvallītī, for whom, see Chapter on Sanskrit Prose, post
6 His father Jagajīsimha was a contemporary of Muhammad Bin Toghlak, see JBRAS, X 31.
7 Printed Bombay. PR, III. 272, IV ov.
8 HR, III vi.
9 IO, 1501, 1957.
CHAPTER IX

Mahakavya (cont.)

SECTION 1

205 Alwars The traditions of Śrī Vaiṣṇavas mention 12 Saints or Alwars, Garudavāhanapandita in his Divyasūracarita, and Anantācārya in his Prapannāmrta, describe their story. The traditional dates, ascribed to many of these Alwars are not accepted by “modern” scholars, probably because according to them tradition cannot be accepted as history. It is not known however why the innocent Vaiṣṇavas should forge chronology, for their reverence to these sages is not due to the time that has gone by, but to the intrinsic merit of their teachings. Speculation cannot displace tradition.

Of these Alwars, some of whom were born in Dvāpara, some in Kali, Kulasekhara was the first, born in Kali year 27, Parābhava,

---

1. See Vaiṣṇavas' Reforms of India by T. Rajagopalan, Early history of Vaiṣṇavism in South India by S. Krishnasami Ayyangar, Life of the Alwars by A. Govinda-ja V. Ramachan, Successors of Ramakṛṣṇa, JBRAS, XXIV 193 and Guruparamparas of the different sects.

2. Printal Sahedya, Madras, and Mysore. Garudavāhana or Śrīnivāsa was also known as Kavipādyapura-tāraka [DC, XXI 8125, TC, IV, 5093, 5046].

3. This is a long poem in 125 cantos dealing with the lives of Śrī Vaiṣṇava Alwars of India. Printed Bombay and Madras [SVH, 90, 97, 203, 451].

4. Bhaktīvadībhavaprakāsha of Venkatāla, son of Pratapperidhayanaka, gives the date, month, year, constellation of the birth of the several Alwars (TC, II, 2010). For Venkatāla's many other works, see TC, II 2025-2052, among which several areṭoṭras.

5. (i) Mahāsa (Peyalwar) in Dvāpara, 860900 (862901?), (Śiddhārtha), Āsvayya, Śukla 10th, Guru, Śṛṭabda, at Maynagurūr (Mylapore) (ii) Bhuta (Padaṭṭalwar) in Dvāpara, 860900 (862901?), (Śiddhārtha), Āsvayya, Śukla, 9th, Budha at Mallāpur (Mahābali puram) (iii) Kāśi (Pongal) in Dvāpara 860900 (862901?), (Śiddhārtha), Āsvayya, Śukla, 8th, Guru, Svavāgra, at Kānci, (iv) Māthu-rayakavi in Dvāpara 868979 (868978?) (Tāvara), Āśraya, Śukla, 13th, Śukra, Cūṭa, at Tirukkoor (Thiruvalliyāt Dēvi) (v) Bhaktīvāmana (Thirumalai) in Dvāpara, 869901, (Śiddhārtha), Puṣya, Kāhula, 1st) Ādī, Makkhā, Tulālagna, at Tirumalai.

6. (i) Parayalwar (Vaiṣṇottama) was born in Kali 47, Krodhama, Jyestha, Śukla, 13th Śvāti, at Dhānurpur (Srvīlliputūr), (ii) Andāl born in Kali 88, Nala, Āśābha, Śukla, 14th, Mangala, Pubbhā, (iii) Vīparāraya (Tondarāppadi Alwar) in Kali 107, Pabhava, Margaśira, Jyestha, at Mandangudi (iv) Thiruppāni Alwar in Kali 163 (8489?) (Bāhula 2nd), Durmaṭi Karlīka, Śukla, 15th (Kṛṣṭi) Budha, (Onyur) Kohfott? at Nūmpūr (v) Parākalī (Thirumangal Alwar) in Kali 217 (8997?), (Nala), Kārīka, 15th, Guru, Kṛṣṭi at Parimabhapurī.
He was son of Drdhavrata. His famous lyric Mukundamaṇḍala displays harmony and devotion.

Among Alwars, Nammālwar or Sathagopa of Kurukapuri, also known as Parāśara or Vakulāḥvarana was the greatest. He was the son of Karṇa and Udayamangai and was born at Īrukkuruhur in the 43rd year Kali of 3059 BC. His original name was Maran. After a period of contemplation while yet a child, he became inspired and the result of it was the singing of the Tamil Prabandham Nālāyiram. This has been rendered into Sanskrit Kurukṣetraṭhānaparāṇana by Rāmānuja, son of Govinda of Kāśyapagotra, and in Ātparyaraṇāvah by Vedāntadesīka.

Among the Ācāryas was Ālavandar (Yāmuniācārya) who occupied the apostolic seat at Srīrangam. He was the son of Īśvarabhitt and Ranganāyaki, and grandson of Nāthamuni. He was a great devotee and his lyrics Cāṭussioki, Stotarātmana, and Śri-tup are famous for their pietry and melody. He lived between 915-1040 AD.

1 Kulaṇaṅkara was according to the Ś-1 Vaisnava tradition born at Kolipat'auam in Keralas, in Kali, 27, (Parābhava) Māgha Sukla, 12th, Guru, Punavasu. But Ganaṇaṭhi Sastri in his preface of Tapasannakaraṇama (TSS), says that that Kulaṇaṅkara mentioned in Tamil Prabandham is said to have lived in Kali 1090 (1422 BC). The source of information is not given.

2 See Chapter on Laghukavya, post.

3 Sathagopasaḥasam is a thousand verses in praise of Sathagopa, by Venukārya (TC, IV 4612, 4060). Sathagopuñjalanakaraṭaparacaryaḥ is a treatise on rhetoric with illustrations in praise of Sathagopa (TC, I 2310, IV 5923) probably by a member of the Bhatta’s family of Srirangam in 17th century AD. For other eulogies, see TC, III, 2095, IV 5292, 5221, 5222, 4664, DC, XVIII 4842. For a short account, see Ind. Rev (1913), 516.

4 He was born in Pramadi, Vaišākha sukla 16th, Śukra, Vaiśākha (TC, XVIII, 6881).

5 TC, III, 8492.

6 TC, III 4165.

7 He was born in Kali 4017 Dhanu Āśūdra Sukla 15th, Braha Uttarāṣūdra. See Ind. Rev. IX 585.

8 According to Prapanchaṁṭha, Nāthamuni was born in Šobakṛiṇi, Kali 8691, Śa, Wednesday, Kṛṣṇa 13th, and he is said to have lived 550 (340) years. See Ind. Rev IX 275.

9 See TC, II 2600.

10 Printed, Madras. There is commentary by Vedāntadesīka (DC, XVIII 7204) and a summary of this commentary Rāmānujasūdhi (Ind 7200). See also TC, III, 2989.
206 Ramanuja was Ālavadār’s son’s daughter’s son He was born in Kali 4119 (1017 A.D.) at Śrīperumbudur. His father was Āṣūrī Kesava Bhattar of Hārītāgrotā Rāmanuja was first named Lākṣmaṇa and to this day he is called Lākṣmaṇamuni and an incarnation of Ādise-a. He studied under Yādavaprakāśa at Kānci, but became estranged from him on account of his jealousy. After escaping an attempt at assassination, he lived at Kānci, until he was called to Śrīrangam to take the place of Ālavadār. He reached Śrīrangam barely to see the remains of Ālavadār about to be consigned to the funeral pile. At Madhurāntakam, he was initiated into Vedānta by Peranambi and soon he became an ascetic.

He wrote his commentary on Vyāsūttras and a Bhāya on the Gītā and three works on Vedānta. In his tour in Kāsмир, his commentary on the sūtras was approved by Saravatī and at her bidding it was called Śrī Bhāya. He installed the Viṣṇu deity at Melkote, in 1099 A.D., settled disputes at Tirupati and arranged for the performance of festivals in several Viṣṇu shrines. He passed away after a life of 128 years in Durmatti 1137 A.D.

Apart from his works on philosophy, his literary merits are indicated in his Gadyatraya viz Vaikunthagadaya, Raghuviragadaya, Saranāgatīgadaya.

1 The formula is शीतला, Śaka 989 (Kali 4118) Pingala, Caitra, Śekla 7th, Guru, Ārdra, Karkata (TO, XVIII, 688).

2 “Ramanuja was taken close to the body to take a first and final look at the great master, when he saw three cut of the five fingers of the right hand folded. Struck with this, he enquired whether the defect was noticed in life and the answer came that the defect was not physical and was not noticed in life. On further enquiry Ramanuja was told that the master had three of his cherished objects unfilled, namely, an easily read and understood commentary upon the Brahma Sūtra, the giving of the names of Parasara and Sathagopa to suitable persons that would make these names live among the people. Ramanuja promised to see these fulfilled and the fingers straightened” Śrī Ramanujugashārya by S Krishnaswami Iyengar, page 8.

3 On this subject, see Kāmagnērakrama, a work preserved in the Yatirāja Mutt at Melkoter summarised by N T Narasimha Ayyangar, JRAS, (1915) 147.

4 His active life embraced the reigns of the Cola Rājas, Kulōttunga I (1070 1118 A.D.), Vikrama (1113-1133 A.D.) and Kulōttunga II. (1135-1146 A.D.)

5 See CC, I 591, II, 592.

6 Ed, Madras, 1861.
On the life of Rāmānuja, there are Rāmānuja-vacanācakula by Rāmānujadāsa, Vāṇāraya-Rāmānuja-vāraka by Vakulabharana, son of Sathagōpa of Ātyreya-gotra and desciple of Varada of Vṛṣya family, Rāmānujadraya-vaśy, Rāmānujacakita, Rāmānūjavijaya by Annayācarya, Rāmānūjya, Śrībhāṣya-vākaraṇa by Kaushika Vencalasa, Śrīsaṅkalayaḥbhava by Nīlakāntašūrī. His desciple Āndhrapūrṇa (Vaduhanambi) wrote Yatirājavanabhava

207. Kurattalvar or Śrīvatsānkamisra, son of Rāma Somayāju, was born at Kūram near Kānci in Kali 4141 (1039 A.D). He was a pupil of Rāmānuja. He belonged to a wealthy family but abandoned his riches and migrated to Srīrangam to join Rāmānuja. There he became a mendicant and lived by alms. His memory was supernatural and it is said that when Rāmānuja was not permitted in Kashmir to make a copy of Bodhīyanā's Vṛtti on Brahmāsūtra, Kūresā could by a single reading of it repeat the work. Thus he helped Rāmānuja in his composition of Śrībhāṣya of which he was his ananuensis. When King Kulōṭṭhumacolī summoned Rāmānuja to his presence to accept the Saiva faith, Kūresa personated Rāmānuja and when he attempted to argue the superiority of Vaiṣṇava faith the cruel king ordered his eyes to be put out. Kūresa is the founder of the family of the Bhattars of Srīrangam.

He was a great poet and his verse combines in it the fluency of lay fancies and the sanctity of theological allusions. His Vaikunṭha-stava describes the glory of Viṣṇu in Vaikuntha, his Atimūṇa-stava, the great deeds of Viṣṇu in his incarnations, his Sundarabāhubhavā, the

1. See also Life of Śrī Rāmānuja by C.R. Sriviiasa Iyengar, Rāmānuja Grantha (Opp., II 4882), Rāmānuja-vamāvatai (CC, I 523). For Stotras in his praise, see TC, I 14, 595, 789, DO, XVIII, 6885, 6709, 6349, 6881, 6841, 6892, 6805, 6842, 6785, 6847
2. TC, III 8581
3. TC, IV 5210
4. Opp. II 8828
5. Opp., III 8061.
6. Revy, 2640.
7. Opp., II, 1801, 7722
8. Mys. OML, 985
9. Ibid., 986.
10. DO, XVIII, 6389. He was born in Saumya, Makara, Kṛṣṇa 45th, Puṣṭi.
11. For a short account of his life, see Sāh. XVII 45, 89, 113, 180
12. There is a commentary by Śrīmānuja (DO, XVIII, 6919).
grace and purposes of idolic forms of Viṣṇu, his Varadārya-tva the particular merit of Varadarāja of Kancī and Śrīstava, the qualities of Lakṣmī. These together go under the name of Pancaṣṭaṭī.1 I Kūresavijaya, probably by Kūraṇārāyaṇa,2 relates his history.

Sriṇaṭsanka’s son was Parāṣāra Bhaita, born in Saka 983 (1061 A.D.)4 He wrote Viṣṇusahasranāma-Bhāṣya and Śrīrangarājaṭava5 Śrīgūraraṭnakosa,6 Kāmadossasi,7 Tamsloki and Astasloki8 Ṣoddāya-cārya9 relates his history in his Pārāṣāryavijaya.10

208 Vedaṇtadesika or Venkatanātha was the high priest of the Vadagalai Śrīvaṣṭava sect. His life and works have been noticed in a previous Chapter.11

209. Saumyaṭamaṭrmuni (or Manavāla Mahāmuni)12 was the high priest of the Tengalai Śrī Vaṣṇava sect. He was born at Kunti-nagara and was a disciple of Lokācārya. He lived in 1370-1444 A.D.12

1. Printed, Madras, with the commentary of Śrīnivāsa, son of Rāmānuja of Aṭṭalai Gōra.
2. Kūraṇārāyaṇa was the author of Sugārīṣasahasatra (Kāvyamāla, VIII).
3. DO, XVIII, 6958, Opq 5516, 7909, II 1052, 1280.
4. He was born in Subbatte, Vāsākha, Sukla, 15, Anu.ādha and died in the year Jaya, Kārtika.
5. Printed, Madras. There are commentaries, some anonymous and another by Venkatesārya, DC, DO, XVIII, 7118, 7119.
6. Printed, Madras. For commentary by Rāmauyādīśa, see DO, XVIII 6884, by Veerāghava (161, 6966), by Venkatsūprasa (180, 5899), and by Jagnēnatha (TO, II 6840).
7. Printed, Madras. TC, IV 4675.
8. Printed, Madras.
9. Doddayācārya of Vādhalagōra of lived in the days of King Rāma Rāya of Vījayanāgar and wrote Vedaṇṭadesikavesaḥbhavaprakāśit (DC, XIX 7677). See SVH, 202 and CO, I 263.
11. See para 150 supra.
12. He was also called Śrīlalai (see Śrīlalaiṣṭakam by Dotteśa (TO, III, 5146).
13. For other stotras in his praise, see DO, XVIII 7301-10 and CO, IV, 5293, 5219, 5226. See also Yākṣapraparavacampu by Yākṣaprabandhata (Mys. OML Sup. 13).
14. He was born 24 141970 A.D. in Saka 1293, Saṭṭhāraṇa, Arpali, 36, Guru, Sukla, Cаṭurādī, Mula, 7.
He composed Yatrājavimāṣṭi, in praise of Rānānuja and Kasturitiśatavā. In Sucaritacāvaka, Raghavārya, son of Nṛsimha, describes the incidents of his life Rāghava lived at Bhūṣtra or 1irumalais near Chingleput. His daughter's son Abhirāmavara or Varavaramuni or Saumyavara, son of Ṭīprasāyana, wrote Nakṣatramālā, a hymn in praise of Sathagopa.

210 In the hierarchy of Ahobalam Mutt of which Adi Van Sāthagopa Śvāmi was the first pontiff, there were many poets of a high order. Adi Van Sāthagopa swāmi of 1irunārāyanapuram lived in 1379-1458 A.D. (Tirumalai Nambākam) Narayana was his successor (1458-1472) He is known to have written 60 works on various topics and in the field of poetry his Nārāyanacarita and commentary on Ala-vanḍarśoṭra are known (Vangipuram) Parankusa was 6th (1497-1511) and wrote Nārasmhamāṭava Sāthagopa was 7th (1512-1522) and wrote the play Vāsaṇṭikāparṇayā (Kalyāṇapuram Cakravarti) Parankusa Ramanuja was 24th (1762-1774) and wrote Śrīprapaṭṭi, Nārasmhamangalāsāsana etc (Eḷanagar Gaḍāḍharapuram) Viraraghava was 27th (1827-1830) and wrote Kṛpāsāgarastava, Kārīranaḍīṭava, Vaihagevaraṭṭava, Ṭevaraṭṭava, Lakhīnarasimhamāṭava and Vaṅkunthavajyacampū in answer to Nilakanṭhavijaya (Attippattu Mādabāśī) Sāthagopa Ramanuja was 34th (1878-1881) and wrote Kaviḥyādayaranyar and Veṇagurivarnana (Ṭurageṭṭī) (Pillappakam Ilayavalli) Viraraghava (1897-1898) was 37th and wrote Śaṅkrakasuprabhāṭa and Śrīgosthīnāṭhaṭava.

211 Among the pontiffs of the Parakala Mutt of Mysore, Srinivasa was the 29th. He lived in 1802-1861 A.D. and wrote Alankārasangrāha.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa Brahmaṭaṇṭra Parakālaśwāmi was the 31st lead of the Parakāla Mutt at Mysore. His original name was Kṛṣṇamāccārya. He was the son of Tāṭacārya and Kṛṣṇāmbā of the village of Amdella on
the Pennar. He was born in 1839 and passed away about 1916 A.D. He was for some time in the courts of Vanaparti, Atmakur and Anagondi. He wrote 67 works on various branches of learning. Among these are Rangarajavilasa, Karthikotsavadiypakā and Śrīnivāsavilāsa. Among poems are Cakaptāḥāṣṭuṭi, Uṭtararangamāṃhātya, Raṃeśvara-vijaya, Nārsimhavilāsa and Maḍangopālamāṃhātya. His Alankāramāhāra is an elaborate work on rhetoric with illustrations in praise of the deity Śrīnivāsa of Tirupati.

212. Lakshmikumara Tattacarya of Śaṅkaraśanangoṭra is a famous personage in South Indian Vaiṣṇava history. He was born at Kumbakonam in 1571 A.D. He was adopted by Venkatācārya, better known as Pancamaṭhabhanjana Tāṭaṭēsa of Conjeevaram. He was preceptor and minister of Emperors Śrīranga and Venkatapaṭi of Viṭānagar and was practically the ruler of the empire in the later half of the 16th century. He was accorded the first honours in all the shrines of South India and was celebrated for his acts of charity. His titular name Kotukanyādāna indicates the marriages of several maidens performed at his instance. He passed away in 1631 A.D. His Hanyamadvimsati is engraved on the walls of Devarājswāmi temple at Conjeevaram of which his descendants are still the trustees.

The greatness of his line is described by Kāsamudajitā in Tāṭāryavādhavaprakāśa. His life is described by his descendant Ranganātha in the poem Lakshmikumārogya.

Section 2

213 Sri Madhvā Acarya or Anandatirtha was born in the village of Belle near Uḍīpi in an orthodox brahmin family in the year Yuva, 4300 Kall or 1198 A.D. on the last day of Ṛavdrs. That day is now known as Maḍhvamavami. His mother was Veṇavalli. His original

1 For full account, see Garuparampura (Mysore).
2 Ed. Mys., series.
3 See paras 434-494. SVH, 282, where an errata from Prabākāśarjula is given.
4 DC, XIX, 7242.
5 Printed, Kumāśabham.
6 He is also called Anandavanagirī, Ānandadevi, Ānandaśāleś, Ānandājīgarī, Jñānāṇḍā, Jñānāṇḍājīgarī (CC, I, 46); See Grierson's Trans. XV, 292; Bhāndarkar, VS, 57 and BR, (1883-8), 207.
7 O.M. Radhakrishnabaiyā's in his Enfr of Sīrī Madhva discusses the question and fixes the year 1298 A.D. as the date of his death. Taking the other H. Krishna Sastri agrees with him. But the inscription at Śrikṣetra dated Sāla 1908 indicates the earliest date. (EI, III, 260 8) See Introduction to Translation of Geśṭhābhāgya by S. Subbanna and A Sketch of the History of Madhva Acarya by G. Venkobama. (14, XLIII, 239).
name was Vāsudeva. His early life displayed miracles of divine powers. By twenty five, he became learned in all the sciences and Vedas. His knowledge was so profound that he was called Pūrṇaprajña. At that age he renounced his family and became an ascetic on the initiation of Acyutapraṇakāśa under the name of Ānandāśītha. In his tours throughout India he engaged himself in philosophical controversies and became the founder of the Advaita school of philosophy. He expounded his Dvaita doctrine in his Bhāyas on Vyāsa Śūtras, the Upaniṣads, and the Gītā. He spent his last years at the Sandantīram, the duel between the rivers Netraṇaṇi and Kumāradhārā in S Canara and he lived for 79 years, 6 months and 20 days and disappeared in Pingala, 1278 A.D.

Of his 37 works, many on philosophy, his mastery of the language is displayed in his poem Yāmakadīvārata, where he narrates the story of Mahābhārata in Yamaka verse. Among his śūtras are Ārjāśūtra, Gurusūtra, Kṛṣṇastuti and Dvādasastotra. Bhāgavatātparyanirnaya and Bhārataattparyanirnaya are learned critiques on Śrī Bhāgavata and Mahābhārata. Kṛṣṇakāraṇāmāhārāṇaya, Śankaravijaya and Śankarācāryavatārakāthā are also attributed to him.

214 Trivikrama Among the immediate disciples of Śrī Madhva was Trivikrama, whom he converted to his faith after a long series of discussions. He wrote Uḍāharapakāvya and Vīrūṣṭūṭi.

Trivikrama's son was Narayana. To him we owe the first account of Śrī Madhva's life in his poems Madhavavijaya, Anumaṇḍva-
vijaya,¹ and Maunnanjari.² His Pāṇḍitāharana is a Yamaka poem.³ He wrote also Sivānāt, ṿiṣṇu-ṭuṭi, Ṛṣimhāśana and Sangraha-Rāmāyaṇa.⁴

215 Of Madhva’s discipes, four succeeded as pontiffs, one after another, Padmanābha, Narahari, Mādhava and Aksobhya.⁵ Jayatīrtha got his initiation. He is said to have died in 1388 A.D. The life of Jayatīrtha is described in poems by Viṣṇutsutra in his Jayatīrthavijaya,⁶ by Kṛṣṇa in Jayatīrthavijayaabdhī,⁷ by Sankaranāra in Jayatīrthavijaya,⁸ and by Karkohallī Śrīnivāsa in Jayintradodaya.⁹

216 After Jayatīrtha, the most famous among the Madhva Acāryas was Vyāsarāya.¹⁰ He lived in 1447–1539 A.D. He was practically the moving influence in the Court of Vijayanagar from the days of Śalva Narasimha to Acyutadevarāya who ruled in 1486–1542 A.D.¹¹ The life of Vyāsarāya is described in the Vyāsayogicantacampū by Somanātha,¹² which was continued by Śivādyārātnaśkarasvāmi,¹³ and the poem Vyāsavijaya Somanātha’s prose is enchanting. The reader feels as if it is Kādambarī. He is reported to be the sister’s son of Anantabhāта, author of CAMPUBHARATA, who lived about 1500 A.D. Somanātha was introduced to his hero Vyāsarāya in the reign of King Acyutadevarāya and must have lived about 1535 A.D. Somanātha’s grand-father Bhatta Gayamukhi Bhāskara, known as Kālameghādhvarn, was a great poet.¹⁴

---

¹ There is a commentary by Venkutabhāta, TC, II, 1666.
² Printed, Bombay with Subrahmanyāya’s commentary. There are commentaries by Anantācārya (DO, XX, 7946), by Jammī Bhāvanāśyaścārya (DO, II, 7946) and by Vīṭalācārya (TC, II, 2003).
³ Printed, Poona DO, XX 7986.
⁴ Printed, Bombay and Belgaum. In DO, XV 7976, there is an anonymous commentary.
⁵ Aksobhya, Viḍyāraṇya, Vedaṇṭa Dāka and Jayatīrtha were contemporaries.
⁶ Printed, Mysore.
⁷ Mys OML Sup 10.
⁸ Printed, Belgaum.
⁹ Mys OML, Sup. 10.
¹⁰ He was disciple of Brahmāyaṭi tī whose life is described in Brahmāyatyāṭhavijaya (See B. Venkobanaro’s Int. to the Vyāsayogicantacampū, Ixxii). Brahmāyaṭi died about 1528 A.D.
¹¹ See para 124 supra.
¹² Ed. Bangalore with a long introduction dealing with the contemporary history of Kingdom of Vijayanagar by B Venkobanaro.
¹³ Op cit Ixxii.
¹⁴ See B. Venkobanaro, op cit iii ix.
217 Purandaradāsa, the distinguished author of Kanarese devotional songs, was Vyāsarāya's disciple. So was Vādiraja. Vādiraja is said to have opened an old treasury at a crisis, for King Acyutadevaraya had rebuilt the temple at Udipi, but before the golden dome was erected the Kingdom of Vijayanagar was subverted by defeat at the battle of Talikota. He was a great poet and among his poems are Rukminī-vijaya, Sarasabhāratīvāla, Tīrthaprabandha, Ekabhāvastotra, and DaśāvataSrāsuṭi. His life is described in Vādirājavītāratuasangraha by Raghunātha.

Satyanāthaṭirtha's original name was Raghunāthācārya. He died in 1674 A.D. His life is depicted in Satyanāthamāhātmyaratnākara, in Satyanāthabhuyudaya by Sankarsana, son of Sēśācārya, and in Satyanāthavilāsa by Śrīnivāsa.

There are poems on the lives of Dvaita Ācāryas. Visvapānya-gūḍa, by Setumādhava; Raghavendrāvijaya, by Nārāyana; and Satyanidhavilāsa, by Śrīnivāsa, Seturāyavijaya, Satyabodhavijaya, and Kṛṣṇa by Śrīnivāsa.

SECTION 3

218 Basava, the founder of the Veerashaiva cult of the Lingāyats, was the prime minister of the Kalacuri King Bhilljala who came to the throne at Kalyan in 1156 A.D. The tradition is that the sect was founded by five ascetics—Ekorāma, Panditārādhya, Revāna, Marula, etc.
Visvarādhyā—who are held to have sprung from the five heads of Śiva, incarnate age after age. These are regarded as very ancient, and Basava is said to have been but the reviver of the faith. Yet the early literature shows that the five were all his contemporaries, some older, some younger. In the poem Basaveśavījaya, Sankaraśādhyā describes his life, and so does Somanātha in his Basavapurāṇa, and Basavanagadīya. Somanātha also wrote a poem Panditārādhyacarita on the life of Panditārādhyā, the Lingayat Guru Somanātha (Palkurki), of Bhṛṅgṛūtagotra and son of Gurulinga, lived in the time of King Prataparudra I (1140-1196 A.D).

SECTION 4

Sri Gauranga, whose original name was Nimai, was born of Jagannātha and Sacī at Nadia in Phalgun, of Saka 1407 (1486 A.D.) on the banks of the Bhāgiratbi. His childhood foretold his future greatness. He married Vīṣṇupriyā, daughter of Ṣanātanamisra. He was called Gaurāṅga or Gour for his fair complexion. When he became inspired and an ascetic, he took the name Sri Kṛṣṇa Caitanya. He sang the glories of Sri Kṛṣṇa and became the founder of the school of Bhakti or devotion. He passed away in 1527 A.D. Among his poems are Gopalacaritra, Premāṁśa, Sankṣetakhaṅgavatāṁśa, Harnaṁakavaca, Dānakehaṃtāmāni.

Rupa was born in 1490 A.D. He was a scion of the Gosśāmi line and Kumāra was his father. Vallabha and Sanatāna were his brothers. His sixth ancestor Aniruddha was a Raja of Karnat about

---

1. On Lingayat legends and literature, see IA, IV, 17, 211, V 188.
2. Farquhar, ORL, 260. For bibliography, see Ibid., 987.
3. Printed, Mysore.
4. Mys O'ML 548; Ibid., Sup. 34.
5. See Venkatesalingam's Works, X 220.
6. For an account of his life, see S. K. Ghose, Lord Gauranga, Calcutta.
7. R. B. Dusserendra Sen, Caitanya and his age and Caitanya and his companions.
8. M. T. Kennedy, Caitanya and his movement, Y Serce, Caitanya's pilgrimages and teachings, Farquhar, ORL, 476.
9. CCL, I, 161.
10. CCL, I, 768.
11. CCL, I, 864.
12. For an account, see D O Sen's History of Bengali Literature (Calcutta), 503.
13. For an account, see D O Sen's History of Bengali Literature (Calcutta), 503.
Śaka 1338. His family was immensely rich Rūpa and Sanātana were made the prime ministers of Hosen Sahara, Emperor of Gauda. By nature, of a religious disposition, they were attracted by the teachings of the reformer Caitanya, and gave up home to become ascetics. Their greatness as religious teachers is described in the Vaiṣṇava literature of Bengal. Rūpa passed away in 1563 A.D.

As a poet and rhetorician, Rūpa is of a high order. The poetic instinct saturated with bhakti or love for Kṛṣṇa manifested itself in several forms of composition, always with the life of Kṛṣṇa as its theme. Viḍadgahamādhava, and Lalitāmādhava are dramas in seven acts describing the loves of Kṛṣṇa, and Rādhā as related in the Bhāgavata, Dānakeliṭaumudī and is a bhāṣa with its hero, Kṛṣṇa Hamsadūta and Uddhavasandesa are poems of message, on the model of Meghadūta. Padyāvali is an anthology and names the authors it quotes.

Among his other works, are Ujjvalacandrika (a dialogue between Caṇḍyayacandra's sister Rādhā and her friend about Kṛṣṇa), Yamunāstoṭra, Gandharvaprārthanāstoṭra, Gaurāṅgaṭavakalpaṭaru, Kusumaṣṭabaka, Mukundamuktāvalī, Cātupuspājalīṭa, Utkālaprātiśhrutā, Laghu-Bhāgavatamṛta, Ānandamahodadhi, and Mathurāmahī. By far his greatest work is the Ujjvalanīlamanī. As a treatise on poetics it describes classes, and conditions of lovers, and the several stages and modes of their affection and is profoundly illustrated with verses, all

1 Rūpa is mentioned by Rajaśekhara in his Kavyamīmāṃsa Rupadeva mentioned in Skau, and Padyāvali and Rupadeva, author of commentary on Gītāgovinda, are different poets.
2 Sanātana lived between 1494—1563 A.D.
3 For a fuller account, see Narahari Chakravartī's Bhaktarāstrākāra.
4 Printed Kavyamāla, Bombay. There is a commentary on it by Cakravartī. It is in fact Gītāgovinda dramatised “The piece is also in its different portions supposed to be applicable to the different seasons of the year, at which the chief festivals in honour of Kṛṣṇa are held, or the festival of Spring in Chaitra of Vaisakha, that of the birth of Kṛṣṇa in Bravana of the rains, and the Raṣayatra or dance of Kṛṣṇa with the Gopīs in the autumn.” Wilson, Theatre, II, 898.
5 For a list of his works, see CC, I, 588.
6 IO, VII, 4170, CC, I, 542, III, 155, also note a commentary by Nārāyaṇa.
7 DC, XI, 8406. There are commentaries on it by Jitānanda and Raghunātha dāsa. See Vālspavaḍharmaprabhakā (Murdhāsabha), Parts I to VI
8 There is a commentary on Hamsadūta by Mādhavamīśa alias Purusottama.
9 See Thomas, Kau 11.
10 CC, I, 538, III, 115, TC, IV, B, No. 3050.
11 CC, I, 62. Composed in 1580 A.D.
12 Ed. Kavyamāla, Bombay, 95.
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devoted to Kṛṣṇa. There are commentaries on it by Jīvagaśa,² by Visvanāthacakravartin,³ and three anonymous.⁴ His Nātakacandrīka⁵ is a treatise on drama based on the Nāṭyasāstra and he refers to the views of Visvanātha as opposed to Bhārata.

221 Rūpa had two brothers Vallabha and Sanātana Sanātana commented on Rūpa's Ujjvalanilāmaṇi and wrote among other works,⁶ Harbhaktivilāsa⁷ and Bhāgavatāśāṃśa.⁸ He lived in 1484–1558 AD.

Rūpa's disciple Raghunāthadasa wrote the short but beautiful poem the Muktācacari⁹ a funny tale in which Kṛṣṇa told Saṭyabhāma that pearls could be grown as a crop and demonstrated it by sowing a pearl and watering it with milk. Then the Gopis sowed all the pearls they had, but no plants came out. After repeated entreaties, Kṛṣṇa relented and returned the pearls.

222 Jiva Goswami was the son of Vallabha, Rūpa's younger brother. He was born in Śaka 1445 (1435 AD) at Rāmaketa near Fatehbad. He became an ascetic when he was twenty and was head of a Goswami mutt at Brndāvana, until his demise in Saka 1540 (1618 AD). Among his works are Gopaḷacakṛti, Madhavamahotsava, Bhaktirāmāśāṃśa, Govundabirudavah and Jāhnayastaka.¹⁰

223 Kavikarnapura was the son of Śivānanda Sena of Kancanapalli near Nadia. His father was the purveyor of the Bengali followers of Caṅkya to Puri, as long as Caṅkya lived, at the cost of Vasudevaḍāta, a millionaire.¹¹ He was born in 1524 AD. He was educated at Kumārakattha, modern Hailas, north of Calcutta. He was a pupil probably of Jīvagosvāmi. In his Gaurāngagānaḍeśadipika,¹² composed in Saka 1493 (1577 AD) he traces Caṅkya's followers to their prior births; for instance, Caṅkya's father Jagannātha is traced to Nanda, the father of Kṛṣṇa, and to Daśaratha, the father of Rāma. Every follower of Caṅkya is traced to one of the Gopikas or

---

1 Ed Bombay Composed in 1580 AD.
2 Ed Bombay Composed in 1625 AD. He wrote a commentary on Bhāgavata in Kavikarnapura's Alakṣiralaknaṣṭubha.
3 CC, 1. 37, OSO, XI 3.
4 Ed Kāśinātka. DC, XXIII, 8639.
5 See OC, 1. 698.
6 See OC, 1. 763. There is another work of this name by Gopaḷa Bhatta. Ito, 1.
7 See OC, 1. 403 4.
8 TC, IV, 4890 2.
9 For a complete list of his works, see Int, 80 Ujjvalanilāmaṇi, loc cit.
10 TC, IV 4471 4.
11 See OSC, (1909), No 96.
12 OSO, (1907), 45, HPR, II. (for an account).
milkmaids in the Kṛṣṇa incarnation and to one of the monkeys in the Rāma incarnation

In his play Cāntānyacandrodaya, composed in 1543 AD, he depicted the life of Cāntānya. Besides Alankārakaustubha, on rhetoric, he wrote Camaṭkārācandrikā, and Ānandabīndūvanacampū, on the loves of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

224 Among the great men of Goswami's order, Sridāsa wrote Rādhakundāstava, Raghunāṭha wrote Vīṇāpakusumānjalistava, and Kṛṣṇakūpurāṇa wrote Rādhāstaka, and Govindaśāsa (1537-1612 AD) wrote Sangitamadhava and Karmāṇḍa. In his Bhaktirasāmrtaśaṅkhdhu, Sanātana describes the four varieties of Bhakti to Lord Kṛṣṇa and develops the sentiment according to the theories of rhetoric.

Raghunāṭha's desciple Kṛṣṇadāsa wrote the poems Govindaśāratvadāsa, and Kṛṣṇalīlābīrastava.

SECTION 5

225 Vallabha Acarya, the famous religious teacher, was the son of Lakṣmīnāraṇa Bhatta and Guru of Purusottama. He lived in 1478-1530 AD. He commented onVyāsa's Brahmaśūtras. The followers of Vallabha school, like Cāntānya's, worship Kṛṣṇa as the supreme being. Among his works in poetry are Premāṇḍa, Mathurāmāhaṇī, Mathurāstaka, Yamunāstava, besides discourses on Śrī Bhāgavata.

1 Printed Calcutta and Bombay
2 Ed. partly by Svapnirasādha Bhaṭṭācārya; Ocf 209 There are commentaries by Lomānta (CC, I, 31) and by Bṛndāvanancantra (IO, 240).
3 IO, 1463, Mātra, VI 212 and 2150
4, IO, 492, 645 There is another of that name by Paramāṇanandadāsa (printed, Benares) and another by Kaṭāva (NP, X, 10).
5 See TC, IV No 3050 & Yadvananda wrote Vīṇāpakusumānjali, OSC, (1907) No. 59
6 See D. C. Sen, History of Bengali Literature, 547.
7 In UC, I 990 Aurocht gives it as the work of Sanātana composed in 1542 AD.
8 But in TC, VI 4484, it is cited as the work of Rupagoswāmi.
9 This poem is described as the work of (i) Raghunāṭhaśaṅkha (IO, VII 8876); (ii) Raghunāṭhabhatta (Mātra, II 571) But the real author of Kṛṣṇadāsa (Utlwar, 38) See article by C Chakravarti (Ia, LVII, 905)
10 See TC, IV R. No 3053
11 For list of his works see CC, I 556 6, Ind Rev (1918), 643. For Śṛṭras, see Vallabhaśacāryastutiṣṭutisāvaita by Gokulāchāri (Printed, Bombay).For Vallabhaśacārya-vamāṇavaita, see Inda., 556. Bhāndakar, VS, 76 and History of Vallabhaśacārya in Western India (London); Grouse, Mathura, Fargnlar, ORL, 977.
12 BR, IV 70 with commentary by Vitthal
His life is described by Gopaladasa in Vallabhākhyanaka, by Babu Sitārama Sastru in Vallabhādīgvijaya

Vallabha's sons were Gopinātha and Vitthala. Vitthala was born in 1515 A.D. and was as great a writer as his father. Among his poems, are Kṛṣṇapremāṁśa, Yamunāśapadā, Rasarasavasa, and commentary on Gītāgovindā. Vitthala's sons were Gindhara and Raghunāṭha. They wrote verses in praise of Kṛṣṇa.

Vallabha's brother Rāmacandra, born about 1484 A.D., wrote the poems Kṛṣṇakutūṭhala, Gopālalilī, Rasikaranjana, and Romavaśiṣṭaka.

226 Devarāja and Gangarao describe the life of Guru Nānak in Nānakcanḍroḍaya.

Section 6.

227 Ravisena Acarya composed his Padmapurāṇa in Nirvāṇa Samvat 1205 (673 A.D.) Jasena in his Harvamsapurāṇa says

कतपप्योद्योपीया गस्हह परिवर्तिता ।
मूर्त्ति कल्वस्य सोमे रविच रवि मिया ॥

"Padmapurāṇa is the earliest complete Jain version of the Rāmāyana unless the Prakrit work Paumachārya of Vimala Sun and another work of the same name by Svayambhūdeva which are said to bear on the same subject, really prove to be works of an earlier date, as is alleged. Later writers have all based their works dealing with this subject, on the book of Ravisenacharya. The incidents related in Padma-purāṇa are said to have occurred during the period (Tirtha) of Santanatha, the 16th Tirthamkara. The story of Rama as narrated here differs in many material points from that of the Ramayana of Valmiki. Rama and Ravana are both claimed here to have followed Jain religion. Lakshmana is stated not to have been a full brother of Satrughna, but son of a fourth wife of Dasaratha, Suprabha by name. Sita was born from the human womb of the queen of Videha. Dasaratha did not die..."
on account of the banishment of Rama, he is represented to have become disgusted with the ways of the world and he retired to the forest to practise penance. Bali, Sugriva and Hanuman were not of any monkey race, but were powerful rulers of the forest regions. Rama never killed Bali. The latter of his free will relinquished the throne in favour of his younger brother Sugriva and himself became an ascetic. Ravana was not a Brahmana, but a Kshatriya, and met his death not at the hands of Rama but those of his younger brother Lakshmana. The latter recovered from the effects of Ravana's Sakti not by life giving drug but by the presence of a virtuous lady Visalya, who afterwards became his wife. These are some of the points of difference. A comparative and critical study of the whole will be interesting.

228 To Jinasena are attributed Hanvamsapurana and Adipurana. The former was written in Saka 705 (783 A.D.) "when Indra Sri Vallabh the son of Krishna was reigning in the South, Vatsaraja at Avanti (Ujjain) and Varaha Vira in Saurya mandala. In the Mangalaccharana, which Dr. Peterson has omitted to quote in full, Jinasena pays his tribute to Samantabhadra (the author of Jivasiddhi and Yuktyan-sasana). Siddhaseana, Indra, Chandra, Arka and Deva (Devanandi) the grammarians. Vajra Sun, Mahasena (the author of Sulochana-katha). Ravisheana (the author of Padma-purana), Varangachanta, Kumarasena, Virasena and Jinasena. The mention of the last two names has given rise to a controversy as to the relation between Jinasena, author of Hanvamsapurana, and Jinasena, author of Adipurana. It has been suggested that the reference above is to the author of Hanvamsapurana and hence he is one with the author of Adipurana. But the difference in the dates of composition of the two works is at least 50 years which makes their authorship by the same person very improbable. Again, the genealogies of the two authors are different. The author of Hanvamsa-purana was the pupil of Kritisena who belonged to Punnatagan, while the author of Adi-purana was the pupil of Virasena who belonged to the Senagana. Also the manner in which Jinasena has been referred to in Hanvamsa-purana shows that the author is referring to a person other than himself. The verse is:—

शांभितांनुद्दौ तथा जितेन्द्रमणसंस्थलितः ।
लीलामिनी जिनतेनस्य कीर्तिसंक्षीपस्मिन्तः ॥

1. Hirata’s, Cat C. P., Int, xxi.
2. See para 5 supra.
3. For an analysis and extract, see Matra, VI, 74 PB, IV. 187 n.
4. For an analysis, see BB, (1899-4).
An author indulging in these terms in regard to himself would certainly be accused of being over presumptuous. But there arises another complication when we prove the two authors to be different. If we accept the date of the completion of the work as given by the author, the mention of Virasena and Jinasena cannot refer to the authors of Jayadhavala-tika and Adi-purana respectively, for they are known to have lived after the date of Harivamsa-purana. To obviate this difficulty we must suppose that two other Acharyas of those names lived before the composition of Harivamsa-purana.

Ādipurāṇa was left unfinished by Jinasena and was completed by his pupil Guṇabhadra, under the name of Ugarapurāṇa. Guṇabhadra also wrote Jhinadatācarita. Among poets praised in Ādi-purāṇa is Kaviparamesvara.

229 Jinaprabha was the pupil of Jinasimha of Laghukharatagaraccha. He was honoured by Emperor Sahi Muhammad at Delhi. He was very prolix in poetry and there was no day where he did not compose new ślokas, of which there are now 700, such as Gauḍamaśtoṭra, Pārvanāthastava, Śrīvirastava, Śāradāstotra, etc. His Dyasrayākāvya, like the one of that name of Hemacandra, describes the life of Śrenika. It was composed in Sam. 1356 (1300 A.D.).

Kīrtirāja in his poem Nemnāṭhamahākāvya in 12 cantos narrates the life of Nemnāṭha who was a Bālabrahmacārin, with exquisite descriptions of the seasons, marriage, etc. Kīrtirāja wrote the Prāfasti engraved in Parāvajayālaya in Jessalur Mandir in Sam. 1473 (1417 A.D.).

Somakirti of Nandīṭāṭagaccha was pupil of Bhīmasena. He wrote Saptavyasanacariṭa and Pradyumnacariṭa in 1474 A.D. and Yasoḍhara-cariṭa in 1476 A.D.

1 See Hiratal, loc. cit. xxii
2 He is different from Guṇabhadra, author of Dhanayakumāracariṭa, Cat. OP. 1865
3 Cat. OP. 648 From the legend of Prince Jayakumāra in this work, Brahmakāmaraja wrote Jayakumāracariṭa (Ibid. 2 a)
4 Printed, Kāryamāla, VII. Bombay
5 See Jss Cat., 38. Hiratal, loc. cit. xxiv.
6 Printed, Bhownagar, from a manuscript dated Sam. 1455 and written at Śrīyoginipura (Delhi)
7 This Prāfasti is printed in Jss Cat., 64-5
8 See Hiratal, Cat. O.P. Int, xxxvii.
Padmasāgaragani describes the life of his Guru Hirāvijayasūrī in his poem Jagadgurukāvyā. It was composed in Sam 1633 (1577 A.D.).

Rañacandra's Pradyumna-carita, a poem in 16 cantos, describes as a Jain version the story of Pradyumna and ends with the ascent of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma to heaven and salvation of Nemi. It was composed in Sam 1674 (1618 A.D.).

230 Subhacandra was the pupil of Vijayakīrtī of Mūlasangha. Besides Pandava Purana also called Bhārata composed in Sam 1608, (1552 A.D.) he says he wrote Candrānātha-carita, Padmanātha-carita, Manmathamahī or Pradyumna-carita, Jīvakarīti and Nandivāraka-thā, etc.

231 Padmasundara was the pupil of Padmāmeru of the Tāpagaccha. He was successful in a literary contest at the Court of Akbar and was honoured with gifts of villages, etc. He wrote his Rāyamallābhyudaya in Sam 1615, (1539 A.D.) describing the lives of 24 Tirthankaras ending with Royamalla of the Agrīkā, class Same year later he wrote his Pārvanātha Kavya.

Śrivallabha Pathaka in Vijayadeva Māhātmya describes the life of Śrī Vijayadevasūri of Tāpagaccha in 21 cantos. He was born in Sam 1634, and was honoured by Emperor Jahangir.

232 Sakalakirti was a Bhattāraka of the Jain religion. His Dhanayakumār-carita, a poem in seven Adhikaras, describes the life of Dhanayakumāra, son of Dhanapala, a Vaiśya of Ujjain, who by his devotion was regarded as a Saint. He wrote poems Sudarsana-carita, Śripāla-carita, and Vīśabhānucarita Mahāvīrapuruṣa is an extensive work.

---

1. Printed, Benares, Hirāvijaya was born in Sam, 1589. PR, IV, 98
2. Bh ORI, 92. The epilogue mentions Jain priests honored by Emperor Akbar.
3. P, (1888-4), 118. PR, IV, 143, 149, 156. PR, V, list of authors.
4. PR, IV, lxxv.
5. BR, (1892 3), 48.
6. PR, III, 255.
7. Bod Cat, 392.
9. DO, XXI, 8123.
12. DO, XX, 8103, PR, IV, 189.
13. Printed, Bombay.
233 Vadirajasuri alias Sanmukha, a Jaina ascetic, was called Dvāḍaśavidyāpāti, probably on account of his proficiency in twelve arts. His Yasodharacaritā is a poem narrating the life of Yasodhara, son of Yasodhara and Candrāvaṭi of Ujjain, a saintly King of Jaina sect. He also composed Pārśvanāṭhacaritā.

234 Somacaritragnani’s Gurugunarāṭnākara describes the life of Laksāmīsaraṇagaṇu of Ṭapāgacca. It was written in 1485 A.D. and is of great value of Gujarāt history.

235 Other Jaina poems are here collected

Pṛthvīcandracaritā of Śāntisūrī (Sam 1225),
Nemināṭhacaritā of Ratnaprabha, pupil of Vādideva (Sam 1233),
Kuvalayamālakāthā of Ratnaprabha, pupil of Paramāṇanda,
Puṣyasārakāthānaka of Vivekasamudraganī, pupil of Jinesvara (Sam 1334),
Vijayacandrācārīya of Candraprabha (Sam 1127),
Harivikramacaritā of Jayatilaka, (about Sam 1350),
Ādināṭhacaritā of Vardhamāṇācārya, (about Sam 1330),
Vāsūpūjyācārīya of Vardhamāṇa, pupil of Vījaysimha,
Pṛthvīcandracaritā of Satyarājagana,
Pṛthvīcandracaritā of Jayāgara, pupil of Jinarāja (Sam 1503),
Paramahamsacaritā by Nayāranga, pupil of Guṇasekhara (Sam 1624).

Abhayakūmāracharitā of Candratilaka, pupil of Jinesvara (Sam 1312),
Prabhāvakacaritā of Prabhācandra (Sam 1334),
Kāvyamanohara

1. Printed, Bombay DC, XXI 818. There is a commentary on it by Lākṣmana.
2. There is another poem of the same name by Kṛṣṇākalyāṇa, printed in Bombay and composed in Sam 1839 (1788 A.D). See Jes Cat, 42, PR, IV 162.
3. Printed, Bombay.
5. Jes Cat, 67. This was composed at Kumārapāla’s Court.
7. Printed Bombay. This is a Sanskrit rendering of Dākṣīṇyacacitaśuri’s prakṛti work (Jes Cat, 48) composed about the middle of the 13th century A.D. He calls it a campū. He mentions earlier poets (now unknown) Pīṣalīpa, Saṭāparṇaka, Vimalāńka, Devagupta, Prabhanjana. In PR, II 25, Haribhadra is wrongly named as the author of this poem.
9. PR, VI List of authors.
10. Ibid., 1.
11. Ibid., 24. The manuscript was written in Sam 1837.
12. Ibid., 47. This contains many styles of poetry and prose.
13. Ibid., 68.
14. Ibid., 57.
15. Printed Bhownagar, Jes Cat, 4.
16. Printed Bombay. There is another work of the same name by Candraprabhā (Printed Bombay).
of Mahesvara (Sam 1304),1 Vardhamanacarita of Asaga, pupil of Nagunandin (Sam 1679),2 Uktiranathakara of Sadhusundara alas Sadhu-raja, pupil of Devasundara,3 Pârvanâthacarita of Bhâvadeva,4 Jambhâswâmiarâti of Jinâsâ,5 Pârvavatâvâna of Padmaprabhârdeva,6 Mallacarîti of Vinayacandra,7 Minekutraiya of Devanâtha, Jagadgurucarita of Suvarpânanda, Sântinâthacarita of Munindra, and another of Bhâvacandra, Candra-prabhâswâmicarîti of Devendra,8 Amâmaswâmicarîti of Muniratnasûrya,9 Upamitibhavaprapancakathâ of Siddharî,10 Suântinâthacarita of Munisunandarâ,11 Canda-prabhavijnâyâ of Râvigation,12 Mallacarîti of Bhrusundarâ,13 and Nagakumarakavya of Mallusena,14 Munisuvrañâkavya of Arhatdása,15 Pradyumncarîti (I) of Mahûsenâcârya alas Pappadâguru, pupil of Cârûkirti,16 and (II) of Yashodhara,17 Bhadrabhâhucarîti of Ratnânandâ,18 Candra-prabhâvijnâyâ of Râvigation,19 Neminirvâja of Vâgbhata 20

Virollîsa of Bhrusundi, and Nagakumarâkavya of Mallusena,21 Munisuvrañâkavya of Arhatdása,22 Pradyumncarîti (I) of Mahûsenâcârya alas Pappadâguru, pupil of Cârûkirti,23 and (II) of Yashodhara,24 Bhadrabhâhucarîti of Ratnânandâ,25 Candra-prabhâvijnâyâ of Râvigation,26 Neminirvâja of Vâgbhata 27

[Kumârasambhava of Jayâsekharâ, Pârvanâthacarita of Bhâvadeva, Dhânyacarita of Jânîkîti, Prabhâvakacarita of Candra-prabhâ, Bhaktamarakâthâ of Rovamalla, Malayasundarâkâthâ of Mûnîkya-sundara]

1 Int to Abhramaksâkavyastra (GOS), 86
2 PR, IV 128; DC, XXI 5188
3 He was also author of Yântakalpa-râiti written in Sam. 1455. See PR, IV, V xxvi, Klett, IA, XI, 255
4 Printed Bombay Probably composed at Avantî in Sam 1432 (PR, IV 195 XV Last of authors) He was also the author of Kalikaçâryakathânâka (PR, I Ap 80)
5 Mys, OML 246, PR, V
6 PR, III Ap 212, with commentary by Nûnâkhâta
7 PR, IV 144 His pupil Dharmaçâsa was also a poet. He lived about Sâm. 1288
8 Gough, 87, 95, 98, 106.
9 PR, III 87-89
10 PR, III 42, 41 and App 168, IV 129 gives the year 903.
11 Jes Cat 54.
12 Ibîd., 87
13 Printed, Benares
14 Mys, OML, 247, 251 This latter work throws light on Nâga history. See Mys Arch Rep (1924), 10
15 Ibîd., 853 CAL, II 276 with commentary
16 Printed, Bhownagar TC, IV 5398. The same story is told in the play Pradâpanaka (DC, XXI, 58677) of unknown authorship
17 DC, XX 793
18 DC, XX 7940
19 PR, IV, ov PR, I Ap 68.
CHAPTER X

Mahakavyas (contd)

SECTION 1

236 Caturbhujas Harcarntakāvyā is a poem in 13 cantos on the adventures of Kṛṣṇa composed on 1493 A.D. at Rāmakeli, a suburb of the Gauda capital of Bengal, then under the rule of Khojas and Habsis. As soon as he was born his father wrote some verse on his tongue with a golden pen tipped in honey and he became a poet. His son Kamalākara wrote a commentary on Lolambarāja's Harvilāsa-kāvyā and Ghatakarpars.

237 Divakara was son of Vaidyeśvara and Muktāmbā of Bhāradvāja Gotra. He was in the court of King Kṛṣṇadevarāja of Vaiṣṇavāg (1509-1529 A.D.) from King Rudra he says he got the title Kavīcandrarāja. His brother Mahānāsudāna wrote Dhūraḍarat-bhāva. Besides the play Pānīḍatkarana, Rasamanjarī, and Devisūṭi, he wrote the poem Bhūrātāmṛta in more than 40 cantos on the story of Mahābhārata.

238 Ekamranatha was born in Kondavidu. He came to the Court of Immacul Ankuṣa of Rāṇa family, of 16-17th century A.D. In his two poems, Jāmbavatiparmāṇa and Satyāpārīnāya, he gives the genealogy of Ankuṣa and a running history of his patron and his ancestors which furnishes valuable history. He also wrote the poem Virabhadrāvijaya. At the beginning of the poems, as usual the poet gives a lengthy account of the family of his patrons. Among the members of the fourth caste (Sudras) was a family which became famous as the Rāṇa vamsa. In that family was born Imma who married Mallamma. Their descendants are represented in the following genealogical table:

1. BKR, 17. CC, III. 156.
2. PR, III. 45, 898.
3. IUC, 2525.
4. See para 132 supra.
5. It is apparently different from Dhūraḍaratappahāsata mentioned in Śāṅkheśa-darpana, 533.
6. TC, IV. 4869, 5602 The last verse now available is

    चक्रके च तं तहन केशावपति सत्यपारिणाय सुधर्षकृष्ण ।
    पारासारिनाय श्रेष्ठता संविभा मयस्वय यथा विवाद. ॥

7. CEB, 242 where another poem of this name by Mukṭēsvara is mentioned.
8. DC, XX, 1732, 1739.
Of these chiefs Jagadeka Raya or Pedda Jagadeka Raya is said to have fought with the ruler of Burana Nagari (the City of Burhan, Nizam Shah and defeating him, to have captured innumerable horses and elephants. Of his sons Jagadeka Raya was the most famous. In a battle he is said to have captured as prisoner a Muhammadan chief Chittakhan, defeated the troops of Nuru Khan and Murtiya Khan and killed the chief Sujata Khan.

239. Venkatesa was the son of Śrīnvasa of Āthreyagotra. Born near Kāncī in 1593 A.D., he lived for more than fifty years. His Rāmacandrodāya is a long poem of thirty cantos describing the history Rāma and was composed at Benares in 1635 A.D. So is his Yama-kārṇava composed in 1656 A.D.

240. Utpreksavallabha, whose real name appears to be Gokula, was a votary of Śiva and was also known as Śivabhaktādāsa. He lived in Malabar about the 16th Century A.D. His Bhiksātanakāvya, in 40 Paṭḍhāṭis, is a fine poem describing "how Śiva went about as a mendicant for alms from Rājarāja Cola King to test his liberality and how the appearance of Śiva influenced the women of the City". The poem is replete with descriptions of high fancy, interspersed with didactic matter. He wrote Sundarīsātaka at the request of King Maḍana.
241 **Venkatekranayajan** was the son of Venkatādīn of Vādhulagotra and wrote at the instance of King Gopāla, son of Dādāji and grandson of Bālījī, brahmin of Vasisthagotra and Metukārī family. King Gopāla ruled as a feudatory of Sivachātrajpati near Chidambaram in 17th century A.D. His *Nātisavijaya* in 7 cantos describes the story of the vanquishment of Kāli at Cidambarīm by Siva by his cosmic dance.

242 **Srinivasa**, son of Varada of Viravallī family and Kaundinyagotra, lived at Śrīmūṇaī early in the 17th century A.D. In his poem *Bhuvaharajāyā*, in eight cantos, he describes the Varāha incarnation, the sacrifice performed at Śrīmūṇaī, the destruction of demon, Dandaka’s father, and Bhūvarahā’s marriage with Lakṣmī. He wrote several other works, of which Ambujavallīlīdaka, Śrīvarāha-cūṁkā, Dhyāna-cūṁkā, and Śrīrangadandaka are in prose. Among his 1st poems are Ambujavallipāramaya, Varāhavijaya, Varahacampū, Vakulamālīmītāparānaya, Śrīdīvycaritra, and commentaries on *Māgha, Raghuvāmaṣa, Nāvadha*, and *Amaruka*.

His son Varadadesika was equally great. Besides *Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa-cāntātra*, *Raghuvāra-vijaya*, *Rāmāyaṇasangraha*, *Ambujavalliṭāṭaka*, and Śrīvarāhasātaka, he wrote Gadyarāmāyana, narrating in prose the story of the Rāmāyaṇa. Varadadesika’s son was Appalācārya and the latter’s son Venkatavarada wrote the drama *Krṣṇavijaya* and in the prologue the works of many of his ancestors are described.

243 **Gangadasa** was son of Gopālaḍāsa of Vadya caste. In six chapters, he describes in his *Chandomanjarī*, the varieties of metres and illustrates them by verses in praise of Kṛṣṇa. He also wrote *Ācyutacārīta*, a poem in 16 cantos and *Dīnasaḥcarīta* in praise of the Sun. His father wrote a play *Parnāṭṭhaharana*.

244 **Abhinava Ramanujacārya** bore the title of Śrī Mahābhārata-Kaṇṭhīravacārya. He was the son of Venkatāraya of Nāḍhruva-kāsya-pagotra of the family of Vādībhakesarin. He was probably a contemporary of Lāmmāgāpatī (of Karvatnagar) of the 19th century. His *Śrīnivasaśaṅkunakara* is a poem in seven cantos describing the greatness of Śrī Venkatesa of Tirupati. He wrote his own

1. *DC, XX 7947*.  
2. *DC, XX 7903*.  
3. *DC, XX 8569*.  
4. *Rd. everywhere with commentary, 10C, 305*.  
5. *UD, 1, 945*.  

---

*DO, XX 969.*
commentary on the first 8 cantos and his brother's son Varadarāja wrote a commentary on the rest of the poem.

245 Kṛṣṇarama was a professor in Śrīvaḍa in Jaipur State about 1900 A.D. In his Kacchavamsa and Jayapuranātā, he described the greatness of the rulers of Jaipur. Among many poems he wrote are Āryālkārṇatā, Palāndusatā, Mukṭaka, Mukūvat, Holamahotsava and Sārasatā, a poetical epitome of several important Sanskrit works in meters. He wrote Chandaschālāmārṇa.

246 Laksmanasuri was the son of Mathusubba Iyer of Punalveli near Srīvillipuṭṭur, in Rāmnād. He lived between 1859-1919 A.D. He was well-versed in all the šrāstras and was given the title Mahāmahopādhyāya. He was Professor of Sanskrit in the Pachayappa's College, Madras. His Kṛṣṇalilāmṛta is a long poem on the story of Kṛṣṇa. Among his minor poems are Viprasandasa, Mīlanasandesa and Venkatesastava. His play Delhi-Sāmrājya represents the story of Durbar of King George V at Delhi and Paulastavyadha the story of Rāmāyaṇa. His commentaries on Anāgarakhaṇa, Uttaṛāmacarita, Mahāvīracarita, Veḷusamhāra, Bālahāmāyaṇa and Raṭṭāvali are well-known. He revised the broken fragments of Madana's Paryatamanjari.

In the field of simple prose he has set an example. His Bhīṣmapāvijayā narrates the life of Bhīṣma, the great Kaurava warrior and imports the ideal of virtue and discipline. His Bhīçrasangraha and Rāmāyaṇasaṅgraha are easy epitomes of Mahābārata and Rāmāyaṇa.

247 Ganapati Sastri was the son of Ramasubba Iyer. He was born at Taruvai, in Tinnevelly district in 1860 A.D. He attained high proficiency in Sanskrit study very early and in his seventeenth year wrote a drama Mādhavivasañta. He was principal of the Sanskrit College, Trivandrum and latterly Curator of Sanskrit publications, in Trivandrum, under the patronage of the Maharajah of Travancore. The title of Mahāmahopādhyāya was conferred on him. He passed away a few years ago. His name has been known to the world as the discoveror of Bhāsa's lost dramas. His researches in literary history are of high merit and they are embodied in the introduction to the many works in the series. His original works are many. He has commented on the plays of Bhāsa and edited them himself.

1 See Sivadatta's Introduction to Naiṣadha. Another work on Jñāpa is Jñāṇagatapancaranga of Mallaśhēta Harivallabhā (Printed, Bāmbay).
2 Some of his works have been printed in Mādras.
Among his poems are Śrīmūlakaṇṭa, a history of Kings of Travancore, Bhāraṭāvaraṇana, a description of India, Tulāpurūṣadānakāvyya, on the Tulābhāra ceremony in the palace, Aparnāṣṭava in praise of Pārvatī, and Cakravartīnīguṇamālā, on the greatness of Queen Victoria. His Arṭhacārttramālā is a rhetorical work with illustrations in praise of King Visākhā Rāma Varma, Mahārāja of Travancore.

By far the most appreciable of his works is Seivatārnārāmanana, a romance in learned but easy Sanskrit prose with its theme the description of a pilgrimage to Ramesvaram. It describes and decries many of the social evils of the day and impresses on the reader's mind, the sanctity and utility of Hindu ideals.

248 Nilakantha Sarma is the son of Punnasserī Nambi Nārāyana Sarma. He was born in 1858 and is one of the famous living authors of Malabar. He maintains the Sanskrit College at Pattāmbi and edits a journal in Sanskrit Viñäna-Cintīmanu. Besides works on astrology, he wrote poems, Paṭṭhabhisēkaprabhāṇa, Sālabhīṣasastaaka, and Āryāsaṭṭaka.

249 Vidhusakhara Bhattachārya of Santimketan, Bengal, is a great Sanskrit and Bengali scholar. Besides works in Pāli, he wrote poems in Sanskrit, Yauvanavilāsa, Umāparinaya, Haracandracarita, and Cīvānīlāsa and romance Canḍraprabhā. He is the editor of Mitra-gōsthī, a Sanskrit Journal in Benares.

Section 2

250 Poems on the story of Mahābhārata are Pāndavabhuyudaya (R No 391), Taruṇabhārata (TC, IV 5116), Abhinavabhārata of Narasappamāṇṭra (DC, XX 7690), Pāndavavijaya by Hemacandrarāya Kavibhūṣana (Printed, Patna), Pāndavacarita by Lakṣmīdevī Devīprabha (CC, I 537), Vikramabhārata by Śrīsvarvidyālakāra (Printed, Calcutta), Bhāratodayotha of Citrabhānu.

251. Poems on Śrī Kṛṣṇa are Rādhāvīnoḍa by Rāmacandra, son of Janārdana (PR, II 396, Tany Cal., VII 2829) with commentary by Trilokanātha (CC, I 505) and by Bhatta Nārāyana (Matra, IV 299), Kṛṣṇābhuyudaya (i) by Flayavalli ŚrīnivasasRaghava, son of Venkatācārya of Kausikagōtra (TC, IV 5962, Mys OML 244), and (u) by Varadadesika, son of Appāyārya of Ātreyagoṭra (DC, XX 7726), Kṛṣṇa-rājunya (Ibid 7731), Yadunāthacarita (Ibid 7795), Kṛṣṇabhākticandrikā of

1. The manuscripts of these works are now in the author's home.
2. The manuscript is with M. Ramakrishna Kavi, M. A., Madras.
Anantadeva (PR, II 23, 103) Kṛṣṇacarita (TC, IV 5893), Kṛṣṇavimoda by Motirāma (Oudh, IV. 9), Kṛṣṇaṇkṛitā by Kesāvārka (Oṣf [341], Kṛṣṇabhāvanāṁtra (CC, I 121), Kṛṣṇacarita by Mānaveda² (TC, III 4032), Kṛṣṇalilā by Madana (CC, I 123), Kṛṣṇalīlābhāvanāṇa and Kṛṣṇalīlāsāra (Opp II 3329, 4538), Kṛṣṇavilāsa (i) by Prabhākara (Opp 1427, 2590), and (n) by Śeśadīkṣā (Rice, 230), Kṛṣṇavilāsacaritamañjara (Opp II 4539), Kṛṣṇacandrodaya by Govinda, son of Śrīnivāsa of Atreyagotra (TC, IV 5677)

Govindaalīā by Rāmacandra (Printed, Benares), Aisvarjakadambral by Vidyābhūsana (CC, I 76), Kṛṣṇacaritamṛta and Kṛṣṇabhāvanāṁtra [CSC, (1907), 17], Kṛṣṇāmṛtamahāhāravā (Opp II 65), and Vrajavilāsa [CSC(1908), 76], Viśāpakṣnumāṇa of YadunandanaṆāda [CSC (1908), 72], Kṛṣṇabhaktakāvya of Anantadeva (PR, III App 394), Bhāgavatodyota of Citrabhānu, etc [Kṛṣṇalīlābhāvanā of Daḍātreya, Kṛṣṇavilāsa of Pupyaṅkota, Kṛṣṇābhuyadayā of Tīmmapayavan and of Vāradarājājayavan, Bālabhāgavata, and Bhāgavatāmraitā, Mukundavilāsa of Nīlakantha, Govindaalīā) (CAL, II 4, 510, 66)

Premendusagara by Rūpagoswāmi (CC, I 36), Premoktyudaya (CC, I 365), Premāmracampū by Candradāsa (CC, I 365), Rādhāsudhākara (Opp 6165), Rādhāmānatarangunī (composed in Sam 1696) by Nandakumārāsarma in the reign of King Candra of Navaḍvīpa and Rādhārasamāñjāri by Caṇṭhacandra (CC, I 504), Rādhārasudhānādī by Hīta Harvamsa Goswāmin with commentary by Narottama (IO, 146), Rādhārahasya by Kṛṣṇadatta (PR, III 362), Rādhāvītā by Dmeṣa and with commentary by Nārāyaṇa, son of Rangānātha (CC, I 505), Rādhāvītā (CC, I 505), Rādhāsoudāyamānajāri by Subalacandra-cārya (CC, I 505), Kṛṣṇavijaya by Rāmacandra (CC, I 511), Gopālalīā by Rāmacandra (Printed, Bombay) and Bṛndāvānamānajāri by Mānasimha (CC, I 899), Bṛndāvānavītā by Rudranyāyavācaspatī (CC, I, 599), Vrajavītā by Śrīdharasvāmin (Printed, Haberlin), Vrajaendracaritā by Sadānanda (Bik, 249), Kṛṣṇābhuyadayā by Vāradarājājayavan (CAL, II 4), Mukundavilās by Rādhītāmanitarītha (CC, II 105), Harīlīā by Bopaḍeva (CC, I 760, OR, III. 390), Harkeśīlāvati by Kavakesari (HPR, I 421), Harīvītā by Kavīsekharā, son of Yasodhacandra (IO, 1177), Kṛṣṇalīā by Kṛṣṇamsrta (HPR, II 41), Kṛṣṇabhāvanāṁtra (IO, 1180), Kṛṣṇalīā by Madana, son of Kṛṣṇa (IO, 2538), Kṛṣṇalīā-

---

1 See para 176 supra
2 The manuscript is with M. Ramakrishna Kavi, M A, Tirupati, more than 400 years old. See Ośtrabhānu's commentary on Bhācāvi (TSS Trivandrum)
Mahā-Kāvyā

Vāsudevacanāta in Veṣūdatta, son of Jagjīrāṇa (IOC, 584-1479); II

IIaṁvamsa-sūrya (CC, I 750), Bālaharīvamsa by Sāṇkara Nārāyaṇa (Mys OML 270), Kāmsanādhana by Rāma (PR, III 393), Śṛi-krṣṇa-carita (TC, IV 5406), Gopālahavīvaka (HPR, II 176), Rasakalpasārata-vya by Brundāvanadāsa (HPR, I 307), Rasalpaśnamādhvāṇi by Ananyaḍiśasāvyum (CC, I 105), Rāsārasadāya (C.I 158, 164)

Kṛṣṇayāna is a work on the life of Kṛṣṇa in imitation of Rāmāyaṇa. As the latter was called Adīkāvyā, this is called Anantarukāvyā. The style is charming, but the manuscript breaks off in the 7th canto. It is stated to have been related by Bhāradvāja, and must have been a production of the 12th or 13th century by a follower of Rāmānuja cult. He says he describes the origin of the world according to Purāṇas, Smṛtis and Rāmānuja (DC, XX 7729)

252 Poems on Rāmāyaṇa are Rāmavilāsa, Rāmacaritra of Rāghunātha, Uḍārārghava of Candīśuṅgakavi, Kālyāṇarāmacraya of Śeṣākavi, Bhadrāṅga-Rāmāyaṇa of Vīrārghava, Rāmakathāsudhodaya of Śūḍāla Śrīnivāsa, Rāmāṅkita of Vēṅkaṭarāngī, and Yudhavārghāvīya of Naṭarāma (Mys OML. 254-5); Rāghuvirāvarya-carita of Tīrṇulakonayāya (Ibid Sup 11), Daṇḍanavadhana by Yogindraṇatha (Printed, Calcutta), Rāghuviracarita by Sukumāra (Trav Cat, 86)

Siṭārāmavilāśa by Lakṣmīnāsomayāya, son of Organti Śeṅkara (JO, 1481), Rāmagunākara by Rāmādeva [Mitha, (1872) 315, CC, I 510], Rāmalīkhetākavya by Padmanāhā (CASBR, 163, composed 1839 AD), Rāmāvilasa by (i) Rāmacarana and (ii) Harinātha (Ol, 132, 214)

Rāmacandrakāvyā of Saṁbhū Kāhūḍa (Tay Cat, VI 2837), Udārārghāva (DC, XX 7094), Prasannarāmacraya of Devāradīkā, son of Śrīpāla (DC, XII 7780), Rāmacandrodaya of Kavīvallabhā (Ibid, 7844), Rāmacarita of Vīśvakṣena (Ibid 7846); Rāghavovilāṣa (i) by

1. See under Subhāṣita post.
Advanta Rāma Bhāṣṣu (CC, I 500, IO, 1138, 1479) and (u) by Pujyapāda Devānanda (CC, I 500), Āscaryarāmāyaṇa (Opp, II 3108), Bīlārāgahavīya by Sāthagopācārya (Opp, II 590), Sīlārāgahavīya (CC, I 485), Ramaṭīva- rāghava by Brahmadaṭṭa (Ric, 240), Abhurāmākavīya by Rāmanātha (CC, I 26), Rāmakutūhala by Rāmesvara, son of Govinda (composed in 1680 A.D). "Ov", 198), Rāmakautuka by Kamalākara, son of Rāma- kṛṣṇa, (IO, 107, 1487), Rāmakathāmṛta by Girdharadāsa (VII, 436, 488), Rāmagunākara by Rāmadeva Nyāyālankāra (CC, I 510), Rāma- vilāsa-kāvya by Rāmacarata Ṭarkavāgīṣa and by Harinātha (CC, I 179, 518), Rāmacarita (i) by Kāsinātha and (ii) by Mohanasvāmi (IO, 978, 1184), Rāmailīdāya by Rāmakānta, son of Bātesvara (CC, I 518), Rāmābhiseka by Kesava (BTC, 161), Rāmakṛṣṇa by Rāmananda- tṛtha (CC, I 507), Rāmābhuyudava by Venkatesa (BTC, 161, 214) Rāmābhuyudayatilaka (Opp, 1355), Situkantharāmāyana by Stīñikantha (Opp, 663).

Śīrāmāvijaya (Opp 6693), Raghuviravilāsa by Laksmana, son of Dāmodara of Bāhāradvājagotra (TC, IV 5460), Raghupātivantīya by Gopinātha (CC, III 104), Rāmacarita by Mohanasvāmi (IO, 978, 1481), Rāmacandrodāya (i) by Purusottamamistra (Opp, II 3780, TC, IV, 4805), (ii) by Rāmadāsa (TC, II 2318), Rāmacandramahodāya by Saccidanānda (CC, I 587), Rāmakṛṣṇa by Bālakṛṣṇa (CC, III 108), Rāmaratnākara by Madhuvaṇṭa (Ondh, V 6), Rāmarasāmṛta by Śrīdhara (CC, I 512), Rāmacandrodāya by Kavīvallabha (Trav Cat 156).

Raghunādanavilāsa (i) by Venkatacārya (CAL, II 12) and (ii) by Pātra- cārya son of Sāthagopa Tātācārya, probably of Kumbakondhi (TC, III 2931), Vikramarāghavaya by Natanakālidāsa (CAL, II 15, Śīrāpātī- vijaya, (Ibid, 16), Paulastyarāghavīya by Rāmacandra of Puleial family (TC, II 2410), Śrīrāmavijaya by a puṣṭ of Arunācalānātha (TC, IV. 5140), Uttararāgahavīya (DC, XX 7694), Raghunāthā gunoḍa by Natyacandidasatīya (SKC, 71, composed in 1570 A.D.), Bālārāmarasāyaṇa by Kṛṣṇa Sāstrei (CAL, II 8), Rāmāyagārasaṃgraha by Isvarālikīṣṭa (CAL, II 14), Lalitārāgavaya by Śrīnīvāsa Raoṭha, Jānakyanāhlabodha by Śripāṭi Govinda (Mitra, II. 193, IO, 1489), Rāmaśingāmṛta by Advasta, son of Bāyabhatta of Benares, composed in

1. He wrote his Śādiṭyaśāntavārttikā in 1701 A.D. (IO 518).
2. He also wrote poems Venkatesvaravijaya and Kṛṣṇarājāvijaya (Opp 8852, 8856) and plays Umāṭṭaprabhasana and Bāhunprabhārahasana and Raghava- manḍanaṭaka (RTC, 272).
3. It was probably he that wrote Mohanasaptāṅgī (CC, I 466).
Saka 1530 (JO, 1483), Sitarāmāṅhāra by Lakṣmānā, son of Sankara of Organ family (TC, III 3215 IOC, 3918-19)

253 Miscellaneous Poems on Weddings are here collected Padmiparṇānaya by Vedāntācārya and Malayāparṇānaya (CAL, II 8), Pārvaṭiparṇānaya by Īśvarasuraṭi (BTC, 159), Īnāmudrāparṇānaya (Opp, II 3648), Sāvītriparṇānaya by Varādācārya (Ruc, 244), Sundarīsvaravāra (Opp, 3077), Rukmiparṇānaya by Goivinda, son of Lakṣmāna (CC, II 34), Sātparṇānaya by Candrākānta Tarkāḷavārā (Printed, Dacca), Maḍrakanyāparṇānaya (Mys OML, 251), Gataṭākāparṇānaya of Sankara-śubrahmanya (Ibid, 247, TC, IV 5466), Rukmānirāghavānā by Goivindanathā (Printed, Bombay), Saflparṇānaya by Chandrābhaṇa Tarkalika (Puttied, Dacca), Madrakanyaparṇānaya (Mys OML, 251), Tatatakaparṇānaya of Sankara-śubrahmanya (Ibid, 247, TC, IV 5466), Rukṭmāniparṇānā by Goivindanathā (Printed, Bombay), Saflparṇānaya (Gough, 187), Sātparṇānaya by Śūryarāyaṇaśādhvaru (DC, XX 7904, TC, II 1206, 1603), Sītākalyāṇa (Opp 2487, 6692), Gaṇakalyāṇa by Govinda (TC, IV. 4204-8), Rukmānirāgavānā by Govindanathā (Printed, Bombay, see also CAL, 16 where author’s name is not given), Vādābīparṇānaya by Kāśīnātha (CC, I 660), Saṭyabhāmāparṇānaya by Rāmācārya (Ruc 244) and by Kṛṣṇa (CAL, II 141), Ramesvaravānāvā by Rāghanuṭhā of the Court of Mūthūrāmalīṅga Sētpuṭa of Rāmnād (TC, II. 1805), Hemōdvāhā by Śīrssvar Viḍyālankara (Printed, Cutcuta), Aṃbukāparṇānaya (BTC, 156), Vakulamāṇiparṇānaya (TO, IV 4675), Veḍavulliparṇānaya by Rāmānūṇa (CAL, II 141)

Lakṣmīkāvya of Utamārāṇa liruralādhīśa in 18 cantos describes the marriage of Lakṣmī, daughter of a Cola king, with God Raganātha of Srīrangam and a festival relating to it.

254 Miscellaneous Poems on Puranic Themes Kāma-kīvīlāsā (Opp, II 8832), Indrābhuddaya by Raghavaṇīya (Ruc, 226) and Raghunāṭha (CAL, II 136), Cakrapāṇīkāvya by Lakṣmīmadhura (CC, I 175), Pancatānterakāvya by Dharmapandita (NP, IX 14), Śīsugīlākathā (Opp, 7420), Draupadīyupatī (Ruc, 230), Draupadīvasṭrāharāva by Govardhana (PR, III 394), Tārakāṣuravādhā (Opp, 5980), Candraprabhavijaya by Ravnupāta (CC, I 180), Candraprabhāya by Dhananjaya (Opp, II 434), Citrabhānukāvya by Harihara (CC, I 762), Mūnketudaya by Ṛṣivanāṭha (CC, I 455), Yayṣadīgvyāya (CC, I 469), Kakūsthanvijaya (CC, I 550), Syāmāṇakaprabandha (Opp, 6292), Usāharana by Harṣānāṭha (CC, I 764), Hariyendrakāvya by Hari (CC, I 769), Kumārīvilāṣā by Sudarṣana on the story of Kanyākumārī (TC, IV 5638), Vajresvarikāvya by Jagaṇaṭṭha (Radh, 22), Rukmāṅgadīya by Padmanābha (CC, I 527);

1 TC, II 1768 The preface gives the names of Śrī Vaippava teachers of Srīrangam
Jagannāthavijaya (n) by Rudrabhatta (CC, I 528), and (n) by Venkāmātya (Mys, OML, 633), Karpūramanjanī by Rajanivallabha (CC, I 82), Cakrapānivijaya (CC, I 123), Candikāṇṭamahākāvyav (CC, I 176), Prabhādavijaya by Kathānātha (Mys OML 634), Kūmāravijaya by Rāmasūri (Mys OML, 9), Kārttikeyavijaya by Girvanendra (Ibid, 243), Kharanidhāna (DC, XX 7816), Kūpāḷaprabandha on the story of Kūrīṇijuniya (DC, XX 7913), Kārttikeyodaya by Candracūdā [Mitra Bik series, 296, CSC, (1904) 13], Bānavijaya by Sīvarāma (OC, III 78), Narakāsurasvijaya by Mādhyavāmātya (Tay Cat IV 2772), Devāvaṭarana by Sīvarāma on the myths of the shrine at Tirukkandiyur (Tay Cat VI 2778), Śāradātilaka by Śeṣagīrī describing the festival at Śrīrangam (Tay Library).

Lingalālāvīlasacarita by Mahālūnga (Rice, 322), Dhruvacarita, Prabhādacarita, Vāmanacitracarita, Govardhanadṛṣṭakpāṇacarita, and Ajāmilopakhyāna by Jayakīma (CC, I 199), Hariscandracarita (CC, I 761), Candracūḍacarita by Umāpatidhara (CC, I 180), Varasaśītacarita (Opp, 7392), Haradaṭṭhacarita (Opp 3896), Kalyāṇarājacarita by Madana (Oaf, 127), Kārttikeyacarita, Nandicarita and Prājapatīcarita by Kṛṣṇa (NW, 442, 478), Usācarita, Kuberacarita, Gauracarita, Vaiśākharacarita, Mārkendeyacarita by Brindāvana Sūkla (NW, 440), Paḍmapāṇacarita, Manīkavākyacarita, Viḍyāraṇyacarita, Sudhāmacarita by Śrīmüśā (CAL, II 25), Śivabhaktacarita (HR, III 2189), Vancīpuranāṭhacarita by Navaniśkara (Ibid 2186), Ambarisacarita (Mys OML Sup 91), Śivacarita by Kaviśvāsilakahara (HR, II 1094); Ujjvanacarita by Raghunandana (IO, 823), Candravamsa by Candrākānta Tarkalankāra (Printed, Calcutta), Kṛṣṇajuniya (DC, XX 7731), Candrāmgaḍacarita by Śankaraṇa, and Sūrīndracarita on the story of Indra and Ahalyā (DC, XX 7905), Sīvanālī by Rājānaka Gopala (CC, I 651), Gangāvatāra by Śankara (IO, 119), Maṭsyaprānpanda (TC, IV, 4436).

Sāmbhuviśāsa by Viśvanātha (IO, 1148); Gangādhavijaya by Venkatasubba (CAL, II 8), Vikramānacarita by Hamsakān; Hariscandroāḍaya by Anantāsūrya, Markandeyodaya by Venkatāsūrya, Sudarśanavijaya by Sundarabāhu, Ambarisacarita, Kuncelavīṭṭa by Bhatta Nārayana, Kārttikeyavijaya by Gīvāṇendravajvan, Kūmāravijaya by Śivacaraṭareṇu, Śrīnivasakāvyava by Ṭrīymbaka, son of Śrīdhara, Gūrvāmsakāvyava by Lakṣmīmaṇḍūri, Virolāsa by Bṛhasundara, Viṣvadeśika-

1 This post is not the same as author of Kṛṣṇavīlasakāvyava (See para supra).
2 He died 6 years ago Manuscript is with Bhāskara Brahma of Adoni.
254-A Navilpakam Rāmānujaçarya (Caṭurvedi Saṭakraṭu) wrote Padmanābhakhadga and Rāmānujākhadga. He passed away about 1935. His son Sundarācārya wrote Hanumadvilāsa, Astaprāsa, and Komalāmbākucāṣṭaka.

Valathur Varada Viśu Ācārya lived near Ayyampet, Tanjore and wrote Bhāratakhadga.  

Mahāmahopādhyāya Kamalakṣṇa Smṛtiṣṭhā was born in March 1870 in a family of Pandits at Bhatpara near Calcutta and died on January 25, 1934. He edited several smṛti texts and composed poetry mostly of panegyric and topical character.

254 B Kesavasuri, popularly known R. Kesava Aiyangar, M.A., B.L., is the son of Rājam Aiyangar of Bhāradvājagotra. He was born in Nandana (1892-1893) at Chakravalanallur near Devipatnam in Rāmnad District, (Madras). He is an Advocate of the Madras High Court. His heritage of poetry has manifested itself in a series of devotional poems, which in point of grace, piety or eloquence vie with similar enlogies of our great religious teachers. Among his stotras are Śrīkeśavavastava, Śrisatyanāthāsthastava, Śrīlakṣīṃharasimhaśthastava.

254 C Ramakrsnasarman known as Kuppusāmi Ayya (Nāgapūdi) was born about 1854. He has now retired from practice as a lawyer and lives at Tirupati. His Śṭavaraṇāvali, a lyric in praise of various deities, exhibits an ardent devotion.

254-D. Somakāvi (Allamaraju) is son of Sītārāmāyya and lives at Chebrole near Pittapuram. He wrote Cātudhāra, Camasākarasarāmi and Ādiṭṭhakarnāṃṭa.

254 E Varadacārya is son of Nārāyaṇa of Śrīvatsagotra. He was born in Ąurmukhi (1896) and lives at Tanapalli near Tirupati. He wrote Karṇabhāskarasamvāda, Bhagavadhāyanasopāna, and Sāyant Ṭanīṣagaravela and has translated Tagore’s Renunciation into Sanskrit verse.

254 F Vijayaraghava Acarya (Viravalī) is the son of Varadārya of Kaundinyagotra. He was born at Malayur near Kānci in 1884.
254 G Sadakṣara was the son of Mahādeva and Gangadevi. He was born at Yalandur in Mysore State in Saka 1536 (1614 AD). He was one of the famous galaxy of poets who graced the Court of Karnāta King Cikadevarāja. Blessed with a divine poesy by birth his name soon became glorious. Sadakṣara bore the title of Kavikunjara. Besides several poems in Canarese he wrote in Sanskrit a major poem Rasārṇava or Kavikarnaraśāna (24 cantos) and minor poems Ratāvali, Kavikoti, Ambāstaka, and Bhadravatava. He passed away in his 22nd year in Saka 1556. He studied under Vasavarāja and admired Vāsavarāja’s Kāvyamimāṃsā on which Pundakavi wrote a commentary.

254 H Banesvara Vidyalankara (Sobhākara) was the son of Rāmadeva, the great extempore poet. He lived at Guptapalli in Hughli about the end of the 18th century. His Citracamga was composed in 1744 His Kālidāsastava is printed in Śyāmākalpalaṃkā. His verses are often quoted in Bengal.

254 I Yagnasubrahmanya or Swāmi Dīkṣita was the son of Ānā Dīkṣita and Valliyambā of Kaundinyagoṭra. He lived in about 1832-1879. He was born at Ettypuram, Tinnevelly District and with a high proficiency in all the Śastras and in poetry, he was the State Pandit in the Ettypuram Samsthanam and was called Kavikesarīn. Besides works on other topics he wrote poetic descriptions of the Imperial Assemblage at Delhi of 1875 and of the visit of the Prince of Wales in that year and a campū Valliparnaya which is (in 12 āraṅgas) quite familiar in South India. There is a commentary on it by Ilathūr Sundararāja Aiyangar.

254 J Candamaruta Acarya was son of Parmalarama of Vatsagoṭra. He was born at Alisur near Kāncī. He studied under his father and visited various States and received honours. He was patronised particularly by Ravivarma, Chief of Itabalapuri on whose poem

---

1. This information is from an article by Gaurīnākara Sarma in Śrīraja, I 13
2. See para 546 and S B J1 Here is a verse of his
3. These works are printed and the unprinted works are with his nephew Mr. V. Subrahmanya Iyer, M.A., Principal, Rameswaram Devasthanam Sanskrit College, Madura.
Maha-Kavya

Vidhuravilāpa he wrote a commentary. He was lastly Professor of Sanskrit in Madras. Besides writing Laghurasakusumāvalī on poetics, he answered Jagannātha's critique on Citrāmāmsa in a work named Citrāmāmsoddhāra. His poem Aminājikathā was left incomplete in 6 cantos. He passed away in 1900.

Candamārūta had a literary rival Venkalavarṇa Ārya of Alavoor (near Kānci) of Śrīvatsagotra. He was born in 1879 and lives at Kānci. He wrote under the name Komallamarutu and his poems and stray verses appeared in Manjubhasṇa and Vijnānāntīmāṇi Journals.

254-K Srinivasa Sastri was of Kaundinyagotra. His brother Nārāyanaśāstrī is a renowned writer whose works will be noticed (in para 727 post). He studied under the famous Mahāmahopādhyāya Tyāgarāja Śastrī (Rāja Śastrī) of Mannargudi (Tanjore District). He upheld the doctrine of Sīvādvaita propounded by Appayya Dīklā by commenting on all the Upamāsas. His erudition in Śastrī was unique and he edited a Journal Brahmaidya. His works were many and his titles were equally so, marks of honour bestowed on him everywhere. Among his minor poems are Vijnāptigatka, Yogyāhogya-samvādaśatka, Śāradāśatka, Mahābhūrameshatka, Hetrājatka, Śrīgurasaundaryāśagarasahatrīkā etc., and a play Sāvānasomam. He is known to have written a several poems and plays, but information is not available. He passed away about 1900.

254-L Ambikadatta Vyāsa was the son of Durgādatta, a Ganda brahmin of Bhanapura in Jaipur State. He was born in 1859. He was an extempore poet and his proficiency in avadhānam was unique. He was awarded several titles, Vyāsa, Śāhityākārya, Ghatikā-śāta, Bhārata-bhāskara etc. He was for some time Professor of Sanskrit in Bhagalpur. Among his several works on Śivarājāvijaya, a long work in prose on the life of Emperor Śivājy, and minor poems Katanāśatakā, Prastāradipikā, Ganēsā-satka and Śivanvāha. He passed away in 1901.

254-M Venkataraghava Acārya (Sellur) was son of Rangānātha of Kauśikagotra and lived at Srirangam in 1849–1906. He was head Sanskrit Pandit in S P G College, Trichinopoly. Besides the
poems Rāmānstaprasamānjarī, Ranganāsthānaprāṣa, Sriranganāyikānaksatramālikā and Āryāsaptati, he wrote the plays Mānnaṭhavijaya.

254-N Ganapati Sastrin was the son of Subrahmapya and Srīlakṣmi of Moudgalyagotra of the village of Painganādu in Tanjore District and lived in 1871-1913. He was the chief Pandit of the Advaita-Sabba of Kumbhakonam and latterly of the Sankara Mutt there. He bore the titles Mahāmahopadhyaya and Vedānṭakesarī. Learned in all the śastras, he has had illustrious pupils among whom is Kadālan-gudi Nātesa Sāstrī, whose labours in connection with Sanskrit Literature are now well known. Besides several works on other topics, he wrote the poems Katākāsatakam, Anyāpadesa, Ṭatākāparinaya, Dhruvacaritā, Rasikalabhasana, Gururājasaptati and some stutis (mentioned in the Index) and Vyātmanamālā on prosody.

Pancapagesa Sastrin (Kaviratna) is his brother. He was born in 1874. Like his brother he was chief pandit at Sankara mutt in Kumbhakonam for about 20 years and is now retired and lives in Tyagarajanagar, Madras. Besides works on Sāstras he wrote campus Hariscandravyaya and Tātākāparinaya and the poems Kāvyakolābala, Gaurīcaraprasapta, Vyāsopūjāmahotsava, Śankaragurucaritasangraha and several stutis which are mentioned in the Index.

254 O Srisvara Vidyalankara was the son of Kṣitisvara Bhattacārya of Rangpur, Bengal, of Vāśyagośtra and a poet of Bengal of great renown. He passed away in 1905. His poem Vyāvānīkavya (in 12 cantos) describes the life of Queen Victoria and Delhi-Mahotsava (in 5 cantos) describes the Delhi Darbar of 1901 and Śakṭiṣaṭaka is in praise of Durgā.

Srisvara’s son is Kokileśvara Sastrin (now Professor of Sanskrit in the Calcutta University) was born in 1871 and was greatly honoured by the Maharaja of Cooch Behar, in whose College he was Professor of Sanskrit for a number of years, and he delivered Sree Gopal Basu Mullick’s Fellowship Lectures in 1930-31. His exposition of the philosophy of the Upanishads has had a wide appreciation.

254-P Gopalamasāstrī (Nadiminty) was the son of Bhagavat Paṭanjali Sastrī and Kāmākṣī of Kaundinyagotra. He was born at Nāgur Agraharam near Pārvaṭipuram, Vizagapatam District. He lived
Like his father and grandfather he was initiated in Śrīvidyā and he wrote the poems Siragauripannaya and Siṭārāmabhuyadaya. His father Bhagavat Patañjali Śāstri was a State Pandit in Nepal and was the recipient of agrahārams from Kāruppam Samsathan. His poem Paramapuruṣa-adhyānam is now available in part. Patañjali's father was Svaṃangalesvara Śāstrin (1759-1839). He went to Benares and became famous enough to be called Abhinavakālīśa. His poetry was often satirical and had full vent in the Court of Mahārāja Anandagajapati of Vizianagaram. Besides works on the Sāstras, his poems Lalīstaka, Suryāstaka and Jagannāthāstaka are now available and many stray verses of extempore variety are now preserved and are of a high order.

254 Q Ramavatara Sarma was the son of Devanārayana Pandeya and Govindadevi of Bhāradvājagoṭra. He was born at Chapra (U.P.) in 1878 and passed away in 1929. Having studied at Benares he became Professor of the Hindu College, Benares and was later on in the College at Patna. He was a literary prodigy and his contributions to literary and historical criticism are well-known and unique. Besides several works on dārsanas, he wrote poems Māruṣadakam, Mudgaradīta, and a play Hari-Nārādhiyam. His Bhāratyamāntuṭṭam is a small literary history of India written in Anustubh metre. "It reads like the Kashmir Rāja-purāṇa. It form a very small part of a huge work, the history of the whole world. Had this huge work been published, it would have been a Mahābhārata of these days." Above all he prepared a gigantic lexicon on Viśvakosa which awaits an editor.

254-R. Mahesacandra Tarkacudamanī lived a few years ago at Rājārāmpuram, Dinajpur, Bengal. Among modern poets and rhetoricians he is one of the foremost. Besides several minor poems like Kāvyapetikā on various topics, he wrote Dināpurarājaśāmsa (in 17 cantos) and Bhūdevacaritra (in 24 cantos) and an elegy on the late Mahārāja of Darbhānga and a poetic criticism Kāvyatīvāvalī.

1. His Samāsakasumānapali is printed. His Viśhaktavūlaśam and the rest are with his grandson Mr. N. Patañjali Sastri, B.A. B.L., Darvatipur, Vizagapatam District.

2. Except the play the poems have been printed. The manuscripts of his unprinted works are with his son N. V. Sarma, Exhibition Road, Patna to whom I am indebted for this information.

3. Many of his minor poems are printed in Sanskrit Candrīka and Mitragōthi. Journals Dināpurarājāśāmsa has illustrations of several poetic Bandhas in exquisite form.
MAHĀ-KĀVYA

Mahesacandra Nyayaratna who wrote a gloss of Kāvyaprakāśa was son of Harinārayaṇa of Nārīṭa village, Havida, Bengal and lived in 1836-1906.

254 S Sri Kalkisimha or Sri Kalki (T Narasimha (Aiyangar) Ācārya) was the son of Praśīvādibhayankara Tondanur Singalācārya of Śrīvatsagotra. He was born at Melkote in 1867 A.D. He was Sanskrit Professor in the Central College, Bangalore for 23 years. He received Inspiration Divine from Heaven through his Yogic meditation early in 1915 and along with his brother Mr. T Narayana Aiyangar devoted himself to literary service. He was versed in all branches of Sanskrit learning and besides his works which are still in several volumes of manuscript in Vedanta Book Depot, 17 East Park Road, Mallesvaram, the Sanskrit rendering is Tiruvoymuli (printed at Bombay) and Gānāmṛṭātarangini (variety of songs) are classical. His several disciples revered him as Kalki-avajara and he was conscious of that divine inspiration. He passed away in 1935.

254 T Annadacarana was the son of Kālikinkara Thakura, a strotṛṇya Brahmīn of Radhyasrem of Bengal. He was born at Sompada, Noakhali, Bengal in 1862 A.D. (1268 B.S.) in the family of the well known Tāntrika Saint Sarvānandasarvavidyā (who lived about 1426 A.D.). Educated at Calcutta and Benares, his erudition was great and he was Tarkacūdamaṇī, Mahāmahopādhyāya etc. He commenced a Tol (now a Sanskrit College) at Noakhali and later became Professor of Mimāṃsa, Sankhya and Yoga in the Benares Hindu University. He was editor of Suprabhāta, Benares. His writings began when he was yet young. Besides several works on different Sāstras, he wrote the poems, Rāmābhuyadaya and Mahāprasthāna (mahākāvyas), Sumanonjah and R̥ṣucitra and Kāvyacandrikā on a poetics. A combination of attainments in Sāstras and poetry is rare and in his retirement he pursues his service to Sarasvaṭi, being an agnīhotṛ in true orthodoxy.

254 U. Ganganatha Jha (Mahāmahopādhyāya M.A.) is the son of Tīrthanka Jhā and Indumaṇī Devī of Vaṭṣagotra. He was born in 1871. A unique scholar in Sanskrit, he has been connected with various educational institutions as a Librarian of Darbhanga Raj, as Principal, Sanskrit College, Rewa, and as Vice-Chancellor of Allahabad.

1 See para 364. He wrote an essay in Sanskrit on the authorship of Mṛtobhakāţika [MG Ji III 26]
2 For his stray verses and poems such as Prapanthākavya, Prarthanākavya, Āsā, Atmanā śaṇa, see Journals Vidyodaya and Samākṣaṇaadānakā
University for a full decade from 1923-1932. His commentary on Prasannaraghava is a lucid exposition and his various other writings on other branches of Sanskrit learning are still appearing in press.

254 V Batuknath Sarma is the son of Īśvarīprasadā Misra of Bhāradvājagotra. Born in Benares in 1895 and educated there, he is now Professor of Sanskrit in the Benares Hindu University. Besides editing Bhāraṭa’s Nātyasastra and Bhāmaha’s Kāvyalankāra and other rare works, he wrote the poems Vallavādulam, Satakasaptakam, Kāhakasatakam, Ātmamvedanasatakam and Sītaśayamvaram (mahākāvyam) and a play (Prasanasā) Pāntriyatāndavita which displays an elegance of diction in a vein of the ardent faith and devotion.

254 W Guruprasanna Bhattacarya was born in 1882. He is the son of Rakhalāsā Bhattacharya and Jñānasakhī Devī of Maudgalyagotra of Bengal and a descendant of the renowned Kāśīrāma-vacaspāti a very respected author on Śāstras. Educated at Bhatpara, the famous seat of learning, he studied in the Calcutta University and after a period of service in the Benares Hindu University, he has been since 1921 Professor of Sanskrit in Dacca University. Among his several works, are the poems Śrī-Kāśamahākāvyā and Mithuram and Varuṣhīnicampū, and plays Nībhājacanta (6 acts), Maḍālana-Kuvalayāsā (7 acts) and Bhāminīvālāsa (6 acts) and these contain poetry of exquisite grace and varying interest.

254 X Pramathanātha Tarkabhusanā (Māhāmahopādhyāya) was the son of Tārācandra and Rāmārangunī Devī. He was born at Bhatpara, Bengal in 1866 in a Pāscātīya Vedā Brahmin family of Vāsishtagotra. He studied under the great veterans of Sanskrit learning like Rakhaladās Nyāyaratna, Silacandra, Sārvabhūma and Kālīsacandrāsarma. He became Professor of Vedānta in Sanskrit College, Calcutta and is now the Principal of the College of Oriental Learning in the Benares Hindu University. Besides several works on Śāstras, he wrote the poems (printed), Kokuldūta, Rāmārasodāya and Vījayaaprakāsa. His father Tārācandra was the State Pandit of Benares Raj. Among his poems are Kānanaśataka, Rāmājanmabhāna and Śṛngāra-ratnākara.

1 Two Acts have been published in the Vallari. His several essays on literary topics are appearing in Oriental Journals. His unprinted manuscripts are with him at K. 31-50, Kal Bharava, Benares City.

2 The manuscripts are with him at Dacca or at his residence at No. 6, Ramakrishna Das Lane, Calcutta.
254-Y Ranganatha Tatacarya of Royadurga was born in 1894. He is the son of Raghunatha of Sathamaramanagotra. He is the senior Pandit of Saravat Mahal Library, Tanjore. Besides Sukasandes and Hanumaṭprasadastaka and Vākyaratnāvalī (a book on Sanskrit idioms), he wrote short plays Nyāyasadbhā and Kutsāṭakusidā and prose stories Kaniyan-Grāmaṇī, Jaratī-Nagarpālanasabhā-ca and Navinajāmātā.

254-Z Tirumalar (Srīsaila) Tatacarya was the son of Desikācārya of Sathamaramanagotra. He was born in 1872. After service in the Sanskrit College at Tiruvadi, Tanjore, he is now Principal, Sanskrit College, Tirupati. His critiques on Alankāra and Mimamsā have got him a wide recognition at Pandītaraṇa et al. Besides his commentary on Bhāmahālāṅkāra and Śī-apisuṇḍādi (on slesa) he wrote the poem Drutacarita and the novel Menakā.

255-A Venkatacalamayya is otherwise known as Chelamayya Gāstrīn (Pārupūdi). He was born at Magām village near Mukṭesvaram in East Godavari. He was honoured by several States in and about Nizam's dominions and he is proficient in several languages. Besides some minor poems, his play Gopicandracarita in 7 acts is a quasi-philosophical work on the plan of Jain poems in which ethics are well combined with humour and poetry.

255-B Srinivasa Acarya (Mudumbai) is the son of Rāghāvācārya of Srīvaṭṣagotra. He was born in 1887-8 at Agaram near Kānci and was educated at Bhūṭapur. Besides summaries of the epics and Bṛgavaṭa and some minor poems, his Manimekhalā and Pravālavallī are romances based on the Tamil Tales and Kairavāṇi is a prose narrative of the theological traditions of the Deity at Trīphcane, Madras.

255-C Raja Kṣitindra Deb, Rai Mahasay of Bansbena Raj (Vamsavatī), Bengal, was born in 1876. He was the eldest son of Raja Pūrṇendra Deb and Sācalī Deb of Kāśyapagoṭra. Kṣitindra is among the foremost of Bengali noblemen, whose houses have devoted their

---

1 See para 328 supra.
2 Printed JSP, Calcutta.
3 Ibid.
4 Manjusā Journal.
5 He is the editor of the Journal Udyanapaṭikā.
6 The manuscript is with the author's son P. Subbarao, Sanskrit Pandit, Coconada.
7 See para 578 supra, note.
all to the good of society. The first ancestor of his family was 
Devaditya who was a contemporary of Ballalah Sen whose cult of Kula 
ism he opposed. The seat of the Raj was moved from Patuli to 
Bansbera by Rameswar Deb about 1680. Rameswar was a patron of 
letters and he brought in scholars renowned in different branches of 
Sanskrit learning from Benares and elsewhere and founded several Tols 
or Sanskrit Colleges. Jagannatha Pancaanana (the famous scholar of 
Bengal) was one of its first pupils. Purujendu, father of Kasthinda, was 
a worthy son of this house and he maintained and improved the 
Tols and had the Sanskrit work Kalyanavidhi composed by eminent 
pandits on the ritual of Kali worship. Surindra Mohana Deva 
Sarma and Dharmaditya Dharmacarya wrote panegyrics on the 
greatness of this ancient house along with the Mughal emperors who 
have honoured them from time to time. Kasthinda is a poet and has 
composed minor poems. He is known as the Grandfather of the Library 
Movement in India. He ran the first Bengali Journal Purnima. True 
to the lineage he is devoutly attached to Kali, and he lives near the 
temple of Kali in Kalighat, Calcutta. Hamsevari temple renowned in 
Bengal for its architecture was built by Rapi Sankar in 1514.

255-D Tiruvencata Tatadesika was the son of Singaracarya of 
Sathamananagotra. He was born in 1892 and lived at Tekkallapadu, 
Nellore District. True to his traditions, he is an authority on Mantra- 
sastras and wrote the poems Nakharasataka, Nrsimhasataka and Shrut-
malika, all printed at Ongole.

255-E Ramanatha Sastri (S) is the son of Kshna Bhattar of 
Kausikagotra. He was born in Palghat and became well versed in all 
the Sastras. In Mimamsa, his learning is unique and that has been 
recognised by the several titles conferred on him and he is now 
Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Madras. Besides works on 
other subjects, his drama Manmanjuna in 7 acts contains exquisite 
poetry and is interspersed with songs.

255 F Vidyadharasastri is the son of Vidyavacaspati Devi-
prasadasha Sastri and grandson of Bhasyacarya Harmanadapta Sastri of

1. On Bansberia Raj, see W K Truminger, *Notes on Bansberia*, its Raj, its temples, 
its missions and schools, in *Bengal past and present*, Journal of Calcutta Historical 
Society, 1903, Imperial Gazetteer Hugli, B V Roy—Links with Calcutta, 
*Ethnology in Ancient Historical Records*, Calcutta. Original Sanad granted by 
Emperor Aurangzeb in 1673 is exhibited in the Victoria Memorial Hall, Calcutta.
Bhāradvājagotra  He was born in an illustrious house of scholars at Churu (Bikanir State) in 1901 and is now Professor of Sanskrit in the College at Bikanir. His father was proficient in all the Śāstras and his extensive work Satcandividāṇa is an authority on ritual and his great work Gangāsimha-Kalpadruma still unprinted is lying in the private library of Maharāja Ganga Singh Jee of Bikanir. Vidyādhara bears a number of erudite titles and among his poems are Svapupāṇḍali, Śrīyapārthaṇā, Vidyadharasatāka (on nīti) and an original drama, Purnamallam.

255-G Paramananda Sarma (Kavindra) belongs to Rṣikula Lakshmanagadh, Jaipur. Besides the poem Kartharjunīya he has retold the story of Rāmāyana in separate poems, Mantharādurgilasiṣṭa Dasaratḥavilāpa, Māricavāḍha, Meghanādavadha and Rāvānavadha.

255-H Kṣitiśacandra Cattopadhyaya is the son of Śaraṭcandra and Giriśālī Devī of Kāsyapagotra. He was born in 1896 in Calcutta. He is now Professor of Sanskrit in the Calcutta University and edits two Journals Manjūśa (in Sanskrit) and Calcutta Oriental Journal (in English) which are well known. Besides various essays on topical subjects his sixty stores (Sastitāṇḍram) original and translated exhibit a graceful style which in his own words ‘don’t smack of the midnight all but are all palpitating with life’ For instance, they are Rāma-mayī, Vāyuparīvartanam, Ādusavatrabāḍhyate, Dumbhasyaduscetīta.

255-I Vidyusekhara Bhattacarya was the son of Trailokyanātha. He was born at Harischandrāpurā, Malda, Bengal in 1179. After spending some years at Śaṅkumāṭaṇ he is now Professor of Sanskrit in the Calcutta University. He has been honoured by various titles for his versatile learning. His Sanskrit renderings of Niśādprāṇa is a splendid performance. He was the Editor of Mitragosthī Journal. There and in the Samskṛta-Candrikā his several minor poems, songs and his prose essays on Sanskrit poets appeared from time to time. Besides the poems mentioned in para 249 supra, he wrote Nagulā, Baddhavīhaga and Kṣṭrakāṭhā (Buddhist stores) and Bharata-caritra (in prose) and Purgāśaptaṣaṭī in praise of Kāli.

255-J Ratni Devi is a young girl of 13 years of Hathras (Hathras). Her prose narrative of Raghuvaṃsa is remarkable (Sury Jl IX 286).

1 See JSSP, Calcutta, Sārāga Jl. Sury Jl.
2 Published in JSSP and Manjuśa Journal, Calcutta.
255 Laghu Kavya or Minor Poem is one that is not a Mahākāvya in the sense described, viz., "a writing of considerable length, varying descriptions and elaborate construction, embracing a narrative theological or historical, divided into cantos for convenience of narration." In theme, many minor poems are narratives of lesser length, such as Nalodaya, and in sentiment they are erotic, religious, gnomic or didactic.

256 Niti or the ethical or didactic poem has a very ancient origin. Long before the composition of Mahābhārata, which is a mine of such literature, there was aphoristic ethical poetry of which only relics have come down to us.

The philosophical turn of the Indian mind developed the science of ethics from the earliest times and the keynote of all didactic poetry in niti, śānti, purāṇa, i.e., the vanity of earthly pleasures. To attain a mind tranquil, to get out of the trammels of birth and living, to discard pleasure and pain, to discriminate virtue and vice, to discover the truth and the Divine and to imbibe the love of tolerance and brotherhood, these are the ends of Indian ethical poetry. "Scattered throughout the most various departments of Sanskrit literature," says Macdonell, "are innumerable apophthegms in which wise and noble, striking and original thoughts often appear in a highly finished and poetical garb. These are plentiful in the law books, in the epic and the drama they are frequently on the lips of heroes, sages and gods, and fables are constantly uttered by tigers, jackals, cats and other animals. Above all, the Mahabharata, which to the pious Hindu constitutes a moral encyclopaedia, is an inexhaustible mine of proverbial philosophy. It is however natural that ethical maxims should be introduced in great abundance into works which, like the Panchatantra and Hitopadesa, were intended to be handbook of practical moral philosophy.*

257. Stotra Religious poetry in India is as old as Indian thought. Samhitas of the Vēgas, particularly of Atharvan, contain...
eulogistic invocations of various deities and these eulogies abound in the literature of Upaniṣads, epics and Purāṇas. They are known as Stōtras. They are either epithets, descriptive of the powers and greatness of the deity addressed, or collections of names, at times strung into verses. They are called nāma-stroṭas or nāmāvalis. The number of the epithets are generally 108, 1000 or 1008, āṣṭottarasata or sahasrā or āṣṭottarasahasra or shortly called āṣṭottara. There are also prayers in amulet form which to this day are believed to be very efficacious. They are raised to the status of mantras and some of them are prefaced by the mention of pān, chanḍas and ṛeva and followed by the benefits of recitation.

Many of these stōtras are treasures of lyrical beauty and poetic imagery. For instance, there are these lines in Lāhīṣahasranāma:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{त्रिपतेः कुप्तपते} & \text{ सुपकारमहादेशकमयमहा} \\
\text{महाकुरुकुषः सुमहादुर्जयमहत} & \text{वर्णपदमहस्यन्यस्मरमं} \\
\text{सुस्पन्धास्मशुक्लस्मरमं} & \text{वनमनात्मकं युगं तथा तरंगिन} \\
\text{तरंगिनं} & \text{स्मरं} \\
\text{स्मरं} & \text{स्मरं} \\
\text{स्मरं} & \text{स्मरं} \\
\text{स्मरं} & \text{स्मरं} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Ed} \text{ everywhere, and with English translation of Bhāskararāya’s commentary by R. Anantakrishnasāstry, Madras. Bhāskararāya or Bhāsūrānāṇa was son of Gambhīrarāya Dīkaṭa of Benaros and lived about 1629 A.D. In CO, I, 411, his other works are enumerated.}\]
Later literature abounds in short pieces of eulogical poetry, also known as stotras. Their number is legion. Here are several collections printed everywhere according to the taste and persuasion of the editor. Here are, for instance, Brhat-stotraśānakāra (Madras) Stotraśaṅkāra (Bombay), Stavāvali (Calcutta) and Stotraguccha (Bangalore). They are saturated with expressions of devotion and philosophy, often illustrated by allusions to tales of theology and are none the less fine specimens of melodious poetry.

258 Sṛngara or erotic poem is amorous. 'Amorous,' in its widest sense is the innate and ultimate idea and whatever contributes to the story of love, its origination, dissipation and culmination is a necessary adjunct to the poetic description. Nature therefore plays a prominent part. "Various birds" says Macdonell "to which poetic myths are attached are frequently introduced as furnishing analogies to human life and love. The Chataka which would rather die of thirst than drink aught but the ramdrops from cloud, affords an illustration of pride. The Chakora supposed to imbibe the rays of the moon, affords a parallel to the lover who with his eyes drinks in the beams of his beloved face. The Chakravaka which, fabled to be condemned to nocturnal separation from his mate, calls to her with plaintive cry during the watches of the night, serves as an emblem of conjugal fidelity. In all this lyric poetry the bright eyes and beauty of Indian girls find a setting in scenes brilliant with blossoming trees, fragrant with flowers, gay with the plumage and vocal with the song of birds, diversified with lotus ponds steeped in tropical sunshine and with large-eyed gazelles reclining in the shade."

SECTION II.

Niti

259 Sundarapandya (Ācārya) belonged apparently to Madura, the capital of the Pandyas. His Nitiśāṅkāsti is quoted in Pañcatantra, in Jānāsrayi and by Kṛṣṇalilasuka. Sundarapandya is mentioned as an ancestor of Arikesām in an inscription of about 750 A.D.
and must have flourished earlier than 5th century A.D. The verses in śāmā metre are pretty. The poet says that it received unique honors.

230 Candragomin or Candra was the celebrated author of the grammatical treatise Candra-Vyākarana. This treatise was used profusely by Jayāditya in Kāśikā. He was a Buddhist Vāsurāja, the preceptor of Bhartrihari, was his pupil. According to Belvalkar, Candra refers to Hānas, probably to their expulsion by Yāsodharmar in 344 A.D. and he fixes the date of Candragomin as about 470 A.D. But it is probable that he lived far earlier. Like his predecessors in grammatical literature he was also a poet of no mean merit. He fell into disfavour at the court of a prince Ratnakirta and seeing the prince infatuated by wealth and power, he addressed him a letter in the form of a poem Śīyalekhdhārmakāvyā on the evanescence of worldly treasures and made him forsake the world. It is a poem of 114 verses. After an introduction of 18 verses in praise of the three Jewels, the author begins by saying: 'Entering this ill-smelling abode of birth which is filled with heaps of impurity, is very narrow and is pervaded by dense darkness as into some hell, he has to endure great misery with crushed limbs.' Then follow verses about the miseries of age when man will repent what he did or did not do, for 'then messengers of Yama will take him by the hair and carrying before the judge.' The tortures of pratas and the river vaṭarani are described. Then comes the admonition. Thus ends the poem. "To exert oneself in the interest of others is the true way of salvation, for those that are overcome by thirst in the desert be thou a tree, a cloud, a pond." A prayer follows that all the world may obtain omniscience. Five stray verses are given in Vallabhideva's

---

1. For instance, 
   सहानयंति सततः जलधर्मविद्या सस्तिते ।
   द्वैरेख्य सता वक्तव्य नितिति: कृष्णेन्द्रवर्जचिति ॥—107.

2. There are variations as Candragomin, Candrayogin, Candra, the dramatist in different persons.

3. Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, 58

4. Published in the memoirs of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, IV. 1189, Keith (SL, 79) mentions Subhūlka of Nāgārjuna [Trs. H. Weisse, JPTS. (1896), 1], see Vidyabhiṣaya, JAS., (1907), No 9., Winterella, SL, 11, 1859.

5. See JRAS. (1880) 1183
Subhāstāvali. These are probably found in that poem. He also wrote Ērāsādhanasatāka.

261. Bhartrhari is by tradition known to be the son of a Brahmin, Candragupta, by his Śūdra wife Śimdhumati. His stepbrothers were Vikramārka and Bhatti. Bhatti is said to be a prakṛtised form of Bharṣṭ and Bhatti and Bharṭ have been sometimes considered to be identical. Their proficiency in grammar is probably a cause of the identity Bhartrhari’s grammatical treatise Vākyapadīya is well-known. ITsing says that Bhartrhari became an ascetic and for a long time wavered between the world and its renunciation, and passed away in 600 A.D. though it is probable he lived earlier. He has been called a Buddhist, a Brahmin and a Saivite, as the reviewer pleases.

262. His Subhasitas or Satakaṭraya on Nīti, Sṛngara or Vaiṛṛga are a specimen of sententious poetry, enveloping lofty ideas for the guidance of mankind. They have suffered from interpolations and the editions of the work differ therefore to some extent in the contents. In the Subhasitas, or the Satakahrdaya, or Satakaṭraya, the poet has attempted to create a form of poetry that is sententious, with lofty ideas that can guide mankind. However, these verses have been subject to interpolations, and different editions of the work differ to some extent in their contents.

1. विषय विषयणां च दूरमतत्तमन्तराः।
उपसुक्त विच्व हास्य विचयं। समरणादिप।
कैविष्ण अभेत हि भजन्ति विनीतमालवन्यं ज्ञाय विस्मयकं ज्ञयतत्तमत्तवः।
कैविष्ण सायुज्ञससि दृष्ट्विनीमोह श्रीमाधवलावणागितां। कोऽधर्म न साध्यसितः।

2. Farquhar, O.R.L., 399; Winternitz, IL, II 1. 269
3. For these stories, see para 42 supra
4. See IA, III 285
5. See A. B. Keith, SL, 176
7. Telang (Int to Satakas) places him in 1-2 Century A.D
8. See Keith, SL, 173, K. B. Pathak, Was Bhartrhari a Buddhist? JBRAS, XVIII 341. On Bhartrhari, see Keilhorn, IA, XII, 326.
10. For instance, in Vaiyagyaśītaka, Telang’s edition contains 113 verses, while Bohlen’s 100 verses only.
It has been thought sometimes that all the verses in these Satākas are not the work of Bhartrhari, and that they include verses of other authors chosen by Bhartrhari. Opinions are various and A. B. Keith, for instance, says that “it seems unnecessary to exclude the probability that in his collections Bhartrhari may have included work not his own, as well as verses compiled by himself,” but he thinks that Śrīngārāśatāka is the work of a single author, for “unquestionably there is a definite structure which may be, of course, the work of a skilled compiler, but which more naturally suggests the product of a creative mind.” Bhartrhari’s Subhāśīta have been held in high esteem for several centuries, and Indian tradition accepts these Satākas as Bhartrhari’s own. There are in the modern recensions and editions verses included in the Satākas that are attributed in the anthologies to other authors, but these must only be interpolations, which are easily made when the verses are isolated in ideas and each verse expresses by itself a moral or a sentiment.

There are commentaries on Nyāsaśatāka by Mahābala, and all the Satākas by Avanī Rāmaśandra son of Kundopandita of Sāndilya gotra, by Dhanasūra, by Rāmaśā, by Gunāvavāyā, by Minanātha, by Indraṇī, and two anonymous, and on Nyāsa and Vairaga by M. R. Kale.

There is a fourth Paddhatī called Śaṁtipaddhāta with a Gujarati introduction printed in Bombay.

1. For a good appreciation, see A. B. Keith, *SL*, 178-183
2. Peterson collects verses of Bhartrhari in Subhāṣītāvalī (*Int., 74*) and details the ascriptions. He says “Of the 110 verses given in Telang’s edition of Nyāsaśatāka 8 are in our book expressly assigned to Bhartrhari, 32 are given anonymously and 13 are expressly assigned to other authors. Of the 118 verses given in Telang’s edition of Vairagyasatāka, 11 are in one book expressly assigned to Bhartrhari, 11 are given anonymously and 6 are expressly assigned to other authors. Of the 100 verses given in Bohlen’s edition of Vairagyasatāka only one is one book ascribed to Bhartrhari, 17 are given anonymously and 8 are expressly ascribed to other authors.”

8. Printed, Bombay
4. *DC*, XX 5073
7. *IO*, 1564.
8. *CC*, II 90.
11. Printed, Bombay
Vitavṛtta is a small poem describing the conduct of licentious people. Madhava attributed it to Bhartrihari in his Jadavṛtta which in four chapters is a similar work on mad lovers and fools.

263 Harihara’s Bhartrharinrveda is a play which is “in great part a glorification of the Yoga philosophy which teaches that the summum bonum is the discrimination and separation of soul from matter, thus leading through renunciation of the world to isolation of the ego.” It has bāṇṭa for its sentiment. The leading man is the famous ascetic Gorakṣanātha or Goraknath (regarded as the incarnation of Siva), the founder of the Śaiva sect of Kanfat Yogins in the early part of the 15th century AD. His chief temple is at Gorakpur, less than 300 miles from the house of Harihara. It is said that Bhartrihari became upset by the sudden demise of his consort, on hearing a false news of his death. He was consoled by a Yogin and he attained such a condition of renunciation, that even when his dead wife was recalled to life, he had lost his attraction for the world.

Harihara is mentioned as the author of the play Prabhāvatīparanaya.

264. Bhallata was a poet of the Court of King Śankaravarman of Kā-мир (884-902 AD). His Saṭaka is a hard but pleasant poem on morals and quotations by Abhinavagupta, by Kṣemendra and Mammata attest the appreciation. Bhallata’s other verses are quoted in the anthologies.

1 DC, XX 8010
2 DO, XX 8000.
4 See Goldstucker Lit Ramanas, I, 161, Wilson, Sects 218, M Williams, Buddhism, 193. Farquhar (OIE, 847) gives 1200 AD
5 Mitra, VII. No, 2395, Levi, II 77, 88, OC, I 854, 762
6 OC I 354
7 In some editions of Śrṅgaḍharapadāṇḍāṅgini the name is given as Mallabhāṭṭa and Bhattachari
8 Ray V 128. There is a Kavibhallata referred to in Nannaya’s Āṇḍhraśabdādintāmaṇi
10 ZDMG, LVI. 105, Keith, SL, 281; Peterson, Subh, 75-77
There is another Bhallata, of a later date. His Naṭaka in praise of the Devī (Perundevi) of Conjeevaram shows dexterous poetry.

265 Silhana is a poet of Kāśmir. He often imitates Bhartharan. His Saṅṭisāṭaka is quoted in Sadāṅkānakāmṣṭha composed in 1205 A.D.

266 Dhanadaraja, son of Dehala, wrote three Sāṭakas like Bhartharan in 1434 A.D. Jagannātha (Panditarāja) has four chapters on Prāṣṭāvika, Śṛṅgāra, Karuṇa and Saṅṭa in his poem Bhāmāvīlāsa. So does Caṭurvargastra of Rādhamangalam Nārāyanasaṅśṭri.

267 Somaprabha was disciple of Vajrasimhācārya, the Jain ascetic. In his Sundūraprakara he describes the good and bad qualities mostly according to the tenets of the Jain religion. He wrote also Śṛṅgārvairagyaṭārangini. Narābharana is a collection of moral and wise sayings and states what are the ornamental qualities of men.

268. Among other didactic poems are—Saṅṭisāṭaka by Silhanamisra (Printed, Calcutta) with commentaries (CC, I 641), Saṅṭivīlāsa (i) by Subrahmanya (ii) by Handasa (ML, 259) (iii) by Nilakantha (Printed, Bombay), Vairāgyasāṭaka (i) by Padmā- 

1 The manuscript is said to be in the village of Navilpakkam near Conjeevaram. Here are some verses.

2 CC, I 647 Ed. by Schonfield, Leipzig. See Keith, ST., 231. 2 and JRAS, (1911) 257.

3 Printed, Bombay.

4. Printed, Bombay, DC, 8085. On the author, see chapter on Alankara poetics.

5. He was born in 1882 A.D. He wrote also Puṣṭapuranamahākāvyya, printed partly in S India.

6. DC, XX 8095.

7. Printed, Bombay.

8 DC, XX 8086.
nanda (ii) by Appayadikṣa (iii) by Janārdana (iv) by Somanātha (Printed, Bombay) (v) by Sankarācārya (Opp 4054), (vi) by Nilakantha (Opp, 4629), Pancātantrasangraha (Mys OML, 248), Niśṭimāla of Sadānanda (Printed, Calcutta), Niśatmanā (i) by Sambhurāja (BTC, 141), and (ii) Dyādviveda (IOC, 960)², Niśatākā (i) by Venkatāryā (Mys OML, 248) (ii) of Śrīvāsaśacārya (DC, XX 8038) and (iii) anonymous (Ibid 2057), Niśāra of Ghatakarpara, Niśāra and Niśṭrasamuccaya (Ibid 8059-61), [Niśīkandrika of Śrīmā Dhānanda, Niśatākā of Sundarācārya, Niśvākāmpīḍ of Somadevasūri]¹, Niśṭalāsa of Vrajaśaṃkha (NW, 504), Niśṭعرف attributed to Vararuci and Niśḍipādipa attributed to Vatālabhatī³, Niśṭumāvali of Appā Vājapeyn (Opp 4803), Niśṭalakalpaśa by Śāhibrama (SKC, 93), Kaṅkānṭhābharṣa (Mys OML, 243), Mugdhopadesa of Jalaḥṣa (Printed, Bombay), Āryāmanjarī by Devarāja (CC, I 54), Āryavignaptī (i) by Rāmacandra and (ii) by Viśvanātha and by Viśṭārma (CC, I 54)

269 Anyapadesa is a peculiar class of poems where some moral is preached by an indirect appreciation or condemnation of the natural qualities of particular objects 

There are the following —Anyoktimala (i) by Accāndikṣa and

---

1 With commentary by Devarāja NW, 16, OC, I 293.
2 Print. See Ost OR Bk Agency, Poona, 108.
3 Print. Haberlin, 509.
4 For instance ·

विदातां दरति द्रीता चेतुः किं सारतविककैतवेन ।
देन्य यदि मेयसि सुत्त्रवेण विज्ञवीति कर्तुपयु त्वम ॥
उससी करणवेय वैतकसिनक न यथवातोऽहुः ॥
शिव शिव तावकड़ैँ केषकुटप्पलं तत्ततेव सिंहोसिस ॥
केलीलोमसारातक समुःसारवादामदेवदीवर ॥
सम्भवातुः विकासिकमः सम्प्रदेश आर्यप्राप्तिः ॥
कात्सार वत कासर परिपत्ताकसिसक पुष्पः-
शिवाश्च कल्पानु वातविहिः श्रवण चाकार क्राणात ॥
कोकात्रीतिनिवासयमवेदी रुप चतुर्वाः-
वेद चं शुभेषमः कस्यते शर्मेञ्च तद्धावता ॥
हेरान्तै कविकुत्तर्पन्न ज्ञानां बनीषैः किं नीपते
रुद्धारायनवियोऽः पुनर्विर वस्तुमंतराः ॥

5. DC, XX, 8320. He was of the family of Appaya Dīśiṭa.
270 Sankara\(^{16}\) was the son of Sivaguru and Āryāmih, of the family of Vidyādharīja. According to tradition he was born at Kāladi on the banks of the Alvoi (Cūrmi) river in Kerala (Malabar) in the year of Kali 2593 (509 B.C.). Before he passed his eighth year, he was proficient in all Indian Literature and he had begun to perceive the unity of absolute existence on which the philosophy of the advaita school is based. Not heeding the protests of his parents, he got himself initiated as an ascetic by Govinda Bhagavatpāda and soon began to wander through the cities of northern India with a band of devout pupils preaching his new doctrines. He founded five Peethas or Mutts in different parts of India, as centres of propagation of his tenets and to this day these Mutts are held in veneration\(^{16}\). He wrote his

---

1 DC, XX 8021. It is also called Kavikaumudī. It contains fancies on 83 objects including birds, beasts, etc.

2 CC, I. 20.
3 Printed, Bombay
4 Printed, Bombay
5 CC I 20
6 Printed Bombay PR, I 118
7 Printed Bombay. Utrāwar, 891.
8 Printed, Bombay
9 Printed, Bombay and Srivangam.
10 Printed, Bombay
11 Printed, Bombay and Madras
12 Tanj Cat, VII 2000.
14 Printed, Bombay
15 CC, II 4
16 DC, XX 8019

18. His horoscope says तुब्हस्ये दूरे कृजे रविज्ञे च दूरी च कृजे.

19. There are four (1) the Śrīdha Pitha at Dwarka established on Māgha Śukla Saptami of the year Sādhana in the year 9211 of the Kaliyuga corresponding to the year 9349 of Yudhishthrasaka (420 B.C.) with Śri Brahma Svarampacharya (Visvarupa), the brother of the famous Suresvaravahaya (MandanaMitra) as its first Asharya (2) the Jyotir Matha at Badarkaṇḍa established on Pausba Śukla Purṇima of the year Yakshas in the year 2616 K. Y corresponding to 2654 Y. S. (495 B.C.) with Total-
commentaries on Prasthānatraya, viz., Brahmaśūtras, Gīta and Upani-
śads. Tradition gives us fabulous accounts of many miracles performed
by him and of his practical experiences in transmigration. He returned
to his native village in time to have a last look at the face of his
revered mother and to set fire to her funeral pile, and to this day
that place of cremation is remembered and visited by devotees. Great
men are short-lived and so was Sankara. He lived only 32 years and
died in Kali 2625 (477 B C)

271 Much has been said on the date of Sankara but with no
unanimity of ideas and the dates given by them range as wide as in the
case of Kālidāsa, over a space of 14 centuries.

charya (Anandagīr) as its first Aoharya, (8) the Govardhana Matha at Jagannathā, established on Vasiṣṭha Sukla Dasauni of the year Nala in 2617 K Y corresponding to 2655 Y. S (484 B C) with Pāmadapācharya (Sanandana) as its first Aoharya, (4) the Saraswati Matha at Sringeri, established on Pausa Sukla Purunma of the year Pungata in 2018 K Y corresponding to 2656 Y S (483 B C) with Hastamalakācharya (Prithvip-
dhara) as its first Aoharya and (5) the Kamakot Pitha at Kanohi established on Vasiṣṭha Sukla Purumna of the year Sudharthi in 2620 K Y corresponding to 2658 Y S (481 B C) with Śri Sankara Bhagavatpada himself as its first Aoharya

For the Ácharyas in Śringeri Mutt, see Lakṣmīnāraṇa Śastri’s Guruveśāmabhākāvyam written during the days of Samāj khara II (1714-1780 A.D.) of Kāladi. (For a full account, see Myś Arch Rep (1939) 15. This work mentions the foundation of Vijanagar by Vidyāraṇya as in Śaka 129 (nāga-śūla arka), Dāği, Vaisakha, Sudśa, 7th Sunday.

1 In this locality, there is now a large Agraharam with a fine temple, and a
bathing ghāt in the river Alwāl a few miles from Kāladi Road Railway Station in the
Oochu State Railway. This act of devotion was due to the perseverance of Mr Rama-
chandra Iyer, the ex-judge of the Chief Court of Mysore and to the munificence of Śri ŚankaraÁcharya of Śringeri.

2 This is according to Kamakotipitha (Kumbakonam) According to Dvāraka
Mutt, Sankara lived in 2631-2669 Yuḍhathira Śrīka According to Śringeri Mutt, Sankara was born in Sāṃ 14 (42 B C) 
But this list gives Śrīśeṣvara the first head, 800 years, this is easily explained because Śringeri Mutt ceased to exist until it was
revived by Vidyāraṇya According to Saññananda’s Śankaraṭīyaya he was born in

Mādhava’s Sankaraṭīyaya gives the date of death as श्रेष्ठाध्यक्ष, meaning Kali
2625 (477 B C) The anniversary is on Meṣa Śūkla Ātridt
3 TEILE (Outline of the History of Ancient Religions, 140) and Max Müller
(India, 360) and M Barth (The Religions of India, 89), have accepted the date 788 A.D.
K T Tehnag (IA, XI 174, 268, XII 95, XIV 64, 185, XVI 42, 180)
places Śankara not later than 590 A.D (See also JBBAS, XVIII 82, 218, 237).
Fleet (IA, XII 310, XIII 412 and XIV 360) says that Nepālavamāvali
Wright’s History of Nepal, 118 123 mentions Śankara as having visited Nepal in the
reign of Vṛṣadēva (680 655 A D) whose son Śankamaṭeh was named after Śankara
But B Indraji (IA, XII 412) says that Vṛṣadēva lived about 260 A.D. Bhandakar
Among modern scholars, many are almost certain that Śankara flourished in the 7th or 8th century A.D. The real foundation of this opinion is traceable to the confusion that has been introduced in the Śankaravijayās or Sanskrit accounts of the life of Śankara, which written, as they are, far later than the times to which they relate, mixed up the accounts of more than one personage of the name of Śankara. Of the

(Rey 1882 8, 15) fixes the date at the end of the 6th century A.D. W. Logan (IA, XVI 160) criticises the statement in the Keralōpattī that Śankara lived about 687 A.D., during the reign of Cheraśīm Perumal and fixes his own date the first quarter of the 9th century A.D. (see also IA, XL, 116) M. Dubey and K. B. Pathak (IA, XI 174, JBRAS, XVIII 916) rely on the chronogram आयादीपाते वर्णसं वर्तमान found in आयायादीपातेः नागार्यम् and give the dates 788-795 A.D. See Bhaṭṭa (1925), 150. The Dābhast (II 141) brings down the date to 1849 A.D. Ramachandra (Lives of Eminent Hindu Authors) places him in 610 B.C. Būndaśi (Elements of South Indian Philosophy, 32) follows Tarakāla’s History of Buddhism and fixes 650-700 A.D. See also Peter saw India to Subh 195, Wundischmann’s Śankara WEBER, II, 51, and Maccoun, SE, 212. Kayali Ramanālu (Dedication Poems, 6). Cowell (Preface to Sāndarçāra maanangraha, vili) and Gouin (Preface to Philosophy of the Upanishads, vili) and Jacob (Tr of Vedāntaśāra, 23) fix the 8th century, A.D. M. Williams (IJ, 46) gives 650-740 A.D. Wilson (Preface to Sanskrit Dictionary, VII and Essays I 194) says the 8th or 9th century A.D. Roy (Myor’s Cato’er, I 677) says Śankara was born in 677 or 787 A.D. at Granganore. R. Mitra (Noitoc, VII 17) accepts 8th century A.D. T. Foulkes (JRD, XVII, NS 196) gives 650-700 A.D. N. Brahmacarya (Age of Śankara, Aduy) reviews the dates and fixes end of 6th century or between the middle of the 4th and 6th century A.D. Coenbrooke gives 1000 years ago Taylor gives 900 years ago, in Deduction to the translation of the Padābhachandrodāya See also Buchanan’s Mysore (III 80, 74), Wilks’s History of Mysore, I, Ap v Madras Lit Soc, X 19X 6 and 65, Mackenzie’s Cole’son, II 73, S V Venkatavara (JRD, 1916), 181) reviews some of these dates and says Śankara’s age was 65 years and he lived in 805-99 A.D.

1. On the life of Śankara, there are the following poems—

(1) Bhāja Śankaravijaya of Gītākhandārya, a direct disciple of Śankara

(2) Poilinā Śankaravijaya of Anandagiri, Ed Deb Ind, TC, II 1470. IA, V.

(3) Śankaravijaya of VidyāŚankara or Śankarānanda

(4) Kamāla Śankaravijaya or Ādiśāryavijaya of Govindaśāhā (SK, II 101)

(5) Gurmāvijaya of Anantānandaṅgār (DC, XXI, 8836 TO, II, 1470)

(7) Śankaravijaya of Vāsudevaśā (DC, XXI, 8807).

(8) Śankaravijayaśāsī of Sādānanda, disciple of Śankara

(9) Śankaravijayāvalīśa of Śīlaśā (DC, XXI 8145).

(10) ŚankīŚīka Śankaravijaya of Mādhava (Vidyāraṇya) Ed with commentary by Dhanapātisuri, Bombay DC, XXI 8146.

successors of Ādi Sankara there were some who were equally great in the propagation of the doctrines. Kṛpaśankara, the 9th (27-68 A.D.), Ujjavalasankara, the 16th (328-366 A.D.), Arbhakasankara, the 20th (396-436 A.D.), and Acidānandaghanendra, the 32nd (667-671 A.D.), Dhīrasankara the 38th (801-839 A.D.)

272 Dhīrasankara of Abnavasankara was a miraculous personality. He was born at Cidambaram in the year of Kali 3889 (787 A.D.) as a posthumous child, the son of Visvajit and Visista. He was 30 months in the womb of his mother and fearing the calumny of relatives on the suspected guilt of conception during widowhood, the innocent mother left the infant on a green leaf in the forest and went away. Picked up by the women of the hermitage of sage Vyāghrapāda, the child grew up and was initiated by the sage in the sacred lore. He was on the Komakoti Peetha for 38 years (801-839 A.D.) He went to Kashmir and after vanquishing various scholars like Udbhata ascended the Sarvagnapeetha. He ascended to heaven with his carnal frame by entering the Daśātreyā cave in his 32nd year.

The following verses Saḍgursantānaparnmala are interesting

273 Among “Sankaras” works are Słostras. राजनिंरस्त्र अत्रास्तुनणं विष्णुर्जन शिवज्ञज्ञ दर्शनेयं ज्ञज्ञ हुसद्युज्ञ देशीयुज्ञ नवर्तामाक्षिक सतानीतान्त हरिमी०ब्लकनकाराय त्रादशमन्जरी देशीयुज्ञ नवर्तामाला विपुलम्बन्द्रृति राजराजेश्वरी, विद्वद्ध जननोमेन श्रवणे तियापणे नागणेश्वर श्रवणे श्रवणे जयश्वर

and Aṣṭakas on अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे अभ्यास पाणुःक शिवाणात्माको कालायुक्त श्रवणे 1. For a collection of these works, See DC, XVIII and XIX CC, I III, Bhārati (1926), 155, SR II 93 97, SKO, 888-9 Ed. Srirangam, Madras and elsewhere Sankarashtrasangrāha, Poona.
To the 20th Acārya, Mūkārībhaka Sankara (396-436 A.D.) is attributed Pancasāti, known as Mūkapancasāti. He is praised by Rāmila in Manprabhā and by Mentha in Hayagrīvavadha, who, it is said, were his pupils. He was contemporary of Mātṛgupta. He was born dumb and when he was restored to speech by a hypnotic bath by the grace of sage Vidyāghana, he praised Kāmūkī in his Pancasāti, in five sections, Āryāstuti, Pādaravinda, Kātākṣa and Mandasmīta, where he poured forth his heart in melodious strains of liquid poetry.

Samantabhadra was a very early Jain poet and probably lived about the beginning of the Christian era. "In the Vīravamsavali of the Śvetambaras he is entered as the 16th Pontiff who lived in 889 after Nirvāṇa. In the Book of Stories, Ārādhana-Kāthā-Kosa of Prabhācandra, there is this traditional account. He was a resident of Kānchi, a sage of might. Coming to suffer from an abdominal disease, he wandered all the way from Kānchi to Paundrāpura, Dāmarupa and Benares. At the latter place he performed a miracle, by manifesting an image of Parsvaṇatha out of an image of Siva."

He wrote Devāgamastotra and Svayambhusotra. In Aūpīrāṇa he is thus praised:

नमस्समांतनमद्राय सहते कविवैचिनि। यहचोवरपाते निरमिश्रः कुमताद्रय ॥
कवीनां गमकारनां ज वादीना वायुमनामपि। यहस्समांतनसदश्य मुहिः चूडायणागायेते ॥

Siddhasena Divakara, author of Nyayavatara, is mentioned along with Samantabhadra. They are both recognised by the two sections of the Jains, both were great logicians, both lived probably in the early centuries of the Christian era and the tradition of converting a king by manifesting an image of a Tirthankara out of an image of Siva, is reported about both. These coincidences have led some to entertain a belief that the two persons were identical. But since they are separately mentioned by such early writers as Haribhadra Suri and Jinasena, the theory is untenable. His mother was Devāśikā and father a Purohit of King Vikrama of Ujjain. His works have been printed.

---

1. See Gūnraṇānmalikā, verses 4050 and commentary
2. Printed, Bombay.
3. For the same account, see Mahātmanprasāṭi (II, III). Samantabhadra's other name was Sāntīvarma, see Roco's 1st to the inscription of Sravana Belgoa. See Hiralal's Introduction to Oat of Sanskrit Ms of OP and Berar, ix xii. His works have been printed.
4. See Hiralal, 1c xiv.
bhū-ágà to identify him with the Ksapanaka, one of the nine gems of Vikramāditya’s Court. After he met Vriddha Vādīguru he became his disciple and was given the name Kumudacandra. When later he became a Śrī he assumed the name of Siddhasena Divākara.

“Once he presumptuously declared in the presence of his guru that he would turn the whole sacred lore from Prakrit into Sanskrit. To the explanation of the sin committed by this sacrilegious utterance, he was administered by his guru the ‘Paranhika Prayaschitta,’ which required him to remain dumb for twelve years and visit sacred places. In observance of this vow, he once went to Ujjain and lodged in the temple of Mahakah. Here he incurred the displeasure of the priests for not making obeisance to the god Siva. They called the king Vikramāditya who compelled Siddhasena to bow before the god Siva. Siddhasena did this reciting the Kālyanamandira ode which had the effect of splitting the image of Siva in twain and manifesting out of it an image of a Jain Tirthankara. Being impressed with his power, King Vikramāditya and many others became converted to Jainism.”

Jambudīrīyathana Kesari Naya Kesari
Sindhīseṇaṁvijñāyataṁ Viśalakṣṇagārakūtya

277 Asvaghosa

On the identity of Asvaghosa with Māṭjceta and Āryaṣūra, opinion is divided. Many works are attributed to them under these different names and all are alike in the merit of their poetry. There are Asvaghosa’s Gandhisṭotra, Āryaṣūra’s Jaṭḥakamālī, Māṭjceta’s Śaṭpanyacatkaṣṭotra, Ekottarikṣṭotra, Triṣṭnamangalasṭotra, Trīṭṇaṣṭotra, Misraṃṣṭotra, Sugataṃcaṭṭraṣṭotra.

278 Kulasekhara

King of Kerala, was a saint among Śrī Vaṣṇavas. According to the tradition he was the son of Drdhavraṭa and was born as an incarnation of Viṣṇu’s Kauṣṭubha in Kali year 27 in 3075 B.C., Prabhava, Māgha, Suddha, Dvādasi, Guruvara and Punarvasu at Tiḻuvanjikkulam. He gave up his throne and became a...
recluse and composed the divine lyric Mukundamala. In the history of Kerala, there are several kings bearing the name Kulasekharan and in the apppellations of the present Maharajahs of Travancore this is one. Stories current in Malabar says that Kṣṇa-Kulasiṅkṣu, author or Kṛṣṇakaṁśa, was a contemporary of a Kulasekharan and Vāsudeva in his Yudhisthiravijaya mentions Kulasekharan. But the earlier Kulasekharan, the Alwar, has been wrongly identified with later kings of that name, and has been assigned to the 9th century A.D. It is not possible to arrive at any definite conclusion on these identifications, beyond saying that the author of Mukundamala lived for earlier than the author of the dramas, Tapatisamvarana and Subhadradhanamjaya, and Vāsudeva and Lilāsuka were in the courts of some later Kulasekharan of about the 9–10 century A.D.

Mukundamala is very popular lyric often repeated and inculcates the merit of Bhakti or devotion as a means of salvation. There are commentaries on it by Venkaṭaśa and Āndarāṅghava, pupil of Kṛṣṇānanda.

1. So it says Ṛṣaṇa kulāṅkāryakā ḍukolāṅkakān
2. Ṭaṣa bhrāyamvat kāle ḍukolāṅkakān bhrāyamvat
3. K R Iyārātd says that these two authors came one after another and Kulasekharan the Alwar lived in 8–9th century A.D. and the dramatists in 8–9th century A.D. and that the later was the patron of Vāṣudeva and Lilāsuka (IHQ, V 558) A S Ramanatha Iyert in [JRAS, (1835), 968 Authorship of Nalodaya] says that Vāṣudeva the real author of Nalodaya, Yudhisthiravijaya etc., lived under king Kulasekharan of the 9th century A.D. Some modern scholars (see Vasishnavism, Saivism and minor religions by R G Bhadrakar and Early History of Srī Vaisnavaism in South India by S Krishnasami Ayyangar) identify the Alwar with the author of the dramas on the ground that they are described as kings in this the same locality and to bring down the date of the Alwar also to 12th century A.D. Keralotpattti give the date of the death of Kulasekharan as 338 A.D. See Trav State Manual, I 228

In Gururāṇgamālikā of Mahādevaṇḍavijaya it is said that Kulasekharan, the royal poet, was taught poetry by Ujjvalasanka, the 16th in ascension (829-867 A.D.)

कुलाञ्चे फवरोकायव बलदेशुहिमाधिविभिन्ने

4 Printed everywhere, Haberln, 615 and Kavyamāla, Bombay. DC, XVIII, 7086
5 TC, II 2036, IV 4893 So says Āndarāṅghava

शूक्तिरेव शृक्तिसारिकति सैवाध्यमय शुक्तिरंगिनिलतदशुपाधितेष शीनार्दशुद्धीत
मौक्त्यान्यश्राविभार्यममन्त्र मुक्त्यचरणाणाब्याययामनमस्त सम्यययु शुक्तिमालाय
श्लाभतत्त्तमकरोहै।
279 Mayura, says tradition, was a friend and father-in-law of Bāna. Bāna and Mayūra were rivals in poetry in the court of King Harṣavarṣīhana of Kanauj, and were equally honoured by the King. Mayūra became glorious, very Sarvāstī incarnate. So says Jayamangala.

Mādhava in his Sanksepa-Sankaravijaya says that Sankara defeated Bāna and Mayūra in philosophical controversy and this Sankara was apparently a later ācārya of that name.

In Bhojaprabandha, Mayūra is mentioned as a poet of Bhoja’s Court, but that work is a fictitious compilation. Bhoja lived far later than Mayūra.

An anonymous Jain commentator has the following story of Bāna and Mayūra. The Jain priests were anxious that the King should not consider them and their religion inferior and in order to convince the King that their holy men could work greater miracles, they got Mānāṭunga tied up by 42 iron fetters and when he sang Bhāktāmara-stotra, the chains came off and he was free.

---

1. See Madhusudana’s commentary on Suryaśāsta. Quakenbos, Sanskrit Poems of Mayura (Col Un Series), Int. 21. Keith, BL, 211.
2. For instance, Padmapatī says

Svavishvaranamadyamāratigarvayā ||
Bhrīravā jñātā māhātā ānjanavat ||

3. So Jalhaṇa in his Suktimuktavall (JBRAS, XVII 607) quotes a verse of Bājaśekhara

Abhāṃ śrāvānāṃ vādīṇyaḥ yamātāmārthāvadak ||
Bhrīravāmukṣamārthāya stotāḥ Bājanamārtha ||

Divākara is mentioned as a poet there in verse 30, l.c. Māli Prabhakara (EDMG, XXVII 77) This verse is found in Śrīmadharmapāḍhaṭi also. The identification Mātanga Divākara, with Mānāṭunga (the Jain poet) by Hall (Int. to Vasavadatta, 91) and Max Müller (India, 380) is wrong.

Jayamangala, a commentator, also says

Svavigharavatāṃprabandhipravānātathātini ||
Nīvaṅkeśa nīpantāṁ stāprobhāyāṁ sarvāt ||

4. See Quakenbos, l.c. 14 15,

Svavāndharmataṃ prabhādāvatā prabhavālakṣānāt ||
Bhākṣāmārutaprabandhipravānāt, svavāndharmataṃ ||

5. Taken from Quakenbos, l.c. 21 22. For variations in Jaina tales, see l.c. 25 et seq. See also Prabandhacūṇḍamāli of Mānāṭunga (Tawney’s Trans, 64, 66).
280. Suryasataka is a centum of verses in praise of the Sun and invokes the grace and succour of Sūrya, his rays, disc, chariot and other accompaniments. Sūrya is described as supreme in the universe and identical with the greatest deities of the Hindu pantheon. Sūryasātaka has been held in high esteem by rhetoricians and has been quoted by Abhinavagupta and Māmamtha.

There are commentaries on Sūryasātaka by Trībhuvanapāla, Yagnesvara, [Madhusūdana, Vallabhadeva, Jayamangala], Śrīranga-deva, [Gangadhara, Bālambhatta, Harivamsa], Gopānātha, [Jagannātha, Rāmabhatta, Anyayamukha], Rāmacandra, and some anonymous.

Besides verses quoted in the anthologies, Mayūra wrote Mayūrāstaka, eight verses, describing the charms of a woman, said by some to be Mayūra’s daughter herself.

There are other Sūryasātakas by Gopālāsarma, Śrīsvara Vidyālankāra, by Raghavendra Sarasvatī, Lingalavi, and by Kodandarāmaya, and Sūryasātava by Hanumān and by Upamanyu.

281 Among Stotras of Sūrya (Sun) SAMHAPANÇASIKĀ ranks supreme. Its diction, devotion and melody have led to the attribution of its authorship to Śambha, the very son of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, but this Śamba is a different poet. He often imitates if not borrows the style and ex-

---

1 For a fine analysis, see Quackenbos, I a 83 et seq. Keith, SL, 201, 212. Ed. by Quackenbos (Col. Un. Sorses) with an elaborate introduction and English translation. Translated into Italian by Berthuemer, Livorno.

2 Printed, Kāvyamālā, Bombay.

3 Ed. by the author (See IV, I 115) mentioned in the Kāvyamālā edition.

4 CC, I 782.

5 TO, III 783, Trav. Cat. 67, 68.

6 Hall’s Pref to Vāsavadatta.

7 DO, XIX 7635.

8 CC, III 150.

9 DO, XII 7621.

10 DO, XIX 7636, TO, I 226, TC, III 2811.

11 These are collected by Quackenbos and translated I a 229.

12 Ed. by Quackenbos, with English translation, I a et seq.


14 CC, I 782. Śrīvāsa was alive in 1694. See Mitra, VII. 119.

15 Utpar, 2448.

16 DO, XIX 7624.

17 TO, IV. 4956.

18 Trav. Cat., 64.
pressions of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti and must have lived about the 9th century A.D.

There is a commentary on it by Kṣemarāja (Rājaṇaka), pupil of Abhinavagupta, who lived about the beginning of the 11th century A.D. Kṣemarāja wrote also Śivāstotra, Bhauravānukarana Stotra, and commented on Paramesvarastotravali and Nārāyaṇa’s Śtvacintāmaṇī.

282. Bana’s Candisataka is a poem in praise of Pārvatī in the form of Candi or Mahīśāsurārdarīni. It describes Candi’s combat with Mahīsa and his destruction by the goddess’s kick. The verses have a majestic gait in Sārūlāvānkrdita metre.

There are commentaries by Dhanesvara, son of Somesvara, and two anonymous.

On Candi, there are Candikucapanḍāśikā by Lakṣmaṇācārya, Candicastanṭa by Rūdrā Tripathi, CandICASTAŚCANDRĪKĀ, by Bhauravānanda, Candikacapata, Candikacarita by Candasimha, Candikālānastotra by Kālidāsa.

283 Manatuuga was minister of King Valrasimha (825–900 A.D.) of the Calukya dynasty of Malwa. He visited the court of Hārī.
Silādiṣṭa and in a controversy with Bāna and Mayūra at Benares, he overcame the evil effects of their sorceries that had tormented the King, by the composition and recitation of the Bhaktāmarastotra, and convinced Nāgarāja by that of Bhayaharanāstavānā.

284 Lokesvarasatakā is a famous encomium of Bodhusattva Lokesvara or Avalokiteśvara, composed in the 9th century A.D., if not earlier. "Each of the verses, in Stagdhara metre, is in the form of an āśirvāda or blessing. The description of the Bodhusattva commences, according to the rule regarding divine beings, with his feet, or, rather, in this case, with the light of his toe-nails. The toe-nails themselves emerge for a moment in verses 16 and 18, and in verse 26 the feet come into play, to accompany us as far as verse 45. Then, more dispersedly we treat of the lotus in Lokesvara's hand, his Amitābha bearing crest, his compassion, his name, his qualities, his worship, love of him, meditation upon him, his praise, his kindness, his grace, the remembrance of him, his action, his universality, his titles, his constancy, his protection, teaching, and so on, as far as verse 83. Then we come to his hand with its lotus, his arm, his dress, his face, his tresses. It is not easy through this thorny track to maintain the freshness of our receptivity, but we acknowledge the thrill which the author has reserved for verse 97, where we meet the Great Being's eye. Or rather, we meet it not, since with a momentary quiver of apprehensive compassion it is turned upon his too ternishly, Hayagriva! From the latter we pass to Bhṛkuṭi-Tārā, saving goddess, and we end with an

1. See Prabhāvaśacarita, Srnga 12
2. In Kalpasutra translated into English, Lucknow, the date of this composition is given as Sam 800 (744 A.D.)
4. There are commentaries on it by Sāntisuri (PR, I Ap 96), by Gunākasuri composed in Sam 1498, by Amaraprabhasuri (PR, III, Ap 218; IV 91) and by Kanakakulasura (PR, IV, 109). Amaraprabha was pupil of Devasundara alias Devasuri who became Surj at Patna in 1426 (See PR, IV viii, Klast, (14, XI 354), Weber 1st, II 936 note) Sāntisuri belonged to Khandellagaccha Kanakakulasura was the pupil of Hīravajasuri. He wrote in Sam 1652, (PR, IV, 103)
5. PR, I Ap 30, III Ap 29 There is a commentary on it by Jinaprabhasuri (PR, I 59, 88) written in Sam 1365 (1309 A.D.) at Sākaṇapura. He was pupil of Jinabhoja. Among his other works (for which see Klast's Onomasticon) are Pancapanmathtastava (PR, IV, 91), Tiṛṭhakalpa (PR, II 79) and a commentary on Aṭṭhasaṅti stava of Nandisena, who completed his work at Ayoḍhya in Sam, 1395.
6. Jinaprabha, guru of Raṇaśekhara, the author of Prabandhacintāmaṇi was born about Sam 1400 and was a different person. See PR, IV, xxxvii
obscurely worded expression (v 100) of the truth that only the words of Sugata are adequate to the description of the whole assemblage of great qualities. Putting the poem side by side with the famous Ajanta picture of Avalokitesvara, if it is indeed he, we can to some extent realize what it may have meant to the poet and his hearers."

285 Ekanatha was the disciple of Janardana Pant of Devagiri. He travelled far visiting sacred shrines and performed many miracles, as did other great teachers of religion. Ekanatha occupied a place between Namdev and Tukaram and taught the Bhakta cult. He lived in 1528-1609 AD. Besides famous as a poet in Mahabali, he wrote the philosophical poems, Hastamalaka and Svatmasukha and a commentary on the 11th chapter of Sri Bhagavata.

286 The poems Suprabhasotra and Avamaharsricaityaastotra are ascribed to King Haavardhana Sarvajnamitra wrote Sragdharsotra.

Stutikusumānjali is a poem in 39 chapters in praise of Śiva by Jagadādha, so is Paramesastotratāvali by Utpaladeva. Stavāntalaharī is in praise of Kṛṣṇa by Visvanātha Cakravarthī.

Among important stotras printed in Bombay are Madhusūdana’s Anandamandakini, Kūranārayana’s Sudarsānasataka, Ďūrvasa’s Tripuramahimastava and Lalitāstavaratāna, Lankesvara’s Sivastupī, Lallādikṣita’s Anandamandirāstutī, Śrikantha’s Ānandasaṅgaraṇatava, Avatāra’s Īvarasataka, Loṅtaka’s Dīnakrandapastuti, Śhananayya’s Viṣṇupahārastotra, Daśakandhara’s Śivāstāvantastotra, Mādhavānanda’s Hastāmalakastotra, Purusottama’s Vișṇubhātikālpalāta.

1 The summary is by C O Blagden [JRASt, (1914), 281].
2 See W S Deenig’s Ekanath, Bombay and Review of his works by C R Śrmvāsa Iyengar in Hindu, Jan 17th 1932 Tarquake, OBL, 800.
3 Ekanātha, who wrote commentary on Bhravrī (OC, I 72) is a different person.
4 Printed, Bombay; Opp, 5592.
5 Thomas, JRASt, (1906) 708 22.
8 Printed Kāvyamāla, Bombay OC, I. 749. This is a commentary by Bhajanakantha.
9 CO, III. 157.
There are also Śrīdhara Venkatesa's Ākhyāgaṇu, Utpaladevācārya's Śivapratīvatāmatāla, Mahākāla's Karpūrakstava, Puspadantī's Mahimnastotra, Rāmakṛṣṇa's Ramanāhēmahimnastotra, Rāmakṛṣṇa's Padvapuspanjali. Lāghubhattarakā's Vimeṣatiṣṭiva.  

287 Maharaja Kṛṣnaraṇa Udayar III (born 1795 A.D.) of Mysore was a poet and patron of letters and is the father's father of the present Maharajah of Mysore. His Devaṭādiubhānamālīkā gives meditative stanzas on various deities with illustrative pictures. His Suryacandrādivāvatārāna, written in 1857, relates 100 episodes each from Rāmaṇya and Mahābhārata and the adventures of the royal brothers Yādurāya and Kṛṣṇaṇyā, the progenitors of the Mysore dynasty of Kings. His Kṛṣṇakathāpuspamanjarī, Čāmundimangalamaṅkā, Mṛtyunjayastotra and Rāmaṇakathāpuspamanjarī have been published in Mysore.  

288. Kasturi Śivasāṅkara Sastri was born at Koochimandarvari Agrahāram, Amlapur Taluk, Godavari District, in the year 1833 and died in 1917 at the age of 83. He belonged to Kaśṭūrivarī Savaram, otherwise called Beta Malhpudi Savaram, one mile from Rajole. He was a Niyogi Brahmin of Vadhōla Gotra. He was son of Somaraṇa. His ancestors were ministers under Native Rajahs and Nawabs, and were highly proficient in Vedic and administrative matters. They were made Desapandyas which position was continued to the members of his family till the boyhood of his father, and in recognition of services the Government also granted an allowance up to the time of Veerasingam, his father's elder brother. He was Sanskrit Pandit in the Arts College, Rajamundry, for 25 years. Besides several works on philosophy, he wrote poems Śivānanḍalahari, Śivapāḍasēuti, Sōtrakaṭāmba, Dwādasamanjarī, Samudrātakam, Śūlapānīṣṭaka, Nṛṣunhasēṭṭra and other smaller Sōtras.  

289 Bellāmkonda Ramaṇa was the son of Mohanaraya and Hanumāyamma. He was born in Pamidipadu Agrahāram in

1. Ed by Visnuprasad Bhandari, OSS Benares, with commentary of Ksmaraja. For other stotras, see Trav. Cat, 60 68.  
2. Printed, OSS, Benares with two commentaries.  
3. Printed, OSS, Benares with commentaries. Translated by K. M. Banerji.  
5. PB, V, 660. Trav. Cat., 60.  
6. Trav. Cat., 51  
CHAPTER XII

Laghukavya—(contd)

290  **Krsna Lilasuka** was the son of Dāmodara and Nīlī and pupil of Īśanadeva, the author of *Gantrapadhati*. Rāghavasānayaṭī, the author of commentary on Bhūgavaṭa was his friend. He was a votary of God Mītyunjaya of Śvetārūryakṣetra, otherwise known as Ṛakṣanakārusam. He lived at Mukūthala, now known as Mukkuttalai, in Malabar on the banks of the Bhārati. He was such an ardent votary of Śrī Kṛṣṇa that he went in trances singing his praise and in one of those trances the song was sung by Śrī Kṛṣṇa himself in praise of his devotee.

---

1  The Trav Cat (58), 88, 91 mentione Īśanahuṭṭidaeva's poems, Paḍmanābha saṭaka, Rāmaṭaka, Kṛṣṇaṭaka, Bhāravaḥṣaṅkṣeṇa, Rāmāyaṇaṃṭa.

2  The whole piece is printed here, as the only manuscript of it is with M. Ramakrishna Kavi —
As an ascetic he appears to have assumed the name of Bilvamangala and founded the Natuvile Madham of Lincutur. The heads of Mutt are known as Bilvamangala. In Gada's Sampradāya-Kula-dipika, it is said “There were some devotees, one named Bilvamangala in the Tamil country, another at Benares and a third, in Orissa. There is a slotra containing 108 stanzas composed by him. All of them were Vaishnavas. The person who was born at Kasi was in his first birth known by the name of Madhavanala, in the second, Bithana, in the third Bilvamangala and in the fourth, Jayadeva who composed the Gita-govinda. When Bilvamangala was spreading the religion of Visnusvami, he got many disciples.”

As it is, this poet may be taken to have lived in the 11th century A.D.

Kṛṣṇa Lalāsula is one of those glorious men, whom every province desires to claim for itself, Bengal, Orissa, Circars and Malabar. It is said in the Circars that he lived on the banks of the river Kṛṣṇa Venna (Krṣṇā) and founded a Mutt at Amaresaram. So in Bengal and Orissa, the story is current that he lived at Jagannath and he was called by the name Bilvamangala on account of the auspicious Bilva in his house. Tradition gives a tale of his conversion as a votary of Kṛṣṇa. He had a concubine Cintāmaṇi. She was very pious and would not allow him to see her on the day of her father's annual ceremony. But the passionate lover scaled the walls of her house at midnight with his hold on a serpent's tail hanging there and bitten by it fell down unconscious. The kind woman attended to him and when he was revived, she appeared before him in an ugly attire and taught him to give up his carnal passion and to devote his love to Kṛṣṇa. He learnt Kṛṣṇa-mantra from his guru Soma and became an ascetic. His sayings are recorded by his disciples. He passed away at Brundāvan.

291 In the field of grammar and philosophy, his proficiency was ever as great as in the field of poetry. He commented on the

1. A Govinda Wariyar says that of three Bilvamangalas whom he mentions (IEQ, VII 884), the first, the founder of the Mutt, wrote Kṛṣṇakarnamārta and lived in 9th century and the author of Puruṣakāra was a different and later person who lived in 18th century.
2. On Visnusāmi and his sect, see Farquhar (I a) 288, 304
3. SB, II 14
4. Farquhar (OBL, 304) gives the date 15th century A.D.
5. For an account of this poet by M Ramakrishnakavi, see Andhra-patrika,
Annual number (1922-23) 1714
6. See SB, II 57
43
Aśādhārya of Bhoja (known also as Sarasvatīmahābhārata) and there quotes several verses of Tāṇmī. He refers to Hemacandra in his philosophical work Puruṣakāra, and he is quoted by Vidyāranya in his Dhiṭavātī.

Among his works now available are Ishubhavanāsubhaga, Gana-pūjaṇī, Karkotakastuti, Ramanacandra totti, Abhavastuti, Kṛṣṇavatī, Visvadhikastuti, Sumangalastuti, Kṛṣṇacarita, Kṛṣṇabībakridī, Abhavāvī, Kauśubhāmala, Kramadipīki, and Sūkraabhīṣayānāna.

292 In his Brndavanastuti, he describes Rāmakrīḍa, in verses which for their charm and melody can rarely be equaled. In his Kalavādha in 3 cantos he relates the story of the conquest of Yamā by Siva to save Mārkandeya and the narrative is addressed in the words of Kṛṣṇa himself to the Gopīs. In his Govindabhisēka (Gopikābhīṣekā) a poem in 8 cantos he illustrates the aphorisms of Prākrit grammar and these were later on commented upon and supplemented by his pupil Durgāprāṣada Yati, by 4 cantos. The whole poem of 12 cantos is also called Śrīc PIPEYara.

293 By far the greatest work, by which his name has been commemorated is Kṛṣṇakarnamrta. It is a lyric in 12 garāgas of exquisite beauty, famed for its music and harmony, on the life of Kṛṣṇa.

1. See para 4 supra
2. Edited TSS, by T. C. Ghart Sastri
3. IOO, VII. 1470-5. Some of these manuscripts are with M. Ramakṛṣṇa Kavi. He says he brought all these manuscripts from Malabar for the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, but that they were returned by the authorities without copying them.
4. See Kupposam Sastri's Rep (1919), 88. In his commentary on Govindānihīrā, Durgāprasadāyaṭi gives these particulars.
5. Printed everywhere Keith, SL, 218.

The poet says:

'.connections...
The thoughts are often expressed in Abhinaya and is the poem familiar among gesture-dancers.

There are commentaries on it called Karnaṇandaprakāsini and Śrāpāraramagadī of unknown authorship and commentaries by Gopāla by Brāṇāvanadīsa, by Sankara, by Pālanka Brahmabhatta, by Pusupālī Pāpayallayasūrya, and by Avancha and Rāmacandra and Rāma Bhatta, Subrahmanyakavi and Pusupati Papiyalayasuna, and by Avancha Ramacandra and Ramakarnamṛti of Pratāpasimha and Rāma Bhatta, Subrahmanyakavi and Pusupati Papiyalayasuna, and by Avancha and Rāmacandra and Ramakarnamṛti of Bangalore Siddhānti and Subrahmanyakavi are of similar description.

294 Jayadeva

Vilvamangala was reborn as Jayadeva, such is the belief of the Indian devotees. Jayadeva was the son of Bhogadeva and Vāmādevi. He was born at Kindubilva (Kenduli) on the banks of the river Ajaya in the Birbhum District of Bengal. For an instance of his natural description:

1 For an instance of his natural description
2 Oxf 128 It is not known if it is the same as the one mentioned in DO, XVII, 6947 and Opp, II 64
3 Oudh, VI 4
4 CO, I 119.
5 Printed, Kāvyamāla, Bombay
6 TO, II 1852, 3031, Opp II, 54. He belonged to Lohitagotra, obviously an Āṇḍhra.
7 SB, II 58 This commentator suggests that the poet was a native of Choescole. The commentator was the son of Tirumalla and Kondamānba. He gives various meanings of philosophical significance.
8 TO, III 2977, IV 8748, 4498, 4170. He was the son of Kondopandita and Gangāmbhā of Sāndilagotra of the village of Kanjalora on the Godāvari branch Ajeyn. He was also called Mohanabilvamangala. He commented on Campbellāyana also (TO, II 1543).
9 Opp II, 8884
10 Printed, Madras, DC XVIII, 7122
11 Printed, Tirupati Srimahante Press, G T, Madras
12 See Gada's Sampradāyakuladīpti, SB I 15
13 Lakṣmidhara, the commentator, says that Jayadeva was a native of Guzerat. Others say he was Māthila. In Bhārtymāla (Canons 39-41) Candragātta says Jayadeva was born at Tindubiya near Furi. Once robbers chopped off his feet and hands and they were miraculously restored. In his old age he desired to have a bath in the Ganges and the river appeared before him in her watery form.
a poet of the court of Laksmanasena, the Vandy, king of Bengal whose capital inscription is dated Samvat 1173 or 1116 AD and whose capital was Laksmiyan.

A rambler in early life, he visited Mathur and Brahavan and was directly influenced by the enchanting scenery and the traditional tales of Radha and Krishna. He became a missionary of that cult of Vaisnava faith. He visited Jagannath and there his life was destined for a change. There a brahman long childless had a beautiful girl Padmavati by the grace of the Lord of Jagannath. He had a dream directing him to bestow her on Jayadeva then camping under a tree near the shrine. In spite of Jayadeva's reluctance, the father left the girl in his presence and went away. Jayadeva had no choice and married her. His married life was very happy, she was of his temperament and his regard for her devotion is expressed in his Gitagovinda in that "to the accompaniment of his song, she dances on his feet." He spent some years at Kathamand and then he composed his Gitagovinda. When the poem was nearing completion, he stumbled on an incident. Krishna repents his illicit animus and seeks pardon of Radha. He thought of expressing that in these words — "Deign, O, Lady, to put thy sprout-like feet on my head and quench the all-consuming fever of love." But his religious scruples would not permit it. Sad and desperate he threw up his work and went to bed. To his surprise, the next morning he found a verse added to his manuscript, 'grant the

1 Lakshmanasena was the patron of Sidharadisa, author of Sadukhtikamamrita Verses of Lakshmanasena and his father Ballalasena are quoted in SP, SAI, and Padya vali (See CO, I, 348) See Pischell Die Hof Lichtvööer Laksmanasena, Gottingen, N, Vasan, Chronology of the several kings of Bengal, JASB, XXV 16 Bühler's Kesh, Rep, 64, Princep's Essays, II H Boyendgo, IA, XLVII 272. His era began in 1119 90 AD but on this question see I I, IV 300, 167, 14, XIX 2. See also S Kumar, On the date of Lakshmanasena, IA, XLI 186, D O Bhattacharya, Dates of Lakshmanasena and his predecessors, IA, XLI 145, XLVIII, 171, XLIX 189. For other papers see R D Bauerjee, JASB IX 271, N G. Majumdar, JASB (1913), 276, 21, XV 281, Lassen, Ind Alt IV 815. Sidharadisa says however that his Sadukhtikamamrita was composed in 91st year of Lakshmanasena's reign which was concurrent with 1127th year of Saka. That would put the accession to 1106 AD. see Smith (EHZ, 105) gives dates 1170 1200 AD.

2 Tradition has preserved a verse, said to be part of an inscription, which says कृत्तिकास्मातरहि जयदेव उपस्थिति । कविरच्छ रत्नानि समिति ऋषिय्रस्त्र ।

3 वादेवरातचित्तिचित्तिचित्स्मय प्रार्थी विविचारणवाश्रेरचक्षु ।

4 शीघ्रादेवतलक्ष्मिनदीमेंटि करोति जयदेवकारः प्रमोऽ ॥
noble sprout of thy foot be the ornament on my head, which shall be the antidote to the poison of love." 1 In he thought was the grace of Kṛṣṇa himself and the poem was soon complete. The village where the Gitagovinda was composed has since been called Jayadevapura. His poem was admired everywhere. He was regarded as inspired. Hundreds flocked to him for spiritual instruction. A noble prince of Ajmeer gave him funds for the celebration of an annual festival of Kṛṣṇa, but on his way home, he was attacked by a robber band and deprived of all his possessions. He was then entertained for some years at the court of Laksmaṇasena, Vaidya king of Bengal. He died at Kenduli in happy retirement about 1120 A.D. His anniversary is celebrated by his followers on the Sukla Śaptami of the Paushya month. 2

The poem was held in much esteem in Orissa. It was ordered to be sung in temples by King Pratāparudrādeva, 3 and King Purusottamadeva (1470-1497 A.D.) 4 composed Abhinava–Gitagovinda.

295 Gitagovinda is a celestial song in praise of Lord Kṛṣṇa. His wife Padmāvatī danced with him in accompaniment to his tunes. The poem has 12 cantos and 24 astapadis. 5 The cantos correspond to the Kāndas of Bhāgavata and astapadis to the 24 alphabets of Gāyatri. Each astapadi begins with a chorus followed by eight feet at the end of each of which the chorus is repeated. The melody and time of every song, that is, rāga and tāla are mentioned at the outset. The

\[
1 \quad समरग्रहणाङ्गममविशिष्टव्रद्धन्वेधिपदप्रक्षवदारम्
\]

ललिति सति दारणो मदनकदनारणो हरुः तःपालितविवरम् ||

2 Saks IX 95, SP, II 59. On Jayadeva generally, see D. Sen's History of Bengali Literature, M. Duff's Chronology 136, R. C. Dutt, Cvs II 295, Weber, IL, 210 note Lassen, ID, 11, IV 615, Lyall's Asiathe Studies, III 185. Tawney's Prabandhakamani, xvii 1818. M. Cakravarti, "Sanskrit Literature in Bengal under Sena rule" JasB, (1906) 157. Life of Jayadeva is found in Bhakta-vipyām (Andhra) (1) by Śripāda Subrahmamya (2) by Dhanala Koyat Dévarapilla (Printed), (3) by Dévarapalli Candraya, Vadlamudi, Bapatl Teluk (unprinted) and in Candradatta's Bhaktamāl (Printed, Bombay) See Int. to Kavyāmālā, Bdn.

3 See JasB, LXXII 96, 146

4. HPR, (1896-100), 17

5. For a detailed description, see SP, II (1899) 69, and Jayadeva and his Ítihali, Saks III 95, IX. 96. Printed everywhere Translated into English by Edwin Arnold, into German by Rickert (Leipsig), into French by Courtallac (Paris), by Lassen (Bonn). This poem is quoted in the Subhāṣītavali and Śrangādarapādhaṭi and by Potaraya in his Prasangaraṇāvai composed in 1460 A.D. (DO, XX. 8066)
melody gives the keynote and the other notes in the gamut, which are used in the song.

296 This work marks, according to Macdonnell, the transitional stage between pure lyric and pure drama, — "a lyrical drama, which though dating from the twelfth century is the earliest literary specimen of a primitive type of play that still survives in Bengal and must have preceded the regular dramas of the later period. The poem contains no dialogue in the proper sense, for its three characters only engage in a kind of lyrical monologue, of which one of the other two is supposed to be an auditor, sometimes even no one at all. The subject of the poem is the love of Krishna for the beautiful cowherdess Radha, the estrangement of the lovers and their final reconciliation. It is taken from that

1 The melody for instance of the first ashtapadi is Malava, the notes of which are G, D, flat, E, F, G, A, flat, and B with D as the keynote.

In Hindu dated 16.11.1927, P. R. Sandara-Iyer, Headmaster, Training School, Tuchinopoly writes "There has been some doubt among musicians here about the authenticity of the Ragas assigned to each Ashtapadi. Let us examine the Raga of an Ashtapadi or Madhyamagrama. He states as his reason that the thought that is conveyed has to be adjusted and expressed in that Raga alone, for the rhythm.

|| न तस्मि वियतो लोक्स सवोऽंस्यपत्तितर्थः ||
|| अस्तयािर्मितिः विवेकात्सत्योष्य तत्तताः ||
|| नीला गातिता तदा हिता कठोऽसु पवर्त्ते ||

which means, "The composition was made by Jayadeva and it is musically perfect in so many ways. I shall, therefore, provide it with the Svaras and the other limbs of music and give it its true colour." So. Kumbha — a musician himself, of course an expert musician of the northern side — clearly means that the music of Jayadeva in the original was bad and he was constrained to effect a change in the melody as evidenced by the further statement in the preface—गमकालापेश्वरत्या मच्यस्मार्गेय वादयेन मधुम-
|| प्रेण मच्चयादिरागेण गाथोऽ ||
|| As it is provided with flourishes and is fit for sweet singing as a Raga, it has to be sung in Madhyamagrama. As a Sadava Raga (six note Raga) of the Madhyamagrama.

It has to be noted that Kumbha of Mewar, a musician-kung as he was, had the necessity to change the original tunes of Jayadeva even as early as the 14th century. Perhaps or more than that, the same necessity was felt by the musicians of the South and for the very reason assigned by Kumbha, the Southern musicians have adjusted the Ashtapadi to the South Indian Ragas now current. By the way, there is in South India, a system in which particular Ragas are assigned to particular ideas for the expression of the lover in particular stages. Take the Nayaki in sixteenth Ashtapad — Punnagavallal has been especially selected for the expression of the same stage of the same sentiment by the musicians of the South like Kasteyama."
episode of Krishna's life in which he himself was herdsman living on the banks of the Yamuna and enjoying to the full the love of the cowherdesses. The only three characters of the poem are Krishna, Radha and a cupid mate of the latter.

In the melody of its diction, in the perfection of its composition, in the ease of its alliteration and in the expression of varied emotions, Gitagovinda has probably the first place in the lyrical literature of the world. Indian mind is mostly philosophical and so was presumably the mind of Jayadeva, full of his devotion to the deity he addressed. The sexual ideas, apparent in the verses, have received at the hands of Indian commentators, an allegorical explanation of divine philosophy, as the longing and union of the supreme and the individual souls.

1 See, for instance

2 O.R. Steinhers Iyengar says "There are four aspects in which the Gitagovinda or Ashtapadi may be viewed: (1) Literary (2) Devotional (3) Musical (4) Mystical. The mystical nature is hinted both in the beginning and end of the work but a full exposition is given in the middle. Radha is not a woman but a thing representing the materialism, and the whole is a gradual story of the pilgrimage of the soul up to the path of glory.

The Ashtapadi begins in a way which gives the whole key to the mysticism. Nanda who was tending his cattle carries the child Krishna. It was a dark night and the sky was cloudy. He entrusted the babe to Radha and Ashtapadi describes the love affair between Radha and Krishna on the banks of the Yamuna or Jamna.
Rāmagītvogīndi and Rādhākṛṣṇavilāsa are attributed to Jayadeva. There are commentaries, by Udayanācārya, Kṛṣṇadāsa, Gopāla, Nārāyanadāsa, Bhāvācārya, Rāmaṭātra, Rāmadattī, Kṛṣṇadeva, Vīthalā, Yānasvāra, Śaṅkīthā, Nīlāvala, Nīlāvala, Śrīkanthamūtra, Gidānanda by Lakṣmīdāra also called Lakṣmānapātra, by Kṛṣṇadattī, by Jaggadālha, by Vānūmahatana, by Pālubhārā, by 

The first song among the others is remarkable in that it mentions the name of the Raga. In it Jayadeva tells us of the ten Avatars, Krishna does not find a place in this list but at the end of the chapter he says that Krishna is the spirit of these ten Avatara. In this work, Jayadeva gives the real significance of the Buddha Avatar, which according to the Pūranas, have been given a wrong version by the orthodox Brahmanas. Olden days and who twisted the Vedas to serve their own purpose The Gita Govind in is the best authority of the ten Avatars, and specially of the real nature of the Buddha Avatar. 

1 The first is mentioned in Prapunadarpana (13. 3. 3034) of Venkatavarī Sarasvatī. For the second, see IO, VII 1460, and for the first, see IGS, Vol. XXII. 

See Gārīm de Tassy. Christomathī blutte et hindine, p 471 where in the Bhaktamāla the Raja of Nīlācalī is stated to have tried unsuccessfully to pass off a Gitagovinda of his own for that of Jayadeva. See IOG, VII 1460. 

2 OC, I 155, II 81, III 83. 

3 It is called Śrīprajājīva (DU, XX 7922 ft) He was son of Yajnavevara and Saryāmba and grandson of Timmayasomayaji of Chorukuru family, a native of the Kṛṣṇa District. He refers to a poem of his and was also the author of Sādhbhiṣa, Svaranjanjī, Alankāravaktaivali (CC, 1. 3) and commentaries on Prasanna Rāghava and Anargharāghava and refers to his work Ramanjī. His step brother of Kondubhattopadhyāya, whose son YajnavevaraṇḌka, was the author of Alankārā rāghava and Alankāravaktaivali (see chapter on Poesies post) On Lakṣmi dāra, see Int to Gangaavatara (Kavvamala No 70) 13. ST, I 33, 67, 69, 209, and SVH, 213. In the colophon to the commentary on Anargharāghava it is said Lakṣmīdāra became an ascetic and assumed the name of Rāmanāḍa under his guru Kṛṣṇadattī. 

Another manuscript (OC, XX 7989 92) attributes the commentary Śrīprajājīva to Tirumalāraya, son of Tirumalāmba and Śrīprajājīva, of Aṭīrāya gotra. Tirumala was the younger brother of Aḥyā Rāmarāya, the son in law of Kṛṣṇadevarāya. After the battle of Tailkota in 1565, Tirumala changed his capital to Penkunda and ruled for 18 years. He was the patron of the author of Vasuṣaśita, the Telugu poet and brother of Venkatādī. The introductory verses give these details. (See paras 124, 144 supra) Lakṣmīdāra was a poet of the court of Tirumala I of Vijayanagara of Adiva Dynasty (1548-1575 A.D.) About the latter, see Sewall's Forg Emp 178 404, South Ind Inst 70, SVH, liv, 18. It is therefore quite possible that this commentary was written by Lakṣmīdāra under the patronnage of Tirumalāraya of Penkunda. 

4 Ibid., called Śrīlekhā The author was a native of Mībhā. He explains every verse as referring to Śiva, Ulav, Cat 27, IO, 187. 

5 This is called Śrādhipā The author says he referred to several commentaries and wrote his own. DU, XX 7987. 

6 PR, II, 188 He also wrote a play Adbhutārāghava, CC, III 2. 

7 Gough, 87.
Laghukavya


In the Nīrṇayasagara edition there are eight verses in praise of the Ganges, Gangāstava, printed. It is thought that is the work of Dhirā Jayadeva, a later poet.

Among other works composed on this model are Gītāgauripati of Bhānudatta, Gītvigīta of Somanātha, Gītaraghava of Hari Sankara, Gītaraghava of Prabhākara, Gītaraghava of Rāmakavi, Gītagirīsa of Rāma, Sangītamādhava of Govindādīśa.

1 IA, XLII 252, BTC, 153, Brk 280, Mys Cat 245
2 SKC, 261 Composed at the instance of king Chandrasahi of Ghāhāpur in the country of Tripuri near Narmadā
3 SKC, 260 Prince Anupāna seems to have been only the patron and not the real author
4 SKC, 67
5 PR, I, 114, Bod Cat 221, IO, 118
6 Printed, Bombay. The author styles himself Mahāmahopādhyāya
7 CC, I 154
8 Printed Bombay. On Kumbhakarna, see chapter on Māru post. He was also the author of Sangītasudhā and Sangītarśa (CC, I 111)
9 It was composed at Śrī Purusottama Kṣetra (Puri) in Śaka 1664 (1586 A.D.)

Mys Cat 245
10 CSCO (1917) 550, Mys Cat. 245
11 PR, III 250
12 DC, XX 7936, probably by Jñagoswāmi. There is another anonymous commentary in SKC, 67
13 CSCO (1907), 88 4
14 There are Gangāstava (1) by Kavikārāpura (2) by Devāvaya (3) by Hambhāśkara (4) by Gangādhara (5) by Śatyaśāhāsanandatīrtha, printed in Bombay, in Brhaspatraātukara, 844, and in Haberlin, 471. See CC, I 140
15 Printed, Bombay. There is another poem Kṛṣṇagīta in more than 9 cantos, on which there is a commentary by Anuṭṭānātyāya Śastri, TC, III 3915
16 Printed, Bombay
17 BR, II 88. See CC, III 88
18 BR, (1884), 8, 9, CC, I 154. He was the son of Bhadhara. He composed it in 1674 A.D.
19 Mys OML, 246
20 Oxf, 129. He was son of Śrīnātha. There is a commentary by Ātmārāma, NW, 616.
21 He wrote also Kāṇākhāta and lived in 1587 1612 A.D. See Dinesandra Sen's History of Bengali Literature, 547.
Gita'itarāga by Abhinavatṛukita,2 Gītakāntādhana (a) by Kalyāna,2
(b) by Kapasekhara and (m) by Candrasekharasasthavati, Sivagītāmāhā,3
by Candāstithamani,5 Ramodaharanāgītāvya,6 Sivālapadi by Venkataparita Naik of
Mysore,7 Gītasatika by Sundarārava,6 Sangita-Raghunandana by Visvanātha,9 Sangitrundana by Sadāsiva Dikīta.10

Mukundavilāsa in six cantos describes the sports of Hira and Hara
as if they were one.11 Sankaśī mātī, of Jay mātiyana, son of Kṛṣṇa-
candra, in 12 palolas, describes the marriage of Vīrata and Sīva.12

299. Vamsamani was the son of Rāmacandra of the Viṣapaṇca race of Mathila Brahmans. He lived in Nepal and wrote
Gītādīgambhara on the occasion of a Tulāpurusadāna by Pratāpamalla
Deva of Katmandu in Saka 1577 (1653 A. D.) "It was composed to
entertain the princes and pailitas assembled to see the Tulāpurusadāna
in which the king in his armour weighed himself against gold and other
precious metals and gives them away to Brahmans. Pratapa was him-
sel a poet and his Astakas are to be found in all the holy places in
Nepal inscribed at prominent places on stone. It is meet that on an
auspicious occasion like this that he should encourage a Sanskrit
dramatic performance.13

300. Venkataramanaiya (C), a principal of Sanskrit College,
Bangalore, is the author of several works. Of these Kāmalāvyaya is a
play in five acts, developed from the story of Hennyson's Cup, a tragedy
in two acts. It has no prakrit. The pith of the story is as he says the
victory of Virtue over Vice. His Navamahakusumajanai is meant "to
bring home to every one that there is only one divine power called
God who is worshipped and contemplated under various names and
forms by different kinds of people in the world. "To include this all
important truth, the popular Hindu theology and mythology have been
adopted as far as the narration of the story is concerned, keeping at
the same time the central idea running throughout each part or poem.
The poem is of 108 verses divided into 9 parts, viz., (1) Ramagītā
containing essence of Rāmāyaṇa, (2) Kṛṣṇagītā, narrating briefly the
story of Bhāgavata, (3) Dāsāvatāragītā explaining the objects of ten
avālasas of Viṣhnu, (4) Ganesagītā showing that God under this name

1 Mys OML, 246
2 Osf, 193
3 Mys OML, 245
4 CAL II 17
5 Mys OML, 255
6 Mys OML, 695
7 BTO, 168
8 Printed, Bombay.
9 Udar, 980
10 CC, I 690
11 Mātrā, X
12 TC, IV 4587, CC, I 690
13 Nīg, l. 18 CC, III 33
7 BTO, 168 He ruled in 1582 1629 A.D.
is also God of Universe and none else, (5) Sadgurugita similarly indicating that all true knowledge proceeds from the great intelligence, the fountain head of all knowledge, (6) Sivagita explaining the Siva aspect of God and demonstrates with convincing reasons that there is no difference between Bramha, Visnu and Siva as far as central truth is concerned, (7) Vanigita, (8) Laksmigita and Gourigita showing that even female aspects of Divine Power contribute in effect to the same central idea"

301 Narayanatirtha is said to be the last incarnation of Madhavanala. He calls himself the pupil of Sivaramanandaatirtha. He lived at Kuchimanci Agraharam in Godavari District about 1700 A D. His Krsna-lilatarangini embraces the story of Krsna in 12 tarangas. The musical modes and rhythmic time are specified and explanatory verses are inserted between the songs. The poem is fit for the lyre and showers sentiments of devotion.

Krsna-lilatarangini of Bellamkonda Ramaasatri is a work of similar description. Krsnaabhavanamrita of Visvanatha, Krsnaabhakticandrikai, Krsna-lilamrita with Acyutarao Modak's commentary, Krsnanandalahiri and Krsnapmritatarangikai of Venkatesa have the same theme.

302 Among the friends of Jayadeva in the Court of King Laksmasena were Govardhana, Saraana, Umapati and Dhoji Kaviraja alias Srutidhara. Jayadeva mentions them thus in Gitagovinda:

$$\text{नाच पाचवयुःपाणिरसतस्वरूपमुरूः, ग्वरा}$$
$$\text{जनीति जयदेव एवं शरणप्रचाचको दुरस्थुते}$$
$$\text{श्रुतिरत्नस्वरूपवर्नराविधयोववर्णन}$$
$$\text{स्वर्णी कोपि न विद्युष्ठंतरवरी ठोपी कविक्षमापति}$$

1 See para 290 supra
2 I examined the Inam register from the Collector's office. The grant was by Kolavennu Buchama Rao and Timmanina Rao in Fashi 1151, subsequently confirmed by Morgin Beg in Hizra 1157 and certified by the Collector on 4th May 1715. The original grantees were Bhagavatula Linganna and Gopalaun, Peddibhotla Gurulingam, Vedantam Ramesam and 5 others.
3 DC, XX 7951, IOC, VII 1463
4 See under that author post
5 Printed, Bombay
6 Printed, Bombay
7 Tradition says so
303 Dhoyi had the fuller title Gau Gau Dhoi Kaviraja. He was Srutadharma, because he learnt by a single hearing. His Pavanaduta describes the message of Kuvalayavati to King Lakshmanasena and is on the model of Meghaduta. His Satyabhama-Krishnasamvada is not now available.

304. Sarana, says Jayadeva thoro, was quick but hard in versification.

305 Govardhana was son of Nilaembra Somayajin. He had a brother Balabhadrana and a pupil Udayana. He calls himself an Aarya Aryasaptasati or shortly Saptasati is a collection of 700 verses on various subjects, erotic in character, in the order of the Sanskrit alphabets. The flow of his diction keeps with the running gait of the Aarya metre. He refers to Lakshmanasena in his poem as a master of arts. There are commentaries on it by GokulaCandra, by Ananta, son of Tryambaka, by Gangarama and one anonymous.

1 Keith, LS, 220. For quotations in anthologies, see Thomas, Kav 122. The Kaviraja mentioned in the memorial verse quoted page 345 surya is therefore the same as Dhoyi. This dispels the suggestion of the identification of that Kaviraja with the author of the Raghaavapattavaiya. Gau is a Hindustani title for a learned musician. Kaviraja is the Sanskrit title of an excellent poet, versed in different languages.

वारनिष्ठक वनकलितकं नाम स्रजस्वलं चौ गोविन्दारकः तत्कस्मात् चक्राणि।
श्रीशोभ्यक सक्तंसदिकोत्किशोरितिविवेंद्रसि काव्य सारस्तलिव महामंजरविकालवः।

Pavanaduta, 101.

2 Ed Calcutta. See also J.SB, (1906) 41, HPR, I 297.

3 This is referred to in Prapanca, 433 of V_EVENTS Yuvabhanana (TC, III, 609). See Kuppusami Sastri's Rep (1916, 19), 86.

4 Referred to as a playwright in Dstrupa (Ed by Hall, 30 note). Keith, LS, 205.


6 भवनिष्ठक वनकलितकं नाम स्रजस्वलं चौ गोविन्दारकः तत्कस्मात् चक्राणि।
 श्रीशोभ्यक वनकलितकं काव्य सारस्तलिव महामंजरविकालवः।

Here on the pretence of describing the beauty of a maiden's eyes, the poet dooneness Jamam.

7 सकलकलं कल्पस्थितं प्रसु अभन्नवः कृष्णदेवोऽशः।

The explanation of the commentator on this verse that the king alluded to was Pravarasena of Kashmir is obviously wrong. See Peterson's Int. to Subh. 88.

8 PR, II No 79, IOC, VII 1827.

9 Ed, Benares. Tanj Cat., VII, 2931, IOC, VII. 1627.

10. Cudh, (1877), 16.

11. TC, III. 4116.
The name of the work seems to have suggested itself from Hāla's Saptasāti.

Among similar works are Śṛṅgārasaptasāti (anonymous) (BTC, 164, DC, XX 8013), Āryāsaptasāti of Viśeṣvara, son of Lakṣmīdhara (Printed Bombay, DC XX 8011), and Śṛṅgārasaptasāti by Paramānanda, son of Vrajacandra, composed in 1869 (Ed Benares), Āryādvīśātya by Dūrvāsas (Opp II 4487, 8163, 8119), Āryātvatisati by Sāmarāja Dīkṣita (Printed, Bombay), Āryātvatisimuktaka or Rasikaranjana of Vrajarāja (Printed, Bombay), Śivadāyasahasra by Nṛsimha (Mys OML, 258), and Śivapādakamalareṇusahasra by Sundaresvara (Ibid), Śri Kanthaṛārisūti (Mys 8).

306 Umapatīdhara was the minister of King Lakṣmīpāpasena. The story goes that to restrain the king from a scandalous alliance with a Mātangī, the poet wrote some verses, indirectly hinting at the disgrace. The king was displeased and dismissed the minister. Sometime later, he noticed the poet wandering in the street in rags and when he addressed him another verse, the king repented and restored him to his favour. His Kṛṣṇacarita probably gives the life of Kṛṣṇa. His

1 Ed, Bombay No 21 (with Gangadhara's commentary) This is a piece of most exquisite poetry. It is said that the real author was Śṛṇgāla, a poet of the court of Hāla. He has contributed greatly to the art of poetry in the Srīvijayā. His story includes some verses of Hāla with prose German Translation (Leipzig), Bhan Day's Essay on Śṛṅgāla, Principe's Essays, II 1544. T, XII 214, Buhler, LA, I 807, Peterson Int to Kadambas (BSS, 24, 74), T Rajagopala Rao (South Indian Research, I 295) identifies Śṛṅgāla with Śṛṅgāla, S, Konow's Int to Karpuramanjars (HOS, 193), Macdonell (SL, 364), says it is a rich treasury of popular Indian lyrical poetry. Bhandarkar, EBD, 171, Mandlik, JBRA, X 127, V, Smith (EH 208) gives the date of Hāla, as the 17th Andhra king, about 30 BC, T S Narayana Sastri (Sanskara, Part I D, 98) says he was the 18th King of the dynasty and son of Aruṇa Śatikarni and assigns him to the dynasty. This is a great praise to say that Ādi Śukhāya was the contemporary of Hāla. His works are known as Hāla, Śṛṅgāla, Śṛṅgāla. The are commentaries on Saptasāti by Gangadhara, Premarāja, Bhuvanapāla, Piṭāmbara, Sādhanaṣadāśa, Kālaśaṣadāśa, Kulabāladeva (PR, III ap 399, OC, I 151) and Vamanabhūpāla (TO IV 506). Hāla is said to have been the patron of Guṇḍābhīya. For several recensions, see Melrose Swarn's Int to śṛṅgālāprakāśa.

2 See Rājaśakara's Prabhaudhādvyupariṇāma, (Tawney's Translation, 161, 159), Farquhar, (ORL, 306, 378) says Umapati were contemporary of Vidyāpāti at Thrutn of the 10th century A D. See JBRA, XXXIV, 142, and ZDMG, XL, some poems in Maithili are published in JBRA, XLIII 76, B Chatterjee, Padāvāl Literature (J, of Dep of Letters, Calcutta Univ, XVI, 41).

3 It is mentioned in Prapancaārāpana (TO, III 4094).
PARJATAPAHARANA is a short drama and contains musical pieces. Nārada presented a Pārijata flower to Kṛṣna and this he gave to Rukmī. Satyabhāma grew jealous and when Kṛṣna sent word to Indra for some more, they were refused. Kṛṣna with Arjuna as his lieutenant went to war, defeated Indra and brought the flowers.

Umāpatidhara composed the Deopara inscription of Vijayakam and his verses are quoted in Saduktikarnāmīti and Sūktimuktivati. Sārana called also Caturmastrana is quoted in Saduktikarnāmīti. There are poems on the same theme by Kavirāja (see para 87 supra), by Nārīyama (see para 214 supra), by Raghunātha (see para 146 supra, DC XX, 7848, \|, 8397), a cūmpī by Kesākṛṣṇa (Bh. 256, C, I 335) and plays by Gopālādasa (C, I 335) by Kamandrodhaya and by Kamāratacārava called Caturvedī Sūktakṛṣṇa (C, II 2374, SIV, 254)

307 Amarukasatā In his visit to Mithusati, Sankara encountered Mandana and sought a controversy. Mandana's wife was Bārati, an incarnation of Sarasvatī. They set her as their umpire and after a long interval Mandana acknowledged defeat and became an ascetic adopting the tenets of Sankara. Then Bārati "begged the favour of a controversy with herself", for Sankara had not yet defeated but one half of Mandana. She herself being the other half. He objected to arguing with women, but she quoted precedents. So, as before, the disputation went on for seventeen days. Bārati trying to discomfit Sankara passed from one Sastra to another, and finding at last that she could not inflict a defeat on him in any other science, she resolved to humble him by means of the science of Jvō or Kam-astra. Now Sankara had not had the experience needed to answer questions on this science, and so found that his reputation as well as the resultant victory of his cause was at stake. So he begged of her an interval of one month for preparation to meet her in argument, which being allowed, he went to the banks of Narmada and in the hole of a tree in a some forest there he left his body in hiding and asked some of his

1. JBORS, III 20 09, Ed. Giersen with translation by Aufrecht (CC, I 388) says it was written in the reign of Hinduśātra Harinārada. Giersen says that Umāpati lived at the Court of Hamalihādeva of Mithila, whom Uma pati calls Harinārada.

2 EJ, I 807 11

3 Gopāla Bhatī, author of the drama Sānanda Govinda (CC, I 707; Levi, app, 31) and Gopālārāja, author of the bhāpa, Śyāvatāyana and Śyāvaramanjari (CC, II 188, 160) are different
disciples to keep watch over it while the living soul was away from it. Then by means of his Jogi powers he separated his soul from that body and luckily came upon the dead body of a King Amuruka, which was about to be committed to flames, and entered it. The king rose and all the town rejoiced. However, in a short while, the minister as well as the queens of the late king found some things extraordinary about their restored sovereign and suspected that the soul of some Mahatman had come to live in the body of their master. So messengers were secretly sent to search for a human body hidden in lonely spots or caves, and to burn when found, so that the Mahatman might remain with them and the king continue to live long time. Meanwhile Sankara in the body of the king was acquiring the experiences of love with his queens and was recording those experiences in a treatise which has come down to us under the name of Amuruka-satakam. And in the midst of these lovely women and their blandishments, he forgot his promise to his disciples about his going back to them, and the month agreed upon soon passed away. The disciples then began to search for him, and hearing the miraculous resurrection of Amuruka, they went to his city, sought audience with the king, and sang a few philosophic songs which at once roused the memory of Sankara. Then they hastened to the place where the body had been secreted. But by this time the messengers of the king had found it out and had just begun to set fire to it. The unattached soul of Sankara now hastened back and entered his own body in this perilous condition. He then prayed to Vishnu conceived as Nrisimha to help him, which he did by sending down a timely shower of rain that put out the flames. Sankara was now in his own body again.  

Apart from the merit of this story, the graces of Amuruka's conception and expression are unique. Vamana and Anandavardhana quote the verses and that is a worthy recognition of its quality and its age.

308 The poem is a sataka or century, but the four recensions have only 51 verses in common, these are the texts used by Ramarudra, Ravicandra, Arjunavarma and Vemabhupala. Each verse depicts the
condition of the Nāyikā in a particular mood towards her Nāyaka
"The Sataka" says Keith "is essentially a collection of pictures of
love, and it differs from the work of Bhartṛhari in that, while Bhartṛhari
deals rather with general aspects of love and women as factors in life,
Amaru paints the relation of lovers, and takes no thought of other
aspects of life. Possibly if the reference to the purpose in the title in
the manuscripts has any value he may have planned illustrating other
sides of life, but that is idle conjecture and we have sufficient cause to
be grateful to him for what he has given us without seeking more.
The love which Amaru likes is gay and high-spirited, delighting in tiny
tiffs and lovers' quarrels but ending in smiles, the poet hardly ever
contemplates the utter disappearance of love." 1

There are commentaries 2 by Arjuna Varman 3 by Kokasambhava, 4 by
Sarāmakrī, 5 by Caturbhujamātra, 6 by Nandālīla, 7 by Rudramadeva, 8
Ravindra, 9 by Rāmarudra, 10 by Veṇabhairāṇa, 11 by Sūrvadhāsa, 12 by
Saṅkaracārya, 13 by Veṇakāvaṇa, 14 by Ilāmākābhatṭa, 15 by Devasaṅkarabhata, 16 by Gosthipāṛ, 17 and two others anonymous 18
Jñānānanda Kalādhara-sena explains the verses in the senses of love and renunciation. 19

1. Keith, SL 183, where he gives a fine exposition of the poet's plan of the poem

and conception. See Peterson Int to Subh. 2 and Thomas's Int to I II, 22

2. See CC, I 27, II, 5, 187, III, 7, Mys OUL 242, CAL, II 2

3. Ed. Bombay by Durgaprasad with a valuable introduction King Arjuna Varman

was the son of Subhatavarman. He ruled about sam 1207 (1211 AD) See for inscriptions, JASB V 978, JAO, VII, 22, 25. For verses in the anthologies, see Peterson's

Int. to Subh. 4 He refers to poet Madava who was his guru as an author on rhetoric

4. CAL, II 2

5. Int by Durgaprasad, 1 e 3

6. Oudh (1877), 16

7. PB, III 593

8. CC, III 7

9. Oudh, XVI, 54. See SKC, 277

10. CC, I 28 IOC, VII 1520

11. DC, XX 7976, 7981. Tony Cat., VII, 2014-20, TO III 2706, 2718

Vema is the hero of Vāmana's Viśeṣāyupacārī

12. CC, II, 5


14. See DC, XXI 8573

15. CC, I 98

16. CC, II 5

17. OAL, II. 2

18. CC, I 93, IOC, 711

19. Printed, Calcutta Oudh, XIX, 40, SKC, 60.
309 Ritusamhara\(^2\) in six cantos is a short poem of 153 verses of various metres ascribed to Kālidāsa,\(^8\) descriptive of the six seasons of the year. "With glowing appreciation of the beauties of Nature, in which erotic scenes are interspersed, the poet adroitly interweaves the expression of human emotions."

On the question whether Kālidāsa was the real author of this poem, opinion is divided.\(^8\) Among arguments advanced for the negative are that Mallinātha did not comment on it and rhetoricians did not quote from it. Keith answers the arguments, thus: "More deplorable still are some of the aesthetical arguments adduced, complaint is made that the poet begins with the summer whereas the spring was the usual beginning of the year forgetting that Kālidāsa was not composing an almanac or writing a Shephard's calendar. Again, heart or its derivatives (tap) is found seven times in Canto I as if this did not accord with summer, as does eagerness (samutsukatva) with the rains and longing (utkantha) with autumn. The poet is censured for asserting that the swans excel maidens in beauty of gait and the branches rob their arms of loveliness, later, he was not guilty of such discourtesy. He mixes a metaphor in speaking of clouds as having the lightning as creeper, as we have seen, Vatsabhāti borrows the phrase, and exploits two other verses of the poem, proving its antiquity and rendering most probable its authorship. It is objected that he uses here only the construction amalatah, in lieu of the ablative, though equally once only in the Kumarasambhava he has amekhalam, the freshness and liveliness of the several verbal forms (\(u\) 19) is unparalleled and therefore, not by Kālidāsa. Even the lack of developed use of figures of speech is adduced against him, and the

---

1 Printed everywhere Ed with commentary of Manirāma by Durgaprasad with commentary by Gajendragadkar, Bombay, with commentary of Venkatacarya and notes and English translation by M P Kale, Bombay, with notes and English translation by B G Kher, and also by Sitarama Ayyar, Bombay. Tr into Latin and German by Bohlen, Leipsic. Ed by Herman Kreyenburg, Hanover with preface by Sir William Jones.

2 For a short account of the work see Maodonell, SL 387-9, Studies of Ritusamhara, Karmoyagin Journal, Apte's Age of Kālidāsa, 85. Vatsabhāti's Sādṛṣṭuvaṃṣa describes the seasons (Printed Bombay). So does Śīśirasṭuvaṃṣa (CC, I 655).


4. SL, 82.

45
use of samhara in the title has been questioned as unique Poets happily do not feel themselves bound to be parrots." In dealing with the date of Kālidāsa it was pointed out how wide the divergence is among scholars and so long as standard of taste and judgment differ in nature, it is not possible to assert the infallibility of any conclusion, and unless something certain is discovered to support a view It is again a matter for inquiry whether the works foisted on the name of Kālidāsa are not really the works of different Kālidāsas and whether lapse of time has not tended to ignore the difference in identity. It is likely the work of Kālidāsa III or Kotijit.

Sṛngāraṭilaka is another poem "of Kālidāsa" in 23 verses of fine sentiments of love and affection.

Puṣpabānnavilāsa is a piece of fine lyrics and lyrical beauty Though ascribed to Kālidāsa, the real author was Arkabhatta, the writer of Sāhityakaumudi There are commentaries on it by Venkatapanditarāya, and by an unknown author called Śrṇgāracandrīkā.

Besides the poems Durghatakāvyastrakā, Duskaramāla, Citgaganacandrīkā (in praise of Devar and of exquisite grace) and Bhramarastaka, and Śṛutabodha on prosody, Aufrecht mentions the following works under Kālidāsa's name Ambāṣṭava, Kāliṣṭātra, Laghustava, Vidvadmadaṅkāvya, Brndīvanakāvya, Sṛngārasāra, Gangesākā, Mangalāṣṭaka, Candikādandakāṣṭotra.

---

1 See para 13 supra
2 See para 24 supra
3 Ed everywhere, Ed by Gildemonstor, Bombay and in Hacberlin, 14, See Keith, SL, 199
4 For instance, पोष्यकारकरते हि कलङ कर्ण राष्ट्रमसिद्धन्यते घृङ्ग |
5 Ed Bombay and elsewhere.
6 See PR, VI
7. TC, II 2719, 4171
8 TC, II 1550
9 Printed Kāvyakalāpa, Calcutta
10 There is a manuscript in the Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras There is a commentary on it by Durgayya, alias Sūkhaswāmi, son of Vāsudeva of Śāhamaṛṣaṇaṅgaṭra of about the 18th century A D.
11 Myr Cal. It is quoted by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Pratyabhijñāṣṭra, and Dāvarāṇthi in his commentary on Dvānaliṣākāloka
12 Ṣi, II 8
13 Ed, everywhere, by M E, Lanceran, Paris
14, OC I 99
310 Damodaragupta was the famous poet of the court of King Jayapida of Kashmir who ruled between 751-732 A.D. He was that king's constant companion His Kuttamimati or Sambhallimata is an amusing work on erotics of peculiar interest. The scene is laid at Benares, a city where even courtesans by their ornaments (candra) and troops of attendant lovers (bhujanga) attain likeness to Siva. A gentle courtesan of that city, Mālaṭi, once heard from the terrace of her house, an āryā sung by chance, directing women to acquire the art of pleasing lovers. Then she sets off to the house of Vikarāḷa, a woman, the reverse of beautiful, and from her learns 'wonderful ways of beguiling the hearts of men.' The work is full of stories in illustration and is a practical treatise in the art. For instance, the whole story of Ratnavali is summed up Damodaragupta is a loveable author and never misses a place in the anthologies.

311 Jagannatha was the son of Perubhatta and Lakṣmi. He was a Tailunga of the Veginati sect of the village Mungunda, in Godavari District. His family name was Upadrasta. He studied poetry and rhetoric under his father and logic and grammar and other sciences under Jnānendra Bhikṣu, Mahesācārya, Khandadeva and Savaviresvara, at Banaras. He was entertained at the court of Emperor Shah Jehan (1628-1638 A.D.) and Prince Dara was his favourite patron. Tradition says he fell in love with a lady of the Muslim Court and had secret intrigues with her, she was dead and her separation caused his retirement. He spent the rest of his life in...

1 स दामोदरगुप्तास्य कृत्तिमताकारिण्यः। कवि कवि नाभिर्व दुर्ग द्योतिचिच्य लघुदत्।

Ref. IV 496

2 Ed Bombay. For a fuller account, see PB, II 28-33. Duttprakāśa (NP, V 126) is a work of similar theme.

3 (i) Jagannatha, son of Narāyaṇa, author of the poem Nānavilāsa (BTC, 158) (ii) Jagannātha, author of Svanabhāravīlaśa (BTC, 162) (iii) Jagannātha author of poems Sārisena and Kṛ̹iśtimātavali (CASP, 196, 802, CC, III 132) (iv) Jagannātha author of Nṛṣambhaśoṭras (PR, V 575), (v) Jagannātha Sena, quoted in Fadyāvali (vi) Jagannātha author of Śankaravilāsacamu (CC, I 196) (vii) Jagannātha author of Vajrasvaravīlaśa (CC, I 196) and (viii) Jagannātha, author of Māmasūbhārakṛ̹tikāvāla (Oudh, V 2) are different.

4 जिनीविनविनामिनिपतते नीति नवीन वयः
Muttra, where he died in 1674 A.D. It is said he desired an interview with Appayadikṣita, but the latter who was very orthodox refused to see him as he was a fallen outcaste. This incensed him and the vent was his scathing criticism of Appayadikṣita's Citramimāṃsa. Apart from his proficiency in rhetoric, his lyrics are charming and musical. Amṛtalahāri was in praise of the Jumna, Lakṣmīlalāhāri in praise of the Ganges. There are besides Karṇalāhāri, Sudhālāhāri and Anyāpadesa.

Asaphvilāsa in prose is in praise of Nawab Asītkhan, a counsellor of Shah Jahan who died in 1646 A.D. Jagadābhārana is a poem describing the splendor of his patron Dara Shāh Prāṇābhārana. It is a similar work in praise of king Pranānārāyana of Kumārūpa and abounds in ideas of wit and wonder and Yannunāvarnamacampa is probably associated with the theological sanctity of the Jumna. These are quoted in his Rasagangādhara.

---

1. Aṣyutaroṇa in his commentary on Bhāmānivilāsa and C R Vaidya in his introduction of Bhāmānivilāsa describe these biographical allusions contained in the poems. It is said his last verse was this:

यबनी नवनीतकोसलाल्ली शयनीये यदि लो-यते करदाचित्
अनन्तलेख्येत नरी सर्वे न वती सावलो बिनोदितः

Suryanārāyana Sastri in his Life of Sanskrit Poets (Telugu) says that Jagannātha lived between 1675 and 1663 from the days of Emperor Akbar. In the trial of a suit before the Emperor between two Mussalmans, Jagannātha was a visitor and though he did not know Persian, he was able to repeat at once the whole proceedings. Akbar was struck by the young man's remarkable memory and asked him to describe his daughter Lavangi, a princess born of a Rajput queen, who was then passing that way with a pot on her head. He gave out the verse with facile grace and when Akbar asked him what he wanted he desired the hand of Lavangi. Akbar asked Jagannātha to dine with him as a condition of the alliance and this done he was wedded to Lavangi. He lived down to the days of Shah Jahan and when his patron Dara was murdered in 1659 A.D., he retired from court, went to Bombay and after praising the Ganges in beautiful lyrics, he and Lavangi gave up their mortal coil in the waters of the Ganges.

2. See for an account of Jagannātha and his works, S K Do, SP, I 275-281.

3. Ed. Kavyamāla, Bombay, Madras and Vizagapatam. OC, I 196

4. Ed. Bombay with three commentaries. There is another poem of the same nature Gangaḷāhārīpāka by Lakṣmīnārāyanapa Kavi entitled at Bonaros.

5. OC, I 196. There is from quotation for it in the introduction to Rasagangaḍhara (168).

Bhaminivilasa is by far the most known, being a collection of verses of isolated ideas meant mainly to teach the four Purusartha and practical ethics. In four Ullasas of Anyokta, Sringara, Karupa and Santa, the work might be a collection of verses composed by the poet at stray intervals.

Visvesvara was the son of Laksmidhara and brother of Umapa of the race of Rande of Almodha Devesvara, eighth in descent, said to be living thirty years ago at Anupasagar on the Ganges. He lived in the beginning of the 18th century.

His writings are many and cover poetry, drama, poetics and dialectics. Rukmiparvaya is a nataka Navamalka is a nataka and Sringaramanjari, a sattaka (in prakrt) Mandaramanjari is a romance in prose. Vak-ojaataka, Holkaataka, Laksmivilasa, Sadruvarpana, Romavaisataka, and Aryasatka are poems of lyrical merit. Aryasaptasati is really a work on erotics of considerable poetic thought. Kavindrabharama in four chapters is a Citraka and contains verses of intricate composition. He wrote commentaries on Naisadhya and Rasamanjari.

1. Ed. Bombay with the commentary of Acyntacaya Modak of Laksminarayan (with English Translation) DC, XX 8085 with an anonymous gloss. For a notice of this work, see JASB, XXXI, 527, Keth’s SL, 284. There is a commentary also by Madhama (IOC, VII 1526) composed in 1802 A.D.

2. Madhyaparyatanamanyakasa krata maha.

3. (i) Visvesvara quoted in SKM, (ii) Visvesvara, author of Camaikacantarik a poem on Sarvagrasangabhinaka (TC, III, 5818; IOC, VII 1507; S R De, SP, 248), (iii) Visvesvara, author of Sahityasara (Opp 2728), (iv) Visvesvara, commentator on Candrahhuka, are different authors.

4. See CC, II 139, and Kavyamala, VIII 52.

5. Ibid.

6. DC, XXI 5411. It describes the amours of Vijayasena of Avanti with Navamalka.

7. PR, IV 81. See Kavyamala, VIII, 52.

8. Mentioned in Kavyamala, VIII, 52.

9. Ibid.


11. DC, XX 8010.

12. DC, XX 8011. Printed, Benares.

13. Printed, Kavyamala, Bombay.

14. TC, III. 8905, TAnj Cat, VI 2555. See TC, III, 3943, where he is called Sarvana.
313 JAGANMOHANA, an anthology in 66 verses, describes the attraction and qualities of women of different castes and countries and in different attitudes and activities.

314 Among LAKICV poems are the following:

Candrakavi (Lakicv No. 448), Candrodhayamara (BTC, 158), Candralaksmopresadhati by Narahari (Printed, Bombay), Kucasataka by Atreyan Sriyusa (DC, XX 789), Mrigankasatika and Manovalambikā by Kavikankanā (DC, XX 8008, I'hma 945, 948), Kucipancāsika by Vṛttamaṇi Śrīnīvaśa (Ms OML. 224), Śrīgāraṇakandukī (Gough, 106), Rasavātisataka by Dīnandīdhana (Ct, I 490), Virahimodasudhā (Ms OML. 11), Virahimanananda by Vināyaka (Ct, I 578), Śrīgārāmanjanī by Rāyamanohara (HR, III No. 1825), Sumanaranjana by Śrīnivāsa (HR, III 1726, CIII, II 16), Kekāvalī by Mayūrapant (Kā 40), Mahāvastu by Keta (Kā 75), Kekāvalī by Vidyādhara Kaviṇā (Ct, I 125), Candikucapancasati by Laksmanacārya (Printed, Bombay), Śrīgārāvatsa by Bhāvanīśvara (CC, I 661), Rasasarvasva by Vīthala (CC, I 490), Rādhāsudhākara (Opp 6168), Rasikaranjana (i) by Rāmadanda composed in 1524 (Printed, Bombay) and (n) by Ragunātha (HR, III No. 1887), Rasabhūṣaga (Ms OML. 265), Śrīgārāsataka (i) by Narahari and (n) by Janārdana, (m) by Vrajalā (Printed, Bombay), Rasakajvanam of Arjunavarmadeva (Bṛ 110), Rasikabhūṣaṇa (Opp. 5145), Anivaryakālambhami of Vidyālīhūsana (CC, I 574), Rangatāpurṇi of Śivarāmabhūtī (CC, I 645), Śrīgārāṃțalahari of Śāmaraṇa Dīkṣita (Printed, Bombay), Śrīgārākalikā (i) by Kāmarāja, (n) by Har (Printed, Bombay), Śrīgārāvatsa by Bāndhāsara (CC, II 158), Śrīgārāsara by Kālidāsa (Opp, II 6014), Śrīgārārasamandana (Printed, Madras), Śrīgārānasīthi by Bhāvanīcārya (Bṛi, 73), Ānandamandakini by Madhusūdanarasavrati (Printed, Bombay), Śrīgārākalika (i) by Kālidāsa and (n) by Jīgabhātī (CC, I 660), Śrīgārākalolā by Royabhātī (PR, VI, 28), Śrīgārāmanjanī by Mānakavi (Ct, II 158), Śrīgārāmālā by Sukalambhāsana composed in 1745 A.D (CC, II 178), Śrīgārākuṭābhala by Lalāmadī (SA, 75, 293), Pramōḍalāhari (PR, V 358), Vidvāmadatarangini by Rudrasimha (Ms OML 237), Kavitalākāpiya by Gauranohara (DC, XX 8024), Śrīgārārasodana by Bāmakavi, son of Bāmakṣya of Kāśyapagotra (about 1550 A.D) Śrīgārāvatsa by Vāgbhātā and Śrīgārakosa (Opp, 6247), Sarasvatīvilāsa and Dévyāryāsūtaka of Kānapatī (CC, I 493),
CHAPTER XIII

SECTION I

Sandesa

315 Sandesakavya A popular species of lyrical poetry is Sandesākavya or Dūtakavya. In the Rāg Veda (X 108) Sārāma, a dog, was sent as a messenger to the Pāṇis. In the Purāṇas and Rāmāyāna, we have the message Rāma of through Hanumān, of Yuddhisthīra through Kṛṣṇa, and of Nala through the swan. The idea of Rāma's message was the source of Kālidāsa's inspiration and to him the credit is due of the creation of Sandesākavya. His Meghasandesa makes the allusion

इत्याद्यते पवननय्य भैषज्यवोन्दुक्तिः सा

Kālidāsa had to justify the use of inanimate objects as messengers of love by the distracted condition of the lover's mind. Bhāmaha found fault with such impropriety and when he particularly instanced the employment of cloud, wind, moon, bee or parrot, it was as if by his time other poems of this type had been popular, though we are not now able to point to any such poem by name. Bhavabhūṭa in his Mālātīmādhava copied the Meghasandesa.

316. Ghatakarpapara It may be that Ghatakarpapara conceived this idea earlier. In his small poem going by his name, he describes the sad plight of a bereaved lady and her appeal to the morning clouds to convey his condition to her distant lover. Ghatakarpapara

1. अयुक्तिमयम्या दूल्धा जलकृष्णाधेतंदवं ||
   तथा अमरहारीतचरकाकृष्णाधयं ||
   अवाचो गुलाबचाब्र दूल्धशब्दिवरुणः ||
   कथा दूल्ध अप्येक्षनिति दुःखा न नुज्यते ||
   गदि चोलकण्ठया रथदुःखवारत साहले ||
   तथा समुद्र भूमन्न अपेक्षोपरि, नुज्यते || I, 42-44.

2. दैवतपूज्यं गत्ते विचरार्चिण्यं महिमया चेत ||
   आस्वाद्यादिः तदुच्च कथये मायेयामवस्थापि ||

3. For the identity of Bhāsa and Ghatakarpapara, see under Bhāsa post
4. Printed everywhere.
was one of the nine gems of Vikramaditya's Court. The name seems to be a cognomen attributed to him from the last verse of his poem where he vows that to him who could excel him in Yamaka he would bear pots of water. The self-praise is well deserved and his poetry in spite of the Yamaka is free and exquisite. The High estimation in which he has been held is seen by the commentaries that have been written on it [of whom the great Abhinavagupta was one], by Bharatamallika, by Sankara, [Vivarana,] by Govardhana, by Kamalakara, by Kucalahavi, by Vaidyanatha, by Vindhyesvariprasāda, and other anonymous.

His Nitisāra is a short didactic poem in 21 verses in the form of a dialogue between a hog and a lion. The ideas are amusing. Madana's Kṛṣṇalīla was composed in Sam 1680 (1624 AD). It has verses consisting of two pairs of rhyming lines, one of the lines being taken from Ghatakarpara, so that four consecutive verses of this poem have an entire verse of Ghatakarpura.

317Meghasandesa or Meghaduta A Yakṣa, employed under Kubera, the Lord of Alaka, is banished from Kailāsā for

1. यात्रेः यात्रेः त्रिशिष्ट फलकोष्ठे भ्रात्रदक्षिणकर्मस्य जीवन कविनि यमके परेण तत्स्री क्षेत्रं शुद्धकर्मपरेण ||

2. For instance,

निचित मुग्धपेत नीरदे शिखरानाइधुक्कुर्रदे !
सलिन्तिरिलित रम्य संतोषी बिचित्र-परिवर्त नाप्स्तनिष्ठीत् हैं

3. CO, I, 174
4. Mātra, IX No 3172 Manuscript is dated Śaka 1650
5. DC, XX 7919
6. DC, XX 7920.
7. Printed, Calcutta
8. Ed Bombay
10. CC, I 174
11. CO, I 174. Tanti Cat., VI 2719, 2728, 2728, 2729
12. Haberla, 564 See Jacob's Ramayana, 136, Keith SL 200
13. POC, VII 1261

For instance,
dereliction of duty, away from his consort and his home. In his rambles, he makes his abode in Rāmagiri in Central India, a spot whereof the waters are "sanctified by the baths of the daughter of Janaka." On the approach of the season of the rains the pangs of the forlorn lover become intenser and with a maddened mind he thinks of his beloved and fancies her in a like condition of despair. Then dawns the idea of sending her a message of affection and solace. He espies a cloud hanging by the peak of the hill, bound as it were northward, and begins the request with a praise. He takes it that the cloud made a response. He describes the route from Rāmagiri to Alaka with cities and shrines and rivers, amidst silvan scenes with allusions to tales of mythology, for which the Hindu has a fascination.

Ujjain must not be missed, though it may be a little out of the way

Nor must the cloud fail to console the emaciated (stream) Nirvindhyā, pining for its showers

On reaching the Hymālayas, the poet is full of devotion.

1 The source of the theme is now discovered to be the story of Aśādhakaṛṣṇa Ekādaśi, Yogini Māhātmyam. A yāka Hemamālī neglected his duty of culling flowers for Mānasa lake and stayed away with his wife Viśālākṣi. Kubera cursed him with the disease leucoderma and banished him. In the Hymālayas Hemamālī met sage Markandeya and on his advice he observed Yogini Vṛṣṭa in the dark half of Aśādha and he was restored to health and home. This is mentioned by K Lakshmana Somayajn in Udyānapātryā, II 174.
The shady bowers of the Mandakini’s shores present lovely scene

The City of Aiaka is reached Through the splendours of the City, the cloud is taken to the residence of the Yaksa, and the presentation is enchanting

There the cloud would see Yakṣa’s sweetheart in a state of lonesome thought and vacant look, and if perchance she was in slumber the cloud had better not wake her up for fear of disturbing her in pleasant dreams. On the approach of the cloud she would have pleasant omens

For ever he has in his mental vision her fair frame and he says

To inspire confidence in Hanumān, Rāma mentioned the incident of the Tilaka

and Yakṣa gives here a parallel.
He remembers the words of Śīta
and adds a word of consolation

Then follows the assurance of reunion. Here does the poet
commune the sensuous and the divine

The poem ends with a word of thankfulness and benediction:

For lofty conception, artistic design, aesthetic sentiment, divine
idealism, delicate embellishment and graceful expression, the poem
stands supreme and it is a monument of poetic art in the architec-
ture of letters.

1 Ed. everywhere. Ed. with notes and translation (i) by K P Pathak, Poona, (ii) by B G Khare, Bombay, (iii) by S Ray, Calcutta, (iv) Ed. with notes by G R Nandargikar, Bombay Ed with commentary by Haripada Chaitopadhyaya, Calcutta Ed with vocabulary by Stanzer, Breslaw Tr into English verse by Wilson, London, and into German by Max Muller, Königsburg and by Schutz, Bielefeld. For a critical appreciation by D. Pecharya Sastri, see Andhrapatrika Annual Number (1927) 100, and by B Venkataramaya, Bharat (1927), 22. See also M Rangacharya’s critique on Meghasandesa; and V Gopala Charya’s Sandesadhvayasarasvadini in Udyanapatrika, Trivadi
Commentaries. There are commentaries on Meghasandesas by Kavicandra, \(^2\) Lakśminivāsa, \(^2\) Cārtravardhana, \(^3\) K-emahamsagani, \(^4\) Kaviratna, \(^5\) Kiñnadāsa, \(^6\) Cintāmanī, \(^7\) Janīrdana, \(^8\) Janendra, \(^9\) Bharatasesa, \(^10\) Bhagīrathamśra, \(^11\) Kalyānamallā, \(^12\) Vahmasīmha-gan, \(^13\) Rāma Upādhīya, \(^14\) Rāmanātha, \(^15\) Vallabhadeva, \(^16\) Viçapati Hara Govinda, \(^17\) Vīsvanātha, \(^18\) Vīsvanāthamśra, \(^19\) Śāsvata, \(^20\) Sanätāna-saran, \(^21\) Sarasvāpitṛthra, \(^22\) Sumatīvijaya, \(^23\) Handāsa Siddhāntavāgīsa, \(^24\) Megharāja, \(^25\) Dakṣināvartha, \(^26\) Purpasarasvatī, \(^27\) Malliśtha, \(^28\) Rāmānatha, \(^29\) Kamalākara, \(^30\) Sthiradeva, \(^31\) Gurunātha Kaviyātirtha, \(^32\) Lālīmohana, \(^33\) Harpaḍa-chattopādhīya, \(^34\) Jīvānanda, \(^35\) Śrivatsa Vyāsa, \(^36\) Divākara, \(^37\) Asada, \(^38\) [Ravikara, Mūtijkavi, Kana-kakūrti, Vijayāsūri], \(^39\) and some anonymous.

R. Krishnamacharya’s Meghasandesasavimarsa is a delightful discourse on the verses. \(^40\)

---

1. CC, I 466
2. PR, III 395.
3. PR, III 395, VI 345
4. PR, III 395, VI 346
5. CC, I 466
6. CC, I 466
7. CC, I 466
8. PR, III 19, App 324 Manuscript
   dated Som 1403 VI 344
9. PR, VI 344
10. IO, 415, 994
11. CC, I 466
12. IO, 599 This mentions commen
    tary by Udyotakāra
13. CC, I 466
14. Rsc, 28
15. Orx, 125
16. Ed by Hulizob, Madras. PR, II
17. Orx, 125
18. NW, 626
19. Ovāh, XVII 14
20. CC, I 466
21. Orx 125
22. Cambridge University Library.
23. PR, I 128
24. Printed, Calcutta
25. CC, I 466
26. Printed, Trivandrum
27. Printed, Srinsagam
28. Printed, everywhere.
29. Orx 125
30. CC, I 466
31. Tanj Cat, VII 2685 He lived in Benares
32. Ed Calcutta.
33. Ed Calcutta.
34. Ed Calcutta.
35. Ed Calcutta.
36. PR, IV 28, 84
37. IO, 1616.
38. PR, III 19, App 324 He was son of Katukarīja and Asalādevi and of the Bhīllalama family. He had two wives and by the second wife two sons Rājada and Jātṛsimha and by the first wife Arisimha. He was called Kaviśabhadra-ga and was a disciple of Abhayādeva who succeeded Bhadreśvarasunī. He composed his Vivekamānārit in Som 1248 (PR, II 101 and IV vi.)
39. CC, II 108, III 100, CC, I 466; Ovāh, XV 80, TO, III 4988, SKC, 71, PR, IV 28, IO, 5990
40. Printed, Madras
The tale of Meghasandesa stops with the direction to the cloud Sequels have been thought of by later poets Kṣanamūrti, son of Sarvasāstri of Vāsisthagotra of the Cūrcars, wrote Yakṣollāsa at the beginning of the 17th century. He calls himself Abhinava Kālidāsa and wrote also a bhāna Maḍanābhyudaya Mandikal Rāmasāstri wrote Mehgapratisandesa Korada Rāmacandra wrote Ghanavṛttā Mahāmahopadhyāya Paramesvara Jha of Mithila wrote Yakṣamilanakāvya Bhatta Vamana’s Hamsasandesa embraces the same theme.

The poetry of Meghasandesa is enchanting in the extreme, and not merely the theme, name and metre Mandākrānta were adopted, by many poets, but the lines of Meghasandesa were interwoven as part of their own verses, so as to make up Samasyā Meghamāyaya wrote Meghadūpasamasayalekha So too are Siladūta, Cetodūta, Nemidūta In Nemidūta, Vikrama, son of Sangama, describes the life of Nemi after his renunciation and the message of his queen through a mountain. In Pārvabhyudaya, Jinasena used a line or two of Meghasandesa Nilakantha, son of Janāidana, was a tutor to the harem of Alahaviradikhan of the 17th Century A.D. He wrote Cimanīcarita, with phrases taken by Meghadūta.

In the hands of Jain poets this form of poetry took a religious turn. In conveying news to their preceptors in Vijnaptipatra, doctrines of philosophy were inculcated and explained and consistent with such fancies the messenger used became cetas, manas, bhālṭi and the like Siladūta of Cāntrasundaragāmi composed in 1431 A.D. describes,
SANDESA

365

Cakravarthi, how "Sthulabhadra, a great Jaina prince, renounced the world at the death of his father and became a disciple of the great Jaina sage Bhadrabhanu, how the former, who came to his city by the order of his preceptor was not the least moved by the persuasive arguments put forward by his wife Kosa against the prudence of his taking the order and how in the long run, on account of the powerful influence of his immaculate character (sila) he was able to prevail upon his wife and persuade her to become a nun and thus put an end to all earthly sorrows and sufferings".

Merutunga of Anchalagaccha composed a Jain Meghaduta in four cantos on the life of Neminatha. He became a Suri in Sam 1426 (1472 A.D.) and studied under Mahendra-prabhasuri. He lived till Sam 1471 (1527 A.D.).

322 Some later poets similarly used this style of composition for ethical and philosophical teachings.

In Kâkadûta, a fallen brahmin in prison sends a message to his beloved Kadambari (drnak), a satire on society meant to teach morals. In Indudûta, the poet embodies a devotional message to Śri Tâpa Gaṇapatî from the city of Yodha.

In Hamsasandesa (anonymous) a person disgusted with the world wanders in the forest and sends Hamsa as a messenger to Śiva in Dvâdasânta and to Mukâkanyâ through the route Satcakra.

Hamsayogin's Hamsadûta is a communication between Bhakti and Jivatman.

In another anonymous Hamsasandesa, "The outstanding feature is the two-fold course, namely, the Adhyatmic and the Yogic which are in accordance with the significance of the name 'Hamsasandesa.' Among these, the Adhyatmic course is the attainment of Sivasayuja by a man who is dependent on the Prarabdha Karma and is consequently passing through worldly existence, after he is freed from all

---

1 Printed Sri Yasovijaya Jain Granthamala, Benares
2 He wrote also Śīkumāra-pālamahâkâvyâ and Mahâpalacanâta
3 Printed Atma Ser Bhownagar, with an elaborate introduction. There is a commentary of Śīlamānas, PR, IV 120. See Nandargikat's Int. to Ragh, IV 120, note. 4 Merutunga, author of Prabandhacinântaka, is a different poet (see para 119
5 Sah, XXIII 173
6 Printed, Bombay JRAS, (1884), 450
7 TO, IV 8041
8 The manuscript is said to be with the Raja of Churakkal, Malabar
worldly bonds and his identity destroyed by faith, understanding, hearing, steadiness, tranquility, endurance and other kinds of austerity. The Yogic course is the mind’s journey through various stages beginning with ‘Susumna’ up to ‘Dvadasantendumandala’ and its final repose along with Bhakti in the state of Amritayoga”.

323 The following are other poems of this kind —

Uddhavadūta (a) by Rūpagoswāmin, and (b) by Mādhava, Uddhava-sandesas, anonymous. Viṣṇusandesas by Kochum Tamba-ran, Subhagasandesas (a) by Lakṣmanasūri, and (b) by Nārāyana, Pānṭhadūta by Bholanātha, Kṛṣṇadūta by Nṛsimha, Garudasandesas by Bellamkonda Rāmarāya.

Pavanadūta (a) by Vādcandra, and (b) by Dhovī, Vāṭadūta by Kṛṣṇanātha Nyāyapancānana, Mārutasandesā (anonymous).

Tulasidūta by Vādcyānātha, Mānasandesā by Viṣṇumā Vira-rāghava, Manodūta, (a) by Vrajanātha, son of Ramakṛṣṇa, (b) by Viṣṇudāsa, (c) by Rāmārāma, and (d) two anonymous, Madhurosthā.

---

1. Printed Triv. Samskr. Series No 103 It is accompanied by a metrical commentary
2. Printed, Haeberlin, Bombay and Calcutta, DC, XX. 7910, 7963
3. Ibid, SEC, 65 He lived in Talitanagan about the beginning of 19th century.
4. Int to the Jaina Meghadūta
5. JRAS, (1900) 763 He lived at Kodangalur in Malabar
6. Printed, Tanjore
7. JRAS, (1884), 449 He was in the court of King Rāmavarma of Jayasimha and (1541–1547 AD)
8. IO, VII 289
9. OAL, II 4
10. See para 289 supra
11. Ed Bombay He wrote the play Jñānasuryādyā on the tenets of Digambara sect. (Jaina Granthavali)
12. Ed Madras and Calcutta
13. Ed Bombay
14. Printed, Madras
15. Samskrīta Sahitya Parshat Library, Calcutta,
16. OML, No 2984
17. There is a Manodūtākāvya (SEC, 70, 287), a description of the relations between Jīvaśīm and Paramāśīm
18. Printed, Bombay It was composed at Brūḍārāṇya in 1758 AD and is a message by Drupadī to Kṛṣṇa
19. IOG, VII 1470 Mbra, II 613 It is in Vasāntālaksā metre
20. Bangīya Sahitya Parusbat, Calcutta, No. 1292. It is in Śūkhasini metre
21. Jaina Granthavali, 382 SEC, 170, 287
sandesa, Padāṅkadūta (a) by Kṛṣṇasārvabhauma, and (b) by Bhālāniṃtha, Bhaktidūta by Kālprāśada.

Candrādūt (a) by Kṛṣṇacandra, (b) by Vinayaprabha, Indudūta (a) by Jambukavi or Jambunāga and (b) by Vinayavijayan, Dātūhāsandesas by Nārīyana.

Kokilasandesas (a) by Varadācārya, son of Vedant desika, (b) by Venkatācārya, son of Satakru Tātārva, (c) by Gunavardhana, (d) by Udānda and (e) by Narasimha, Kokasandesas by Vinayavijaya, and Raṭhāṅgadūṭa.

Hamsadūṭa by Raghunāthadasa, Hamsasandesas (a) by Vedāntadeska, (b) by Rūpagowāmin, (c) by Bhatta Vāmana, (d) by

---

1 Mys OML, 251
2 Printed Bombay and Calcutta He was in the Court of King Raghurāma of Nuḍḍa and composed it in Śaka 1641
3 IO, VII 1467
4 Māntra, III 27
5 HPR, II 159
6 BR, (1894), 854
7 PR, III 292, in Mālān metre with antya yamaka In BR (1907), the manuscript is dated Sam 1442. He wrote also Jinaṭāpika, PR, IV 90, V. List of Authors
8 Printed, Bombay
9 Cal Trav 195
10 Ed by W F Gunavardhana, New York,
11 This is mentioned in Gurusparampara (Mysore), 300, as also his Hariṣa sandesā
12 Tanj Cat, VII 2863
13 See Ceylon Antiquary, IV pl. 111
14 See Cochin State Manual, 61, 72, Travancore State Manual, 480, DO, XX, 7469, 7910. This was in response to Bhṛṅgasaṇḍeṣa of Vāsūdeva, DO, XX 7914, 7942. In CSV, 1101, Bhṛṅgasaṇḍeṣa (Bhramasandesas) is noted as the work of Jīva gowāmin. There is a Bhṛṅgasaṇḍeṣa, printed in Sahīdaya, XXIV, 57. See para 251 supra
15 OAL, II 5
16 TO, IV 4497
17 Printed, Mysore OAL, II 16.
18 D O Sen’s Vangassabhyta Panoaya, 860
19 Ed Madras and Mysore and recently by Sambasiva Sastry, Madras with commentary. See para 121 supra. There are several commentaries on it (i) by a disciple of Śīvavāsa of Kaukhalgorta (DO, XX 7974) (ii) by Parakalā Śwami (Ed. Mysore) with a philosophical interpretation, and (iii) by Bṛṅgaśīrṣācārya (Ed. with English Tr and Notes)
20 Ed Bombay and Calcutta. There are commentaries on it by Nṛṣimha, Rāmānaka and Viśvānātha Cakravartī. See JRAS (1884), 450-1
21 DO XX, 7972 This is the same as Vāmana Bhatta Bāga
Vidyavindhama Kavindracaryasarasvati, and (e) by Venkatesa, (f) by Purusarasvati, and (g) two others anonymous.

Pikasanadesa (a) by Ranganathacarya and (b) by Kocha Naresimhacarya, and Pikaduta, anonymous.

Sukasanadesa (a) by Laksmidasa, (b) by Rangacarya, and (c) by Karingampalli Nambuddi, Kiraaduta (a) by Ramagopala and (b) by Varadaracarya, son of Vedantadesa, Bhramaraduta by Rudra Nyayavacspati Bhattacarya, Catakasanadesa (anonymous), Cakorasanadesa (a) by Perusun, (b) by Vasudeva, and by Venkatakavi, Padmaduta, Mayurasanadesa (a) anonymous, (b) by Rangacarya, and (c) by Srinivasacarya.

1. BTQ 168 He was the author of Kavindralohapaduma and in his praise Kavindralohapaduma was written OC, I 89

2. GC, I 783

3. BSB, (NS I) 41. Notices, II, Series I, No. 67. Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat Library, Calcutta. He was probably in the Court of Ramaendra of Nudda.

4. This is mentioned in Guruparampar, Mysore.

5. HPR, II 158 OC, III, 112. He is different from the author of Bhavavilasa (Printed, Kavyamala, II 111 Bhandarkar's List, No 71). There is another Bhramaraduta in Bikanaer Library, see BTQ, 929.

6. JRAS, (1881), 451. The poet applies for the patronage of King Ramavarman of Malabar.

7. This is mentioned in the prologue to his Vasumangalanatkia, DC, XXI, 8497. Tanj Or VII, 8386. Author had title Navina Patanjali.

8. BSB, (NS I) 41. Notices, II, Series I, No. 67. Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat Library, Calcutta. He was the author of Siyodaya etc. The Ms is with M Ramakrishna Kavi.

9. Mys OML, 246

10. CASB, 102 Ed. Calcutta. 21 CAL, II 8

11. BTQ, 9250

12. BTQ, 9250

13. BTQ, 9250

14. BTQ, 9250

15. BTQ, 9250

16. BTQ, 9250

17. BTQ, 9250

18. BTQ, 9250

19. BTQ, 9250

20. BTQ, 9250
CHAPTER XIV

Citrakavya

324. Citrakavya embraces all ingenious forms of poetic composition. Hemacandra says,

खर्ल्ल्याद्वारायणांतरिक्षमच्चयतृतृतंद्वदिनांविनम्

The ingenuity is displayed in the arrangement of letters or in the combinations of letters, making different words or different senses. These are शब्दभालक्षण, or verbal figures of speech. The figures that make up a Citrakavya are Anuprāsa, Yamaka and Ślesā.

325. Anuprāsa or Alliteration is of two classes, शब्दनुप्रास and पद्मनुप्रास, or Alliteration of Letters and Alliteration of Words. The former is of two kinds, Cheka and Vītī, meaning the repetition of a single consonant and two or more repetitions of one or more consonants. There is a special kind called लतानुप्रास where the letters and sense are the same, but there is difference in anviya or syntactical relation.

326. Yamaka is a permutation or reverberation of words called by some ‘Chime.’ It occurs when the same letter is repeated or when the same word is repeated with different meanings with a regularity in the places of repetition, the beginning, middle or end of the foot or the whole foot or all the feet or in alternative feet by alterations of caesura. Caesura are of three kinds: Śunkhata occurs on the transference of the caesura by the separation of an entire letter; Parvarṭaka, on the resumption by a letter of its own form on the cessation of its conjunction with another letter; Ćurnaka on the disappearance of a word on the disruption of conjunct letters.

327. Ślesā or pun is in letters or in words, Sābakālesa and Arthaślesa. The latter occurs where the form does not vanish by a change in the position of words.

In the former a series of letters may or may not be split into different words to make different senses, abhanga and sabhanga.

लय च पद्मबालामालंकरविराजिता | (Abhanga)

भास्करस्येक्षितस्यप्रकाशनोद्वेष्टिर्दिनां | (Sabhanga)
328 Nitivarman wrote the poem Kicakavadham. The poem is inscanted by Premacandra in his commentary on Kavyadarsa, as a rare instance of a poem opening with asīh or benediction. It is a favourite of Pandits of Bengal. It is mentioned by Bhoja in Sṛngārprakāsa and quoted by Namisādhu and Sarvānanda and several lexicographers. It was probably composed earlier than the 9th century A.D. In five cantos the poem describes the episode of the Kicaka's assault on Draupadī and his assassination by Bhīma as told in Virātaparvan of Mahābhārata, but adopts only parts of the narrative of the epic as suit the purpose of his poem, tīṣayamanaka. "In the history of Sabda-citra in Sanskrit it has been said "Kicaka-vadhā marks an important stage of development. Perhaps Nitivarman wrote this yamaka-kavya, to illustrate the extent to which yamakas might be used as accessories in the delineation of rasābhāsa like Kicaka's Sṛngāra." There is a commentary on the poem by Janārdanasena probably of Bengal and an earlier gloss by Sarvānanda-Nāga.

The benediction is in the name of Siva and Kṛṣṇa. "Then follows to the end of the first sarga, a eulogy of the poet's patron, whose name is not given, but who appears to have been a king of Kalinga, for whose delectionation Nitivarman wrote his interesting tour de force in yamaka and slesha. The narrative does not commence till we come to sarga 11, which, like the first, fourth and fifth, is composed entirely in yamaka. The third sarga, which gives us Draupadī's long speech to Yudhisthira and his brothers, illustrates slesha, with occasional lapses into yamaka at the beginning and at the end. Considerable skil is displayed in managing these verbal tricks, and some of them are indeed very happy, and not in the least laboured, like those of Nalodaya.'

329 Nalodaya, a short poem in 4 cantos, describes the life of Nala. "The chief aim of the author is to show off his skil in the manipulation of the most varied and artificial metres, as well as all the elaborate tricks of style exhibited in the later Kavyas. Rhyme even is introduced, and that, too, not only at the end of, but within metrical lines. The really epic material is but scantily treated, narrative making way for long descriptions and lyrical effusions."

1. यदु रसबलि कामिचषेषकादीनि दर्शने तत्र रसादीनायकता यमकादीनायकितविद्।
   रसामीले च अजुस्तमयविद्यम्॥—Dhvanyāloka, p 87.
2. Ed. by S K De, with an elaborate introduction and notes for the Dacca University. See also JERAS, (1929), 109.
3. l.c Int. xiv, IO, 1184.
4. Mila's Notices, No 615, Haraprasad Sastri's Notices, 1905, IO, 1492
There are commentaries on Nalodaya, by Mallinātha,1 Prajnākaramitra,2 by Kṛṣṇa,3 by Tṛuvoenakātusūri,4 by Ādītasūri,5 by Haribhata,6 and Nṛṣimhasarma,7 by Jivānanda,8 by Kesāvāditya,9 by Gopāsa,10 [by Bharatasena, by Mukundabhatta, by Śivadatta, by Ravyadeva, by Hariprerna, by Ātrevabhatta],11 by Prabhakaramitra12 and others anonymous.13

330 Rākesasakavya14 is a short piece of twenty verses in an enigmatic and alliterative style, containing a description of sylvan scenery around, by a person roaming about in the forest with his spouse. There are commentaries on it by Premadhara, by Śambhubhāskara, by Kavirāja, by Kṛṣṇacandra, by Udayākaramitra,15 and by Bālakṛṣṇa Pāyagunda.16

331 These two poems have been attributed to Kālidāsa and the latter also to Vararuci Rāmārasi in his commentary on Nalodaya says that it was the work of Ravyadeva, son of Nārāyaṇa.17

इति इदुक्तूण्यासादले रामारसिरामारसिरा राजवेदेवरितितमाताकाभिनग्नलोकदयोऽकृष्ण यमकोबोडिन्या नगराज्ञातिनिम चतुर्य धान्याः ।

(JBAS, Extra No 1887, p 337)

1 DC, XX 7923
2 Printed, Calcutta DC, XX 7924 He was a native of Miśhila and son of Mahāmāhapāṇḍya Vidyādhara of Puṇyagrāma (Poona). Earliest Ms. is dated Śaka 1735.
3 DC, XX 7926 Tanj Cat., VI 2787–94
4 DC, XX 7927.
5 DC, XX 7931 Tanj Cat., VI 2795
6 CASB, 89
7 Ibid, Tanj Cat., VI 2807
8 Printed, Calcutta
9 PR, III 395
10 IO, 2584
11 CG, I 280, II 60, III 60
12 PR, IV 24
13 DC, XX 7928–30, TC, II 2591, Tanj Cat., VI 2797, 2799, 2800, IO, 8160
14 Ed Bombay
15 Ed Bombay DC, XX 7989, IOO, 1493 contains a commentary also
16 CG, I 493, II 117
17 The commentary was composed in Sam. 1664 (1607 A.D.) JASB (1887) Extra number, page 1387 Rāmārasi was one of the three sons of Vṛddha Vyāsa, who lived at Dīnavana near Pattan during the reign of Sultan Salm and who wrote a commentary on the Bhāgavata at Pattan. See PR, III 30, App 387 340 and Keilhorn's calculations, IA, XIX. 34 A manuscript in Tanj Cat., VI. 2792 gives the name, Ravyadeva, son of Bhātis Nārāyaṇa.

इति नारायणस्त्रीविदेवरितिते नगराज्ञातिनिम चतुर्य धान्याः ॥
But Vāṣṇu, another commentator, calls the author Vāsudeva, son of Bava

शति नलोदय वाषुदेवज्ञि चतुर्थगारिकः परिपलित ||
रक्षितत्नूयधिमिता वृत्तातिर्वचनमयिता ||
जनहासायमिता वियुष्य विषुव्य मनाधुना यमिता ||

A king Rāma is mentioned in the introductory verses as in Tripuradahana of Vāsudeva and A S Ramanatha Iyer therefore concludes that Nalodaya must have been the work of the author of Tripuradahana who lived in the beginning of the 9th century A D.¹

332 Sobhana was a staunch Jain and converted his brother Dhanapāla into his faith after prolonged effort. He was known as Sobhanamumi. He lived in the Court of Dhāra in the 10th century A D. His statu also called Cañurvīmaṇikā consists of 4 groups of verses, “the first in praise of 24 Tirthankaras, the second in praise of all the Jinas, the third in praise of the Jain doctrine, and the fourth in praise of various deities”. The verses are so constructed that the second and fourth line of each verse agree to the letter in sound, and bear different meanings. Dhanapāla wrote a commentary on it.²

333 Srivatsanka was the son of Rāma ahas Vedavyāsa, the second son of Kuraṭṭīkara.³ He lived about the beginning of the 12th century A D. His Yamakaratnakara⁴ is a poem in ṛṣyā metre on Śrī Khṛṣṇa and is followed by his own commentary.⁵

334. Dharmaghosa was a sage who died in Sam 1357 (1301 A.D.) He wrote verses capable of four different meanings. His Yamakaṣṭupi is well known, on which his successor Somaṭīkara wrote a commentary.⁶

---

¹ See para 65 supra. See JMG, XIV 302, JRAS, (1925), 563.
³ Weber, IST, II 944, Śantisuri’s Prabhāvakaracātra, xvii, 814.
⁴ See para 207 supra.
⁵ Pramāṇa, Medras DC, XX, 7797.
⁶ For instance

पदार्थार्थानि संवत्तितानि सदार्थानि सद्देशानि सदार्थानि सद्देशानि शिरः शिरः शिरः शिरः ||
335 Mananka calls himself a King (Mahābhūja) in his gloss on Gītāgovinda. He is quoted by Rajamukuta in his commentary on Amarakoṣa (A.D. 1431). Besides a commentary on Mālatīmādhava, he wrote Yamaka poems Brṇāvana and Meghāvuda.

336 Venkatesa was the son of Śrīnīvaśa and grandson of Venkatesa of Ātreya gotra. He was born in Kali 4697 (1396 A.D.) at Arasāmpalai near Kānci. He was of the family of Venkatādhana. Besides a commentary on Malatīmādhava, he wrote Yamaka poems Byndaḥana and Meghabhūda.

337 Gopalaraya or Gopālasāmy, son of Jīnavallu Immadī Venkatarāja, was a descendent of Immadī Ankusa, and must have lived in the latter half of 13th century. His Rāmacandrodaya in 5 Uchwasas gives the story of Rāma in Yamaka form.

338 The following works are in this style of composition, Dharmaghosa's a Yamakastuti Śrīsayamakasataka Acyuṭānī, Rāma-nilāṃśta of Kṛṣnamohana, Rādhāprasāda, Yamakasikāmaṇi of Kṛṣṇa-kavindra, Yamakabhārata of Ānandaśāriha, Yudhisthiravyaya etc, of Vāsudeva, Śauncarnītra and Raghūdaya of Śrīkantha.

1. CC, I 452
2. See PR, III 11, 280, CC, I 154
3. IO, 158, 395
4. Printed, Kāvyasangraha, Calcutta
5. PR, I 119, III 11, 281
6. Tanj Cat., VI 2631. This was composed in Śaka 1578 (1656 A.D.)
7. This is a long poem of about 80 caitlos Tanj Cat., VI 2688. There is a commentary by the author himself (Ibid., VI 2684) composed in Kali 4786 (1656 A.D.)
8. Mys OML, 260
9. See DC, XX 7732
10. DC, XX 7689, CAL II 11. There is a commentary on it by the author. The manuscript says it was written on the full moon day of Āsvayuja Kṛṣṭīkā, Saka 1706 (1684 A.D.)
11. PR, III 17, 310
12. Mys OML, sup II.
13. TC, IV 4531
14. CC, I 878
15. IOC, VII 1464
16. See para 218 supra.
17. Opp., 2361
18. Printed, Bombay. See para 66 supra
19. Mys OML, Sup., 10. It was composed in Malabar in 1700 A.D.
20. TC, IV 5059, with commentary by Rūdasamāna, TC, IV, 4818. The poet praises the Yamaka compositions of Ravidēva and Kulaśākharaṇa. 
Citracakāvya

Slesacudāmani of Sṛṇavāsa, Slesollasa of Sivaprasāda, Slesacampūrāmāyana of Venkaṭācārya, Sles-acintāmani of Cidambara, Rāmāstaprāsa of Rāmabhadra, Prāsabhārata of Sūryanārāyaṇa, son of Visvanātha of Kāsyapagotra

Citraratnakara of Čakrakavi, Visesanarāmāyana of Vīrārāghava, Somakunjara's Citracakāvya, and Kṛṣṇamohana's Rāmalilāmṛta

339 Citracakāyas appear in numerous forms. In Nalodaya and Kīcakavadha there is the narration of a single story and the cleverness consists merely in the combination of letters which can form words of different senses. In Dvisandhana poems, the same verse gives two different meanings, and thus narrates two distinct tales. Besides those already noticed, there are Sandhayākarandanandam's Rāmacarita which depicts at once the story of Rāma and the history of his patron Rāmapāla, and Ānandakāvya. Rāghava-yādava-pāndaviya has verses of three meanings, and relates three different tales. Pancakalyāṇacampū deals similarly with five different tales and Saptasandhana with the lives of seven great men. Somaprapha has a Saṭārthikāvya, where a verse has a 100 different meanings. Rāmakṛṇa-pāvlioma has the first half of each verse repeated backwards in the second half and narrates the stories of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa.

In Nārāyaṇa's Niranunāśikacampū, Śūrpanakhā complains to Rāvaṇa of Rāma's assault and because her nose and ears had been cut off, the poet aptly eliminates all nasals, which Śūrpanakhā could not have pronounced.

---

1 TO, IV 688
2 CC, I 677
3 Bae, 254
4 Tanj Cat VI 2848
5 Printed Kāvyamālā, Bombay
6 Tanj Cat, VI 2554.
7 TO, IV 5664 Here is another work of this name DO, XX 8054
8 Tanj, Cat, VI 9671
9 Jes. Cat 54
10 CC, I 518
11 Ed MASB III 1 56 See para 189 supra
12 CC, I 46
13 TO, IV 4206 For instance

For Nīrūṣṭhīya verses, see Tanj Cat, VI 2729 An instance of Nīrūṣṭhīya, Nirnurdhanya, Nirnastha and Nīrūṣṭhīka is in Pratāparudrīya (vi 89)

Also in Sahityaratnakara, VI 25 et seq.
Poets have exercised their intellect to frame verses of one or two letters only. For instance

For instance

Sahityaratnakara, VI 91

न नौसुबली उत्सोभो नाना नानानना मदु | तुलोध्युशो नउणोनो नालेना बुलबुलुदु | Kavyanuvasa, V.

340 Nitthala Upamaka Venkatesvara was son of Visvanatha and Kāmāmbā and probably lived near Vizianagaram about the middle of 19th century A.D. He was a poet of modern times of rare merit and has left an instance of poetic composition at once graceful and unique, a combination of accrostics of surprising ingenuity. In the apparent garb of a poem on Rāmāyaṇa, Rāmāyanasangraha in 30 cantos in prose and verse (composed in 1866 A.D.), he has arranged the letters of verses, so as to form four more poems out of particular letters combined and read together from the verses It is therefore described as Caturśītraṅganāḥ He has imbedded his own name and description in one of such devices in his Bālakānda

The poem Gaurīvivaha is formed by the regular combination of the first letter of the verses of kāndas from Ayodhya to Yuddha and describes the marriage of Pārvatī.

The poem Śrīrangadiśeksetramahatmya is formed by the regular combination of the first letter in the second pāda of the verses from kāndas Ayodhya to Yuddha. Here thirteen shrines are described with their theological history.

The poem Bhagavavadavataracarita is formed by the regular combination of the first letter of the third pāda of the verses from kāndas, Ayodhya to Yuddha, and describes the incarnation of Viṣṇu.

The poem Draupadikalyana is formed by the regular combination of the first letter of the fourth pāda of the verses from kāndas, Ayodhya to Yuddha, and describes the marriage of Draupadi.

Above all a combination of the first letters of each of the verses in Bālakānda makes up Ramakavaca.

341. Bandha is the name given to verses in which the letters are arranged in the form of sword, lotus, car, serpent etc. So says Jaggama

शब्दतः यत्र वर्णयो खुद्गापाखुदविशतुता

1. TC, IV. 5081-5087.
There are Bandhas in various poems and works on rhetoric. They are numerous in Venkatādhvāri's Lākṣmīsahāsra, Venkatesvara's Citrabandhabhāmāyana is wholly composed of verses of various designs, such as Kankaṇa, Chaṭra, Andolikā etc.

Kamalamalikastotra of Venkatādhvāri, son of Nṛsiṃha of Śrīvatsagāpta, is another feat of alliterative ingenuity, a garland of lotuses in praise of Lākṣmī. It is accompanied by a commentary:

मात्रसुदारसमाम रससितामा
मातासि याज्ञरसारदासाठा मा ||
माता भवायनमालवसामाना मा ||
मा याम मे तत्तता तत्तीयान मूसा ||

Kankaṇanabandha is the most ingenious in this class. In it, the narrative is formed by rewriting a verse, for instance, of 32 letters backward and forward from a particular starting point and thus making 64 verses in all. The story of Rāmāyana has been so related.

In Venkatesa's Rāmacandrodāva, the 26th Canto contains Bandhas and there is a Kankaṇanabandha.

कामामामायासारमे हा‌रामायादारागास ||
कामामामायासारमे हा‌रामायादारागास ||

342 Vakrokti is a clever diversion or subversion of a saying. The intended meaning of a word is wantonly not understood and the person addressed, most often reprimanded, perverts the meaning of the word to avoid an inconvenient answer. So says Māmāta,

यहकस्मिन्याग्रायने योक्ष्यते |
स्पष्टा काकशा ते स्पष्टा सा वकोक्ष्यतः दिव्या |

There is the first verse of Mudrārāka in illustration:

बन्धा केव प्रकटा ते विभिन्न द्विफला कि हन्तेतद्वसा ||

Vakrokti is a clever diversion or subversion of a saying. The intended meaning of a word is wantonly not understood and the person addressed, most often reprimanded, perverts the meaning of the word to avoid an inconvenient answer. So says Māmāta,

यहकस्मिन्याग्रायने योक्ष्यते |
स्पष्टा काकशा ते स्पष्टा सा वकोक्ष्यतः दिव्या |

There is the first verse of Mudrārāka in illustration:

बन्धा केव प्रकटा ते विभिन्न द्विफला कि हन्तेतद्वसा

1. Kāvyaprakāśa, IX. 85 et seq
2. Tanj Cat., VI 2788 85, with Yagnanārāyanā’s commentary. See also Pratīparudrāyaśāhunagā vi 63 Sāhityarājanākara, vi. 25 and all books on rhetoric in chapters on śabdālāṅkāra.
3. DO, XVIII. 6864.
4. See para 97 supra.
5. Tanj, Cat., VI 2058 Sep., para 239 supra
There are Ratnākara’s Vakroktipancāsaikā,² Rambhāsa kasaṃvāda,² Śivarāma’s Lakṣmī-Sarasvatīsamvāda³ and Girijukalamāvāda⁴

On Vakroktī, as the essential of poetry, Kuntaka wrote a treatise Vakrotijīvita⁵

343 Dvglott poems consist of verses that can be read in any two (or more) languages.⁶ Here is an instance of identity in Prakrit and Sanskrit:

सत्तेस साहसराग पारिवर्त रस्मोक मुनि सर्वमयः
विरस बिरहायास बोधा तब चित्रमहस से ॥

344 Srinivasa Kavisarvabhauma was a poet of the Court of Krṣṇa Rāja Udeyar, Mahārāja of Mysore, of the last century. Besides Krṣṇarājanaprābha-vōdaya, a poem on his patron, he wrote Krṣṇarājaja-yotkar-a in prose and verse in such a way that with an alteration in punctuation the work becomes Sanskrit or Kanarese

345 Cyuta is a species of composition in which the main word is indicated by the omission of a mātra, half mātra, bindu or varna. So Hemacandra says

सूत भात्राबध्मानमित्वाचकर्णमयलेखन पार्था !

For instance:

अर्धवांस्त्रिक मयः ।
पयोचनरासरकान्ते बिन्दाक्षविराजिते ।
कान्तसर्वविषमाती ताले दु-खेन क्षणये ।
अन्य श्लोकमें नकारे न्यायम् श्लेष्यम् ॥

346 Gudha is another species in which some word is concealed in the verses. Hemacandra says:

गुठ्ठ कियोकारिन्स्तपन्नविद्यवादविचपेत चावथ ॥

1  Printed, Bombay with commentary
2  Mys OML, 254.
3  CO, I 540
4  PR, III. App 298
5  Ed. by A. K. De, with critical notes and introduction, PR, II. 17, 19
For instance:

कारकमूढ़ यथा ।
केनेषो दुर्भिकर्णेन हृद्ये विनिवेशितो ।
पिन्नत्ते शरवेण बारि कहारसीलयम् ॥
अतं "शरी" हिति कर्मणे शूद्वनयः ॥

क्रष्णकावि, son of राघुनाथ दिक्षित, wrote क्रियागोपनारामायण or चन्द्रकालावली, a poem in 14 cantos, on the story of रामयण. The merit of the poem is that the predicate is concealed in the verses.

347. विदग्धमुक्षमन्दान of धर्मशास्त्र, a Jain, is a collection of enigmatical verses, in 4 chapters, on different topics in चित्र वरिण्य. There are commentaries on it by तुरान्त्र of शिवराज्ञ, by धर्मशास्त्र and by गौरींता and नराहरी and one anonymous विशेषार्या कविद्वारनाभरणा is a similar work.

348 वाग्भूषण of रामचन्द्र of भार्गवागोत्र is a group of periphrastic and curiously composed verses in praise of various Gods. He lived somewhere on the banks of तम्रपार्श्व in the पांड्य country.

धुर्गहातकाव्या is a highly artificial poem of 80 verses in praise of various deities with an anonymous commentary. There is a poem of that name attributed to कालदास printed in Bombay.

1. TC, I 10, 896, IV 550b (with commentary).
   For instance:

   भवाभारायणस्कीर्णेवरि कमलायण | दृति न्यायसात्तलेन वेषका वैविभेषितीपित | ॥

2. Printed, Bombay TC, III. 8977, DC, XX, 8090; Metra, IV. 294.
   For instance:

   अनेकशिरिद्वार राष्ट्र कार्न्ते श्रीरुपपशुः ।
   विविषा तदुद्ध्वार राजदुःश्रोतसङ्कावाहः ॥ बलमीनिः ॥

3. TC, III. 2747.
   For instance:

   ध्रुवद्वार विचित्रसतीर्थिवितान्त् पञ्चाशस्यश्रुतकस्मात |
   भागाधिपते भवसमर्दाधिपतानु भ्राम्य निन्य धरणं विनिवेशि ॥

4. 100, VII, 1498.
CITRAKAVYA

Kavirākṣhaśiṣyam is a poem of 100 verses of involved meaning by an unknown author, calling himself Kavirākṣha. There are commentaries on it by Nāganarāya, son of Devanārādhya, and two anonymous.

349 Nagaraja was the son of Jalapa and grandson of Vidyādhara of Karpatigotra. He is spoken of at the end of his poem Bhāvasataka as a King who was the ornament of the Taka race. "Taka race here mentioned is probably the same as that to which Madanapala, the patron of the author of the Madanaparjatha, (work on law) belonged. It was a family of petty Chiefs whose capital was as stated in the introduction to the latter, a town of the name of Kashtha situated on the Yamuna to the north of Delhi" Bhāvasataka "consists of 101 verses, some in prakrit in each of which a certain person is represented to be doing a certain thing in a certain condition and the reason why he or she does or the minor sense of the verse is meant to be found out by the reader. It is however given at the end of the verses."* 

Camaṭkāracanḍrika, (i) by Kavikarṇapūra, (ii) Narottamaḍāsa and (iii) by Visvesvara, and Vyajokusatāka of Truskrama* are similar.

350 Siṣṭāmīya or Sabdoḍāharaṇa of Bhāskarasūri, son of Rāmaśwāmi Dikṣita, narrates the story of Rāma and is meant to illustrate grammatical forms like Bhattikāvya. Sabhyaśarana is an anthology with double meaning, in 9 chapters, by Rāmacandra Bhatta of Attalaḍesa. The last verse interlaces the last sūtra of Panmi with ingenuity. He was a great grammarnan. There is a commentary on it by Govinda (jyotirvid), son of Nilakantha, of the family of astrologers of Sīlapurī on the banks of Godāvari.

---

1 DC, XX. 8024. Printed, Bombay. There is a fanciful reason given for the peculiar name.

2 DC, XX. 8025.
3 Ibid, 8026, 8027.
4 Ed. Bombay. PR, III. 21, 293, IV. 69, BR, 1882-8), 9, 198.

There are Bhāvavita by Rujrākavi (Printed, Bombay), Bhāvasūkta by Venkatācārya (Mys OML, 680) and Bhāvāmabhārī by Rāma, son of Kṛṣṇagopāla of Aṭrayagotra (B No 2975).

5 CC, I. 138, III. 99.
6 CC, II. 147.
7 TC, IV. 5993.
Sarvasena's Harivijaya is a poem with double entendre describing the victory of Hari, while the same text directs the movements in chess play.

Section II

Some Modern Poets.

351 In the 19th century, Gangadharasastri Talunga of Benares wrote the philosophical poems Hamsāstaka and Alivilāsamala, Duhkhabhanjanakavi of Benares wrote a biographical poem Candrasatkharacarita, and Paramesvara Jha (Mahāmahopādhyāya) wrote Yakvamulakāvya, a sequel to Meghaduta.

352 Subrahmanya Suri, son of Śankara-Nārāyana, was born in 1850 at Kadayakkudi near Pudukkota. He was 7th in descent from the famous Chokkanātha Diksita. He was a Professor of Sanskrit in Raja's College at Pudukkota and passed away in 1913. His learning was versatile. He was very good at poetry and grammar and proficient in singing and painting. His Hariṇāṭas attracted an enchanted audience and were known for their devotion and erudition. Besides the play Valli-Bāhuleyam, in seven Acts, depicting the marriage of Valli and Skanda and a bhāna Manmathamanthana and a prose piece Santanucarita, he wrote several poems Buddhistesas, Padyapancaratna, Hariṇāṭasamānyam and stories adapted to music, such as Rāmavatāra, Visvāmitrayaga, Śītākalyana, Rukmīnīkalyana and Vībhūtimāhātmya etc. His Dolāgītas and Halīsamānjanas, songs on various deities, are interesting, particularly those relating the whole story of Rāmāyana.

By far a very valuable poem is Aśeṇana-Rāmāyana. In 199 verses in Ārya metre where the first three padas narrate the story and the fourth pada impresses a moral. The work is unique and represents Vālmiki's work as a mine of ethical precepts.

353. Kṛṣṇarana was a professor in Ayurveda in Jaipur State about 1900. In his Kachavamsa and Jayapuravilasa, he described the greatness of the ruler of Jaipur. Among many poems he wrote are Aṇīśankaraśataka, Palāndusataka, Muktaka-muktavali, Holāmahotsava.

---

1. See Cat. QP, Int lv., No. 6801. For verses on caturanga, see R. No. 14609.
2. Printed Benares and Darbhanga.
3. He also wrote a romance like Vāsavadatta.
4. Except the works printed by M. L. J Press, Madras and the other manuscripts are with the poet's son, S. Sankara Narayana B.A., Account General's Office, Madras.
and Sarasatika, a poetical epitome of several important Sanskrit works. In metrics he wrote Chandaschatanandana.  

354 Shankerlal Maheshwar Shastri, Mahamahopadhyaya of the Prashnora Nagar community lived in Jamnagar in 1844-1916 A.D. He commenced writing poetry at the age of 15. The Maharaja of Jamnagar bestowed upon him the title of Sighra, an ex tempore poet. He served in the Rawajiraj Pathasala of Morbi in Kathiawar for many years. Among his many works Savitri-caritra, Candra-prabhat-caritra, Dhrutabhyudayananata, Gopalacinti-maati, Anasurabhyudaya, etc.

355 Venkatesa Vamanam Sohani was son of Vamana Vittala. He was Professor of Sanskrit at Meerut and Allahabad and lived in 1882-1925. His son VV Sohani is Professor, Rajkumar College, Raipur (C P). Among his many works, all printed, there are the minor poems, Indradhunapavarga (philosophical), Divyaprasandha, Isalahari, Ramacandrodhiya (in 4 cantos) and a biography of Sri Chatrapati, Sivatiraprasandha. His admiration of Kālidasa is illustrated in his poem Kālidasaprasamsa.

356 Mudumbai Venkatarama Narasimha Acharya, lived in 1842-1928 A.D. He was the son of Virarāghava and Rangāmba of Śrivastya-gotra. The progenitor of his family was Mudumbai Acan, one of the 72 Śrīvai-gava Acaryas set up by Rāmānuja. One of his ancestors Kṛṣṇamācārya had two sons, versed in music and literature and they came to be known as Sangīta-Mudumbai and Śāhīta-Mudumbai, and our poet was of the latter line. His learning was all comprehensive and he was honoured as a poet laureate in the court of Vijayarāmah Gajapaṭi, Maharaja of Vījayanagaram (Vizagapatam District). He wrote about 114 works in different branches of literature. Among his dramas are Gajendravyāyoga, Rājahamsīvanātaka, and Vasavīpašani-vapakaranā, and his Ciṣṣyāloka dramatises the story of the solar eclipse. Among his major poems are Rāmacandrakaṭhāmpita and Bhāgavata, which are long poems on the stories of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and minor poems are Kālīvahelana and Niṭvrahasya. He wrote a romance in prose a campū Ujjvalānanda, and a work on poetics, Kāvyālākārasangraha.

357 Medepalli Venkataramanacarya, was his pupil. Born in 1862 at Anakapalli in Vizagapatam District, and educated under different teachers of great merit, he has been the senior Sanskrit professor in the Maharaja's College, Vizianagaram. His Girvāṇa Satha-gopānasahasram is a rendering in verse of the sacred collect of Tamil

---

1 See Sivadīttā's Introduction to Naṣadha, Bombay.
Prabandhas and is a valuable treasure of devotional lore and exhibits a classical style rarely seen after the 15th century. Above all his narratives in prose of many plays of Shakespeare, on the line of Lamb's Tales are specimens of elegant simplicity. His history of rhetoric written in Telugu, which is an epitome of the results of literary research in the sphere of poetics.

358. Hemacandra Roy, Kavibhāgana, is the son of Jadunandana Roy of Varendra Kāyasīha family of Gautama goṭra. He was born in the village of Rāmanagara in Pabna District in Bengal in Saka 1804 (1882 AD) on 18th Asvina. After a distinguished career in the Calcutta University, he has been professor of Sanskrit in Edward College, Pabna. His poems are remarkable for lucidity of expression and embrace thrilling themes of love and romance. They are Satyabhamaparigraham, Subhadraharauam, Haihayavijayam, Pandavavijayam and Paraśurāmacarītrim.

359 Mathuranatha, popularly known as Manjunātha, is the son of Dvārakānātha and was adopted by Sundaralāla, a Pandit of the Court of Jaipur. He is of Gautama Goṭra, born on Āśādha Kṛṣṇa Saptami Sam 1940 (1890 AD). His ancestor Baviṣṭikṣit was a Telugu Brahmin who settled at Benares, and a later descendant Manuladikṣit came away to Prayāg. The family was known as Devarṣyaṉṭaka, after the name of a village Devarṣa, gifted to him by his pupil there. About Sam 1700, Śrīkṛṣṇabhātta was born. His scholarship is highly praised by Harharabhātta in Kulaprabandha. Having been honoured by the Chiefs of Bundī and Amber, he was made the State Pandit of Jeypur. There at Jeypur he wrote the poems Īśvaravilāsa, Padyamukṭavah, Tripurasundarīstavarāja, and Alankārakalāndhi.

Mathurānātha is the Superintendent of Sanskrit studies in Jeypur State. In his Manjukaviṭānikunja (Bower of poetry) he has gathered...
minor poems Sāhiṛavaibhava, Jayapuraaibhava, Sanskritagathāsaptasati, Sanskritasarvasva, and Kavyakalārāhasya.

"The poem is divided into several sections," Says Gopinatha Kaviraj, "with verses on different subjects in each. The description of the seasons, the representations of the various moods of the human mind, the delineation with touches of humour at intervals of the darker phases of the modern social life, all these have a ring of freshness and spontaneity about them which mark them out as distinctive of true inspiration. The author is at his best in his manipulation of the metres not merely those which are current in the Sanskṛita classics but even some new varieties coined by him in imitation of Hindi, Urdu and Persian."

360. Srisailatatacarya, better known as D. T. Tatacarya Sironmani, is the senior professor of Mimamsa, Sanskrit College, Tiruvadi, Tanjore Dt. He was born in 1892 at Tiruvarangam in South Arcot. His powers of Sanskrit elocution are remarkable. Among his poems are Kapinamupavasa and Mugdhānjali.

---
1. This is a literal reading of Hāla’s Saptasati.
2. Printed, Kumbakonam.
CHAPTER XV

SECTION I

Subhasita

361 Subhasita, generally spoken of as anthologies, are various collections of verses as several topics, proverbial, erotic, ethical, descriptive and devotional etc. They may be the composition of one author or selections from other authors. In some of the collections of the latter class, the names of the poets are appended and they thus serve as valuable landmarks in literary history. Many of these poets are now only known by name and their works are not available. Treatises on rhetoric often serve the purpose of anthologies, for they quote verses in illustration from various poets and works by name. Works of single authors may be classed under Laghu Kāvyā, while collections may stand apart as essences of the whole Kāvyā literature.

362 Kavindravacanasamuccaya* is the earliest of anthologies now available. The author’s name is not known, but among the authors quoted Mayūra, Vākpatirāja and Rājasekhara are the latest. It must have been composed about the end of the 10th century AD. The value of the work has been enhanced by the excellent introduction of F W. Thomas which contains information on many unknown authors and collects their verses quoted in other anthologies.

363 Nandana’s Prasannasāhityaratnakara is an anthology in 1000 stanzas. “The compiler is very proud of his knowledge of Panni and Sahitya. He says his work is beyond computation. He commences with Śivavrajā. This work is compiled in imitation of Kavivacana-samuccaya in which collections of verses on different subjects are called Vrajyas. That is Buddhistic, while the present is Hindu.”

364 Amitagati was a Digambara Jain ascetic and pupil of Madhavasūna. He wrote Dharmaparikṣa in Sam 1070) and Subhā-

---

1. Printed, Calcutta
2. Such work has also been admirably done in the Introduction to Subhāṣītāvalī by P. Peterson
3. Hatprasad’s Sastri Neel. Cat. No. 1574.
4. P.B., IV ix.
śiṭṭaraṇasandohā in Sam 1050 (994 A.D.) during the reign of King Munja of Dhāra.

365 Sridharadāsa son of Vatudāsa, was a Vandalika or a governor under king Jāksmanasena of Bengal. His Saduktikarnāṃpta composed in Saka 1127 or 1205 A.D. comprises various topics from select authors whom it names.

366 Jālhana or Arohaka Bhagadatta Jālhana Dēva was son of Lakṣmideva. They were ministers of the Vādava king Kṛṣṇa. His Sūkṣmuktāvalī was composed in Saka 1179 (1257 A.D.) during Kṛṣṇa's reign by Vādava Bhānu Pandita or Bhāskara at the instance of Jālhana. The introductory verses give an account of Jālhana's family and are summarised by R.G. Bhandarkar thus.

"There was a person of the name of Dada who belonged to the Vatsa Gotra and appears to have been in the service of the Vādava king Mallugi, called in other places Mallugi Vijjana, of the Kalachuri race, who had usurped the throne at Kalyana in 1157 A.D. was not allowed to enjoy it peacefully. Besides internal disturbances he had to face the attacks of the surrounding chiefs. Mallugi appears from the above to have been one of those who were hostile to him, and Dada, who commanded his troops of elephants, fought a battle with Vijjana. Dada had four sons named Mahidhara, Jahla, Samba, and Gangadhara who contributed to raise the importance of Mallugi's kingdom. Mahidhara succeeded his father in the command of the elephants and had to conduct the war with Vijjana. His son Ananta appears to have assisted his father and captured many elephants from his master's powerful enemies. After Mahidhara's death his brother Jahla succeeded to his office and is said to have restored Bhallama's kingly power firm. Bhallama was the son of Mallugi and acquired finally the paramount sovereignty of the Dekkan for his family, about the year 1187 A.D. Jahla led a maddened elephant into the army of the Gurjara prince and obtained fame as Bhagadatta. Bhagadatta is a prince mentioned in the Mahabharata who fought with Arjuna with great bravery. Jahla spread terror into the heart of Malla, frightened.

2 Ibid BR (1882-3) 45, ZDMG, LIX 226 Ed. Kāvyamāla, Bombay with a young introduction on the inscriptions of the Paramāra dynasty. On Munja, see under Bhāṣa post.

3 Printed partly by Rāmītvaṭṭacārma, Calcutta, CSC (1903) 106., Mitra's Notices, No 1180, ZDMG, XXXVII, 361 89, 503-59 For author's names, see Aunrechis Collections, No 573, BRAS (1905), 1028 1088.

4. Report (1897)
the forces of Malugn, who must have been an enemy of Bhilama, and vanquished Munja and Anna. Who these chiefs were we do not know, and a great many of them had to be vanquished before Bhilama could acquire supreme power. The Munja mentioned here was not the celebrated prince of Dhara of that name Jahla captured many elephants and gave them to his master Bhilama. Janardana was the son of his brother Gangadhara and he appears to have succeeded as commander of the troops of elephants. He taught Simha or Singhana the art of managing elephants and thus enabled him to conquer Arjuna Singhana, called also, Simha was the son of Jaitrapala and Bhilama. If he was taught the art of managing elephants by Janardana, it must have been so when he was a young man and during his father's reign Singhana himself came to the throne in 1210 A.D. Janardana's son Lakshmideva succeeded to the office and contributed by his courage and bravery to consolidate the power of king Krishna. Krishna was the grandson of Singhana and ascended the throne after him in the year 1247 A.D. Lakshmideva constructed a large-tank and had an extensive and beautiful garden. His son was Jahlana, who with his brother assisted king Krishna by his counsel and commanded the troops of his elephants. He compiled this collection of elegant sayings.

Sūktamuktāvālī is in two recensions, short and long. It is particularly valuable for its preservation of the famous verses of Rājasēkhara enlising great poets, of whom some are women. It begins with a summary of the contents.

367. Sarngadhara was the son of Ğāmodara, grandson of Rāghava and great-grandson of Hammīra Bhūpāta of Sākambhārī country. It is an anthology of 4689 verses, some by the collator, and was composed in 1363 A.D.

368. Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣṭāvālī has 3327 quotations of

1 DC, XX 8109, 8118, PR III No 870. For a full review and list of authors, see Peterson, JRAS, XVII 57-71. Keith, SL, 229, Quakenbos, Poems of Mayura, 9 note.
2 Ed. by P. Peterson, BSS, Bombay and partly by Antficht, ZDMG, XXV, 455, XXVII, 1, 77, DC, XX 8092. See Bohtlingk's notes, ZDMG, (1878), 835.
3 He is different from Vallabhadeva, the commentator whom he quotes (see para 99 supra for further elucidation), PR, IV 110-1, and Peterson, Int to Subh. 113-4. A B Keith, Bull Or Studies V (cannot be earlier than 15th century A.D.) S K Das, JRAS (1927), D C Bhattacharya, JRAS (1928).
4 Ed. by P. Peterson, BSS, Bombay. For a review by Buhler see 1A, XV.
very great value in literary history. He was a Kāśmirian and his authors are mostly of Northern India. He must have lived after Sultan Zamaal-"dīn of Kāśmir (1417-67 A.D.), for he quotes Jonarāja, who was contemporary of that Sultan.

369 Nilakantha Diksita was betitled Prabandhasāgara by king Rāma-varma of Vanci (Travancore) of the 15th century. In a poem of 18 stābakas called Varnanāsārasangraha he elaborately describes several objects, seasons, countries and deities.

370 Śrīvara was pupil of Jonarāja. Jonarāja continued Kalhana’s chronicle till 1412 A.D. and Śrīvara followed till 1477 A.D. Besides Kaṭhākantuka and Janarāja-taratangini, he wrote Subhāṣītaśālī where he quotes about 400 poets.

Vījaya-senāsūrī wrote Sūktiratnāvalī in 54 verses in Sam 1647 (1591 A.D.). It appears from the Prasaṣṭi on the Vṛti on Vījaya-prasaṣṭikāvya, that another Sūktiratnāvalī was composed by Hemavijaya-agni. There is also a Sūktiratnāvalī by Vaiḍyaraṇa, son of Rāmabhātta, but authors are not named.

371 Haridāsa, son of Purushottama, of the Karana clan was an inhabitant of the Maharaja-Kharagada. Purushottama had four sons, Kṛṣṇadhāsa, Dāmōdara, Nārāyaṇa and Haridāsa. Haridāsa was a worshipper of Gaṇesa and was proficient in all sciences and arts. He composed Prasṭavaratnākara in 1614 probably of the Vikrama samvat, at Jatapattana during the reign of Varavirasahī in 21 chapters on various topics.

372 Harikavi was a poet of the Deccan. Cakrapām was his brother. His anthology Hāravali or Subhāṣītabārāvalī shows an intimate acquaintance with the literature of the whole country from Kashmir to Deccan. He quotes from a poet of Akbar’s Court.

1. See Jonarāja’s Rajaṭarangini, 7
2. DCO, XX 8087. He wrote commentary on Saurilkaṭhoḍaya, (DCO, XX 7886) during the reign of kings Rāma-varman and Gaṇḍavaran of Calicut of the 15th century A.D. See para 169 supra.
3. Peterson, o.c., VI. nl BKR, 61, BR, (1888-4), 51.
4. Printed, Bhownagar.
5. IOG, 1208.
7. For a full account, see PR, II 67-64. For a synopsis of quotations, see Thomas, Int to Kav. 14 authors are named. There is a Subhāṣītabārāvalī of Har (OC, I, 725).
Akbariyakālidāsa) and from Jagannātha's Bhāminivilāsa and must therefore be assigned earliest to the latter half of the 17th century A.D. To the student of literary history this anthology presents many points of interest.

Vrajanātha was in the Court of King Mādhava, son of Jayāsūlha who was a descendant of Prthvirāja, and lived about sam 1809 (1713 A.D.) His Padyaṭarangini with commentary in 12 tirangas is a large collection.

Kāvyasangraha is an anthological collection of verses from various sources enumerating groups of nine, eight, seven, six and five noted persons, things and qualities, possessing similar characteristics.

373 The following are other anthologies: Padyaṭarangini of Harī Bhāskara, Padyaṭavali (i) of Rūpagoswāmin, (ii) of Mukunda and (iii) of Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Paḍyamuktavali of (i) Gūḍhārāma, Govinda-bhatta and (ii) Paḍyāṅgṭasarovara; Padyaśangraha by Kavibhatta, Padyaśeni of Veṇīdatta, son of Jagajjīvāna.

---

2 He mentions a Bhagyāprabandha by Rajasakha and quotes two verses from it and one of these authors is Pundānana. On this, Peterson (to C 0) infers that the author of the Bālakrīmāyanā etc. may have composed a Bhagyāprabandha and says Rājasaṅkha was a contemporary of Somādeva author of Yasiḍṭalaka (composed in 859 A.D.) and of King Bhoja whose date of accession he puts at 966 A.D. There is a Harāvali by Puranottama, (PR, III 863.)

3 PR, IV. 26-32 Author's names are not given. For references, see Thomas, Int. to Kavī.

4 DC, XX. 8080. For instance.

---

4 BR, (1884-7) No 856, PR, III 395, OSC, (1908) 62, OC, I 324. It contains 880 quotations from various Vaiṣṇava authors, such as Yogaśvara, Lakṣmīdāsa, Śrīdharasvāmi, Subhānga etc. There is a commentary by the author's son Jayarāma. Authors are named. For list, see BR, (1887-91) Int. see Aufrechter's article in ZDMG, XXXVIII, 544-7.

5 Ibid
6 PB, IV 37
7 PB, III 395
8 OC, I 824.
9 BR, (1884-7)
10 OC, I 824
11 Printed, Haberlin, 529
12 BR, (1884-7) No 875, BR, (1887-91) IX Authors are named. It was composed in the reign of Emperor Shah Jahan (1625-58 A.D.)
(Prastāvataraśāradī of Candracāda, Prastāvataraśāradī of Śripāla, Prastāvataraśāradī of Kesava Bhattacharya, Prastāvaśārasangraha of Rāmānanda, Prastāvaśārasangraha of Lādhītraśirasena, Prastāvaratnakāra of Harhara)

Subhāṣita kaustubha of Venkatādhvānī, Subhāṣitamuktaśāvali (i) of Purusottama and (ii) of Mathurānātha, Subhāṣitāvali of Sakalakīrtu, Subhāṣitaratnakāra by K. P. Parab, Subhāṣitaprabandha or Bhojakṛtasubhāṣita, Subhāṣitaratnakosa of Bhattā Śrīkṛṣṇa, Subhāṣitaratnakosa of Puruṣottama and (ii) of Mathuranātha, Subhāṣitapadavali, anonymous and by Śrīnāṭacārīya, Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Bhattā Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Gopinātha, Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Peddabhattacharya, Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Śrīkṛṣṇa, Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Peddabhattacharya

Subhāṣitaratnakosa by Bhattā Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Subhāṣitanī of Venkatādhvānī, Subhāṣitapadāvali, anonymous and by Śrīnāṭacārīya, Subhāṣitaratnakara by Cakravatī Venkatāūrya probably of Kalyānapuram, Subhāṣitasurasadrama (i) by Keladi Basavappa Naik and (ii) by Khandera Basavaśyāndra, Subhāṣitasarvasvā by Gopinātha

Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Śrīkṛṣṇa, Subhāṣitasudhādhāravāna by Peddabhattacharya

1. GC, I 899
2. HPR, II 185
3. HPR, I 296
4. PR, (1887)
5. DC, XX. 8098 On the author, see Chapter on Campu gad
6. GC, I 728, PR, III. 897 IV. 81, IV. 31, VI. 897, SKO, 175.
7. NW, 698
8. DO, XX. 8103
9. Printed, Bombay
10. CO, I 728 Thomas, Int to Kav, 12 Authors are not named
11. GC, I 728, IB, (1893-4), No. 98, 56, 860. Authors are not named.
12. GC, II. 174.
13. DO, 2458, GC, I 728
14. Also called Sabhāyālakāra Samyogārangāra, BR, (1884-7), No. 417, BR, (1897-90), ixi Authors are named.
15. GC, I 728
16. Printed in part with commentary by Narasimha (DC, XX, 8096)
17. DC, XX, 8099, 8101
18. TC, I. 800 He also wrote Muṣkilapancaka (TC, I 873) and Vṛṣṇipancaka (TC, I 828)
19. TC, II 2563, where author’s names are not given.
20. BR, 246, GC, I. 728
22. DC, XX, 105, TC, I 1054, TC, IV. 5241, 5644 Written at the instance of King Kampe of Vijayanagar in 84 padiha contains an account of Śyana’s family.
23. DO, XX. 8117 in 18 sātakas He was of the family of Mahāmahopādyāya of Ekalāvara City
Subhāṣitaratnākara (i) by Munideva Ācārya (ii) by Kṛṣṇa, (iii) by K S Bhatavadekar, (iv) by Umāpati, son of Nirmalanātha, Sūktamuktāvali (i) of Visvanātha, son of Vidyānīvāsa Bhaitācārya, (ii) of Purusottama and (iii) of Mathurānātha Subhāṣita by Harhara, Sābhāsya-vrungasāra of Jagannāthamitra, Sūktavali by Laksmana, Subhāṣitāvali.

Subhāṣita, Subhāṣitamuktāvali, Subhāṣitasamuccaya, Subhāṣitasudhānandalahati, Subhāṣitasuraḍruma, Subhāṣitaratnamālā, Subhāṣityamanjarī, Subhāṣitārnavā, Subhāṣitasangraha

Cātuḍhāra, Cāturaṭnākara, Cātuslokas

1. PR, I 74
2. PR, III 85, 54
3. BR, (1887)
4. Printed Bombay.
5. Bh. Cat
6. OC, I 728.
7. Ibid
8. Metra, V OC, I 728
9. OC, I 696 Composed in 1867 A.D
10. Kuppusami Sastri’s Rep. (1916-9), 40 Of the rare authors and works are Viśvādhika, Purandara, Udhamā Dandin’s 2nd verse of Avantiśundarikāsthā, Taranāvacaśapati, Bhaṭṭakaṭha, Vyāsa Sātakaṇṭha, Sundarapāṇḍya, Vallabhadeva, Gajendra simha, Bavigupa, Amṛṭavarṇa, Cappatodeva, Svarṇaśrītara, Ankṣvalā, Rāmabhaṭṭa. It quotes Someśvara and must have been composed later than 1180 A.D For another work of this name, see IOC, 1518.
11. BR (1888-4), No 91 Authors are named Thomas, Int to Kav 12, 14
12. Ibid No 92, PR, VI 967, Uhuvar, 1094. Authors are not named. Another larger work of this name is in Aufrecht’s collection, No. 61 in 84 Muktamālās. Authors are not named. See Thomas, Int to Kav. 13, for contents.
13. OC, I 728 Authors are not named
14. DC, XX 810-3-4; Taylor, I 140.
15. TC, II, 2569
16. TC, I 794, OC, III 160
17. OC, I 728, DC, XX 8099-6102, TC, I 800, 871, II 1631 This is probably the same as the work of Cakravatī Venkatāchārīr. TC, I 800
18. TC, I 468
19. PR, III 997, HPR, II 249
20. DO, XX 8032. This contains 6 Padhātis with 915 verses. There is a commentary on it, DO, XX, 8035
21. DO, XX 8035 This mentions Kākaṭindra and must be later than Pratīparudra
22. DO, XX 8089-1052 These are different collections.
Padyaracana by Laksmaprabhata, Rasakajivana by Gadadharabhatta,
Subhāṣītasārasamuccaya, Sārāsāngraha by Sambhudaśa,
Śabhyālankaraṇa by Govindān or Govindjīta, Sabbhābhūṣapamanjarī by Gautama

373-A Sundaradeva's Sūktisundara was composed about the
beginning of the 17th century. His anthology is valuable in that it
contains verses of various poets of the 16th and 17th century in
praise of the rulers of that period, particularly Mussalman. Among
these are Ākbar (or Jallāladīna or Kābitendra), Muddapharsāha,
Nizamaśāha and Shah Jehan. He must have been very familiar with
those Courts and here is a verse in which he has used some Urdu
terms

Emperor Akbar is thus praised by Akbaryakāliṣā

Of these Candracūda was son of Bhatta Purusotama author of Anyokhikan
thābhārāṇa, Candrakavihārīvīraśāya, Kārtvīryodāya and Prastāvaśaṅkārīmāṇi
(CC, I 180) Bhayyabhāṭṭa was son of Krṣnabhāṭṭa and brother of Advaitabhāṭṭa.
The latter wrote Rāmālingavargama or Takrārāmāyaṇa at Benares in 1628 A.D.
HPR, Cat VII No. 5214) Ramacandra wrote Rādhācarita (CC, III 1107)
and Emperor Shah Jehan is praised by Hanniraj anamisra

Virasimha (1500-1540 A D) and Rāmacandra (1555-1592 A D), Kings of Rewah, are praised here by poets Rāmacandra and Akbarija-Kālidāsa 1

373-B Acarya Kavindra or Kavindra (which is only a title)

"was originally an inhabitant of some town on the banks of the river Godavari He had studied the Asvalayana sakha of the Rgveda and had mastered other branches of learning also In his very childhood he lost his interest in the world and having taken Sannyasa made Benares his abode The Sannyasin must have met Shah Jehan when the persecution of Hindus was at its highest and the Pilgrim-tax was re-imposed on pilgrims to Allahabad and Benares The Sannyasin seems to have exercised wonderful influence on the emperor in order to make him abolish the tax, The joy of Hindu India knew no bounds and congratulations poured from all quarters Addresses after addresses, verses and prose eulogies, were presented to the Sannyasin, the Defender of Faith Titles of Kavindra, Vidyamdhana and Acarya were conferred upon him These addresses in prose and verse along with the names of their authors who were scholars of repute or holy men have been preserved for us by Sri Krsna Upadhyaya in an anthology (Padyavah) called the Kavindracandrodaya"

abhisekam bhootyārācārya nākā Trầnkāṭakāṭō gajau airāyāh karmāhātāh kārmanāhātāh kāśīnānubhāt 2

Sriśvāmin

1. See Imperial Gaz., of India, XXI 279 ff King Virasimha was patron of Rāmacandra, son of Lakṣ                                                                                                ma Bhatta, who wrote Rādhācarita, Rasikaranjana and Romāvaḥaṭtaka, (See para supra) King Virabhānu (1540-1555 A D) of Rewah was patron of Bhanukara and as such is mentioned by Mohanaḍāsa in his Rasodādhi (CC, I 465, 495, 498)

In a small poem of 75 verses, the last 6 verses appear to be eulogy of Emperor Akbar for the verse harsālomājālīkāla is ascribed to him in Rasakajīvana (Anuśās, XII 896-9) and Padya cana The Colophon mentions the name of Gangādhara as having written it, Har Dutt Sarma guesses that Gangādhara might be the name of Akbariya Kālaḍāsa
Kavindra was a friend of Visvanātha Nyāyapancānana. He was very rich and he had a treasurer Kṛṣṇa Bhatta. He utilised his wealth for the enrichment of Sanskrit literature and had a library of immense merit embracing all branches of learning. The catalogue of his library has been printed in Baroda and contains the names of many works now unknown. His asceticism and spirituality commanded the respect of Emperors Jehangir and Shah Jehan and Prince Dara and a manuscript of Vāmana’s Kavyālankārasūtra bears a seal with the name ‘Salim’, a name by which Emperor Jehangir was fondly known to his contemporaries. Kavindra wrote works in all branches of learning. His commentary on Daśakumārakarita has a memorable colophon.

His collections of Rāmāyana were very valuable and his list mentions Mṛkandurāmāyaṇa, Saugrahārāmāyaṇa, Vyāsārāmāyaṇa, or Kākabhūtundirāmāyaṇa, Vālmiki’s Nātakarāmāyaṇa, Vibhiṣaṇarāmāyaṇa, Brahmarāmāyaṇa, Śiṃhārāmāyaṇa, Agastyrāmāyaṇa, Śivarāmāyaṇa or Sevarāmāyaṇa, Agamarāmāyaṇa, Karmarāmāyaṇa, Skandarāmāyaṇa, Pulastyarāmāyaṇa, Aruṇarāmāyaṇa, Bhāratarāmāyaṇa, Dharmarāmāyaṇa, Adbhutarāmāyaṇa, and Gāyatrīrāmāyaṇa. There are also the poems Kṛṣṇavilāsa, Corakāvya, Kalpita-Kēdambarī, Meghavinoda, Sekharakāvya, Hāṣyaśanaka, on poetics, Bhāratasūtra with commentary, Rāmāṇīśāmancika, Kāmasammohana, Kolanayukākhyāna, and in drama, Sarasvātikanthabharaṇanātaka, Kṛṣṇabhaktirasāyana, Bhilana, Āsthānabhubana, Nepāla’s Hāṣyanātaka, and Meghadyuṭi, Medhavilāsa, Bhojarājatarampi and Prajarābhṛatta’s Rājarātarangini, and various books on the different arts (64 Kalas).
CHAPTER XVI

SECTION 1

Poetesses

Among the authors of the hymns of the Rg Veda, we have some women. The Ātreya house produced the poetesses, Visāvarā (V 28) and Āpalā (VIII 91). In the Kāsivat house, there was a line of poetesses and of these Ghoṣā was the greatest. She was the daughter of Kāk-īvan. She calls herself a princess and probably her father was a ruler. She remained unmarried to a late age, when she was favoured with a husband by the grace of the Āsvins. She wrote in Jagati metre and her verses are easy and well balanced (I 117, 122), Juhū (X 109), Sāvatī (VIII 1), Māndhāṭī (X 134), Mādhavī (I 91), Sāsiprabhā (IV 4), Aṇulākṣmī (II 78, III 28, 63, 74 and 76), Revā (I 87), Pahāyī (I 83) and Rohā (II 63) are also poetical seers of the hymns. Asvalāvana mentions Gārgī, Vācānāvī and Badavā Prāṭītheyī along with the ancient venerable Rās Lōpāmudrā is referred to in the Ānukkranānī (I 179-192).²

374 Dhanadeva’s verse is quoted in Sārangadharapaddhati:

शीताकिंविषादमोलोरिकाया काव्य कर्तुः सति विज्ञासिन्धयोग्यः।
विश्वसेवविनिशेतु विश्व वक्तु यः प्रवीणस्य कर्पः॥

Rājasekhara praises some poetesses, Śīla, Vīṇārā, or Vīṇā or Vīṇākā, Subhadra, Prabhuḍeśī, Viṅkanṭjambhā

मद्यदर्पणस्मृतं श्रमः पाण्डाली रीतिहर्षेऽः।
शीतास्तिकरिकाच्यो बाणोतित्वु च सा यदि॥
केकौतिनितम्भे गिरि ग्रंथेऽरं रक्षिता।
विज्ञास्य निजामानां न मौन्मथयुर्व वच॥
सरसवती कण्ठारी विज्ञावर्त्तय जयासी।
या बैद्मिगिरा बासः काव्यद्रासाद्यनतरः॥
सूतिनां स्वरूपेतिनां विलात्युत्सै।
अशुदेशी कविकोटी वातापि हृदि तिर्यगि॥

¹ See Women Poets of the Rg Veda (IA, I. 113), Poems by Indian Women by N. Macnicol (Htr. of India Series), JI of Sams Sah, Parishat, XVI 4
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Villa's expression followed her imagery, Vikatanitamälä's verse was elegant in simplicity. The style of Subhadra appealed to the poetic mind and stuck to it for ever. Mrityu and Mārulā excelled in suggestions of ideas.

Vijā was Sarasvatī incarnate except that she was dark in complexion. Vijakā has been identified with the queen of Cardrādīta, son of Pulakesin II, from the Nerur and Kochre grants dated 659 A.D.

Fajāsekharacarita mentions poetesses, Kāmalilā, Sunardā, Kanakavallī, Madhurāngi, Iltānī and Vimalāngi (of Malava). Ballāla's Bhojacarita mentions some poetesses too, but it is doubtful if these were not fictitious names.

The anthologies also quote verses of Jaghanacapala (Padyav), Avilambitārasarvasvatī (Padyav), Indulekhā (Subh), Kuntidevi (Subh), Candālavindā (Sām), Nagamā (Sp), Padmāvati (Pml), Madālasā (Sp), Rajakasarvasvatī (Sām), Laksmi (Sp), Virasarasvatī (Padyav), Sarasvati (Sām), and Siṭa (Bhojaprabhandha).

1. Vaghhata in his Kavyāmuṇḍa quotes a verse as of Śilā's. Is it Śita? See Peterson, Subh. 180
2. See Peterson, Subh. 117, Thomas, Kav 104, Aufricht, ZDMG, XXVII 85, CC, I 569, Bhandarkar Rep. (1895) xix, xlvii
3. Peterson, Subh 94
4. See Peterson, Subh. 119 Thomas, Kav 104 Aufricht, ZDMG, XXVII, 85, CC, I 571, Bhandarkar, Rep (1897) xix, xlv Bhoja quotes from Vijākā and Vikatanithambā
5. IA, VIII 44, 165. B Bhattacarya (Brief Summary of Sahitya Sastra, Journal of Dep of Letters, Calcutta, IX) says that he was contemporary of Dandin.
6. DC, XVI 8167, JMy, XI 7679
7. Some of these verses are very good. For instance.
POETRY

SILA

প্রিয়াবিবির্যায় হৃদি বিস্তা সমাগতা ।
হতি মতা গাতা নির্দা কে কুক্তনামপাট।

Subh 1197

JAGHANACAPATI

ফিনিশিথিকেন নিসাবারাত্র নগরীঠিক।
পলী বিদেশ্যতে পর সুম্ব অবনচপলায়।

Kav 318

INDULIKHA

একে বারিনিধী প্রকাশমন্দরোকনমঃ
কেবিতাকর্যযিগিতা নিজপাদু, শ্রীঘণঘণি চন্দ্রভচিব।
মিথ্যাচৈতন্তসাহিক যিনিয়িল প্রক্ষাতীতীতপথমঃ
মনেহ পুনরূপধননিমিত্তেতীতোত্তিকিতে রবি।

Subh 1902.

MARULA:

কথা কণাতি তৎ প্রভুরিয়মরাখন নদী মে ।
মহাযুব্রা কৃষ্ণাদুলকমজন্তৈ পাচকতায়।
সমরসমানু কিবিনিহতি ন হ ন হোলী মহামুু
স্মরেকম্প বালা সম হৃদি নিপুল পরদিত।

Subh. 1326.

MORIKA

মা গচ্ছ প্রমদায়ি পিয়াতীপূয়ারূপ্তো মে ।
বালা মাহাশিবাতীতন ভবতা মাপনোতি নিধা পরায়।
ছিল মান্তক্ষারাপ্রিয়াবনসহেয়নসমুদ্রপীতি
শুংকনৃসুলকালকৈনুদিন নিশ্চুলসমস্তুদুদুপ।

Subh 1053

VIKATANTIAMBA:

অন্যান্তু তারুপমদেহায় শৃঙ্গ ছোল বিনোদয মনস্মুমানচালায়।
বালামাজাতুজস কথিকামাল৭ ব্যর্থ কদর্যনি কিন নবমাদিকায়।

Subh 733

VIDYA OR VJIIA:

সিংহকালিকাত্মন্তরেতিমন্তীকালস্বরূপে মাতি।
রক্তমীলকৃতপিতরীর ধরারিত জন্মগ্রহিতমন্ত্র।

Subh Int 118.
Bhavadevi

सन्नामधे तुयावस्ममन्नुबा जन्म १ सह- 
याःध्वनी नाथा ज तन्त्र ध्वनि समानाथुदिविने।
भवासोमाने विद्वत्सरोपुष्पक्षवती- 
रसिफिघुरुद्र तदिहु नमकं फतिम्यम।

Kav 62

375 Priyamvada was the daughter of Sivarāma and wife of Raghunātha. She lived in Faridpur, east Bengal, soon after 1600 A.D. She wrote the poem Śyāmarahasya and her earliest verse was in praise of Kṛṣṇa.

376. Vaijayanti was the daughter of Mārābhaṭṭa of the village of Vhanuka in Faridpur District. She married Kṛṣṇāṇaṭha, son of Durgāśā Tarkavāgīśa of Kotalipada. She lived in the middle of 17th century A.D. She learnt Sanskrit under her father and was proficient in Mīmāṃsā. Once when her husband could not make out a passage अनंतुनेर त्वारिणोत्कर् and taught his pupils wrongly as meaning, "Here too not said, and there too not said," but dissatisfied with the interpretation appeared to be troubled over it, Vaijayanti gave the correction construction अनंतुनेर तत्र अपने उक्तम्. She wrote fine poetry but it is all merged in Ananḍaitikācāmpū composed by her husband Kṛṣṇāṇaṭha, and her collaboration there is mentioned by Kṛṣṇāṇaṭha himself Ananḍaitikācāmpū. Once it is said while Kṛṣṇāṇaṭha was composing verses descriptive of a nāyikā, Vaijayanti composed a verse at once.

अहिरवं भमबोधितिमिर्यमादि तत्समाधिकल्ल नामिद्वयोरेष्वत्।
हति मनोदयितम् नयेन हि यत् अर्णसामवि कं समुपशिवे॥

JAYANTI is mentioned in an article by the editor of Visvakosa in an old magazine, Bangavashi, East Bengal. She has written a fine poem, said to have been seen by Pandit Amulyacaran Vidyābhūṣan, Assistant Secretary, Bengal Sāhitya Parishāṭa.

1. For an account see Sah, XXI 112
2. I am indebted for this information to J. N. C. Ganguly, M.A
377 **Uppaya**, Manoramā and Subhadrā of Malabar, Avantisundari, wife of Rājasokhara, and Sundarī and Kamalī, wives of Ghanavāma, were poetesses of renown

Gangādevi, Madhuravāni and Tirumalāmbā have already been mentioned

378 **Lakhina** Thukurami is the famous poetess of Mithila. A verse of hers is repeated

अकान्ता दरस्मचला गतिना सम्मुक्तता निर्मेय
हर्षदासमदुरिमतिमात्रेकदशास्त्रनी।
ला पढ़ी कटिपंबरी तनवरसस्तवस्वर्जिता
मालोढ़स्वरदना लक्षणो जूनी वृत्तीये संव॥

Here is an indirect from of the signs of the Zodiac numbered in serial order from mesā

**"**Attacked with the severe onslaught of the God of love is she
Distraught like a craft or a fish in a dry place is she Oh, Thou bull-minded one, the damsel round of arms as a water jar, with arched eyebrows (the destined wife of thou who art like a lord amongst kings and who is not† (goss) like a shop-keeper's wife who plies the scales (who has no equal) She feels pain like that of a scorpion bite Surely, let the result of married life relieve her**"**

379 **Triveni** was the daughter of Udayendra puram Avantācārya and was so named because she was born immediately after her father completed his poem Yādava-Rāghava-Pāndaviya She lived in 1817-1883 A D She was married to Praṭivādi-Bhayankaram Venkatācārya of Śrīperumbudur Her poetic instincts manifested themselves even before her marriage and after her marriage, she studied philosophy under her husband She had a son who predeceased her and after she became a widow she wished to erect a temple for some idols
discovered in her place and presented to her by the Collector, who was pleased with her Hāratīpancāka. For that purpose she went to the courts of Travancore and was well received there. Dewan Rangācārya of Mysore was her admirer and by his patronage she completed the shrines. She was prolific in her writings and her capacity to make up *samayās* ext tempore was remarkable. Among women she stands foremost in poetic contributions to Sanskrit Literature. Her poems of devotion are Lakṣmīśahasra and Ranganāthasahasra, her lyrics, are Sukasāndesā and Bhūngasandesā, her poems are Rangābhuvadāya and Sampāṭkumāraṇjayā and her plays Rangarātsamudāya and Taṭṭvamudrābhādraṇdaya, the latter of which is allegorical.

**380 Lakṣmī Rājī** was a princess of Kadathanadu, Ikavalam Kovillogam, Malabar. She lived about 1890. Her Santinagopālakāvya in 3 cantos relates a story that a brahmin lost his ten children successively, Arjuna promised to save the last and when he was unable to do it resolved to enter the fire. Kṛṣṇa intervened and from Vaikuntha brought back all the ten lost children. The last canto has Yamaka composition.

**381 Sundaravalli** lived about 1900 A.D. She was the daughter of Narasimha Iyengar of Mysore and studied under Kasturī Rangācārya. She wrote Ramājanacampū in 6 cantos corresponding to the Kāndas of Rāmāyana.

**382 Jñanasundarī** was a dancing girl of Kumbakonam. She lived there and passed away about 1910. She was the pupil of Kuppuswami Sastri of Śrīvatsagopura and was, as she says, the author of several works, of these however only one Hālīvacampū in 6 Stābakas has been traced. There are old gentlemen living in the southern districts who remember her discourses, dancing and recitals, well and with delight. R. Fisher, Bar-at-law, of Madura was her particular patron. She visited the Mysore court and there received the title Kamrajā. Her narration of the wedding of Minākṣā and Sundarēsa makes a pleasant reading. In verse she is fond of alliteration.
383 Kamaksi married G A, Muthukrishna Iver of Koundinagastra. She was born in 1902 and is the daughter of Pancapageshvara of Ganapati Agharam in Tanjore District. She is the Sanskrit tutor in the Girls' School in Cuddalore. She has mastered Kalidasa's literature and her Ramacarita is a small poem composed with words and phrases used by Kalidasa an epitome of Rama's story.

384 Sister Balamati lives at Madras. She is a well-known nationalist of South India. Her Aryabarmasana is likewise a summary of the story, in easy verse, much, read by beginners in Sanskrit study.

Section 2

Royal Poets

385 The early vedic literature has an instance of a royal bard Vivasvatra. The epic literature describes kings as highly learned and it is not unlikely that many of these patrons of poets were themselves poets. Vikramādiya is mentioned as a poet and some of his verses are quoted in the anthologies, though the identification of Vikramādiya is impossible. Samudragupta is called a Kaviraja in the inscriptions. Dynasties of kings of several parts of India had royal poets, so far as it is known, from about the 6th century BC. Kings whose works are now extant have been mentioned elsewhere in the several chapters of this book. The anthologies quote verses ascribed by name to royal authors. Of these a few are now known to history.

386 Dharmasoka was the third in ascent from Kamsa of the first Gonanda dynasty of Kashmir. Kalhana says that this king freed himself from sins by embracing Buddha's religion and built the city of Srinagar with ninety six lakhs of houses resplendent with wealth.

S बण्वला गोहाना लब्ध्वसस्मितापुज्ज्वले ||
गरीयस्व गुरू श्रीमान्के श्रीगारं नू०. ||

Ray I 104,

Dharmasoka appears to have been a poet and his verse is enchanting.

For instance

अहम्महानेर्वाद्विसाह रत्नसवर्णिति
प्रसरिति सूत्र श्रीवस्तीयः कथामृदुलिति ||
कलितपुज्यक वथ स्तोत्रान्तसन्तकोका
वण्यति शनीवश्च वाकसप्ते तरक्षः द्रष्टयः ||

Saduk II 1-3

1 Ray I 101, et seq
387 **Gonanda**, the poet, was one of the three early Kings of Kashmir, who lived according to Kalhana before 240 BC. Here is a humorous verse:

```
सरिंद्र कठिता सख्ति सौ नैव मणामालिण | निरस्त्रमवृद्ध सभ्या बाहुवताबृत्य धृते ||
```

_Raw 385_

388 **Gopaditya** was the son of Aksa. He founded several temples and agraharams. He ruled over Kashmir for 60 years in the 5th century BC. Sunanda, the fourth ancestor of Gopaditya, wrote a work on erotics, and Gopaditya himself appears to illustrate it:

```
अयुं दूरतिजागररंहिविचाराबोिसं तत्‌त्रुत्तते- 
दाशिक्षेआ वद को सवानिति शुष्ककौशिष्पतमृतते।
सपरिशुकरांकु तक्रसश्र्करापकु तरसहृष्ठर्षभागे 
सुपशासि प्रतिभा तत्त्वतति बुद्धगििनि वाकशासि। ||
```

_Subha 2110_

389 **Ranaditya Tunjina** was the son of Yudhisthira and came to the throne after his brother Narendraditya. He ruled over Kashmir somewhere before 522 AD. He takes a simile from an umbrella thus:

```
गथवलत्रसन्हवतसवासितारम्भं बुधु 
सपरिशुकरांकु तक्रसश्र्करापकु तरसहृष्ठर्षभागे 
तत्त्वतति बुद्धगििनि वाकशासि। 
```

_Subha 3075_

390 **Samudragupta** is traced by Harisena, where the king is described as a prince of poets. "His is the poetic style which is worthy of study and his is the poetic verse which multiplies the spiritual treasures of poets."

391 **Muktapida (Lahitaditya)** was the son of Durlabhavardhana of Karkota dynasty of Kashmir. He ruled in 699-735 AD. Salkiswami was his minister. He wrote didactic poetry:

```
1 बललयर्षेषु चरणि दूषं निभिषति तोयापमवपिनमाणि।
तथापि वध्या हरिणा नराण्यो क ऋष्माराधिति संस्कारं। ||
```

_Sang_

---

1 Ray I 386 346 See under Kalhana _supra_
2 Ray III. 379 et seq
3 See para 11 _supra_ 1a, XLII 172, 188, 280, 249, _JRAS_, (1897), 20,
4 Ray VI 116 et seq, Vaidya, _MI_, 202, S D Pandit, _Int_ to Gaudavaho, _JSS_ gives date 645-732, M Duff gives 720 760 AD. But Cunningham gives date 894 AD.
Yasovarman, King of Kanouj, was the patron of Bhavabhuti and Vākapati. He was defeated by Lalitāditya Muktapīda. Yasovarman’s exploits are described in Vākapati’s Gaudāvahā. So says Kalhana.

Yasovarman’s play Rāmābhīyudaya is mentioned by Dhanika to illustrate chalana and quoted by Abhinavagupta.

He compares himself with Asoka thus:

रत्नतब नवप्रभृतिमया शासी मिश्रया युणे-
स्वामयानि निधिषुलयासससथुदेकाससे समाये ।
कालापाल्यकायित्वहुदे तदनेमायायो
सत्ती दुर्योगोक केहि सहा सत्तोक हुते

Jayapida was son of Vajrādīṭa and succeeded his brother Sangrāmādī. He ruled over Kashmir in 751-782 A.D. Kalhana calls him a pandita.

392 Yasovarman, King of Kanouj, was the patron of Bhavabhuti and Vākapati. He was defeated by Lalitāditya Muktapīda. Yasovarman’s exploits are described in Vākapati’s Gaudāvahā. So says Kalhana.

He compares himself with Asoka thus:

रत्नतब नवप्रभृतिमया शासी मिश्रया युणे-
स्वामयानि निधिषुलयासससथुदेकाससे समाये ।
कालापाल्यकायित्वहुदे तदनेमायायो
सत्ती दुर्योगोक केहि सहा सत्तोक हुते

393 Jayapida was son of Vajrādīṭa and succeeded his brother Sangrāmādī. He ruled over Kashmir in 751-782 A.D. Kalhana calls him a pandita.

---

1 Compare Mentha’s verse quoted para 35 supra.
2 See Levi, II 9, Keith, SD, 390–4, Anreith, ZDMG, XXVII 75, XXXVI, 591, CC, I 174 and JBRAS, XVI 177, BB, (1897) xli, Peterson, Subh. 95, JOR, III 267, (for extracts). For another Yasovarman of Paramār dynasty, see under Bhōja post.
3 M Duff gives dates 779-813 A.D.
In his court flourished Udbhata, K-iraswāmi, Manoratha and other poets. So says Kalhana

His description of nature, says Kalhana, was even in his times oft remembered.

For instance

For instance

394 Avantivarma, the first of Utpala dynasty, ruled over Kashmir in 855-884 A.D. In his court flourished Mukṭākana, Sivaswāmin, Anandavardhana and Bhatakara. His similes are often drawn from nature.

---

1 Ray, IV 403, et seq. IV 469 497, 548
2 See also BKR, 65, 73, PR, I 65 II 28
3 Raj, V 1-127. See para 56 supra
395 Vakpiraja II, also known as Munja, Lpparaja, Prithvivelabha, Sivavelabha, was a poet and patron of poets. He was the son of Siyaka. He ruled at Dhara in Marwar in 974-993 AD. He was defeated and executed by the Calukya king Tailapa II.

Munja is praised by Sambhu, Halajudha and Kaviraja. His treatment of Bhoja, his nephew, is the theme of the works entitled Bhojacantra. Dhananjaya and Padmagenta flourished in his court and Ksmendra instances his verses as of particular merit. Remnants of his poetry now extant eminently attest the appreciation.

For instance:

\[
\text{देवि त्व कुपिता त्येव कुपिता कोज्ये पृष्ठिक्या गुण.}
\]

\[
\text{माता त्व जगता त्येव जगता माता न विरोधयर.}
\]

\[
\text{देवि त्व परिहासकलिकक्षेत्रता त्येवेऽख}
\]

\[
\text{ब्राह्मणतापदो नमस्तिलिङ्गा शारिरिक्ष पादु व.}
\]

Subh. 20

\[
\text{कुलतवमुं क्षत श्मिति किं न यक्षश्चिन्}
\]

\[
\text{किमिष्ठति पदलय नहु सुवा किमिलाया।}
\]

\[
\text{द्रव्य स्मिनो मश किमुक्ति तदिनाय।}
\]

\[
\text{हरेज्यति निमिन्त्र प्रकटतः वकोविति।}
\]

Saduck 43-2

\[
\text{जनव्य तमकालोर्क्षुध्वणेमरामालिनितसुतलीदैवत गुप्तचाप।}
\]

\[
\text{निमुस्नजन्यतिस्य यस नक्कारूरूपवशकरणपूव्य मायमिन्दुरुपिन्।}
\]

Saduck 93-3

396 Kalasa was the son of Anantaraja and father of Harva. He ruled over Kashmir about 1080-1088 AD. The description of him as a man of letters is delightful.
Equally worthy is Kalhana’s description

Vikrama—XVIII 56

Kṣemendra quotes a verse as an instance of prosodiment

The following verses, besides others found in the anthologies, suggest that Kalasa must have written plays and poems from which they have been culled for quotation

Subh 52, 53

397 Arjunavarman, son of Subhatavarman, was a successor of King Munja. He ruled in Malva about Sam 1272 (1216 A.D.). In his commentary on Amaruka,* he quotes a verse of “his ancestor Munjadeva.” There he says about himself

1. See para 306 supra. In an inscription it is said (JAGS, VII, 24)
Jalhana quotes a verse of his about Amaruka's poetry

Here is another verse.

398 Lakamanasesa was the Vaidya King of Bengal who ruled at Lak-anâvat. His era began 1119-1120 A.D. Sndharadása composed his anthology in during his reign. In his court flourished Jayadeva, Umâpati, Govardhana and Saraña. His description of Krśna is alluring

399 Anandagajapati, Zamindar of Vizianagaram (1850-1897 A.D.), was a great poet. Many stray verses are now repeated. For instance

---

1. See para 291 supra
2. See paras 291 802 6 supra.
unnamed poets

400 The following royal poets are also quoted in the anthologies Acīṭadeva, Anantadeva, Anurāgadeva, Amṛṭadeva, Arthaavarman, Bhramaradeva, Bhāskarasena, Dhanadādeva, Kumārādattī, Karnātadeva, Nānyadeva, Prabhākaradeva, Rūpadeva, Vasantadeva, Vijayapāla, Vinayadeva, Visanāditya, Vikramāditya, Vikrantavarman, Sankaradeva, Suravarman, Harivarman, Vāsudeva, Purusottama-deva, Harṣapāladeva, Kesavasena, Sankaradeva, Pravarasena, Kusumadeva

Section 3

Unnamed Poets.

401 The anthologies ascribe verses to poets whose real names are not known, but who have acquired new names such as Sabdārṇava or Lālītānaprāgraḥ as if they were titles conferred on them from attractive ideas exhibited in their compositions. So were other poets known by phrases Dīpasikā-Kālidāsa, Ghanta-Māgha, Chatra-Bhāravi and the like. In the case of the following poets, for instance, it is only the titular name or sobriquet and stray verses that have come down to us.

Dāgdhamadana

| Yadī śrīvibhīṣyottītya ṛṣite dīnaśīnośc | 
| Ṭōdī śrīvibhīṣyottītya ṛṣite dīnaśīnośc ||

Subh 1255,

Dārśaniya

| Saṃśi bilāṭṣya santāpākṣa tattvāntata gata kāśṭhādaḥ yāyākṣepānātīrṭāṁkṣaśa ||

Katham viśmāntaśāhūthatāṃ sahisto n tā maśadāvah tīvānābhāvātīrṭāṁkṣaśaśaśa ||

Subh 1172

Cāndrodaya

| Pratīd āgatiśrūyataṁ nājū ṛṣṣāhūśi śrīyāṃ śīvat ṛṣīyāṃ śūnāva kūnādūpāyana ||

Nimīritavati śātanā bhārī kāṇītāram kāśṭhāditaśaṁ kūru viśādam cāndrodaya ||

Subh 2035

1. There is Ananta-deva Silhāra, whose grant is dated saka 1016 (IA, IX 269).
2. See chapter on Music post.
3. Probably the same as Viṇaśprabha (page 367 supra). Author of Candrudja,
   CC, II 36.
4. Probably King of Orissa whose grant is dated A.D. 1488, Supra.
5. See page 36 supra.
6. Author of Drśāntakalika or Drśāntaśataka, printed Haberlin, 217 CC, I. 266, Subh. 297 297
Dhairyāmija

विन्याचंद्ररुप जातसरागोपाधि वेदता ||
इह्सो चेन पञ्चामिर देशातनागार्य चित्ताः ||

Subh 1208

Nidradaridra

जने कोपपरायसुव्री धित्तमा स्वरेणव द्वय सया
मा मा मस्तु परिमनिति सदती गन्तु मद्धवा तत्त ||
नो यायात्परियम चारुकंजीमा शास्त्राभिमितं
आत्मलाववह असन विषिना निद्रादरित्र कृत ||

Subh 1362

Priyātiraha

पक्षावृत्तिकसति किंतू निपातिति कोंट नवेंवशिचर्णकान
श्रुदात्प्रेण च चक्षुषा सहिरर्ष्य ब्यायनयुक्तिंस्ते ||
चक्राको दिवसारीकामये तर्करोिनुमना
गोनालोप्रितमण्डलोपिय हयया नात रक्षिणेऽनि ||

Subh 1921

Mukhra

नैषा वें युद्धतर्गतकेन विसोदं शतां मैना चपल युद्ध मेदशेन्द्रगरकीय ||
रक्षयास विद्वद्ध हव शाणनायस्म गतवा क्राणपालते निज्ञातिस्मत नुठुर धमानव ||

Subh 2107

Vagīna

अतकश वार्षीकश सन्युगलमाक्षाकलसानन्नं द्रहनोलोपवलम्नपोनककल्ल ||
अकाण्डा दोवश्वी वदनकलक्कक्कामधरत तदसाक्षावणु युग्मनिगिरीत सुपकति ||

Saduk 3-2, 49-1

Virasarsvati

स्नुरान्गस्थिय मुरारिक्षेत्र दारि वचवचनय ||
पुनर्मच युग्मसंक्रके काकियागरानलो जल्ललत ||

Saduk 62-5

Bheribhramaka

रस्मोचकनित्य योजनार्यस्यमिदो बाणारु दशा मंधाप
नवन्तस्ताधुराश्वलक्षणस्यो श्रवहिव्युक्तसय ||
विष्नुवंसंस्तितिुरा ग्राममुरुम्यक्तवर्ण्यकमां
गुण्ये वाच्यदीर्घारातुं जगतो बीराण्डे मेरीश्रम ||

Saduk 49-1
CANDALACANDRA

अम्बेळहु वदनमम्बकिम्नुकात्त पाथोनिधि कुमुमचापश्वतो विकार।
मातुषभूष सुमग तवधि दूरस्ये चण्डालचन्द्रवन्द्वदाकु निशाश्व तस्य॥

Saduk 36-2

JAGHANACAPALA

इूदिननिखीयपने निरसंचारायु नगरविभिषु।
पलौ विदेशयोते पर सुख नचनचलाया॥

Kav 518

402 Kankana may be King Ksemagupta surnamed Kankanavarśa who ruled over Kashmir in 958-968 A.D. (Raj VI 150-180) But it looks as if the poet got his name from the following verses and is a different author.

कण्ठमें शिखिलतां गमिते कधन्वितु यो मन्यते मरणं विरुध्भास्याय।
गण्डक्ष एव में बलात्मकतो युराम्यासुधिक्षिते मुनन्ते विलेतीर्विव्यः॥

Subh 1015

निर्माताराम्योक्तनियोजालबुधिपदव।
भारतपापु मूलानि पापिलेकसिलक्षण॥

Saduk. 71-1.

The following verse attributed to him in Śārasamuccaya, commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa, (PR, II, 15) is playful.

बीलाप्रभुमाध्याति शृंगेर गम्योरनाम्यन्तरे
कस्तूरीवचित्त वचरम्योक्तोरः वादरात्।
ताद्रश्च च कोरे क्रोति जयुकाचकानुकारं तस्या
क्षणिः कौक्ति शैलबलखेलस्ते रिस्तवा सक्षीतः पुरु।॥
CHAPTER XVII

Desavṛttā

Vidyapati was the son of Ganapat and grandson of Jayadatta. In Ls 291 (1410 A.D.) a copy of Kāvaprakāśa was copied under Vidyapati’s order and in Ls 309 (1425 A.D.) Vidyapati himself copied Bhāgavaṇa Puraṇa. There is a copper plate grant of Mahārāja Sivasimha to Vidyapati dated Ls 293 (1412 A.D.).

His Kirtilata, a poem in Avahittha language, mentions Ibrahim Shah of Jaunpur (1401-1440 A.D.). Vidyapati lived in the first half of the 15th century A.D.

Vidyapati’s name is equally known by his two gazetteers in prose, Bhūparikrama and Purusaparīksha. Bhūparikrama covers Balarama’s journey round the earth, describing 56 countries. Passing along the banks of the Sarasvaṭī, the poet mentions various historical events, down to his own times, including the battle of Hammira with Allaudin. Purusaparīksha contains moral or political tales for the instruction of children. It is on the plan or Pancaṭantra, but the characters

1. Sir G. A. Grierson gives a genealogy in Matthi Chrestomathyas, 39. A similar list was published by Rajkrṣṇa Mukhopādhyāya in Bengadarśan a few years ago. See Basantkumar Chatterjee, Padavali Literature [Jl Dept. of Letters Calcutta University, XVI 28 84] which gives a complete account of Vidyapati.

2. Ls is Daksmaṇḍasena Era which commenced in 1119 A.D.

3. India Govt Ms fol. 117 a See B. Chatterjee 1, c. 96.

4. B. Chatterjee, Lc 83, quoting from Bangiya Sah Patri Patrika, where V. Rāmaṭurṇa gave the text.

5. Campbell’s History of India, (168 9)

6. Nagendranath Gupta (Introduction) thinks that Vidyapati died in 1448 A.D.

7. i c. 231 There is another work of this name by Mādhava (CC, I 256)

8. CSC (1903), 445, CSC (1899), No. 59.
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are men, some of whom are historical. It was written under the orders of Sivasimha of Mithila, but the king died before the work was finished.

404 Pattubhatta or Poṭaryārya of Vadhūlagotra was born in the village of Kākmāṇipura near Masulipatam. His Prasangaratnavah was written in Sāka 1338 (1466 A.D.) is a collection of miscellaneous descriptions and comprises stanzas on moral and social duties, rules for particular ceremonies and personal conduct and sketches of individual biography and character. The 77th chapter gives short accounts of princes from the great Vikramāditya to Simhabhūpaṭi, Rāja of Pittapur. Proverbial expressions are abundant.

405 Jaganmohana wrote Desavalivṛtti at the request of king Baijala of Chohan race who died in Saka 1570 (1648 A.D.) It describes the 56 kingdoms of India with the names of rulers, ancient and modern, and contains much historical information.

406 Mahesa Thakkura wrote Ākbarnāma or Sarvadesavṛttāṁtasangraha in prose and he was presented by Emperor Akbar with the Ādrabhāṅga Raj.

407. Ramakavi wrote Pândavaḍīgovājaya in the court of Rāja of Sekharabhumī in the 18th century A.D. It describes the conquest of India by Pândavas. It is very voluminous, probably bigger than Malābhāraṣṭra. "Like Desāvalivṛtti, it is rather a geographical work describing the most noted places in India with historical or Paurāṇika events associated with them. The chief interest of the book consists in the accounts which it gives of the manners, customs, laws, religions, institutions and other social particulars of different parts of India before and after the Mahomedan conquest. The stories of Vikramāditya, Śālvāhana, Bhartṛhari, Śankaracārya, Prabhākara Bhatta, Jumār Nandi, Jayacandra (king of Kambhoja), Pratāpāruda (ruler of Orissa), Surabhātta, etc., find a place in it. The authorities quoted are Bhavṣya Purāṇa, Skanda Purāṇa, Rudravidya, Vīṣvaguṇādarsa, Mahābhājaprabandha, Śākāval etc."

1 TC, III, 8771 DC, XX 8065, where contents are given.
2 OR, I 340, Big 709, P. R III 395 See B Chatterjea, l c, 25
3 OSC (1902), 49-5. It contains an interesting account of Kalyānavarman killed at Puri in Kali 1600 Haraprasad Sastri (JBORS, III 14) mentions Vikramajāgara of Jaganmohana
4 See para 96 supra, All Un Studies. Vol V Gazetteer Literature of India.
5 OSC, (1896) No. 72.
408 Cambhucandra Nṛpati wrote Vikramabhārata at the beginning of the 19th century, incorporating various stories about Vikramadītya and from Purānas.

409 Padmanandi wrote Jambūdvipa-pragranapī in 15 chapters, describing the various divisions of Jambūdvipa and their measurements according to Jaina Siddhānta.

Jambūdvipa-varnana is a geography with maps and drawings according to Jain authorities. The author’s name is not known.

410 Venkatakavisarvabhuma was the son of Jogibhukta and Parvati. He appears to have lived in Godavari District about the end of 18th century. He says he was a master of all arts and sciences and as indicative of his wide learning, he planned his Prapancadarpāna. It is a huge encyclopaedia in three parts, Dharmakhandha, Arthakhandha and Kāmakhandha and under these heads it embraces various topics on Mantras, Purānas, astrology, etc., poetry and poetics, etc. Often he makes quotations, but there is much there that is his own composition. References to authors and works seem to be so incorrect and unknown if not queer, that we are led to doubt their authenticity.

411 Ramakrsna Sastri’s Bhuwanapradīpikā was written at Hassan in 1808 under the patronage of Krishṇa Raja Odeyar III of Mysore is an encyclopaedia, “on a variety of subjects such as creation time, the Manvadis, geography, astronomy, history of Southern India and of Mysore with many details about his patron Krishṇa Raja Odeyar III, the Purānas, duties of the four castes and religious orders, Yoga and Vedanta. Among the Jain kings of Tundira-desa are named Satvandhara, his son Jivandhara, his son Yasodhara, his son Gunapala, his son Vasahpala, his son Prajapala, his son Lokapala, his descendant Himastala who ruled from Kali 1125 Pingala and in whose reign Akalanka vanquished the Baudhīs, then followed Harivikrama, Simhavikrama, Satyaratha, Nyayaratha and Dharmaratha whose son...
CHAPTER XVIII

Kathanaka

(Fables and Fairy Tales)

SECTION 1

412 Closely allied to Gāḍyā Kāvya in the style of prose and to Nīr Kāvya in import are the Fables. They are generally called Kathā. But to distinguish these tales from the species of Romance called technically Kathanaka, I have used the term Kathānaka. In these fables and fairy tales, "the abundant introduction of ethical reflection and popular philosophy is characteristic, the apologue with its moral is peculiarly subject to this method of treatment."

"The controversy that was carried on towards the end of the last century between the advocates of the Eastern and the Northern origin of European fiction had reference especially to a particular class of creations—to those of chivalric romance—to the marvellous exploits magnified out of the traditional achievements wrought by the companion Knights of the Round Table or the Paladins of France. With all confidence, a different class of fiction that, at a later age, found accession into European literature can be traced back to oriental sources. Sir William Jones, in his discourse on the Hindus, observes that they are said to have laid claim to three inventions—the game of chess, the decimal scale of notation and the mode of instructing by apologues. The universal prevalence among the Hindus of the doctrine of metempsychosis was calculated to recommend to their belief the notion that beasts and birds could reason and converse and consequently the plan of such dialogues originated with them. Despite the questionability of the evidence in favour of the originality of the Hindus in the art of instruction by apologues, the purposes to which the Hindus directed it are peculiarly their own. Fable is with them practical ethics—the science of niti or polite. Each fable is calculated to illustrate some reflection on worldly vicissitudes or some precept for human conduct."

The oldest Aryan fables, dating from centuries before Christ, have, according to Dr Rhys Davids, travelled to different parts of Europe and have assumed various modern shapes. Otto Keller maintains the

1 Macdonell, SL. 369
Indian origin of fables common to India and Greece and suggests an ancient Assyrian channel of communication. The substantial link of connection with the west is the literature of the beast-fable. The Mahabatupulya sutras of the Buddhistic literature appear to contain the earliest Sanskrit legends in prose styled Ityuktha and Vjakara (corresponding to the Itihasa-purasas in the Brahmanas) or legends in the form of parables styled avadana exhibiting many elements of the later animal fables and further tales of presages and wonders abhuta-dharma and lastly special instruction in and discussion of definite topics, denominated upadesa and mdana. All these tales, partly mythical, partly didactic and partly allegorical, reappear in a more archaic dress in the Brahmanas in the purana. The poetry does not point to any close similarity with the language of Kalidasa’s. The prose passages are devoid of all lucidity or simplicity. The verse and the Aranyakas as well as in the prose legends interspersed in the Mahabharata which, in the general tenor of their language, present many salient points of similarity with the style of the Buddhistic sutras. Most conspicuous among these are the Jataka tales, which treat of the prior births of Buddha and the Bodhisattvas.

In the Rk Veda are the stories of Man and the Fish, Indra’s metamorphosis into birds Markata and Kapnajala. In the Chândogyopanishad “we have the allegory or satire of the dogs which search out a leader to howl food for them, the talk of the two flamingoes whose remarks call attention to Raivaka and the instruction of the young Satyaka finding a bull, then by a flamingo, then by an aquatic bird.” Fables were directly known to Pañanjali. ¹

Early Sūtra works of Jamas, contain impressive tales illustrative of their ethics and philosophy. Saśtitaṇṭra consisted of stories explanatory of the subtleties of Sāṅkhya philosophy.

SECTION 2

Brhatkatha

413 The earliest regular collection of Fables was Brhatkathā of Gunadhya. But to us it is only the name that has survived. Gunadhya has almost become mythical. He was placed in the same pedestal as Vēlmiki and Vyāsa. Gunadhya was inspired and was the third of the

¹ See ISI, XIII 486, Weber, IL, 211, Keith, SL, 242
² See Oldenberg’s Materials for the study of Indian Tales called Brhatkatha, Tr of Russ Or. Society, 1888
Tripic Triad Govardhana salutes them all in a strain and compares their poetry to a river with three branches. He feels that Gunadhyya was Vyasa incarnate. Kalidasa mentions old men of Ujjam well-versed with the stories of Udayana. Bana compares Brhatkatha with Haralila. Subandhu names it in a simile. Dandin instances it as a class of Katha. Dasarupa names Brhatkatha and Dhamka calls it the source of Mudrarakshasa and quotes two verses as ‘Brhatkathayum’.

Nepalamahatmya draws a parallel between Valmiki and Gunadhya. ‘Both come to Nepal, Valmiki because Narada, instructed by the gods, points out to him, to the north of the hill of Changu-Narayan, the confluent of the two branches of the Virabhadra as the ‘sacred spot worthy to be the cradle of a poem as pure’ as the Ramayana, Gunadhya, because Civa has imposed upon the demi-god of whom he, Gunadhya, is the human incarnation, as condition of his deliverance, after the composition of the Brhatkatha, the erection of a lingam on a sacred spot difficult of access, both before leaving Nepal, Valmiki, to return to his hermitage, and Gunadhya to heaven, erect commemorative lingams, the Valmukuta and the Brugvecare.

414 In copper plates discovered at Gummareddipura, Kolar Dt dated 40th year of King Durvinita (early part of the 6th century A D) it is said. ःस्वादात्ताकारण देवमार्तीतिनिधिभुजुक्केषेन किराताठीनाय पश्चद्वांगतीकारण दुर्बिन्दुनामकेतेन.

A Cambodian inscription of the 9th century A D mentions Brhatkatha. ‘That inscription is one of the five steles of the Thnal Bara, consecrated to the eulogy of King Yacovarman (Bergaigne Insc sanscrites de Camp et due Cambodge, 2e fasc Nos LVI-LX).

पारदशिरास्वलयो य्रयाबय श्राकाम | अनीतियो विद्याबालिहास्त्रैय्यक्तिसिक | LVIII C, 15

‘A Paradah out of which the Kalyana subsists (willing to help but always happy) Gunadhya who did not like the Praknt (rich in virtue.

1. Megha, I.
2. समझीपितकम्प्रोक्तणीपश्चात्पर्यन्त | हरसरस, Int.
3. ब्रह्मतासारांश्चैव सार्वभौमिकान्त | Vasav.
4. Kavyadarsa, 1 88
6. See Mys Arch Rep (1919), 65 9, IA, XLII, 204, JRAS, (1919), 889.
but not loving harshness), Vicalaksa, a stranger to the udi (with big eyes but without the torments of exile) & he was Cura having humbled Bhimaka.

Mr. Barth has pointed out (I c p 313) another allusion

榴 Revolutionary, why the ignorant Vicalaksa, a stranger to the mli (with big eyes but without the torments of exile)

he was Cura having humbled Bhimaka.

It matters not if a virtuous man is even vilified, because he was really a virtuous man Gunadhya was reinstated in his place, even the poison that is closely united with Civa serves sufficiently as a graceful ornament, what to say of the moon?

I still suspect a third allusion

In Kafhasaritsagara & Brhatkafhamanjarī, these represent the original Paisachi text to a great degree though these poems read by themselves disclose an originality of poetic narration. These two poems are from Kāshmir. Later has been discovered Budhasvāmī’s Brha$katha-Slokasangraha representing the version of Brha$kathā current in Nepal. Vāmanabhatta’s Brhatkathāmanjarī is a South Indian production, but only the 24th Betala is available there.

The stories forming Brha$kathā had a divine origin. There are two versions of it, Kāśmerian and Nepalese. Somadeva thus recounts the story “Siva once narrated to Parvati the marvellous history of the seven Vidyadhara Cakravartins. He was overheard by one of his attendants, Pushpadanta, who communicated it to his wife Jaya, a servant of Parvati. The latter again spread it amongst her fellows and the indiscretion of Pushpadanta soon became known to the divine pair. Parvati, filled with anger, then cursed Pushpadanta and condemned him, in punishment of his fault, to be born as a mortal. His brother Malyavan, who dared to intercede for him, received a like sentence. But when Parvati saw Pushpadanta’s wife, her faithful attendant, overwhelmed by distress, she relented so far...
as to set a term to the effects of her curse. She decreed that when Pushpadanta, on meeting a goblin or Pisacha called Kanabhuti, in the Vindhyas, should remember the great tales and his former birth and should tell them to Kanabhuti, he should be delivered from his mortal body. Malvavan also should be allowed to return to heaven when he had heard the Brihatkathas from Kanabhuti and had spread them on the earth. Agreeably to this order, Pushpadanta was born in Kausambha, as Vararuchi-Kalavarna, and became a great grammarian and the minister of Yogananda, the last of the Nandas. After an eventful life he retired into solitude and on a pilgrimage to the temple of Parvat Vindhyavasini, he met Kanabhuti in the forest. He remembered his former life and communicated to the Pisachas the seven great tales. Having accomplished this he re-obtained his celestial nature, according to Parvati's prediction Malvavan, also, who in his human birth had become Gunadhya of Pratishthana and had served King Satavahana as minister, came accompanied by his two pupils Gunadeva and Nandideva, to the dwelling place of Kanabhuti. He received from him the seven stories in the language of the Pisachas and wrote them down in 100,000 Slokas each, with his own blood. By the advice of his pupils, he sent the whole to king Satavahana, hoping that the king being a man of taste might preserve and spread them. But that monarch rejected with disgust a work that was written in the language of the goblins and with blood. On receiving this news Gunadhya burnt six of his stories, the seventh was preserved with difficulty through the entreaties of his pupils. King Satavahana, who accidentally learned that the recitation of the remaining book charmed even the beasts of the forest, repented of his former conduct, repaired to Gunadhya's habitation and obtained the manuscript of the remaining story. He studied it with the help of Gunadeva and Nandideva, and wrote the introduction, detailing its origin, likewise in the language of the Pisachas. The book then became one of the stories that are famed in the three worlds.

**Npapatamahatmya (Chap 27-29) has a different story**

"It begins like the Cashmerian legend with a conversation between Parvati and Siva. The Goddess asks the God for a story that has not been told before and while Siva relates it, all the doors being closed, the Gana Dhrungun, under the form of a bee, enters through the key-hole, overhears Siva's tale and repeats it to his wife

---

1. F. Lacote, Essays, 80 81
Vijaya Some other day Parvati starts relating the tale to her maids, but Vijaya knows it already. 'Who is guilty of that indiscretion?' Sire, through the intensity of his meditation, discovers the culprit, sends for and curses him. Bhringin asks the God to have pity, the God complies and forgives him under the following conditions, he must become a man, learned virtuous and skilful, he must write down in 900,000 verses, full of poetical feeling, the story he had overheard; he must erect a linga in a place difficult of access, and then only, will he be delivered from human condition and allowed to reascend the Kailasa. In this preamble we find again the notion of the originality of the Bhaktakatha and besides, a precise detail on the nature of that poem it is to be a love poem, the purpose of which is to produce a dramatic feeling, it must be rasavamanvantah. But one can see that the Nepalese version differs from the other in two particulars, the gana which is cursed is called Bhringin and there is only one Bhringin born at Mathura under the name of Gunadhya. Having become an orphan, he sets out for Ujjavini where King Madana, the consort of the learned Ilavati, daughter of the king of Gauda, is ruling. The Pandit Carvavarman, who is in the king’s service, appreciates the talents of Gunadhya and obtains for him a place of pandit at the Court. Then comes the story of the king’s mistake on the word modaka. Gunadhya asks for twelve years to teach him grammar; Carvavarman, only two. There is a bet as in the other version of the legend, Carvavarman wins it, thanks to the revelation of the grammar Kalapa (Katantra). Gunadhya is condemned to silence, he goes to live as an ascetic in a hermitage. The ascetic Pulastya passing by, advises him to write his tales in the Paccaci language, he will afterwards go to Nepal, erect a linga in honour of Civa and thus obtain deliverance from the curse which has made him a man. Gunadhya writes his poem with minerals on the leaves of trees, as he composes he recites the verses aloud, the wild animals surround him to listen to him and they forget to eat; the game served at the royal table is so lean that the king complains, the cooks blame the hunters, these in exploring the woods meet Gunadhya surrounded by the attentive animals, they themselves, falling under the spell, remain to listen. There is no longer any game for the king’s dinner, enraged, he goes to see what has become of the hunters, sees Gunadhya and presses him to come again to Court, Gunadhya refuses, 'Sire, I have composed 900,000 delightful verses in Paccaci, you must have them written in Sanskrit, as for myself I will go to Nepal.' He goes to Nepal, sees
the Puspadacevara, then setting forth for the temple of Puspadacevara which he performs around the valley the pradakšina which the Nepalamahatmya describes at great length, it is the guide book of the modern pilgrim. Having returned to the temple, Gunadhya gathers all the munis who live in Nepal, establishes the Brhatkatha and in an aerial chariot (vimana) reascends to the kailasa to resume his place among the Gods. Bhagavana at the present day, under the form of a bee, Brhatkatha returns, at each phase of the moon to have a look at his linga.¹

417 Gunadhya was born at Pratisthāna on the Godāvari, so says Ksemendra. Somadeva mentions the city of Suprasthā, capital of Pratisthāna, or at times calls it Pratisthāna on the banks of the Godāvari. It is the capital of the Indra dynasty of Sātvāhānas of which Hāla or Sātvāhana or Śālavāhana was an illustrious scion. According to Puranas Hāla was the son of Arvata Satakaru and ruled between 2644-2649 Yudhisthara Saka, that is, 493 to 490 B.C. On an identification of Śālavāhana and Śālavāhana it has been said by modern scholars that the patron of Guṇāḍhya lived about 78 A.D., the date of the Śālavāhana era ²

418 Budhasvamin’s Brhatkathaslokasangraha comes from Nepal, and this led to its being called a Nepalese version of Guṇāḍhya’s original, a version according to some orientalists, earlier than the works of Somadeva and Ksemendra.

2 Ksemendra (Ayyu 137) calls city of Prasenajit Suprasthā, and Mahabharata (111 8114) notes Pratisthāna as a tīrtha at the confluence of the Jumna and the Ganges.
F Lacotte thinks that Gunāḍhya was born at Mathura and lived at Ujjain or Kausambi (Essays, 26).
3 On Hāla, see note on para 505 supra.
On his Saptāśati or Kośa, Bāga says 

अविनाश्यमानायमयकर्तम् पवित्राय 

Hawara, Int 18

On the identity of Śālavāhana with Śālavāhana, see Wilson’s Col Writs, Ill 181 note and Seshagiri Sastry, IA I 814.
Bhulé (Kashi Rep 47) places Gunadhya in 1st or 2nd century, and Weber (IL, 218, 1st I 368) in 6th century A.D. (Ed, I 307) Keith (SL, 209, JRAS, 1901), 145) and Levi (TI, 317, Le Nepal, II, 63) give the date 2nd or 3rd century A.D. Speyer (Studier) says Brhatkatha lies between 600 and 600 A.D., nearest the latter. Tawney (JRAS 1908), 903 agrees V Smith, (EH, 19*) dates it in the latter half of 1st century A.D. See also S. Krishnaswami Iyengar on Brhatkatha, JRAS (1908), 688.
Slokasangraha is now available as a fragment. It is a poem of sargas meant obviously to be an extensive book, but the fragment gets us only 28 sargas of about 4,539 verses. Either the work was left incomplete or the manuscript has been lost to us. In estimating the dimensions of the whole collection, Lacote says, "Naravahanadatta must relate the conquest of his twenty-six wives (IV, 3), and yet, at the end of the twenty-eighth book, that is of 4,539 verses, he has only come to the sixth one. The history of the first five has taken up 3,622 verses, the proportions being the same—and one does not see that he abridges more as he goes on with the narration, far from it—the history of the twenty-sixth spouse would take us into about 19,000 verses, so it one must add the whole history of the conquest of the empire. I do not think it would be an exaggeration to estimate the whole length of the poem at 25,000 verses at least, divided into more than 100 sargas."  

The poem begins with an encomium of Ujjayini and the death of Mahäśena or Pradyota Gopäla, his son, succeeded him, but afflicted with the talk that he was a patricide he abdicated in favour of his brother Palaka. Warned as if by a heavenly sign, he gave up his throne and Gopäla's son Avantivardhana ascended the throne. Then comes the story of his love with Surasamanjarì. The 28th canto leaves us with Naravähanadatta in the company of Bhaṇirathayasas.  

F Lacote thinks that Budhasvāmin must have lived about the 5th or 6th century A.D. He remarks, "The differences with regard to the other two versions are enormous. The subject announced at the beginning of the fourth sarga, after the three sargas which form the introduction, is the history of Naravahanadatta, son of the king of the Vatsas, Udayana, and emperor of the Vidyadhara. It is the same as the principal subject of the Kāthasvāntasagara and of the Bhāthakathamanjari, but the arrangement of the matter and, in some parts, the matter itself are altogether different. The spirit in which the subject is dealt with is also quite new. It is no longer a question of slight differences in the order of the books, like those one notices between the Kāthasvāntasagara and the Bhāthakathamanjari, which, in spite of the various readings, show a common original. Here we have a poem entirely different, if it has the same ancestor as the other two, which to me seems to be certain, its relation to them is several degrees removed."

1 Ed and Tr by E. Lecouv, Paris  
1 Essays, 110, 114  
1 Essays, 10-11.
419 Ksemendra Brhatkathamanjari comes next. Ksemendra was in the Court of King Ananta of Kâśmir (1029-1064 A.D.). His writings have been noticed in a prior chapter. His three Manjars are in reality distinct pieces of poetry and they can be called epicles only in respect of the narrative of their originals.

Ksemendra's poem like Somadeva's is divided into eighteen 'lambhakas' the names of which are the same as those of the corresponding Books in the Kathasaritsagara. Besides, we find in the Brhatkathamanjari a double system of subdivision. Most of the accessory tales and some of the principal episodes of the hero's history are followed by a colophon which resumes the substance of the tale; something like the marginal sub-titles found in the translation of the Kathasaritsagara by Mr. Tawney. It is a kind of index of the several incidents found in the text, and it is most convenient for ready reference. His method of subdivision, being found in all the manuscripts of the Manjari, must be rather ancient.

420 Somadeva, son of Râma, was a Brahmin poet of the Court of King Ananta of Kâśmir who ruled about 1029-1064 A.D. Ananta's son was Kalasa and Kalasa's son was Harâ. For the amusement of Sûryavatî, queen of Ananta, Somadeva wrote KATHASARITSA GARÂ in 18 Books of 124 'arangas and 24,000 verses, the earliest large collection of stories extant in the world, about 1070 A.D. Somadeva declares that his work is a condensed Sanskrit version of Gûpadhyâ's Pârisâci Brhatkâthâ.

In his prospectus of the Edition of Tawney's Translation of this work N. M. Penzer says:

"Turning to the work itself, one is amazed by the mass of stories of every conceivable kind it contains. Animal stories dating back hund-
reds of yours &c., wild legends of Rig-Veda days explaining the creation of the earth, harrowing tales of blood-sucking vampires, beautiful and poetic love stories and vivid descriptions of terrible battles between gods, men or demons. All these are found in the storehouse of romance. Nor should it be forgotten that India is the true land of Romance, more so indeed than either Persia or Arabia, for India's own history is a romance hardly less exaggerated and enthralling than the tales themselves.

The collector of these stories, Somadeva, was a man of genius who rightly ranks next to Kālidāsa among Indian poets. His power of telling a story in a clear, entertaining and absorbing way is only equalled by the richness and diversity of his subject-matter. His knowledge of human nature, the elegance of his style, the beauty and force of his descriptions and the wit and wisdom of his aphorisms, are masterly in their execution.

On the other hand, in most eastern collections of tales (especially Indian), the way in which fresh stories are embedded in other ones and the bewildering rapidity with which one follows another, makes the reader long for Ariadne's thread to lead him safely out of the labyrinth. The Editor, therefore, has taken special care to provide an efficient thread in this new edition. A system of numbering the stories has been introduced, that not only makes the reading easy, but acts as a guide to students of Comparative Folk-lure.

The Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara is, of course, a much older book than The Thousand Nights and a Night, and is the origin of many tales in the Nights. Through them it has given ideas not only to Persian and Turkish authors, but also to the western world through the pens of Boccaccio, Chaucer, La Fontaine, and their innumerable imitators.

Mr. Tawney's excellent notes, supplemented by those now added, afford an enormous amount of information which will prove interesting not only to the student of Comparative Religion, Folk-lure, Magic (both black and white), Ethics, Sociology and Anthropology, but also to the intellectual lay reader, who wishes to increase his store of out-of-the-way and esoteric knowledge.\(^1\)

"Its literal translation is 'The Ocean of Streams of Story'. Somadeva felt that his great work united in itself all stories, as the

---

ocean does all rivers. Every stream of myth and mystery flowing down from the snowy heights of sacred Himalaya would sooner or later reach the ocean, other streams from other mountains would do likewise, till at last fancy would create an ocean full of stories of every conceivable description - tales of wondrous maidens and their fearless lovers, of kings and cities, of statecraft and intrigue, of magic and spells, of treachery, trickery, murder and war, tales of blood-sucking vampires, devils, goblins and ghouls, stories of animals in fact and fable, and stories too of beggars, scenes, drunkards, gamblers, prostitutes and bawds.

This is the Ocean of Story, this the mirror of Indian imagination that Somadeva has left as a legacy to posterity.

421 Somadeva thus dealt with the original Brhatkatha

In the preface Somadeva gives the following account of his work.

"The first book in my collection is called Kathapitha, then comes..."

1 "As in the original work, so also in this one, there is not anywhere the least omission, only the language is more compact in order to avoid the book becoming too large. I have endeavoured as much as possible to choose the most suitable expressions, and while describing in the stories the various movements of the passions (as), a work has been produced which may be considered a piece of poetry. My work did not spring from the desire to secure the fame of learning, but simply to facilitate the memorizing of that many coloured net of myths."—Brothmans

"This book is precisely on the model of that from which it is taken, there is not even the slightest deviation, only such language is selected as tends to abbreviate the prolixity of the work, the observance of propriety and natural connexion, and the joining together of the portions of the poem so as not to interfere with the spirit of the stories, as far as possible, kept in view. I have not made this attempt through desire of a reputation for ingenuity, but in order to facilitate the recollection of a multitude of various tales."—Tawney

"As is the original such is the copy, it does not deviate from it, even by one line, I simply epitomize the primitive work and I translate, that is all the difference. Careful to observe, as far as possible, the literary propriety, and the logical sequence, in doing my best not to break off either the narrative or the spirit of the sentiments expressed, I am no less careful to arrange a portion of a regular poem."—Lacole
Kathamukha, then the third book, named Lavanaka, then follows Naravahanadattajanana, and then the book called Caturdarika, and then Madanamancuka, then the seventh book named Rainaprabha, then Alankaravati, then Sakuvanasas, and then the eleventh book called the Vela, then comes Sasankavati, and then Madiravati, then comes the book called Pana, followed by Mahabhiseka, and then Surasamanjan, then Padmavati, and then the eighteenth book Visamasila.  

Somadeva then gives the wonderful origin of the tale at great length (Kath I 1-13-181)

"Each book comprises a number of stories loosely strung together by being narrated for the recreation or information of some individuals or arising out of their adventures. There are Vaisa, King of Kausambhi, and his son Naravahanadatta. The marriage of the latter with various damsels of terrestrial or celestial origin and his elevation to the rank of King of the Vidyadharas, a class of heavenly spirits, are the leading topic of most of the books but they merely constitute the skeleton of the composition, the substance being made up of stories growing out of these circumstances or springing from one another with an ingenuity of intricacy, which is in reality one of the great charms of all such collection."

"The stories all wind up at the end of each book or not infrequently sooner. The action is never suspended for any prolonged interval and the complication is not of such a nature or extent as to convert variety into confusion. The stories are always characterised by the features of Hindu nationality and are illustrations of Hindu opinions, usages and beliefs. They exhibit, in a striking and interesting manner, the peculiarities of the social condition of India, and in the exposure of its vices and fancies furnish those delineations of the similar imperfections of all civilised society of which the general applicability and truth have recommended their imitation to the satirists and story-tellers of Europe. The greater number of them turn upon the wickedness of women, the inconstancy, prodigality, treachery and craft of the female sex. These attributes no doubt originate in the feelings which have pervaded the East unfavourable to the dignity of the female character, but we are not to mistake the language of satire or the licentiousness of it, for truth, or to suppose that the pictures which

---

1 OSC, (1898) No 148
2 Wilson, SL, II p 112-119
are thus given of the depravity of women owe not much of their coloring to the malignity of men. 1

422 The well known Arabian nights are a similar composition. They were rendered into Sanskrit under the title Aravyavamini by Jagaddandhu Pandita at the request of Sambhucandra, Zamindar of Kakiniya. In his introduction to the translation of Arabian Nights, Sir R F Burton thus sums up the subject-matter of Kathasaritsagara in comparison with the Arabian nights "The thaumaturgy of both works is the same; the Indian is profuse in demonology and witchcraft, in monsters as wind-men, fire-men and water-men, in air-going elephants and flying horses (I 541-543), in the wishing-cow, divine goats and laughing fishes (I 24), and in the speciosa miracula of magic weapons. He delights in fearful battles (I 400), fought with the same weapons as the Moslem uses, and rewards his heroes with a "Turband of Honour" (I 266) in lieu of a robe. There is a quaint familiarity arising from similar stages of society, the city is adorned for gladness, men carry money in a robe corner and exclaim "Ha, Good!" (for "Good, by Allah"), lovers die with exemplary facility, the "soft-sided" ladies drink spirits (I 61) and princesses get drunk (I 476), whilst the eunuch, the hetara and the bawd (Kaṭṭam) play the same preponderating parts as in the Nights."

JAGANNAIHAMISRA'S KATHAPRAKASA BORROWS THE TALES OF KATHABARSAHITASAGARA (IV-xiu and xxiv-xxxii). 2

SECTION 3

Pancatantra

423 Pancatantra, 3 the famous collection of fables, has, it has been said, a circulation in the world, next only to the Bible. Hertel records two hundred (and more) versions in about fifty languages some of which are extra-Indian. During the reign of King Chosran Anosharwan (531-579 A.D.) a Persian Physician Burzoe or Burzuyeh translated it into Pahlavi and incorporated it into his Book of Stories called Kārataka and Damanaka. This Pahlavi translation is lost as also its Sanskrit original and we have now an old Syriac version made by Bud in 570

1 Wilson, SL, II 114
2 OSM, (1908), 110
3 I O No 4105
4 For a full history of Pancatantra, see Hertel's History of the Beast Fable in India (BOS).
A.D. and an Arabic version made by Abdallah Ibn al Mugaffa about 750 A.D.¹

Pancatantra is so called because it is divided into five Tantras or sections, and is as such known also as Pancopākhyāna. Vīruśarman extracted the essence of all the most celebrated works of this class and composed it as Nīrutṣāstra for the education of the sons of King Amara salā of Mahārājya in the Deccan. The prefatory invocation is addressed to Sarasvatī and all authors on ethics, Manu, Vācaspatī, Uśanas, Parāśara, Vyāsa and Cānakya. The use of the word dināra, it is said, points to its date as somewhere after the Christian era, and therefore, says Keith, "it is not sufficient to assign it to the 2nd century A.D., at the earliest."²

Speaking of the priority of Kautilya's Arthasastra, it has been said

"The titles such as separation of friends, winning of friends, war and peace, the loss of one's acquisition, and hasty action, given to the 5 books of the Pancatantra are political ideas explained in no earlier work than the Arthasastra. They are adumbrated with appropriate illustrative stories in the Pancatantra. There is reason to believe that the author of the Pancatantra is indebted to the Arthasastra for the use of the word Prakriti in the sense of a friend or an enemy (Mitraprakriti and Antarprakriti). A friend or an enemy inside a State is called abhyantaraparakriti and outside a State, bahyaparakriti. In the 15th book entitled Tantrayukti of the Arthasastra, Cānakya says that use of the word Prakriti in the sense of a friend or an enemy is his own device (svasanajna) which he explains as paraś asamitas-sādab, a word not used by others. Besides making use of the technical terms devised and political ideas taught in the Arthasastra, the author of the Pancatantra not only mentions the name of Cānakya as a writer on Nīrpaśastra or Nītasāstra, but also makes verbatim quotations sometimes wrongly and sometimes rightly from the Arthasastra in support of his views."³

424 Purnabhadra, the pupil of Jinapati Sūrī, was a Svaṭāmbara Jain monk.⁴ He revised Pancatantra at the instance of Somamantrin in

¹ Ed. and Tr by G. Bickell, Leipzig. See for these other versions, Edgerton, I. a 41. 2 W. Norman Brown, The Pancatantra in Modern Indian Folklore, JAOS, XXXIX. I. 3 Keith, SL, 245 et seq., JRAS (1926) 504. There are Pandavaṇṭrakāvya of Dharmapandita and Pandavaṇṭrakāvyaṇḍapāṇa (CC, I. 314). 4 My. Arab. Rev. (1997), 16. For his poems, see para 104 supra, see PR, IV 27.
It is marked by the appearance of twenty-one new stories, including a famous one of the gratitude of animals and the ingratitude of man.

Purnabhadra used an earlier Jain recension whose author quotes Magha and Rudrata must have therefore lived after the 9th century A.D.

In Sam 1716 (1600 A.D.), Meghavijaya composed Panaṅkhañānodāra, a modified version of these various recensions.

The south Indian Pancatantra is a careful and slight abbreviation and preserves the narrative and the language with faithfulness. Very often its sentences agree with Tantraṅkhyāvīkā and it is later than Bhāravi.

The Nepalese version has all the verses, particularly of the South Indian recension. "We may agree with Hertel in thinking that the South Indian Pancatantra and the complete text on which the Nepalese is based," says Edgerton "were not identical, nor directly derived one from the other, but that they are closely related offshoots of the same archetype."

425 Tantrakhyaṇa or Tantraṅkhyāvīkā is a form of Pancaṭanṭra, manuscripts of which come from Kashmir and is itself in two sub-recensions, in one of which there are more verses and more prose. According to Hertel "it is the only version which contains the un-abbreviated and not intentionally altered language of the author, which no other Indian Pancatantra version has preserved, while the Pahlavi translation distorts it by numerous misunderstandings.

But according to Edgerton, "In short, the difference between the Tantraṅkhyāvīkā and the other versions, in their relations to the original,
is a difference of degree and not a difference of kind. All are to a considerable extent original. All are to a not inconsiderable extent unoriginal. On the whole, the Tantrakhayyikā contains more of the original than of any other. In this respect it is surpassed by the Southern Pancatantra, which has much less unoriginal material than the Tantrakhayyikā, and probably less than any other version, except the greatly abbreviated and versified Somadeva.

426 It is said that there has been an unbroken tradition of narratives in the style of Pancatanṭra from time immemorial with ramifications in various times and countries and these versions “all go back to a book of fables and stories consisting of five books or sections and a brief introduction. The introduction provides the “frame” or setting, and at the same time suggests what must have been to the author’s mind the key-note of the whole work. It was supposed to be a kind of Pursenspiegel or Mirror for Magistrates teaching worldly wisdom to princes, by entertaining examples, as well as by cleverly phrased precepts. The precepts are principally found in the verses which are abundantly scattered through most parts of the work. The examples consist in the stories themselves, which are told mainly in prose. Each of the five sections or “books” forms a dramatic unit in itself, and all five are, as I said, set into the introduction as a frame. In the introduction a wise brahman undertakes to enlighten three ignorant princes. He does so by narrating to them, one after another, the five books of the Pancatantra. Each of the five books contains not only a primary story, which we call the “frame-story” but also at least one, and usually several, “emboxt” stories, that is, stories represented as told by one character in the frame story to another. Sometimes there is a double “emboxtent”, a character in an “emboxt” story tells a story to another character (In some of the late versions of the Pancatantra this process was carried even further, so that we have a sort of “Chinese nest” of stories). Most of the stories are beast fables, that is, their principal actors are animals decked out with human properties but a number of them have only human characters, while some have both men and animals, and even though rarely—gods and other supernatural beings. The stories are in general very well told and of a high artistic quality.”

Among several scholars that have investigated the history of Pancatanṭra there are preeminently two, J. Hertel and F. Edgerton. In

---

1 HAOS, III 16 See Keith SL, 259, 60
2 Edgerton, HOS, III, 4
Hertel’s view there are only two different sources of Pancatantra tradition, one Tantrakhyāyikā and another “K”, archetype of all other versions and an intermediate archetype to which the Southern and Nepalese and an intermediate archetype to which the Southern and Nepalese versions and Hitopadesa go back. But Edgerton says there are four independent streams of the tradition flowing from one single old source Southern Bṛhatkathā of which Somadeva’s and Kesamendra’s are epitomes, (ii) Iaṇṭākhyāyikā (ii) Southern Pancatantra (iv) the original of Pahlavi version Purnabhadra’s recension is a combination of Tantrakhyāyikā and Southern Pancatantra

Somadeva’s Kathāsārītsāgara contains the five books of Pancatantra, “separated from one another by extraneous materials, but preserves considerably more than Kesamendra does of the bulk of the narrative and Kesamendra’s text of Pancatantra is the most drastically abbreviated among all versions”

From a comparison of these various versions Edgerton made up the text of what he considered the original of Pancatantra.

427 Hitopadesa is a far later version of Pancatantra and has been more popular with the students of Sanskrit Literature. Avowedly based on Pancatantra, Hitopadesa is a work with a plan original in itself of Nārāyaṇa. Instead of five books, Hitopadesa has only four. Its third book has as its frame a story which is only a remote reflex of Pancatantra Book III. The frame of its fourth book is wholly new, though evidently intended as a companion piece to Book III and suggested by the title of the original Pancatantra’s third book Book IV of the Pancatantra is wholly omitted, the stories of Book V, including the frame story, are included as embossed stories in Hitopadesa Books III and IV. Several of the embossed stories of Pancatantra Book I are transferred to the Hitopadesa’s new Book IV, those of Pancatantra Book III are impartially divided between Hitopadesa Books III and IV.

1 See on this Hertel, ZDMG, LVI, 817, LIX, 113, 118, Winternitz DLZ, XXXI, 2760
2 This has been separately edited, Der Auszug aus dem Pancatantra in Kesamendra’s Bṛhaṭkathānānjarī, Leipzig
3 “Pancatantra reconstructed,” HOS, Vol 2 Text and critical apparatus and vol 8 Introduction
4 Ed everywhere, by F Johnson, London, by P Peterson, Bombay and in Handbooks for the study of Sanskrit by Max Müller with an interlinear translation. On Hitopadesa, see Edgerton, AOS, III 20–22; PS, III, 397. There is a Hitopadesa-padyāsaṅgraha (CC, III 158)
not a few stories of the first three books of the Pancatantra are omitted altogether, and various stories not found in the Pancatantra are inserted in all four books of the Hitopadesa, presumably from the unnamed "other works" referred to by Narayana."

**SECTION 4**

428 Ananta Bhatta who describes himself as son of Nagadeva Bhatta, a Brahmin of Kanka caste. In his Pancaśāhyānasangraha or Kāthāmṛtaṁdhū he professes to preserve the whole of the narrative Pancatantra.

"Each fable is designed to illustrate and exemplify some reflection on worldly vicissitudes or some precept for human conduct, and the illustration is as frequently drawn from the intercourse of human beings, as from an imaginary adventure of animal existence and this mixture is in some degree a peculiarity in the Hindu plan of fable or story telling."*  

429 Simhasanadvatrimśika or Vikramārkacaritra is a collection of thirty-two tales. The throne was a gift from Indra to Vikramādiṭhya and when Sālvāhana vanquished him and killed him in battle, the throne was buried in the earth. King Bhōja by chance unearthed it, and as he was ascending the throne, images of maidens sculptured on the throne became animated and related the tales in praise of Vikramādiṭhya to Bhōja and regained their liberty."

There are various versions of the work, attributed to Kālidāsa, Rāmacandra, Siva and Siddhasena Divākara."* Këmankara, a Jain, who lived at the beginning of the 14th century A.D. wrote in prose, with verses at the beginning and condensed the tales. The South Indian version is generally known Vikramārkacarita. There are North Indian versions, one in verse and are considerably different, and are both anonymous. In Bengal, the recension is ascribed to Vararuci and is mostly Këmankara's.

---

2 *CC*, I 78 *IOC* VII 1560.
4 It is also known as Dvāṭrimśat putṭalikā, *OAL*, II 1, 2 and Dvāṭrimśat sīlabhanjikā (CC, I 717).
6 *CC*, I. 717, III 148.
430 Sukasaptatikatha is a collection of 70 clever stories of erotic nature but of ultimate didactic import. It is said that this story was related to Indra in his assembly by Nārada in the form of a parrot and that any one who hears the story attains all ends. One Devadāsa kept a parrot and when the King sent him away to a distant country with intent to seduce his wife, the parrot to whom Devadāsa entrusted the care of his family began to relate each night one story to her, keeping her interested in it till dawn and by the end of 70 stories the husband returned and all was well.

There are three recensions of this work, omnior and simplicior of B. Schmidt (who has edited a Mahrati version), the first by Cintāmaṇi Bhatta and second later by a Śveṭāmbara Jain, and a third by Devadattī, son of Puruṣottama-deva.

431 Vetalapancavimsati is a series of 25 stories, very old in origin. Ksemendra and Somadeva relate the same stories in their poems. Independently we have versions by Sivadāsa in prose and verse and by Jambhāladatta in prose and one anonymous in prose. Vallabhadāsa's work is an abbreviation. There is also Vetālavimsati of Venkatabhatta.

432 Tales relating to Vikrama are found in Ananța's Viracanța and Sivadāsa's Sāluvāhanacarita, in the anonymous Vikramoḍaya, in the Jain work Pancadandachatraprabandha and Nandīśayāgnika's Vikramārkacaritra. Vikramasenacarita is a collection of stories like...
Vikramārjuna narrated to King Vikramasena of Prathisthana by a vampire stationed in a simsupa tree.

433. Merutunga’s Prabandhacintāmani and Rājasekhara’s Prabandhakāsa contains quasi-historical narratives.

Hemacandra’s Ṣraddhusalākāpurusacarita and its supplement Parṇaśtraparva contain much folklore besides tales mythical and biographical.

Siddharāja was the pupil of Saddarsin. His Upamitabhāvaprapancakaṭhā was written in the year 962 (Vīranīvāna?) which would mean Sam 492 (436 AD). This tallies with the date of Haribhadra (who died in Sam 585) who wrote his Lalitavistara for Siddharāja’s edification.

Peterson says (PR, IV 5), “Of the fact that Siddha and Magha were cousins there appears to be no reasonable doubt. Their common grandfather was Suprabhadeva, minister of the king of the time of Srmala in Gurjaradesa. Suprabhadeva had two sons, Datta and Subhankara Magha (who tells us himself that he was the son of Dattaka and the grandson of Suprabhadeva) was the son of the one, and Siddha the son of the other.”

Prabhacandra’s Prabhavakacarita was revised by Pradyumnasūrya about 1250 AD. It is a collection of stories in verse, mostly biographical notices in 22 chapters, probably based on a similar work of Hemacandra.

434. Somacandra was pupil of Raṭnasekhara of 1apā Gaccha. He wrote his Kaṭhāmahādaḍghī, a collection of 126 Jain stories, in 1504 (1448 AD) beginning with the story of Karpūraprakara.

Bharatakaviṭrūmsikā are 32 stories of Jain origin, satirical of Brahmm usages.

1. DC, XXI 8592
2. Ed by J. Hartel, Leipzig
3. See paras 119, 201 supra
4. Ed H. Jacobi, Bob Ind. Tr J. Hartel, Leipzig and by Helen M. Johnson, GOS, Baroda See Keith, JRAS, (1908) 119, SL, 204
5. Ed Bob Ind. Calcutta PR, IV 129, III. App 146
6. Printed Bombay
7. See PR, IV. 79-81 He wrote Samarādityacarita, in Sam 1384
8. Among such stories are those relating to Bāpa and Mayura, see Quackenbos, Poems of Mayura (Col Un series), 17-19.
9. PR, III. 18, 317, IV, oxxxiv
435 Jagannathamisra's Katbāprakāśa is a collection of tales taken from various sources and contains interesting episodes. The fourth story relates the sufferings of Bhārata during his sojourn in his father-in-law's home. Jagannātha was the son of Laksmāna of Rādhāvamsa and lived about the 17th century A.D.²

Katbākosa³ is a collection of twenty-seven tales, illustrating in simple prose the usual fruits of different actions of men, such as kindness, worship, anger, avarice etc.

436 In Citrasenapadmāvatikathā,⁴ a small poem, Rājvallalāva pāhaka, pupil of Mahimacandra or Mālucaṇḍrasūrya, gives the fable of Citrasena and Padmāvatī. "These were a pair of swans in their previous birth and dwell in a lake in a Campakavana on the boundary of Campa. Once upon a time in midday, a merchant came up to the bank of the lake and put up there with his caravan. The merchant bathed in the lake, worshipped Jīna and after having prepared food, waited for a guest, when a sage fasting for more than a month happened to pass by him. The merchant was exceedingly glad to meet with such a guest, and took him to his place and supplied him with the best food sufficient to satisfy his hunger. The pair praised this action of the merchant with all heart and in consequence of that virtue they were born as prince Citrasena and princess Padmāvatī in their next birth and became husband and wife. This was composed in Samb 1524 (1580 A.D.)"⁵

437 Kalkacaryakatha⁶ in prose gives the tale of Kālikācārya, a Jain Sthavira. It was composed by Samayasundara, pupil of Sakalacandra. It narrates also the ancient tales of the establishment of the Vikrama and Śāka era. According to it, Śāka kings took their name from the Śāka Coast or bank and were defenders of the Jaina faith until they were conquered by Vikramāditya. But 135 years after that conquest, there was a Śāka King who destroyed the successor of Vikramāditya and set up an era of his own.

438 Kavikunjara's Rājasekharacantra or Sabhārājanaprabandha is a poem inculcating morals by means of stories abridged from those which are said to have been originally related in the Court.

---
¹ IO, 948, 1436 where a summary of its contents is given
³ Ibid, No 58 PR, III. Ap. 215, IV lxxxix
⁴ CSC, (1910), 96 gives date 135 युग च युगम स्वराज्यन्दे सकलर्थ शासितानां के
⁵ PR, III 92 See also Jacob, ZDMG, XXXIV, 266, CSC, No 57 (1910), 94.
of Rājaśekhara and which were afterwards repeated by Rājaśekhara to Subuddhi.

439. Vidvāpāṭī's Purusaparīkṣā is a collection of 44 stories and has been noticed. Ānanda's Madhavaṇalakaṭhā relates in prose the story of Madhavaṇalana and Kāmakandalā.

Muktācarita is anonymous. In simple prose it narrates the story of the miraculous power of pearls sown and grown by Kṛṣṇa on arable fields for the delectation of Satyabhāma.

Srivara's Kathālautuka gives the story of Yusuf and Julaika from the well-known poem of Jāmi. It was composed during the reign of Sultan Šamūlabdin in 13th century A.D. The Sanskrit translation of "Aladin and Wonderful Lamp" from the Arabian Nights by Appasastin Rashvadekar excels the original in narration. Nārāyaṇa Bālakṛṣṇa has a Sanskrit rendering of the Aesop’s Fables, Isabanīṭkāṭhā. Sulematacarita by Kalyānavamalla relates the story of Solomon and David from Old Testament.

440. There are the following Jain stories in prose:

Sripālacakrīta of Jayālīrtisūrim, Hiraprasna of Kirtivijayagūm, Amaradatjamitranandacarita of Bhāvacandrasūrim, Cauryāśīprabandha of Rājaśekharasūrim, Dhanadatkācarita of Bhāvacandra, Bhāvanābhānukelacarita of Hamsagūm, Rupasenacarita Kāmaghatanākāṭha, Rājaśekharacarita of Dāyavardhanagūm.

And the following in verse: Ambālacakrīta, Uṭtaralumāracakrīta of Cāracandra, Paḍmacarita of Sūbhavardhana, Balabhādarcarita of Sūbhavardhanagūm, Vimalanāṭhacarita of Jñānasagara, Vimalasahacarita of Indhāmsagāṃu (all printed), Udayanarājacarita of Mallisena (Opp. II. 421), Vasumāṭiṭrasena of Gāndhāra (Opp. 4714), Vijayacandra-carita of Candraprabha Mahattara (PR. VI. 46 written in Sam. 1127), Sūbhāṅkacarita of Mahēsvare (Oṭf. 18).

---

1. DO, XI 8167
2. See para 403 supra
4. CSC (1908), 196 The story begins with a query by Satyabhāma.
5. Ed and Tr by R Schmidt, Kiel See para 188 supra
6. Printed, Bombay
7. DO, XVI 8160
The following are other books of tales:

Kathālātāmānanjari of Nārāyana Śāstrī, Kathāvakī of G. Rāmi-
swāmi Śāstrī, Puruṣaparīkṣā by Lakṣmanasāiva,1 Kathākumāmanjanjari
(anonymously),2 Madanasahacapetuka of Lakṣminārāvapa,3 Sudāmakaritra
of Śrīvāda,4 Śrīyanatī of Candrasekhara,5 Kathārava of Śrīvāda,6
Purukṣaritā of Candrasekhara,7 Ārakabrahmakāṭhā (anonymously)7 and Pramatākaritra of Brahmavidyādhvāra.8

In Kathāpancaka,9 Mrs Kṛṣṇarao of Bombay depicts five careers
of sinfulness and despair and inculcates the high Indian ideal of puṇa
and forgiveness. "In the pathetic tales of the dejected young widow
and the fisher folk, the blame seems to be thrown on the hard tyranny
of social laws and customs rather than on the individuals. The old
widow in whom the motherly instinct triumphs over vengeance, and the
generous youth who rises above nature and self-interest to rid the
people of a heartless tyrant are full of tragic dignity."

Āravacarita is a symposium of stories illustrating Hindu ideals
selected from the epics and Purāṇas prepared at the instance of
V. Krishnaswamy Iyer, Judge, High Court, Madras.10

442 Ratnasimha's Maithūtesacarita is a poem on the present
dynasty of Darbhāṅga.11 Rudrasimha's Vignānaṭarangini describes
the life of a mythical king Sāṅkaradāsa. It was composed in 1411 A.D.14
Sāṅkara's Sāṅkaracetovilāsa is a poetical biography of Zamindar
Ceṭhasimha.15 Pāṇdurāṅga's Viṣṇupurakaṭhā, composed in 1808 A.D.,
contains an account of Bijapur and its Moslem sovereigns Uḍâyāraja's
Rājavindra describes the greatness of Mohammad Begadha of
Ahmedabad, a king of Gujarat.16

---
1. Printed, Madras. For Puruṣaparīkṣā, see CC, I. 340
2. Printed, Srirangam
3. Printed, Calcutta
5. BRI, 76
6. OR, 158, CC, II 15 (mostly in prose.)
7. IO, 1569 Mys. 688 There is a Madhavāṇalanātaka by Ānandaśāhara
(PR, V ) and another by Kaviśwara, CC, I. 450.
8. Mys. 688
9. Printed, Babakan Granthakar, Bombay
10. Printed, Madras
11. Jayasimha's Cal. of Mathūla, I. No. 295
13. OR, 121
14. For a critical notice, see Bühler's Rep. (1874-75), 9-10. The lives of Gujarāt
kings (Gurjarākāṃśāpatīs) is given in the colophon.
443 In *Colavamsavaliācarita,* otherwise known as *Bhrādisvāramāhātmāya*, the origin, construction and development of Bhra-disvara temple in Tanjore is described. Incidentally the work gives the history of 16 Cola kings of the Solar race who ruled at Tanjore for about 12 centuries beginning with Kulottunga Cola and ending with Bhadra Cola.

444 *Lakśmīra Diśita's Viralhadraavijaya* is a poem meant to describe the festival of Virabhadra but contains also an account of the Kempe Gowda Chiefs of Mysore Ekāmbara was a poet of the Court of Kempe Gowda III, known more fully as Mummudi Kempe Virappa Gowda who ruled in 1705-1728 AD.

Jayarāma’s Rādhāmādhavavālasacampū describes mainly the lives of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā and incidentally the court life of Sahāj Bhonsle. There is an introductory essay in Mahratti on the rise of the Mahrattas and their kingdoms Puruṣottama’s *Śvākāyya* describes the Mahrata rule from Śivaji to the abdication of Bajirao II.

445 *Tritantri.* I saw the manuscript of a work called *Tritantri,* some years ago, at Rajahmundry, but I lost touch with it. It was the work of Venkatārya. The first *tantra* is named *Śraddhātantra.* It is quasi-dramatic. Nārada enters the stage and says, I shall create a war between the three worlds. In the second *tantra* there is a story of the marriage of Sukumari, daughter of Raṇākara, Emperor of Delhi. Then there is the story that the emperor offered the hand of his daughter to one who would bring a pearl of the size of Āmalaka and a person who posed himself as mad obtained a pearl of a bigger size by the grace of the Lord of the Oceans, when the Emperor proposed the marriage the person said that he had no intent to marry the princess, but only to falsify the verse written at the gate of the palace. In the third *tantra* there is the story of Prabhāvaṭī.

446 *Avadanas* of Buddhist literature are illustrative stories appended to ethical and religious precepts. They were well-known.

1. A summary of the work is given by P P S Sastri in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
2. For an account of this dynasty by B. Puttatiya, see *JMy,* XIII 728
3. Ed. by V K Rajavardē
4. Ed. by J. B Modak, Bombay
5. It is regretted that the information given above is very meagre perhaps in accurate, and it is based on mere recollection.
CHAPTER XIX

Gadyakavya

(Romance)

SECTION 1

447 Romances Kāvyas are of two kinds, Sravya and Drṣya, audible and visible. Of the former, some are in verse and some in prose. Works in verse have been noticed under the heads of Mahākāya and Laghukāva, major and minor poems. Now come works in prose—Gadyakāvas, commonly called Romances.

Gadya has been thus defined as गद्यन्योजित गद्य, what is not in verse, that is, prose.

Of romances there are two classes, KATHA and Akhyayika.

Earlier authors recognised a distinction between them; and Bhāmaha wrote in his Kāvvalankāra:

प्रक्तनाकुलसम्भवदार्थपद्धतिः
गेयन गुतोदारायो गोचरायात्मिका मता
व्रतमायायरते तस्मान नायकन्त हवेदीत्वम्
वचन चापवर्णेन कालं सान्यायाति च
कविरसमायते कथने कैदियापन्तः
कन्याहर्षानुक्रमाधिप्रवर्तकान्तिः
न वक्तृपरश्रुतेन नुन्ता नौचरायात्वपि
संस्कृत सरस्तावेद्या कथाप्रख्याताक्तवा तथा

1 Generally, see Keith's Origin of Tragedy and Akhyāna, JRAS (1912), Gray's Literary Studies on the Sanskrit Novel (WZKM, XVIII, 40, 50), Dunlop's History of Prose Fiction, McCulloch's Childhood of Fiction and Gadyādarsas of Varada Kānta Vidyālankāra, Calcutta.


For reincarnation in a modern western novel, see Margaret Potter's Flame-Gatherers (London, 1904), and Bain's Descent of the Sun (London, 1903). The earliest example known is The Egyptian Tale of the Two Brothers, written in the nineteenth dynasty (1875-1200 BC), tr. Maspero, Contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne, 3 ed., pp 3-90, Paris, 1906.)
Akhvajika is a literary composition, which is written in prose in words pleasing to the ear (kavya) and agreeable to the matter intended (prakṣṭāṇुकūla), but which may contain metrical pieces in vaktra and aparavaktra metre, the object of these verses being to give a timely indication of future happenings in the story, which should have an exalted substance (udātiṃtha) with some characteristics supplied by the poet’s imagination as a special mark and having for its theme the abduction of a girl (kanyā-harana), a fight (samgrāma), a separation (vibhālamāha) and the (final) triumph (udāva), apparently of the hero, in which an account of his deeds is given by the hero himself in which the story is divided into several pauses called ucchvasas. In the katha, on the other hand, there are no vaktra or aparavaktra verses, no division into ucchvasas, and the story should not be narrated in the hero, but by someone else. It may be written in Sanskrit or in Apabhramsa, which indicated by implication that the akhyavika should always be composed in Sanskrit.”

But Dandin denies the distinction.

But Dandin denies the distinction.

“A succession of words not amenable to division into metrical feet is called prose. Chronicle and Tale are its two varieties. Of these chronicle, we are told, is what is narrated by the hero himself exclusively; the other by the hero as well as by any other person. The

1 S K De, “Akhvajika and Katha in Classical Sanskrit.”
showing forth of one’s own merits is not here, in view of his being a
recorder of events that have actually occurred, a blemish. This restric-
tion, however, is not observed in as much as there (in akhyāvika)
also other persons can narrate. That another person narrates or he
himself does it—what kind of a ground for distinction is this? If (the
metres) Vaktra and Aparavaktra and the having of the title Ucchvāsas
(for a subdivision) are to be the differentiating mark of an Akhyāvika,
ocasionally even in Kathas, why, as in the case of Aru and other
metres, should there not be scope for Vaktra and Aparavaktra? I
umbha and other (titles for sub-division) are observed (in Kathas) as
a distinguishing characteristic. Let Ucchvāsas be one of them; what
matters? Hence Katha and Akhyāvika constitute just one species
denoted by two names. Herein also are comprised the remaining
species of narration. The abduction of a maiden, battle, deception,
somebody’s rise in fortune and such other topics are common to it
(Akhyāvika) no less than to compositions—in—cantoś, they do not form
its differentiating characteristics. Any peculiar mark that the poet
might affect according to his fancy (in a Katha etc.1) he could
without impropriety affect in other composition. For accomplished
persons, in the attainment of their desired ends, can there be any
occasion that may not (just as well) serve as an opening?2

Rudrata, says S K De, “accepted and generalized the characteristics
of Bana’s two works into universal rules governing the composition of the
Katha and the akhyāvika respectively. According to him, we have in the
katha an introductory namaskrāva in verse to the devas and gurus, and
a statement of the author’s family and the motive of his authorship,
the prose narrative written in Sanskrit (or in verse in other languages)
in light alliterative words, the plot including pura-varnana, etc., (as in
the case of the Utpada-kawra, vi, 3), a kahantara at the beginning,
which is immediately connected with the main story, (4) a theme
consisting of the winning of a girl (kanya-labhha), which being the main
issue, the sentiment of love is developed fully in it (vnyasta-sakalas-
āngara). In the akhyāvika on the other hand (1) we have the
namaskrāva to devas and gurus in verse together with an incidental
praise of older poets, a confession of one’s own inability and a state-
ment of the poet’s motive in writing notwithstanding these drawbacks,
which motive may spring from the poet’s devotion to a particular king,
his addiction to the praise of other people’s merits or from some other
special causes, (2) the story should be written in the manner of a katha.

2 See S K Belvarkar’s translation of Kāvyādārakā.
but emphasis is put on the injunction that an account of the poet himself and his family must be contained in it, written in prose and not in verse, there are divisions into uchchvasas and two arva-verses should occur at the beginning of each chapter, excepting the first.”

It will be therefore noticed that the earliest traditional forms are described by Bbâmaha, but as later poets did not conform to these rules, —for instance, the definition of Katha did not suit Kâdamba—* facts had to be faced. Dandin, an admirer of Bâna, repudiated the distinctions and probably offered an apology for Bâna’s indifference to the accepted canons of classification. Rudrata submitted himself to things as they were and adapted his definition to suit Harṣacarî† as an Ælhyâikanâ and Kâdamba as a Kathâ and later rhetoricians do not dilate on this topic, though the orthodox view was not yet forgotten by Visvanâtha.

Hemacandra says Kathâ may be in verse or in prose and instances Lîlâvatî* as पथ्मरी कथा and gives other classes of Kathâ thus —

प्रत्यज्ञापनये परम्भोवनाथं नलादयपुत्यानामसिप्तेयक्षापुत्राणमसिनयः पठे गायर् संयोजिता अधिक कथयति तद्रवर्धिन्दर्व आल्पायनं।

1 Peterson says —"This is a description wholly inapplicable to Kâdamba, but it is an exact description of Yasâstilakâmpu. I conclude that the definition of Katha was drawn up at a time when the literary pantheon of India opened its doors to adherents of all creeds and that Kâdamba was dragged into the explanation by later fanatics who abhorred the Jain and his works and would find no better illustration among the books left to them of a definition which they were too conservative to abandon."

2 Bbôja in śrîgâmpralâša (XI) says

वा निषिद्धतात्माशा दिन्यादिवियमेति उच्चति।

कादम्बरेष्व कृतवतीर्ष वा सा कथा कथिता।

and quotes verses from it, all in प्रक्तः In Ch XIV under दूती, he says

सहपाल्लोच्च यथा कुज्जः वानरायणक्षारायणकाला।

Lîlâvatî is mentioned in Vîggbhata’s Alankârâlikâ. On the story of Lîlâvatî, see M Kârâ’s Lîlâvatîkathâ, Bharâh (1926), 3 in Vallabhâcâryâ’s Nyâyalîlâvatî (p 69) we have

यथा वा लेख्यायायार्थं समवे शालिवाहि स्वपतिविद्याः शक्तारसस्तीति

देव्या लीलावला तस्य कालिकमधुर सहीतकमभविष्यति सत्यं।

In Jess Cat (60-61) it is given as the work of Bbâsanabhattâmanava. See para 106 note supra.
Indian and Greek Romance

It has been said that of the Romance particularly the Troyic Romance of the Milesian school one finds likeness in the Indian novels written in the 7th century A.D by Bana and Subandhu. In his introduction to Kādambarī Peterson outlines a comparison in some important points between Kādambari and Leucippe and Clitophon and holds with M. Goblet Alviella that the Indian Romance was directly borrowed from the Greeks. The romances of the two peoples, says Levi, “are totally different both in plan and spirit as even a cursory reading will show. The least part of the Sanskrit romance is the thread of the story or the adventures of its characters, all the stress is laid on rhetorical embellishment, minute descriptions of nature, detailed specification of exploits and of mental, moral and physical qualities. In the Greek Romance on the other hand as in Latin the story is everything. The reader is hurried from one adventure to another, the wilder and more improbable, the better; fine writing is practically disregarded, description and appreciation of nature are to all intents and purposes avoided.”

M. F. Lacote discusses the connection of Greek and Indian Romances. “In India we have been unable to render a satisfactory account of the progressive development of the system of romance writing. It had never ceased to exist but extended to all the narratives in prose and perfected itself in the process so well that the Kathas

---

1 On the question, see G. Banerjee’s Hellenism in Ancient India
when most rigorously constructed were nothing but romances. The Greek romance on the contrary had not delayed to outstrip its primitive type and to approach the ordinary stand of a narrative epic and at the same time the erotic element was present in it in a more marked degree.”

SECTION 2

449 Early literature The earliest passages in prose that have successfully survived “the ship-wreck of Sanskrit literature” are to be sought for in the Samhita of the Black Yajus. Unlike Samhita of Rig which is purely a lyrical collection of hymns, Taittiriya Samhita contains prose portions in it, which formed the only Brahmanas in Katha and Maitrāyanīya Schools. In the Samhita, the sacrificial formulae were accompanied by dogmatic explanations and by descriptions of ceremonials pertaining to them. These explanations were elucidations of the sacrificial enigmas and embodied the speculation of generations of priests. These dialecticae were imparted by oral tradition, preserved as well as supplemented in the course of years in different families or parshads. The more numerous these works became, the more unsystematic their contents grew. Harmony was needed to bring them to order. To this end, compilations of the different opinions were uniformly arranged under different headings and such digests were in later times called Brahmanas. These were in most cases regular commentaries in prose on the vedic hymns, explanatory and analytical. This practice of adopting a prose-style for linguistic explanations and traditional narratives introduced into this Vedic period descended to the Purānic period Mahābhārata and Purānas contain prose portions in them, which at least in the former appear to be directly descended from the language of the Brahmaṇas. This kind of long prose-work becomes too elaborate to be preserved or got up by rote. The compilers now hit at the other extreme. They would be more concise and precise. References must be facilitated. Thus brevity took the place of verbosity. This is the origin of the literature of the Sūtras. The saying was proverbial that “an author rejoiceth in the economising of half a short vowel as much as in the birth of a son.” Sometimes the sūtras were so meagre as to have a single syllable in it, illustrations of which Pāṇini can furnish in abundance. Rules of interpretation were equally hard and the principle of descent and cessation of words was the chief

1 E. g. अश, VIII, lv 68
means of construction. Apart from any want of artistic excellence, they form an ingenious part of Indian literature, to which no other nation can offer a parallel. In a very short time, every department of science or religion began to have a sutra literature of its own, long before the beginning of the Christian era. Then came the vṛtis, which were the sutras themselves in a more expanded form and in some cases they contained hints at the interpretation of the sutras. The language of both the sutras and the vṛtis gave rise to differences of opinion among the learned, and this conflict necessitated commentaries expressive of the arguments in support of the author's interpretation. These were the Bhāṣyas. Strictly speaking, the 'evil,' which the sutra literature was intended to remedy, once more appeared—evil in the sense of elaborateness. Bhāṣya literature therefore mostly resembles the Brāhma-nas but with a few variations. The aim is no longer to explain sacrificial symbols or ceremonial rituals, but to elucidate the intricate theories involved in the sutras of various departments of learning. Their language in general bears no resemblance to the language of the romances. The tone of the former is serious and scientific, while that of the latter is levity and recreative. Bhāṣyas are stuffed with substance and technicality, they are vastu-pradhnā. Literary prose proper is the result of poetic art and rhetorical embellishment.

SECTION 3

450. Early Romances. The literature of Romances, Akhyāyikā, appears to have been quite advanced long before the Christian era. Katyāyana mentions ākhyāyikas (in the plural) Besides naming Sumanottara and Bhāmarāthi, Patanjali mentions Vāsavadattā as an Ākhyāyikā and speaks of its readers as Vāsavadattikās, but does not mention the names of the authors. In his Haracariṇa Bāya praises writers on Ākhyāyikā and (an Ākhyāyikā) Vāsavadattā.


Next to Väsavadatta, we have references to two romances, Cárumaññi of Vararuci and Ţarangavati of Sripāla. Sripāla was a distinguished poet of the Court of Hāla and has been praised by Dhana-pāla and Abhīnanda. Ţarangavati was probably in prakrit Rāmālī and Somila wrote Sūdrakakathā. Besides the mention of Cárumaññi, Bhoja refers to Manovati and Saṭakarniharana which must have belonged to the beginning of the Christian era.

Manovati praised by Dandin was probably of great merit. He says:

वज्रसभ्या राजा सा तनोति मनोवती।
कविनाय्यायोरैस्मिः... ||Avanipundari

451 Haricandra (Bhattara) was praised by Bāna for his enchanting prose composition “luminous in its arrangement of words of

1. See para 6 supra.
2. पुणेया पुणेनाति गक्केव गां तरसतवती कथा || Tilakamanjarī.
3. For the verse of Abhinanda, see para 23 note supra.
4. (i) Bhoja mentions it.
5. श्रृंकु कथायां हिरिमतीकृतान्ते यथा।
6. ज वद्यपरां दिव्यं जो पुजासरः तदंदकारिण्या जोमासाह।
7. भद्राहिरिक्स्यवोच्चहोर्वदी जैस्यमही अंतवाणि उवहो ||
8. श्रवणग्रस्नकृते, xxi, 198.
9. संस्कृतस्तवरितास्मै श्रीन्दुच्यानन्दायीकसमितिमयंक्युश्युप्याद्।
10. कालेकिरित्व बिनयवति वनेनु चार वारताये कमितुरितस्तो जगाम।||

(Ibid, xxx.)

Vinayavati is the beloved of Śrīdraka.

(i) तू श्रुद्धकथाकारी रम्यी रामेश्वरिकी।
(ii) काल्य यंक्षेियोरासीस्यवनारी-स्मृतिमली।
(iii) Ālhaṣ, xxx.

(iii) Subhāṣītāvalli (3227) quotes under Kavipīṭukṛn
11. खुच्चात्रेऽवृक्षविवाहीता कथाः रितिन्या हि निषिद्धमेता।
12. कालेकिरित्व परिचयं चारतिवं च गौरीपितदूरष्यं चारुस्वं च ||
13. सौरिक। श्रुकुनिक व्यक्तिकर्ता। ज्ञात्यागारणे ||

(Shāṇgaśravakāñ, xxi, 2, 3.)
ch:ice letters" His romance, probably known as Malati, has not been traced.

Śīla's language is extolled for simple grace like Bana's, but her work is not named.

Bhoja himself wrote a romance Śringāramanjarī. Kulasekhara composed Āscarvamanjarī. Vādignaghāla mentions a work Kusumamani
manjarī and Jayaratha quotes from Anangalekha, but their authors are unknown. Hastimalla appears to have also written an Ākhyāyīka divided into Lambhas.

1. Bhoja himself wrote a romance Śringāramanjarī. Kulasekhara composed Āscarvamanjarī. Vādignaghāla mentions a work Kusumamani
manjarī and Jayaratha quotes from Anangalekha, but their authors are unknown. Hastimalla appears to have also written an Ākhyāyīka divided into Lambhas.

2. Bhoja himself wrote a romance Śringāramanjarī. Kulasekhara composed Āscarvamanjarī. Vādignaghāla mentions a work Kusumamani
manjarī and Jayaratha quotes from Anangalekha, but their authors are unknown. Hastimalla appears to have also written an Ākhyāyīka divided into Lambhas.

3. Just Cat 55 See Introduction to Yuktikalpataru

4. Jālīhanna's Suktamukhāvalīs

5. Jālīhanna's Suktamukhāvalīs and DO, XXI 8105

6. Jālīhanna's Suktamukhāvalīs and DO, XXI 8105

7. In his commentary on Kāvyādāra, I 28

8. In his commentary on Kāvyādāra, I 28

9. In his commentary on Kāvyādāra, I 28

10. In his commentary on Kāvyādāra, I 28

11. In his commentary on Kāvyādāra, I 28

Tikāsarvāya quotes Kukukāraī kēlukkāvarāhī from this romance.
Malayasundari of Māṇikyasundara is in verse, Citralekhā mentioned by Rayamukta and Guptavati are anonymous.

Rudrata's Gnadokyasundari appears to have related the tale of Kṛṣṇa Aparajita's Mrgānakalekhā is mentioned by Raṣasekhara and must be different from Mrgāvatikathā of unknown authorship. Agastya's Kāṇacantavata, Visvesvara's Madanamanjari, Jagannātha's Anjaliśa and Vasudeva's Rāmakathā have been noticed.

Section 3

452 Bana was the son of Citrabhānu and Bājadevi and of Vatagotra Arthaśāti was his grandfather, Candrasena and Mahīsena his half-brothers and Ganapati, Adhipati, Fārāpati and Śyāmala, his paternal cousins Mayūra was his brother-in-law. They lived at Pṛthukutū on the banks of the Sōna river. As an infant Bana lost his mother, and his father tended him with maternal care. When he was fourteen his father passed away, and with this Bana's life changed. Well educated in Sanskrit and with a competency uncontrolled by elders, he became self-willed and with the buoyancy of youth he planned travel. He gathered together a mob of companions who with proficiencies heterogenous could indeed have got on gaily anywhere. But the fortune was soon dissipated and he returned home. One day he was called to the Court of Harṣavardhana, then encamping near Manipura on the Ajrāvaṇī. There on the commendations of Harṣa's brother, he was well received and soon he became the King's favourite.
Bana's ancestors were devout brahmins and votaries of Siva. Blessed with a hereditary instinct for learning and himself well-educated he had seen life and world. He proposed to narrate to his friends the story of his patron, and that is Harshacarita.

453 Harshacarita begins with an autobiography where Bana traces his descent from Padhśa and Sarasvatī and from Padhśa's brother's son Vaśsa. He names his immediate ancestors of some generations with veneration due to their piety and learning. He gives an account of his early life and his sojourn at the royal court. Next comes the history of King Harśa. In the city of śhānivāra in the country of Śrīkantha, there lived a king Puśpabhitā. In his line was born king Prabhākaravardhana of great prowess. He has two sons Rājyavardhana and Harṣavardhana and a daughter Rājyasri. Rājyasri married the Maukharī prince Grahavarman. On the death of Prabhākaravardhana, Rājyavardhana refused the throne, but before he could install Harśa in his stead news reached them that the king of Mālva had slain Rājyasri's husband and carried her away to his capital, Rājyavardhana set out on an expedition against him, but there he was killed by treachery by the king of Gauda. Upset by this calamity, Harṣa marched on Mālva to avenge the disgrace. But on his way he learnt that Rājyasri had escaped from prison, and was rescued by a Buddhist saint from her resolve to ascend the funeral pyre. Here the book ends as it is with the meeting of Harṣa and Rājyasri, and is obviously incomplete. This in short is the story of Harṣacarita.

From the comparison of the account given by Bana in Harṣacarita with the description of the life and history of King Harṣavardhana Śilādiṭṭya by the Chinese traveller Hionen-Thsang, it has been possible

VOL. XIII 22, On the close lexical affinity between Harṣacarita and Rājaṭarangini, see VOL. XIV. 34; JBS, (1939) 485 On Kādambari and Ṣrīhaṇkuṭha, see Mankowski, SOJ, XIII No 2

1 In Bhoja's Śringarapurāṇa (Chapter 20), there is a quotation

यथा हृद्वर्चित्रेति सब, तस्मां समारोहितं करमारं हन्तकं हन्ते सर्वाः सामासि।

This shows the existence of another Harṣacarita.

2 Ed. Bombay. For a more detailed account, see Peterson's Introduction to Kādambari (SBS. No 24) 1-38. Translated into English by Cowell and Thomas (Cambridge).

3 On Śilādiṭṭya, see Dasbhai's History of Gujarat, 316.
to identify Bāna’s patron with that king who ruled at Kanouj in 610–650 A.D. This certainty of date has brought an additional value to Harṣacarita, as a land-mark in Sanskrit literary history, for the introductory verses mention the names of some prominent poets whom Bāna admired, Vyāsa, Cora, author of Vāsavadatta, Bhattachara Harcandra, Sātāvähana, Pravarasena, Bhīsa, Kālidāsa, author of Brhaṭkathā and Ādhyārāja.

454 Kadambari By far the work with which Bāna’s literary glory is associated is his romance Kadambari. He wrote only the first part of it and what was left unfinished was made up by his son Pulinda or Bhūṣṇabhatta. It is a long tale of complicated construction narrated by a parrot called Vaisampayana to king Sudraka of Vidisa. It describes the loves of Candrāpida of Ujjain and Kadambari, the Gandharva princess and interlaced with it the loves of Kadambari’s friend Mahāśveṭa and Pundarika. The marriages of these heroines are interrupted by the sudden, but apparent, deaths of their lovers, when on the assurances of a heavenly voice, they bide their time. The parrot concluded the narrative and flew away, the woman that brought the parrot told Sudraka that the parrot’s tale was but a description of his life in his prior birth and this seemed to remind him of his past doings and that Candrāpida was only his incarnation. Thus the curse which had caused these impediments in the way of the lovers exhausted itself and Candrāpida and Pundarika were revived and were reunited with Kadambari and Mahāśveṭa at Ujjain. There they lived happily together in sublime felicity.

In literary merit Kadambari is supreme. The reader loses himself in a poetic trance. The name is true to the grace, for Kadambari means

1. For a discussion of the narrativas, see Peterson’s Introduction to Kadambari (BSS, No 34) 60ff. For H louen Thang’s account, see Stanislas Julien’s Memores 1. 247 266, IA, VII. 196 209
2. For a full account of these references, see Peterson, I c 66ff. Three verses of Kadambari in praise of Viṣṇu, Śiva and Brahma are quoted in a grant of Mahārāpaka Kumārapaladeva (Sam. 1997; IA, XVII 280). But the introductory verses are not found in a manuscript, DU, XXI 6815.
4. There is a Lalavāṭikathā in prākrit poetry by Bhūṣṇabhättapānaya (Jess Cat. 55) on the story of Sālīvāhana. See para 106 supra.
5. For a detailed account, see Peterson’s Introduction to Kadambari.
also liquor If liquor makes one forget himself, so does the Romance of Kādambari. Such is the proverbial repute¹ Govardhana days that Vāṇi (Sarasvati) became Bāna.² ‘Bāna’s words breathe a freshness of vigour that bespeak a warm and sincere admiration of the profusion of nature which the Indian Scenery offers to the poetic mind. And in this respect he has very few equals even among oriental poets.”³ From his represen-

1. “कादम्बरीरास्त्रावनामाहारोपिपि न रोचते।
कादम्बरीरास्त्रावनामाहारोपिपि न रोचते॥”
2. “जाता शिलालिंध्नी मथाया शिखऱ्णी तथावगच्छामि।
परागल्लमायथितमभुव शाल सणो बंग्रैशित॥”
3. For appreciation by many other poets, see II of Sam Sah Tr III 886

For instance

गादेवी—

बाणीपिणिरामरघ्वप्राणिकाण्डारणीयः।
भाववन्ति कथा वानः मदनवनस्य भारतीयः॥

्तिलोचन—

“हदि भनेन वाणेन यम्नदेशि पदकम्।
संबद्धविकर्षावि चापश तत्त करणम्॥”

सिविकम—‘नसवम्’

“शधरणविहितविन नमदाकारारिणा।
वनोदेव युगालेन नि शेषे राजिते नन।॥”

चन्दकंद—‘तिलकमण्डली’

“केवलोपिस्फुरतः वाण करोति विद्वानः कवीन्।
कप पुष्करविन्ध्यकुलसन्धि(*नू?) कृतसचिचिदि:॥”

चर्मादात्सुरि—‘विद्यधुमसन्ध्वनि’

“विचरिलसरण्यदा रसमावर्ती जगन्मनो हर्ति।
तदृ कित तथवी? नाहि नाहि वाणी वाणस्य मधुरवीकृतः॥

चन्द्रदेवकरि—

“हे से केवन शद्यगम्भिर्षये केविचित्रे चापरे।
अलब्द्रे कातितिसदरङ्गिणि चान्ये कथावणि।
आलं गभोरश्रीरविताक्रेश्याविचारु—
सप्तारो कविकमिकमभितृरो वाणस्तु पश्मन।॥”
lation of the horse Indrāyudha, he has come to be known as तुरंगा बान। His language is chaste yet ornate and learned yet charming and his descriptions show no end of their resources. The meeting of Sarasvaṭi and Dadbica, the last embrace by Prabhakaravaradhana of his son, these for instance in Harṣacarita, the beginning of the narrative by the parrot, the advice of Sukanasa to Candrapida, the progress of the amours of कादमबरी and Candrapida in the Gandharva capital and the pleasant association of the lovers after vicissitudes, these for instance in कादमबरी are worthy of a special appreciation.

455 There are commentaries on Harṣacarita by Rājānaka Sankarakantha, by Ranganatha, by Rucaka, by Sankara.


dīrput—'उदयसुन्दरीकथा'

1. "श्रीहरे इसवनिवृत्तु पार्विनिलु
नास्ति केवलमोक्षायत वस्तुवस्तु ।
श्रीहरे पर निजसादि वेन राजा
सपुजित कलककोटितेज़न बाण।" ||

2. "वाणस्त्र हृषिवरि निविताकुदिश्य
शासि न केशर कवितासमुद घनित।
मान्य न प्रव च कविकृत काठिदासाश्च
da र्वार्वा रसेन रसितस्य मवलपणव।" 1|॥

3. "वाणविश्व हल्ल काजेदसिनवा
वेश्वर वाक्षपत्राशी।
रसेश्वर स्तोत्रिच काठिदास
da तु सर्वश्रमान्तोत्तरम॥" 8|॥

सोमेश्वरदेव—'कीर्तिकौमुखि' 1|६॥

"युक्तं कादमबरीं धृतवा कब्जी मौनभाषिता ।
वाणध्वनिवन्ध्यायो सब्तीति स्थरितैै॥"

[१५४३—१५६२ खृ श्र]
There are commentaries on Kādambarī by Bhānucandra and Siddhacandra, Haridāsa, Sivarāma, Vaidyanātha, son of Rāmabhātta, Balakṛta, Suracandra, Mahādeva, Sukhākara, Arjuna son of Cakrādāsa, Ghanāsyama, and some anonymous.

456 The story of Kādambarī is found in Vāmana Bhatta Bāṇa’s Uphaṭkathāmānjarī, Somadeva’s Kāṭhāśaṅkṣēpā and Dandu’s Avanṭsundarīkathāsāra, and in the latter the story agrees with the narrative of Bāṇa only so far as the Pūrvabhāga

Dhundirājā Vyāsayayan, son of Lakṣmana, wrote Abhinavakādambarī, and a gloss on Mudrārākṣasa in 1713 A D. He is probably the same as the commentator on Lakṣmīsahasra, and is the author of the musical work Sahajāvilāsa.

Abhinanda’s Kādambarīkathāsāra, a poem in 8 cantos, has been noticed by Vikramadeva († rivikrama), son of Rājarājadeva, and pupil of Vidyācakravart, wrote the poem Kādambarīkathāsāra in 13 cantos, Kalpitakādambarī is anonymous. Tryambaka’s Kādambarīkathāsāra, Śrīkantha-bhūmava Sastrin’s Kādambaricampū, and Narasimha’s play Kādambarikalyana, and Padyakādambarī of Kṣemendra relate the same story.

---

1 Printed, Bombay
2 Printed, Bombay
3 CC, II 17, Bhānācakar’s List, Part I (1893) See under Daudin post
4 SKC, 80, Ukhāv, 893
5 PR, II 58, 188
6 CC, II 17
7 PR, II 188
8 CC, II 188
9, Mys 261
10 See para 166 supra
11 SKC, 80, TC, IV 5115
12 See para 198 supra
13 Tanj VIII 8475
14 CC, III 5, I Printed, Bombay
15 See para 163 supra
16 See para 60 supra
17 See para 100 TC, IV 4232, Kuppusami Sastrī’s Rep. (1919), 88
18 See Kavindrācārya’s List (GOS) No 1956.
19 Sāradā, II, April August 1916
20 Printed, Mysore. See also CC, I 91 where author’s name is not given.
21 TC, III 8460 See on the author Chapter on Sanskrit Drama post
22 See Kuppusami Sastrī’s Rep (1919) 89 It is quoted in Kavikātanthābhārara

The manuscript is with Palakathachen, Santhamugham, Malabar
There are epitomes of Kādambarī, KādambariyaARTHASĀRA by Manirāma,3 Sankṣipta Kādambarī by Kāśinātha,4 KādambarisāngaRAGHA by R V Kṛṣṇapamācārya,5 CandrāpidaCACRITRA by V AnantaCārya,6 and epitomes of Harṣacarita by R V Kṛṣṇapamācārya,5 and by Śrīnivasācārya6

457 Among other works of Bāna are Candisataka, Sivasataka, Mukutaṭādiṭaka and Saradacandrika

Candisataka is a centum of verses in long Śardūla metre in praise of Candī, a form of Kāli, with an allusion in every verse to some incident in the fight between Kāli and Mahāsūra. Its source is the Devimahātmya (ch 80) of Markandeya Purāṇa. This, “the Suryasataka of Mayura and the Bhaktamarastotra of Manatunga,” says Peterson “are three opposing poems written by devotees of one or other of the great forms of religion which flourished side by side under Harsha’s protection.” There are commentaries on Candisataka by Dhanesvara,7 by Nagojibhadra,8 by Bhāskararoya9 and another anonymous10.

Sivasūti like Candisataka was in praise of Siva and of his victory over of Tripurāsura11.

Of Mukutaṭādiṭaka nothing is known except a quotation by Bhoja in Śrīnāraprakāśa and by Guṇavijayagani in his commentary on Nalacampū.12 It has for its theme Bhimasena’s smashing of Tūryodhāna with his club.

1 IOC, 1820
2 IOC, 866, VII 1558 He was a Kasmirian and wrote at the instance of Pañmarāja
3 Printed, Srirangam
4 Sah. XIV
5 Printed, Kumbakonam
6 Printed, Trichinopoly
7 Ed with the commentaries, Bombay, See Hall’s Introduction to Vāsava-ḍatā, 8, 49, Buhler, ID, I 111.
8 PR, I. 114
9 Ibid.
10 Introduction to Kādambarī. 97 f n. On this, G. P. Quackenbos, Poems of Mayura, Int 89
11 The name of the author is not given, but verses from it are quoted under Bāna in all the anthologies
12 यदाह युक्तातिहितनाथे बाण ||
आया. प्रोपितदिर्गजा इव यहा अच्छतासिद्धा इव
drṇyaḥ कलमहाहुः इव अभः मीत्वातिवेला इव ||
विष्णु. क्षयकारिनितसक्तस्मिनस्यविषयं दर्शात्
जाता क्षीणामहाराजा. कुष्मण्डवेश श्वेतपातसभा ||
Parvatipanchnava is a play long considered to be the work of this Bāna, but recent opinion has been inclined towards attributing it to Vāmana Bhatta Bāna ¹.

Speculation has been rife also on a reading of the passage of Kavyaprakāsa according to which Bāna is said to have received wealth from Harṣa in lieu of his poetry and some scholars have therefore thought that Raṭnāvali, Nāgānanda and Privadarsika must be Bāna’s composition ². There is Sarvacaritanatāka mentioned in his name ³.

Śrādātanaṇya mentions a play named Śrādākandrika by Bāna, of which the plot related to Candrapida ⁴.

Ksemendra in his Auḍhyaracaracarca quotes a verse saying that it is part of a description of the condition of Kādambari in her separation from Candrapida and has other verses in his Kavakanthāhāram taught here are referable to similar situations ⁵. Is it possible that Bāna wrote Kādambari in verse also ⁶? Some of these verses are very charming and are as good as verses quoted as Bāna’s in the anthologies, leaving us not in doubt that Bāna was good at verse as at prose. He was probably also a philosopher, for Anandajivin, in his commentary Tattvāviveka on Anubhavānanda’s Nīyaratnadīpāvali, gives a reference to a work of Bāna on Vedānta.

---

¹ See Telang, IA, III 219 and Peterson’s Int to Kādambari, 97
² See on this subject chapter on Sanskrit drama post
³ GC, I. 868
⁴ कल्यत श्राद्धाकोन यथा शारदसन्तिका ||
विवेयेन समस्तैं व काव्यस्यावस्यावत ||

Kesarupa mentions Kāradākandṛkā as an example of Uṭjārītakāuka

⁵ हारे अल्पदेहस्तः नल्लीदीपकः नल्लियोक्षरशङ्करस्यल्लुभिनासुमासः.
यस्येव-वन्यास सरसरातिः व च बादहाने निर्देशयं वै पदसमाधवः.
अथ विश्वासस्यन्नेतीयोऽव वादः विरूप्यावार्त्तमात्रादेवादिग्रहणयोऽगम
पूर्वन्नवदेस्य स्वयंसोदेस्य हर्षावानन्दमाधिनीं दर्शितसन्ततामात्रातीतः.

—Bom Ida p 121.

For all such verses, see Peterson’s Stobh, 62 68 and Thomas, Kav, 55 59.

⁶ e. g. अणिद्धर्यमिथ्वारसरस्य श्यामाश्वस्यवमत्सीशमस्य भृः
तारावधुलोचनवदेस्य हर्षाविवलीमाधिनविन्दुरिन्यः. ||
The following passages from Harṣacarita are of historical value.

1. नागाकुलन्मन सारिकाशाबितमलरत्नाळीयचो नागानेत नागालामुर।
2. श्रुतीतहास्य स श्रीरथ्यत्त नुतंशनास्यालामुर।
3. लालामालन्स च मन्त्राबेदूसूर्यलः मनोकाव्याद्वधेः।
4. चूड़ामणिश्रेष्ठगतिनःविश्वकर्मात्नरः व चार्मालीकर्मरामराधिष्ठ यथा गर्भनेश्वरः।
5. कोमबहुवल च बुधसनिशिनियानेश्वरातुडः ब्रह्मास्मिनी मल्लय गुरु ब्रह्मरमावस्य विद्यावस्य बन्धुवस्य।
6. नागान्विकार्लिन्त च मायामालकालिग्न्त महासेतानिका बजापार्वत न्यक्षित।
7. अतिदिपिलास्य च बृहस्मपथस्य सुभाषिनसितत्वमा सुणालामिर्नामदगिय- मिष्ठातमसय धुमि निके देव।
8. श्रीत्रणाचार्याचं श्रीवर्तस्वच्छन्दविभिन्नविशिष्ठतिदलवर्यें गार्धावाहंस्यायाय विजितार्वकतस्वत्सर्वरसय निरोपिन援।
9. प्रभास्त्रेषु न वृषदत्सनवयादिशिताशिशुच संसारप्रकाशम सौर्ग्य बुधग्र विपेष पुषामिरनवामिनय।
10. आश्रिततुवहुवी च चन्द्रिपितर्वभास्यंयानमितितनयसय नस्थलयायिनर वन्मालनेनानी- यत करण।
11. काक्रव्य चुसूनारिश नारोपकण्डे नितकहि निदित्ते॥

1 Bombay Edn, page 197 200
2 This is Sankara’s gloss. काक्रव्योऽयुवनाओऽविज्ञातितस्मात सपुष्पायायिनक्षेत्र वन्मालयानेनानीयं परदरादिदेवः सप्तकौशिकालस्येदश प्रापत्य लिङ्वत् हति॥
13 अतिभीपश्रमातनक्षयपरक शुक्रमात्र गृहेण वेल्यातो देवमुनिदारैष देवीच्यजनाया
वीतातिथेऽकारणतुः।

18 अभूविवरण्यांसिम चापजङ्गि परिमित्ततमोक्ताःपारानीयमेन्द्रपुरक्षणानांकादरथ्या
रोपनिगिरि
पुरकन लोकण वेकाताधिपतिनिग्रण।

14 महाकालमहे च महामांत्याचिक्यावधातुक वेताहरस्ताठाज्ञानी जचन जयं जय गयोत्स
थोणक धूमार धूमारसेन।

15 रसायनस्तातिमनिवेदनक वैविम्बराना सुमहुपुशातरकाधिनीभद्द्वरणा गणपतेरिदेहि
राजसुत्त्व राजसुतामात्मजानम्।

16 श्रीविलासासनक महादेवीहृदयमितिमार्ताता मदकेन्द्रस्यमक्षूरवे काळिकसवीरसेन।

17 माउख्यनियतुमतविकाताविनिवणां तन्योऽतृप तन्यमाधिके मुकामस्न दहस्य कहुःचरे
पच्छरकम्बलवे॥

18 उत्सारकनति च रहस्य साधिविषेव दूरीविहार चकोरसाय दुरङ्गदुरञ्जनकेतु जीतिवताः॥

19 घृणायासस्त्रयं च सत्तो गणपताभुद्रपुण्डरकन्तनमनिन्हनीर्नास च बन्धिप्रस्मूर
भट्टाभुद्रपुण्डरकेदेशैष अागादु पुकारस्य।

20 वनिद्रारागर परस्परुक्ता जयस्वादज्ञानवा मण्डा मौखरिमूँग्य शुचरामणिवर्णेन।

21 आरूढे परवटक च चारवेदक चारिनीवेष्णुस्य च नन्दकुशरजपातिमातवदिति।
भणवनासमादर्शता समादा शृणुविषयावता पुन देवस्य, यथा।

1. मधुमोहित मधुरक्कचिंमौली दुक्षो पुतराव्याः महसेन कालिराज जचन।
2. व्याजनिनकलव्यादिरी च देवशेष श्यामारापितामानीयाबिधां परस्त राक्ताति
ञाजाः॥

3. विषयुःदिन्तमकरंदेन च करोदतातारेण देवकी देवावकेर देवशेष सौःसूः॥
4. योगपरार्थबिस्वविश्वान्ता च माणिकूयोऽपि भाद्र सरस्नीया वैरन्त रजनिवेदeny॥
5. आणीगुणभूमैण च शालण ब्रह्मचक्री द्विशं बिद्वशं॥
6. रसार्धेवचेष्ठन च मेष्टामर्गेणा दुर्यश्वाती सौरीं गीतिसेन॥
7. अद्यागदेशितचन्दनान च विष्णुचण्गमूर्ध्याचारे पीतवी वीर्चेश्वर सोकम्पू॥

1. On that Sankara's glories says Punjab SankararkAitnaya मुखदेवी पार्श्वसामक्षचुरुकियें
मुखदेवमेंमारिणां श्रीविनुवपरित्य रहस्य व्यापार्धित इति।
459 Dandin was the son of Viradatta and Gauri. His father was Manoratha and Manoratha's father was Bhāravi. They lived at Kānci. Dandin lost his parents in childhood, but as he has himself well described it, the place of the lost parents was taken by Sarasvaṭi and Sruta. After Kānci was besieged by the Chalukya king Vikramādiṭhā, about the year 655 A.D., the city became deserted and Dandin roamed through various seats of learning and attained high proficiency in the Vedas and the arts. When the Pallava king Harṣavardhanāvanīra vanquished his foes and regained his capital Kānci, Dandin came

---

1 See para 48 supra

2 In commenting on Kāvyādāsā

3 This verse is found in Mahendravarman's Mammatū inscription also. From candra it is Pundāla instead of Pallava in this verse (JMy, X 360)

4 Vikramādiṭiya I was the son of Pulakeśa and captured the Pallava capital Kānci (see V Smith, El, 427, 428; Kielhorn, El, VIII App, 14, VII 319

5 Narsimhavarman I ruled between 630-668 A.D. After the siege of Kānci, he regained his sovereignty. During his reign Huen Thang visited Kānci and stayed there for a considerable time (see V Smith, EH, 472, 438; G J Dubreuil, Ass Hist. of Deccan (Pondicherry), G7-70, (The Pallavas, 70). If Huen Thang visited the court of Harṣavarṇaśilādiṭiya of Kāṇauj, it follows that Dandin and Bāṇa might have been contemporaries. Were they friends? Compare these passages

---

Peterson (Int. to Das) infer from this that Dandin must have been later than Bāṇa and places him in the 8th century A.D.
back and was given a place of honour at the royal court. Matrdatta and Ramasarma were his intimate friends.

M Govinda Pai (Jl of Andhra H.R. Soc., VII, 146, VIII 1), discusses the Pallava chronology from Kalabharti to Paramesvararava. it as follows:

1 Kalabharti, 87-107 A.C.
2 Chuta-Pallava, 107-127 A.C.
3 Virakurtha, 127-147 A.C.
4 Skandasuschya, 147-167 A.C. (alias Skanda-varma I)
5 Kumaravishnu, 167-200 A.C. (alias Sivaskandavarma)
6 Buddhavarma, 200-228 A.C. (alias Skanda-varma II)
7 Viravarma, 228-258 A.C.
8 Skanda-varma, III, 258-296 A.C.
9 Simhavarma I, 296-315 A.C.
10 Vignugopa I, 315-340 A.C.
11 Skanda-varma IV, 340-364 A.C.
12 Simhavarma II, 364-380 A.C.
13 Nandivarman I, 414-437 A.C.
14 Vignugopa II, 389-414 A.C.
15 Simhavarman III, 437-472 A.C.
16 Simhavarman, 472-520 A.C.
17 Mahendravarman I, 530-555 A.C.
18 Narasimhavarman I, 555-595 A.C.
19 Mahendravarman II, 595-630 A.C.
20 Paramesvarararva, 530-680 A.C.
21 Narasimhavarman II, 680-695 A.C.
22 Paramesvararvarma II, 695-750 A.C.

Mrdatta is the author of a commentary on Hitayakasi's Souta and Ghyya Sutras (GOS) He was probably a Nambudri Brahmin of Malabar.

Ramasarma is the author of Acyutojita Kavya. Bhuvana refers to him and criticizes his verse:

स्मरितकासा अनुवादकायो मनोबाधितम वरुण कुव्यः
बलप्रदेशः प्रवासत्रिवद्यायस समुद्रमणक्षेत्रिन्द्र सुविव.

भिन्नि माद्वमाधी तरंगेणुष्ट क्रियालयम्.

4.
Dandin was a specialist in the art of architecture. One day one Lahitālaya requested Dandin to go to Mahāmallapura and inspect his jointure of the broken arm of the idol of Trivikrama in the temple then touching the waters of the sea Dandin went to Mahāmallapura and appreciated the imperceptible conjunction of the broken parts of the arm. While he was offering his worship, a full-blown lotus was wafted by the waves of the sea, and when it touched the feet of the Lord, there arose from it the splendid figure of a Vidyādhara. The Vidyādhara bowed gracefully and vanished. Dandin's curiosity was awakened. His mind was set upon discovering the secret of the occurrence and on returning to Kānci, he sat in penance and in the trance of meditation, the story of Avantisundarikātha was revealed to him. Such is the autobiography prefixed to the narrative of the splendid romance of Avantisundarikātha.

Dandin may therefore be safely assigned to the period 635-700 A.D.

1 This is now called Mahābūlapuram in Chingleput District, Madras Presidency.

2 In an anonymous commentary on Kāvyādāśa (I, 28) this work is mentioned as an khyāyikā āstavāyikēṇāti kādastavyakāyikānām.

Vādīganghāla says:

आत्मस्वायत्तकरणमण्डली तां आदिरिश्यामवैभवाद्वेदीक्षणानां रि

and Vādīganghāla lived about the year 969 A.D.

It is interesting to note that in Svapnavāsavaḍāṭa (Trav Edn, p. 50) Vīdugaka says:

मादविपण्डित अवचाण ओहिःसि अकादु। किमुष्मिन्ति राजविद्वेदी अपां

The epithet Yakṣa for Avantisundarī has a rarity in that Mandākuni and Tātāvalī are described here as Yakṣa women.

3 R. V. Kṛṣṇanārya (Sah XIX 232) says Dandin lived in the 6th century, as he omits the Bhāmāha and is criticized by Vāmana. He says Dāsakumārācāra is Dandin's work. R. C. Dutt (Civ. I 18, 35, II 298) says Dandin was an old man when Śūlādīṭya (570-630 A.D.) engaged, M. Haṅgećārya (Int to Kāvyādāśa, 9) gives date 6th century A.D. V. K. Chulparkar, Essay on Dāsīn (Bombay) says ("From a comparison of the story in Chapter V of Dāsakumārācāra and Act V of Mālati-mādhava, he infers that Dandin must have been prior to or contemporary with Bhavat bhujit.")

Weber (IL, 213, 282) mentions the possibility of Dandin having lived under an earlier Bhoja in the 8th century. For a similar view, see F. E. Hall, Pref. to Vasacādāṭika, 19 ff. Wilson (Essays, I 360) relies on the mention of the race of Bhoja in the Dāsakumārācāra and of the rarity of allusions to Yavana and says that Dandin must have lived during the time of one of the immediate descendants of king.
460 This specimen of poetic art was long lost in oblivion and the fall of the Pallava kingdom must have been the cause of it. The existence of the work had so far been gone out of recollection, that even among rhetoricians, it has been rarely noticed and Daksikumaracarita, almost an epitome of it, has come to be regarded as Dandin's original work.

Avantisundarikaṭṭha relates almost the same story as the Daksikumaracarita, except that in the former, the descriptions are very elaborate and narrative very complete, so that we have it in the tales of Śūdraka, Vararuci, Kādambari and Samudradatta, and Saunaka and Bandhumati.

Only a fragment of the work was till recently available in print, but the whole work has been recovered by M. R. Kavi in Madras and is now being prepared for print.

Bhūja of Dhar, so that he places Dandin about the end of the 11th century. For a study of this view, see Kale (Int to Edu).

On Dandin generally, see Weber, LL 218, 231, Essays on the Ramanuja, 16, 1st XIV 65, and Int to Das 1 81, 162, Thomas, Kav 44, Petersen, Subh 101, 180, Macdonell, SL 331, Pushali, Int to Śrīyātrilalā (Kiel) 13 ft Aufrecht, ZDMG, XLII 91-5, CC, I 215, Int to Vasuśīlita (Cal Un series), Buhler, 1A IV 88, Telang, JBRAS, VIII 153 Petersen, Prefa to Dis also II 11 82, R C Dutt On, II 288, Maxmiller, Wrta, 382, 388 Ramakrishnan, Mahakavi Dandit (Kolā, 1) which contains the latest and the most learned account, M. R. Kale, Int to Daksikumaracarita (Bombay), Agashe, Int to Daksikumaracarita (I.B.S), S K De SP, II 68, II 7a, Collins, in his Geographical Data of the Raghuvansa and Daksikumaracaritas (Leipsig) places Dandin's literary activity before 835 A D, Moyer, Data Kumaracarita (Leipsig) B Bhatacarya (Jt Dop of Letters, 1X, 80-1) places him in the last quarter of the 7th century A D.

1 Saumrādaṭṭha is the hero of the drama Paśpabhuṭarāja, see chapter on Sanskrit Drama post.

2 Śuunaka was the pupil of Somaṭrāṭa. Once when they were on a visit to the court of the Kosala king, Śuunaka fell in love with the princess Bandhumati and had secret intrigues with her. In the meantime the king of Trigarta to whom the hand of the princess had been promised came to take her, but Śuunaka managed to escape with her unseen in a boat down the Samyu. The boat was wrecked and he lost sight of her. Lamenting her loss, he saw the corpse of a fair woman on the banks and taking her to be the princess, he cremated the body. He then resolved to give up his life and when preparing for it, he met a Tāpasi and in her hermitage Bandhumati was safe. On hearing Śuunaka's voice, Bandhumati came out and the lovers met. Bandhumati explained that she was rescued by a cowherdess, but the latter was bitten by a snake and died at once and it was her corpse that he had cremated. Thereby, by chance the father of Bandhumati came, having been deprived of his kingdom by the king of Trigarta. The king of Bandhumati's fault, Śuunaka fought and restored his father in law to his kingdom.

It is suspected that there must have been a drama somehow of the name Bandhu...
Brhatkāthā appears to have been the model for the construction of Vararuci as Kāthāyanī's son and lived in the days of King Mahāpadma Śaunaka, the lover of Bandhumati who was reborn as Südraka, reappears here as Kāmapāla. Likewise, Bandhumatī who was born as Sudraka becomes Taravali here. Thus, Dandin maintains an intimate connection with the ancient narratives and attempts to frame a sequel.

461 Chronology does not make it impossible that Dandin knew Bāpa and the proximity of dates suggests that Dandin was Bāna's younger contemporary and probably a friend too. In Avanīsundarī, Dandin narrates the story of Kādambarī and his narrative follows Bāna's Pārvabhāga and diverges widely from the Pulinda's (Bhūṣana's) Uṛtarabhāga. It is therefore inferred that Dandin wrote his Avanīsundarī before Bāna's son thought of concluding the narrative.

It is fairly certain that Dandin studied and admired Kādambarī. He mentions it by name with the usual device of paronomasia.

A reading of Kādambarī by the side of Avanīsundarī will display a conscious elaboration by Dandin of Bāpa's ideas, fancies and descriptions. Same situations are adopted, but the delineation is unique and the fault of the loan of situations is excused by the resplendence of amending shots of poetic imagery blended with the sweetest melody of expression. Extracts are printed at the end of this chapter.

462 Apart from the merit of the Kaṭhā as a piece of literary art, it contains a laudatory preface in praise of several poets which furnishes a clue to some lost works and makes it a landmark in literary history.

Reference is made there to Vyāsa, Subandhu, Guṇādhya, Mūladeva, Śaunaka. The conjecture is strengthened by the following verse in Kaṇmuḍīmabhāṣya.

1. The verse in praise of Vyāsa.

Extracts are printed at the end of this chapter.
Avantisundari-kathāsāra is a poetic summary of the kathā, which in the merit of composition rarely falls short of the original which

1. चुंबन्धु कितन निपन्नो विन्दुलासरस नचननां!
   तत्सैव हृदय बर्धमानसन्नाते * * * ॥
   * * * * तमानवदेयनां ॥
   नौमुलानितिर्यां जाति का हृदकष्टयोजित्ता ॥
   सत्यार्यणददाय देवदत्ताया कृति ॥
   मूलदेवोदि * * * * * * * * * * * * ॥
   चुंबन्धुकाशकुशिकिता लघुभा सचिवाराया ॥
   जगमुद्योग्यमानवं गण्या सचिवारिताया ॥
   चुविनिकनायाश्रयाधिक्षणं चूकचिमि ।
   परेतोथ्यम रिथो राम करीर्तित नापे ॥
   राहार्यास्वंस्यने * * * * ॥
   * * * * * * विजय हरे ॥
   किंता महमुद्रेणात्मन्या निर्विवेका गिर ॥
   तेनेद कर्म वैदेश काठिदासन धारिततम ॥
   चुंबु कृति * * * * * * * * * * * * ॥
   * * * * * * * वापनं पदन्येगापि वर्धानं मुकुन्तमयः ॥
   तत काव्यवेम्याप्ती चिन्ता नारायणसय किमुः ॥
   संतानोत्तमायापिती विचल बाणेन निर्विवेकः ।
   व्याहरेशु जवहो बीला न मरूः * * * * ॥
   * * * * * * * चिततयते सम ।
   वर्षीनापि या जाता ज्ञात्यक्स्कारणसपदम ॥
   शब्दभाषा रागं सा ततोति मनोविता ।
   किविश्रवनजीरसि * * * * * ॥
   * * * * न दामोदरश्च धर ॥
   बालजीने तिर्यास्येतिः हृद हव धनि ॥

Sarvasena's Harvijaya is mentioned by Hemaçandra (KS, 335) Nārāyaṇa is probably Bhattanārāyaṇa, author of Vaiṣṇavabhāra. The verse beginning with चुंबु कृति probably refers to Kumārādisinga. The verse ७ बर्षीनापि probably refers to Kādambarī or Vījñāka.
it sought to epitomise. At present the name of the author is unknown. It bears the Anandanka at the end of each canto and when we see that Bhoja and Hemacandra mention Pancaśikha's poem as of that anka, is it possible that the author of this poem was Pancaśikha? The extant work is also incomplete and stops in the seventh canto.

464 It is a tradition that Dandin wrote three works and if we take Avanṭisundarikāthā, in the place of Dasakumāracarīta, the two other works are Dvisandhāna and Kavyādarsa.

Dvisandhāna is a poem with a double entendre and narrated the stories of Rāmāyana and Mābhābhāraṭa. Except in rare references to it by later writers, the work is lost. It served as a model for

1 For instance, 

2 For a complete account of the Kāthā and Kāthāprakāsa, see M Ramakrishna Kavi, Danda (Kāthā, I). The 7th canto is a citārasarga, in which some particular alphabets are avowedly avoided.

3 Much thought has been expended on discovering the names of the three works here referred to as Dandin's Pischholl thought the third was Mṛtyukatikā, because the verse 

Thruthitaśudhāvastusṣukhāṣṭhamāhaḥ kāhasthrirūpam ||

On this question, see R V Krishnaamacharya, Int to Vāsavadatta, xxxiv vi.

4 Bhoja in his Śṛngāraprakāsa says (in Prakāsa VII) Śuddhāvāsaḥ pitaṁyākṣaḥ bhāṣya. There is no work known as Chandovioitī at all and it may mean only ‘a collection of meters’. Chapters XIV and XV of Bhavacintāmaṇi also go under the name of Chandovioitī and Yādavaprakāsa's Bhāṣya on it is called Chandovioitī-bhāṣya. Even Varāhamihira (in his Brhatasthambha) says

Viduraṁpya bhūṣānām krodhaṁvibhuvati sarvāt karāyatebhavant ||

Thruthitaśudhāvastusṣukhāṣṭhamāhaḥ kāhasthrirūpam ||

5 Bhoja in his Śṛngāraprakāsa says (in Prakāsa VII) Śuddhāvāsaḥ pitaṁyākṣaḥ bhāṣya. There is no work known as Chandovioitī at all and it may mean only ‘a collection of meters’. Chapters XIV and XV of Bhavacintāmaṇi also go under the name of Chandovioitī and Yādavaprakāsa's Bhāṣya on it is called Chandovioitī-bhāṣya. Even Varāhamihira (in his Brhatasthambha) says

Uttaraṁśūnamāṇaḥ bṛjañānaṁ śravītaiḥ ||

Sārīraśabdāya śravītātyaṁ śraddhāḥ sṛpaṇaṁ ||
several compositions of that style and even the name was adopted by Dhananjaya and Kavirāja.

Kavyadarsa, his well-known treatise on poetics, will be noticed in a future chapter.

Svapancastavi is a small poem of devotion ascribed to Pandin called Anāmnasāṭotra.

465 Dasakumaracarita is in two parts, the former Purvapīṭhikā is in 5 chapters and the latter Utparpīṭhikā is in 8 chapters. Rājahamsa, king of Magadha, had three ministers and in regular succession their sons became ministers too. When a war broke out between Rājahamsa and Mānasāra, king of Malwa, Rājahamsa sent away his pregnant wife to a rendezvous in the Vindhya mountains. He was severely wounded in battle and his chariot was drawn off by the frightened horses into the same forest. There he rested until he became conscious. When the queen heard the news of her missing husband, she resolved to die and as she was offering a prayer before hanging herself to a tree, Rājahamsa recognised her voice, and they were united. She gave birth to a son Rājavāhana. About the same time, his four ministers also got four sons, Pramati, Mitragupta, Mantragupta and Visrūṭa. Then the story is related how by chance five foundling boys were brought to the king, and were received by him with kindness. When of age, he sent them out on a campaign of conquest. When the princes were journeying in the Vindhya, Rājahamsa was met by a brahmin Maṭanga and was induced to accompany him to Pāṭāla through an opening revealed to Matanga by Śiva in a dream. When they reached Pāṭāla, the queen of that land offered her hand and kingdom to Maṭanga and Maṭanga became king. In the meantime, not knowing the movements of Rājahamsa, the nine princes set out in different paths agreeing to meet later at Ujjain. Rājavāhana proceeded to Ujjain, and there married Avantisundari, the daughter of that king. The princes met each other one after another and narrated their adventures. At the end of the narrative the princes captured Malwa and proceeded to Puspapura and paid homage to the king and queen. The king distributed among them the various kingdoms they had conquered. Rājavāhana became king of the United kingdoms of Puspapura and Ujjain. Guided by Rājavāhana the princes ruled over

1. See paras 68 and 86 supra.
2. Ed Madras and elsewhere.
their kingdoms justly and "enjoyed pleasures not easily attainable even by Indra."  

"Dasakumara-carita begins and ends in an abrupt manner and it introduces the reader at once to strange persons and strange events. Pūrvapithika, preliminary chapter, is commonly ascribed to Dandin himself, but as it is somewhat less ambiguously written, and as the incidents related are, in one or two cases, briefly repeated in the body of the work, and with some contradictions, doubts have been started as to the accuracy of the attribution."

466 Sesa* or supplement to the Carita, a continuation and conclusion of the stories, is the work of Cakrapāṇi Dīkṣita, a Maharatta Brahmin. It displays an elaborate construction with an expression fairly equal to its precursor Cakrapāṇi was the son of Candramauli Dīkṣita.

Because Pūrvabhāga differs in various manuscripts and in some even the story is altered (See Tany Cat VII, 2998-3007), the oldest commentaries are only on Uttarabhāga and there is much similarity between Uttarabhāga and Avantisundarī M R Kavi (Int to Edn) thinks that Dandin's work was lost and the story was re-written as Pūrvabhāga from materials available in translations or from tradition. He adds "Of the translations of Dasakumaracarita, the oldest is in Telugu by Ketana of about 1250 A.D. A comparison of his work with the original shows that the Purvabhaga corresponds exactly with the Telugu portion except that the story of Somadatta comes after the meeting of Rajavahana and Avantisundari, but before their marriage and that Uttarabhaga is very much condensed in Telugu. Most of the idioms peculiar to Telugu are also crudely found in Sanskrit in the Purvabhaga. Ketana states that he was writing in chapters the story.

1. Ed by H, H Wilson, by Peterson (Bombay), by Buhler (Bombay), by T. Tarkavācoapati (Calcutta) with notes, by G J Agashe (Bombay) with introduction and notes. For a complete summary in English and notes, see Edn by M R Kale (Bombay). See also Meyer, Dandin's Dasakumaracarita, die Abenteuer der zehn Prinzen, Leipsig; Collins, Geographical data of Raghumansa and Dasakumaracarita, Leipsig Tr by Meyer, o o and by Haberland (Munich); by M R Kale (Bombay); by P W Jacob (Hindu Tales), by Wilson (Essays on SL, II 160), by Jänalnätha, (IOC, VII 1551) For Agashe's doubt on the identity of the authors of Dasakumaracarita and Kavyādarśa, see Id, XLIV, 67.

2. IOC, VII 1552

M. R. Kale says that the Uttarapithika printed in his edition is not the same of Cakrapāṇi's work. But Uttarapithika is the Dasakumaracarita proper intended by Wilson. In CO, I 247 it is said that Padmanātha wrote Uttarapithika.
of Dasakumaras (ten young men) as related by Dandin in his prose work. These facts suggest whether the Purvabhdga was translated from Telugu putting Somadatta’s story a little earlier in the Sanskrit rendering. Kannarese translation has quite a different story for this portion. Thus we are tempted to say that the first portion of Avantu was lost and was re-written by several unknown writers. Perhaps the friends of Dandin might have taken copies to Malabar and the ghals have protected them from the ravages of time and political catastrophes.”

But S K De takes a contrary view and says that Dasakumāracaṇṭa is the real work of Dandin and Avantisundaranī is the work of some later author. He says “It is well known that Dandin, the author of the Kāvyāḍarsa, refuses to admit the fine distinctions made by theorists between a katha and an akhyayika, but his own definition of these two species of prose composition is entirely negative and does not help us in fixing his conception of them. It is not until we come to Rudrata, who has accepted and generalised the characteristics of Bana’s two works into universal rules governing the composition of the katha and the akhyayika respectively, that we find these two species entirely stereotyped in theory. It is possible, therefore, that the Avantisundarkatha was composed before this fixing of characteristics in Rudrata’s time, and this would explain the apparent confusion of the characteristics of a katha and an akhyayika made by its author. But he could not have been very far from the time of the author of the Dasakumaracarita whose work he utilised and whose biographical details were not yet entirely lost in his time.”

467 There are poetic versions of Pūrvapīthikā, one by Appayya Dikṣīla, the author of Kuvalayānanda, printed at Serampore in 1804 and another by Vinayaka Gounaśa Mahārājādhirāja undertook “the bolder task of ameliorating (samśodhana) the text. Like the two preceding, his introduction is in metre and in three sections, but they contain six hundred and seventy nine slokas and are therefore much more diffuse. In the body of the work, the author reverts to prose, where his so called improvement—really a disfigurement, consists in the occasional amplification or explanation of the incidents of the original.

1 Int to Edn. See also Agashe’s Int to Dasikumāracaṇṭa (BSS)
2 IHQ, III. 161
3 IOO, 1764, VII 1658 Printed as appendix to Colebrook’s edn of Hitopadeśa
4 IOO 586, VII 1658 It is in three chapters and begins with the story of Rājaham at Pngpam.
the text of which with such occasional interpolations or substitutions, is given without any alteration. The story is also carried on to completion.  

468 There are commentaries on Dasakumaracarita by Sivarāma, Gurunātha Kāvyatirtha, Kaviadrācāryasarasvatī, Harandāsa Siddhantavāgīśa, Haripādachattopadhāya, G K Ambedkar, A B Gajendra-gaikar, Revatikānta Bhattācārya, Jībānanda, Tārānātha, and some anonymous.

There are epitomes, Dasakumaracaritāyangraha, anonymous and the other by R V Krishnamacharya.

469 The greatness of Dandin as a poet has a traditional recognition. He has been known as Ācārya Dandin. It is said that Sarasvatī declared him a poet and that with Vālmiki and Vyāsa he was of the same rank.

---

1 IOC, 1850, VII 1554
2 Ed Bombay This is on the Purvādhikā only. He was the son of Kṛṣṇārāma and grandson of Trilokācāndra and brother of Govindarāma, Mukundarāma and Kesāvarāma. His commentary Bhusāna (Ed. Bombay) relates only to Dasakumaracarita (8 Uchavasas) and not Purva and Uttaρādhikās. He has also commented on Kājambāri (See Rajagrah Library Cat, 60). Ed by N B Godabole and K P Parab (Bombay).
3 Printed, Calcutta
4 Printed, Bombay
5 Printed, Calcutta
6 Printed, Calcutta
7 Printed, Bombay with glossary
8 Printed, Bombay with introduction and appendices.
9 Printed, Calcutta
10 Printed, Calcutta
11 SKO, 81
12 Ed Bombay OC, II 52
13 Upp, II. 8165
14 Printed, Srirangam
15 So say the colophons of his works, as well as Bhatta Gopāla in the commentary on Kāvyaprabhāśa
16 See S Pattabhiram Acarya Dandan as a critic Paper read at the Oriental Conference, Madras, 1924
17 In a rivalry between Kāliḍāsa and Dandin, Samsvāji was called to declare merit. She said कबिदेवी कबिदेवी कबिदेवी न सशस्य but when Kalidasa asked, कीषु रष्टेष्वे she said लमेवाह लमेवाह लमेवाह न सशस्य
18 जोते जगाति वासवीकी कविदेवी मिलामिला लमेवाह न सशस्य।
19 कवी कष्टित तत्रो व्यस्ति कवयस्तवक्ष्यदुस्पातनि।
470 Subandhu. The age of Subandhu as a writer of Sanskrit romance has been a matter of literary speculation. His name is associated with Vasavadatta. In the introductory verses to Haracarita, Bana has a eulogy of poets and poems and there he mentions a Vasavadatta. It has been considered from this reference that Bana had in mind Subandhu's writing, so that Bana's date being known, the age of Subandhu was anterior to him.

In a similar preface to Vasavadatta, Subandhu deplores the decay of poetic aesthetics after the days of Vikramaditya, the generous patron of letters.

Ratvita bhadana navaka bhilasita nni kah ।
Surasriv krtirshyam gatvita bhuni vrikramadhitil ।

On the identity of this Vikramaditya there has been a display of original research. But two considerations chiefly lead us to conclude.

1. On Subandhu generally, see Hall, but to Vasavadatta R V Krishnamacharya (int to Vasavadatta) thinks Subandhu was a Vaishnavaite following Mimamsa philosophy. Weber, I 271 quoting Cunningham (JASB XVII, 98-9) says there is a legend that Subandhu was a Kashmirian Brahman.

2. R V Krishnamacharya thinks this verse here an interpolation as it is not found in some manuscripts. Introduction to Vasavadatta, xxxix.

Vamanas in his Kavyalankara has passage

Sambhavprada yatha—
Jata suptirashrity kshudraya dinshya kutaiprasanyam |
Kshudrayasiddhanav (v)lesnu ।

Some scholars have preferred the reading vasaupuru to vasauny. In Ms No 4 B 820 of Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras, the reading is the latter. The discovery of Avantisundarikathä has set the difficulty at rest, for it is stated there that Subandhu was attached to Bindusara, the son of Candragupta.

Sasaupuru kile nirmaha bhutusarsa bhavem—at ksevam hrudya bhadra ।

The available Vasavadatta of Subandhu is unconnected with Udayana Vatsaraja. There are no data to connect this Subandhu with Vasavadatta mentioned by Patanjali. M Ramakrishna Kavi (Kال, I 70) however says so R V Krishnamacharya (o c Xlii) says that there was one Vasubandhu, pupil of Manmatha, in the court of Vikramaditya Candragupta II. Takkakasun in his Paramarthaśa Life of Vasubandhu finds a passage that king Vikramaditya of Ayodhya sent his crown prince Balaḍiṭya to Vasubandhu to learn Buddhism [JASB 180, 41]. Smith (EH, 292, 290) and Patnak take this Vikramaditya to be Skandagupta. But Bhadarkar says he was Candragupta II who lived in Gupta era 98 or 411 A D and identifies Balaḍiṭya with his son Govinda Gupta (see also IA XXII, 16). Subandhu, therefore, it is suggested, saw that the ancient romance of Vasavadatta so highly prais'd of Bana was lost and with confidence in his literary ability, he set out to make up this loss. On this question, see K. Saraswati, JMy. 
that Vāsamāvatī mentioned by Bāja was not the work of Subandhu. Patanjali instances Vāsamāvatī as an Ākhāyikā and speaks of readers as Vāsamāvatīkās.

In this allusion to Vikramādītīya there is express indication that Vikramādītīya so lamented was the patron of the ‘nine gems’ and if as tradition says the patron of ‘nine gems’ was the founder of the Vikrama era in 56 B.C., Patanjali who flourished far earlier than that date could not have referred to this Subandhu’s romance. In his Śṛngāraprkṣāsa, Bhoja mentions an Ākhāyikā Lilāvatī, now lost. But Nemnātha Kaurājakaunjara, the Canarese poet, has written a romance of that name, probably an adaptation of the Sanskrit original. It describes the love of Kandarpaketu and Lilāvatī and the story is almost similar to that found in this work, except that the name of the heroine had been altered from Lilāvatī to Vāsamāvatī. Is it possible that the source of Subandhu’s plot was the original Lilāvatī and that he narrated the same story in a new form, so as to illustrate the power of Sanskrit paranomasia? But Subandhu, the author of Vāsamāvatī, is not a late writer. He is quoted by Vāmana in his Kāvyālāṃkāra. An anonymous commentary on Vāsamāvatī begins with a verse, which commences Bhāmatī, the commentary on Śankarabhāṣya by Vācaspatīmiśra. It is therefore likely that this commentary was the work of Vācaspatī, who lived in the 9th century A.D. and Vāmana was in the Court of Jayāpida (779-819 A.D.). Subandhu mentions Buddhāhasanagati, Uḍḍyotakāra and a story of Śakunālā (apparently as represented by Kālidāsa). Buddhāhasanagati was a rhetorical work by Dharmakīrti, and

1 See para 450 supra
2 For the view that Patanjali’s Vāsamāvatī was not this Subandhu’s, see Peterson’s Introduction to Kāṭāmbika, 72 and R V Krishnamacharya, i e. xxxvi.
3 “The romance of Vāsamāvatī referred to in Malatīmahāva as in like manner that found in Kathasārīgāra and which has been dramatized in Ratnāvali resembles in so closely a feature, baring the common appellation of their respective heroines” Hall.
4 अनवर्णाधे अविश्वास्य यवविनन्दित्र तिष्वारन्दा in his commentary says that Buddhāhasanagati was the work of Dharmakīrti. Hall (Int to Edn) accepts this statement. R V Krishnamacharya adopts the reading सक्तिकालयस्यनामविवाहार्थम् तिष्वारन्दा and says that Alankāra was the name of a work by Dharmakīrti. Levi says that Dharmakīrti has not been known to be a rhetorician at all. (Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême Orient, III 45) Thomas accepts this opinion (Int to Kavya 46) S K Do does not mention Dharmakīrti as a writer of rhetoric (SP 48), but says that Bāhma adopted Dharmakīrti’s Buddhist doctrine, placing Dharmakīrti in the middle of the 7th century. A.D., because he is not noticed by Huien Thsang (650 684 A.D.), but mentioned by I Tiong (673 693 A D) as a recent author. (See Takakusu, Record of
Udyotakāra, the great logician, was the author of Nyāyavārttika and these writers lived in the 6th century A.D.

471 "Subandhu’s version of the story of Vasavadatta is quite different from that which Bhamaha criticizes as quite incredible and opposed to the usage of the world and to the dictates of political science (lokasastra viruddha) concerning the conduct of a conqueror (Vijujñu). The story of Vasavadatta is as old as Patanjali,asmuch as he refers to it in his commentary on Panini IV 3 57 One of the versions of the story based upon the Brihatkatha is found narrated in Somadeva’s Kathasaritsagāra and it seems to be the Brihatkatha version that Bhamaha has condemned as incredible and opposed to the usage of the world and to the dictates of political science Chandamahasena, the king of Avantu, made a large artificial elephant similar to the one reared by Udayana, the king of Vatsa. After filling it with armed soldiers, he sent it to the Vindhya forest bordering upon the Vatsa country with a view to entice Udayana to come out of his capital for capturing the elephant. As expected, Udayana came along to see and capture it, was himself caught hold of by Chandamahasena’s soldiers and taken as a prisoner to Avantu where he married Vasavadatta Bhamaha condemns this story as incredible and opposed to the usage of the world,asmuch as no king like Udayana who was well informed and had able ministers to advise him could be believed to go out with no assistance to elephant forest at sunset, however fond he might be of elephants. It is also opposed to the dictates of political science asmuch as no king like Udayana ever bent on making extensive conquests would be foolish enough to enter upon a risky adventure as he is said to have done Subandhu’s version of the story of Vasavadatta is not

---

*the Buddhist Religion* Tarānathā (Geschichte, 181 f) makes him contemporary of the Tibetan king Strong btsun sgam po who died in 660 A.D. So does Kern (Manual of Indian Buddhism, 180) Peterson and Hall (Subh 47 Int to Vas.) say that Dharmakīrti, the writer on Alankāra, was identical with the Buddhist philosopher of that name. Anandavardhana quotes verses by Dharmakīrti. Dharmakīrti is now generally placed between the 6th and 7th century A.D. Telang (JBRAS, XXVII, 147, places Dharmakīrti in the middle of 6th century A.D. See Aufrecht, 191, XVI, 206 7, ZDVG, XXVII, 44, CO, I 268, Peterson (JBRAS, XVI, 172 3; Bhandarkar [BB, (1897) xxx], Max Muller (India, Index); Duff, (Chronology), JBRAS, XVIII, 18, 88 96, 143 180). For works and verses of Dharmakīrti in the anthologies, see Thomas Kau. 47 80 and Peterson, Subh 48 6.

1. Udyotakāra’s work is meant to be a refutation of Dunguṅga’s heterodox views. If Dunguṅga lived in 6th century, A.D. Udyotakāra must have lived later (On Dunguṅga’s date, see para 17 supra).
liable to such charges. If that work had existed in Bhamaha's time he would not have failed to notice it in this connection.\(^1\)

The postemority of Subandhu to Bāna is confirmed by internal evidence. To Bāna's works Subandhu was indebted at times for words, expressions, passages and situations, bordering on plagiarism.\(^2\) The use of the word Indrayudha indicates an allusion to the Candrāpida's horse\(^3\) of that name. The resolves of Mahāsveṭā and Kādambari to give up their lives when their lovers were dead and the sudden interruption of their attempts by the intervention of a heavenly voice have their counterparts in a similar situation created for Kandarpakeśa when he missed his sweetheart Vāsavadatta. Above all Subandhu has appreciated Bhavabhūti by drawing upon him for his fine expressions of poetic fancy. The instance given below is too glaring\(^4\) to avoid the inference that Subandhu lived after Bhavabhūti and was a student of his plays. Bāna and Bhavabhūti were too original in their ideas and too conscious of their genius that a contrary inference is not possible. Subandhu appears therefore to have flourished between Bāna and Vāmana, that is, about the end of the 8th century A.D.\(^5\)

---

1 Mys Arch Rep (1927), 25.
2 For instance, see the use of the phrases देव प्रमाणम् अचिन्त्यः, आसीताः यमसि.
3 अभ्राचार्येनक्रयुज्येन सनातनानामा दुरोष्य सह नगरायनीवमाह | (Srinagam Edn 999)
4 Compare कीर्तनेष्वर विद्वत्तित्विं विद्विचेतित्वाकाभिषेकयो वा याजुगवेन च वैश्वनाथस्वादित्वानाथप्रवेक्तः।

धर्मेन विद्विचेति विद्विधितुभोजु सुन्दरमिः

चिन्तानातित्वोज्ज्वलित्विवेकुपूर्वै लम्बा प्रमा निषय | — Malaladvadhava

हृद्ये बिद्विचेतिविद्विधिविशेष उत्कर्षितमिव, प्रत्युच्छितमिव कौशिकविद्विहारिव, निग्रहितमिव चक्रवर्तिवत्तिवः वासुदेवितदिविविषयितविधिविदितवादिविविषयितविधि कन्तयेषु सन्त्यामामा |

Srinagam Edn 191.

5 Hoernle identifies Vikramaditya with Yāṣṭiḥharman, and dates Subandhu about 608-612 A.D. the latter being the date of Harṣa’s coronation, and see JRAS, (1903) 345, (1906) 89, 144, and see contra Fleet, [JRAS, (1904) 164]. V. Smith, [EDMG, LVIII 781 96] places Yāṣṭiḥharman, as founder of Malva empire, in 583-588 A.D, Grey (Int to Edn) places Subandhu between Bāna and Uṣyotākara, at least a century latter than Dandin between 550 A.D. and somewhere after 606 A.D. For this priority see Weber, IAX, I 911 315; R. V. Krahnamacharya puts Subandhu after Bāna and before Vāmana. Hall (Int, to Vas 11) places Subandhu before Bāna (see also Cowell’s Preface to Nyayakrumanjali, VI); Cartellieri (Das Mahabharata Subandhu and Bāna, VOJ, II 115, III 145, XIII 73) says Bāna knew Subandhu and composed his
472 Prince Kandarpaketu, son of King Cintamani, saw the image of a fair damsel in dream and enamoured of her he not set with his friend Makaranda in quest of the original of that image. Halting under a shady tree for a night, he overheard the tale related by a parrot to its spouse, that Vâsavadatta, daughter of King Srâgârâsekhara of Kusumapura, dreamt of a young man of splendid attractions and would not therefore choose any out of the several princes that were assembled at her Svavamvara. She now sent out her own maid, Amâlika, as an emissary to gather news of that young man, who had captured her heart. Kandarpaketu was delighted and made friendship with Amâlika. He accompanied her to Vâsavadattâ's harem, and to avoid her proposed marriage with Puṣpakeṭu, a Vidyâdhara prince, the lovers secretly eloped. On their way they felt tired and fell asleep. As Vâsavadattâ awoke and went out to gather fruits and flowers she saw two rival Kirâta chiefs with their forces in pursuit of her, but in a fight between themselves they destroyed each other. But the Sage in whose garden Vâsavadattâ had entered was incensed at the havoc made by the rival armies and cursed her to become a lifeless statue, as the real cause of the whole trouble, but at her importunities he limited the curse to the day of the casual contact of her lover Kandarpaketu. Kandarpaketu rose to find his sweetheart missing and when in despair he approached the waters of the sea to give up his life a heavenly voice assured him that he would soon be united with Vâsavadattâ. So he rambled through woods and awaited the uncertain day, when by chance he happened to pass by a statue and discovering it some likeness he embraced it, the statue gained animation and Vâsavadattâ stood before him in all her original glory.

473 Subandhu has been praised by later writers.1 Manlhi, Râjasekhara, Vâmabhatta Bâpa2 and is quoted in the anthologies.

work to eclipse Subandhu's fame. Telang (JRAS, XVIII 147) puts Subandhu at the end of the 6th century or beginning of the 7th century and before Bâpa and Dandin also. "At the time when Vâsavadattâ was composed the teachings of Kumârila, had already borne fruit against sects, but in Kâdambari, Hâravârîja and Dâsakumârâcariâ, we find allusions to Mimâmsa to Dauḍghâ and Jain systems though there is no allusion of contrast between them". See also his introduction to Mudrârâkshas, 55 note.

1 And probably by Vâkpati in Gauḍâvâho. See OC, 1 745 and R. V. Kusumamacarya's Int to Râd. xi.

श्रीमद्भक्तबालाकविताप्रमाणित श्रीमद्भक्तविनोदितागः
In his Vāsavadatta, Subandhu's sole aim was to illustrate the potency of expression of the Sanskrit language and his dexterity in framing discourse made of equivoces in every syllable. To him the choice of the plot and ingenuity in its development was of secondary importance. In this field of literature Subandhu is without an equal. All nature and all art is familiar to him. There is not one mythological incident to which he has not alluded, not one word whose significance he has not understood, not one style of prose writing which he has not adumbrated and not one mode of expression which he has not invented for the glory of his tale. "What with the comprehensive range of his hagiology," says Hall, "his familiarity with the bye-paths of elder days, his matchless command of Sanskrit vocabulary, and his mastery over the anomalies of its grammar, he is indeed not seldom an enigma to his scholiasts. There is true melody in the long, rolling compounds, a sesquipedalian majesty which can never be equalled save in Sanskrit, and the alliterations have a lulling music all their own to ears weary of the blatant discords of vaunted modern 'progress'. There is, on the other land, a compact brevity in the paronomasias, which are, in most cases, veritable gems of terseness and two-fold appropriateness, even though some are manifestly forced and are actually detrimental to the sense of the passages in which they occur."

There are commentaries on Vāsavadatta by: Jagadīśhara, Trivikrama, Timmayasuri, Rāmadevamitra, Siddhacandra, Narasimhasena, Nārāyana and Śrīnāgaragupta, Sarvacandra, Śivarāma, Prabhākara, Sarvarakṣita, Kāśirāma, Ranganātha, R V Kṛṣṇācārya, and some anonymous.

1. On Subandhu generally, see Gray, 'Śivarāma's Commentary on the Vasavadatta,' in JAOS, XXIV 57-68; Manning, Ancient and Mediaeval India, II 844-845, Mazumdar, A brief outline of the plot of the Vassavadatta 'Who were the Kankas' (JRAS, 1907, 403); Strehly, 'Un Roman indien, Vasavadatta de Subandhou' in Revue politique et litteraire, LV, 305-311; Telang, 'Subandhu et Kumaravla' (JRAS, XVIII, 147-167), Cartellieri, Das Mahābhārata des Subandhu und Bana, (WZKM, XIII 57 34); Subandhu and Bana (WZKM, I 115-199).

2. DC, XXI 8892; Tanj, VII 801 He gives his genealogy.
3. DC, XXI 8899; Tanj, VII 8018 He calls himself Medhāvi Trivikrama.
4. DC, XXI 8880 9. IOG, 543, 996.
5. CO, I 556 10. Ouéd, XV, 44.
6. PR, IV, 53 11. Hall's Edn 196 214
7. Oxf 155 12. SKC, 61
8. CG I 566; Utkar, 967 13. IOG, 543.
14. CO, III 120.
15. Printed, Srirangam with a long introduction.
16. DC, XXI, 8861 IOG, 543; CG, III 120, Tanj, VII ±020, ±029, ±033.
In Vásavadattākathāvāra, T Narasimha Iyengar gives an epitome of the story.

474 "Bāna’s reference to Vásavadattā probably refers to Vásavadattā Nrittapāra of Subandhu or some other romance of the name mentioned in Mahābhārata IV m 87. The available Vásavadattā of Subandhu does not relate the story of Udayana’s wife and has references to later authors as Bāna, Bhavabhuti et al."

"Subandhu’s version of the story of Vásavadattā is quite different from that which Bhamaha criticises as quite incredible and opposed to the usage of the world and to the dictates of political science (loka-sastra-vrūddha) concerning the conduct of a conqueror (Vijigishu). The story of Vásavadattā is as old as Patanjāli, as much as he refers to it in his commentary on Panini IV 3.37 One of the versions of the story based upon the Bhātabhātha is found narrated in Somadeva’s Kathasaritsagara and it seems to be the Bhātabhātha version that Bhamaha has condemned as incredible and opposed to the usage of

---

1 (a) To Kālidāsa—
Rhetoricians like Kuntalaka assert that Kālidāsa introduced the curse of Durvāsa into the story of Śakuntala.

(b) to Bāhūri—

(c) to Bāna—

is found in Kādambaṣafr

(d) to Udyaṭakāra—

(e) to Jayanti—

This refers particularly to Kumārila

(f) to Bhavabhuti—

Of Mahāmādhava (V-10) śāśvat prātiṣṭhīteva etc., quoted in page 469 supra
the world and to the dictates of political science Chandamahasena, the king of Avanti made a large artificial elephant similar to the one reared by Udayana, the king of the Vatsas. After filling it with armed soldiers, he sent it to the Vindya forest bordering upon the Vatsa country with a view to entice Udayana to come out of his capital for capturing the elephant. As expected, Udayana came alone to see and capture it, was himself caught hold of by Chandamahasena's soldiers and taken as a prisoner to Avanti where he married Vasavadatta. Bhamaha condemns this story as incredible and opposed to the usage of the world, inasmuch as no king like Udayana who was well informed and had able ministers to advise him could be believed to go out with no assistance to elephant-forest at sunset, however fond he might be of elephants. It is also opposed to the dictates of political science, inasmuch as no king like Udayana, ever bent on making extensive conquests would be foolish enough to enter upon such a risky adventure as he is said to have done. Subandhu's version of the story Vasavadatta is not liable to such charges. If that work had existed in Bhamaha's time he would not have failed to notice it in this connection. As Subandhu refers to Vikramaditya (i.e. Chandragupta Vikramaditya) in whose court Kalidasa, also said to have been a poet, it follows that the capital of Chandragupta Vikramaditya was a haven of poets and scholars like Kalidasa, Bhamaha, Subandhu and others and that each poet or scholar was familiar with the literary productions of others living in the place. Accordingly Bhamaha may be presumed to have been earlier than Subandhu and a little later than Kalidasa, as he refers to Kalidasa and not to Bhamaha.  

475. Narahamthirava Sastri of Kasyapagota and of Vatti-palli family was a professor in the Sanskrit College, Tirupati about 1900 A.D. Many of his poems are said to be locked up at Kalahasti. Besides stotras on Sri Venkatesa and Gnanapras만큼ika, which have been printed, his summary of the story Abhinava-Vasavadatta in aṣṭi metre is a running narration.  

476. Anandadhara's Madhavanamahakatha relates the story that Vikramaditya regarded himself in an enigmatic conversation between his friend Māhāvānala and Kāmakandālā, a damsel of his Court, and when the latter was overcome, she was given away to the victor. The

---

1. Myq Arch Rep. (1927); 45.
2. His pupil B Seaha Sastri has written lyrical poetry, and lives at Tirupati.
prose is interspersed with occasional poetry. It appears to be older than the 10th century A.D.²

477 Dhanapala was son of Sarvedeva and brother of Sobhana of Kāsyapagotra. Alienated from his family on some domestic differences, he gave up his home and rambled through the Universities of India. In a few years he grew well-versed in literature and arts, and when he returned he was received by his brother with remorse and affection. He calls himself son of Goddess of Learning. He seems to have been a convert to Jainism with all his family. He was a contemporary of Halāyuḍha,³ Padmāgupta, Dhananjaya and Devabhadra⁴ and at the durbar of kings Siyaka and Vākpati of Dhāra was hailed as the foremost of the learned of his day.

He composed his romance of Tilakamānjari⁶ to please his royal patron, who though versed in all art and literature was anxious to have an idea of the stories of the Jain theology. His long romance was being handed over part by part to the king and once when yet it

---

1 OC, II 104, CAL, B 188, IOC, VII 1558, SEO, 81, Th. of 9th oriental confese, I, 430. There are plays of the name of Maḍhavānasā (OC, I 118), by (i) Ananaṇdha (ii) Kavirava (OC, I 450, PR I 119, V 413) and a Maḍhavānā Kāmakandālā kathā (PR, V, 439, OC, III 97).

2 Sobhana was a staunch Jain and converted his brother Dhanapāla into his faith after prolonged efforts. He was known as Sobhanamuni. He lived in the Court of Dhāra in the 10th century. His stūṭī also called Caturvāsaṣṭikā consists of 4 groups of verses, the first in praise of 34 Tīrthankaras, the second in praise of all the Jinas, the 3rd in praise of the Jain doctrine, and the fourth in praise of various deities. The verses are so constructed that the second and fourth lines of each agree to the letter in sound, but bear different meanings. Dhanapala wrote a commentary on it. Translated and edited by Jacob (ZDieG, XXXII 509). On the same see Buhler, Sb Alad Wien, (1889), 570. See PR, I 69, app 101, III, app 22, IV 121. Weber, ISI, II 944. 


4 Dhanapala, the author of Bhavisayāṭṭakaśa is different from this author. He was a member of the Dakhkada Borna family of Dhanapal. See Int to Bhavisayāṭṭakaśa (Ed. GOS, Baroda, by C D. Dalal and P D. Gane).

5 Duff (Chronology) says he was a protege of kings Mūnja and Bhoja. See also L.A, II 168 and IV 59, and Pañjalosch, 377, Matsunga in Prabandhacintāmaṇi, (Ed Calcutta), 53 63, mentions Dhanapala and Sobhana as at the court of king Bhoj.

6 Buhler calls this wrong (Rep. IV, 73 75).

7 Author of Kaivrahasya.

8 Author of Kaṭhāraṭṭakakōla, see PR, III, App 91.

9 Ed. Bombay.
was incomplete the king fell out and ordered the manuscripts to be burnt away. Dhanapāla was inconsolable, but his young daughter Tilakamanjari had without his knowledge committed to memory every line of the story and she accosted him with a smile and could transcribe the work by her recitation and the beloved father gave her name to his work.

Tilakamanjari is an elaborate tale. It describes the love and union of Tilakamanjari and Samarakefu, and is a regular image of Kadambani and every occasion of note in Kadambani finds a parallel here. Easy in expression and full of imagination, Dhanapāla was a successful follower of Bana. The prefatory verses are laudatory of great poets and the Paramāra kings, and among these are Bana, Bhavabhūti, Rājasekhara, Rudra, Mahendra, Kardamarāja. There is a fine epitome of it by R V Kṣīpamācārya.

His other works are in Prakrit, Rśabhapancāsikā, a collection of 50 verses in honour of Rśabha, the first prophet of the Jains, Patya-lacchi Nāmāmāla, which was completed in Samvat 1029 (A.D 972-3), a Prakrit vocabulary and Pancāmiddhā.

478 Soddhala was the son of Soora, grandson of Sollapeya and great-grandson of Candrapati. He belonged to Valabha branch of the Kāyaśṭha Kṣatārya caste, of which Kālādhīya, brother of Śilāditya, was the founder. He lost his father when yet a child and was brought up by his maternal uncle Gangadhara. He studied under Candra and

---

1. See Merudeva’s Prabandhaṁaṇḍānti, PR, IV 161.
2. The following reverses are interesting:

---

These last two verses show that Kadumāraja was the son of Rudra who wrote the romance Trailokyasundari.

3. *Sadh., XIII*
5. Ed, by Buhler (BB IV 70 166) *It was written as Dhanapāla says to please his sister Sundari who was walking in the blameless way.*
then went to the Court of Śrāṇaka (Ihana), the capital of Konkhaṇa. He was patronised by three royal brothers Chittaraṇa, Nāgarjuna and Mummuṇ Rāja who succeeded each other on the throne. Chitta and his brother lived in the 11th century A.D. He was also honoured at the Court of Vatsarāja, the Calukya King of Lata. His Udayasundarī-kathā was probably composed between 1026 and 1080 A.D. during the reign of Vatsarāja. It seems that Vatsarāja once taunted Soddhala that the composition of stray verses was of no merit and the real joy was in the making of a poem, “a garland of precious pearls.” Soddhala took the hint and in a few days composed his Kathā. He glories in his Kṣatrya descent and calls himself equal to Bāhu and Vālmiki. His ideas, fancies and expressions, all admirable, rank him foremost among the writers of romances in Sanskrit literature.

Udayasundarikathā is a tale in 8 Uchvasas and describes the events that led to the marriage of Udayasundari, daughter of Sikhandarāja, king of the Nāgaloka and Malayavāhana, king of Pratisthāna. In the first chapter the poet describes his own genealogy and the greatness of his race, and the occasion for his composition, and the story begins in the second chapter.

479 Vadabhasimha was an ascetic of the Digambara Jaina sect, pupil of the Sage Puṣpasena. His real name was Odeyadeva. "He puts down his interlocutory antagonists as the lion does the elephant and so was he Vadabhasimha." His tutor is the sole object of worship to him, "whose greatness transforms fools into geniuses." He lived in the southern Districts of the Madras Presidency, where some of the Tīmeveli sects have such appellations.

In his Gāyacintamani, a narrative in 11 lambhas he describes the life of King Saḍyadbhara and his son Jivandhara, culminating in the latter seeking peace in asceticism. Based on the Gunabhadra’s Uṭtarapuruṣaṇa the plot runs in easy language, in close imitation of the situations and descriptions of Kādambari. The ethical import is all-supreme, that “vice ever faileth.” His Kṛtracudāmaṇi is a poem in

---

1 See for their inscriptions dated 1026 A.D. and 1060 A.D., IA, V 277 and JJJRS, XII 329. See also IA, IX 88.
2 Vatsarāja probably died before 1060 A.D. because his son Trilochenapāla made gift to 1050 A.D. as king (IA XII 196).
3 एकैकाणक श्रीमद महानिर्दिष्टं।
4 वस्तुतिः ह्वल हर तस्मात्य कृत्यं परिमोहः।
5 Ed GOS Baroda, with a valuable introduction.
11 chapters on the life of Jivandhara and is in most places a Sanskrit rendering of the Tamil work Jivakacintamani.

The similarity of thought and expression between two sets of general advice addressed to the royal princes in Gāyacintamani and Kādambari and the close resemblances in the construction of their narratives furnish a test for the date of Vādibhasimha. On hearing the false news of Bhoja’s death, Kāndasā is traditionally known to have exclaimed अव धरार निरागास निराकृम्य सरस्वती, these words were repeated in the talk of the mob, on the untimely demise of the king ‘ satvandhara caused by the treacherous policy of minister Kānthānā. King Bhoja flourished in the 11th century A.D. and Vādibhasimha who must have therefore come after him may be assigned to the 12th century A.D.²

480 Vidyacakravartin’s Gadyakarnamrita “deals with the 90 days’ battle of Srirangam between Narasimha II, son of Tribhuvanamalita Viraballī of the Hoysāla dynasty and the combined armies of the Pandyas, the Magadhas and the Kadavas (Pallavas) about a few years before Virasomesvara’s marriage and accession to the throne in 1234 A.D. Kailāsa the abode of Śiva is the scene of the narration and Vyāsa reads the work before Śiva and his followers in Kailāsa” true to its name, it is an ambrosial solace to the hearers.

“The poet traces the cause of the war between the Pandya and the Hoysala kings to a mythical feud between Parasurama, Śiva’s disciple, and Skanda, Śiva’s son, who, owing to their mutual curse to be born as human beings, were born on the earth, one as the Pandya King and the other as Hoysala Narasimha II and entered into a terrible war with each other. The real cause of the war seems to be the rivalry between the Pandya King and Tribhuvanachakravarti Rajarajadevachola in alliance with Narasimha II of the Hoyals just when Narasimha was about to celebrate the marriage of Somesvara, his son by his first wife Kalavati, who died about three years after his birth, Rajarajachola’s territory was invaded by the combined army of the Pandyas, the Magadhas, and the Kadavas. Before Narasimha could send his army to help Rajaraja against the combined army, Rajaraja was taken prisoner by the Kadava King and imprisoned in the fortress of Jayantamangala. On hearing the news, Narasimha made

1. Ed Madras, TC, II 1642
2. Ed Madras by T S Kuppusami Sastri with an introduction
3. Mys 961
a hurried march to Jayantamangala and defeating and slaying the Kadava king (called Vijahu) released Rajaraja. Then marching with his army to Srirangam, he engaged the combined army in battle for 90 days at Srirangam, and routed it out. Henceforward the Pandyas became tributary vassals to the Kuntalesvaras, i.e., the Hysalas.

The portion of the manuscript in which the genealogy of the bride is given is wanting in the Library copy. All that can be made out from what is contained in the manuscript is that Nandideva and Kshemaraja, sons of Vallabha king of Guzrat, were driven out of their kingdom on account of their wickedness, that while Nandi married a princess of Paramaia dynasty, Kshemaraja married Surapala’s daughter and that both lived under his protection. When on the death of Surapala Guzrat fell into the hands of enemies, Nandideva migrated to Kanchi and lived there. The manuscript abruptly ends here. It may, however, be safely conjectured that the bride selected for Somadeva was a descendant of the family of Nandideva of Guzrat. The information thus supplied by the manuscript regarding the fall of the Pandyas and the revival of the Cholas corroborates that recorded in the inscriptions of the Hysalas. No inscription of the Hysalas fails to mention the part played by the kings of this line in putting down the Pandyas and rendering the power of the Cholas firm.”

481 Agastya’s Krsnacarita relates the story of Sri Krsna as narrated in Bhagavata. Agastya’s identity with Vidyānātha has been noticed along with his other works. Agastya’s prose is not less enchanting than his poetry. So it is said at the end of a manuscript:

अनादेश ऋषियां अवधि कवितिनवामित ताति
कतो वैयालिक्यां रचितबुरस्तक्ल बिद्धव।
वस्ती वाण्येशी कवितिनिंसनाच मित्तुते
निपर्यैत्व पद्धरहि परहि चक्षु विद्यामय॥

Agastya lived in the court of king Prabāparudradeva of Warangal who ruled in 1294–1325 AD.

482 Vamana’s ambition was to emulate Bāna of Kādambarī fame in the field of romance and, as he says, his resolve was to remove the deep-rooted ill fame that after Bāna there was no poet capable
of fine writing in prose. Bana was of the Vastsagotra and in that same gotra, Vamana was born. He thought he had a quasi-hereditary claim to gain a name in the same field, he was Bana incarnate and called himself Abhinava Bana. Bana glorified his patron Harash and this suggested to Vamana the theme, that is, the life of his patron, Vemabhupala, known also as Viranarayana. Thus came Viranarayanacarita or Vemabhupalacarita.

Vemabhupala or Viranarayana was the Reddi King of Addanki. He ruled in 1403-1420 AD at Kondavidu. From the progenitor of the dynasty the descent is traced and the genealogy begins from King Prola. The adventures of this King led to his romantic marriage with princess Ananta, daughter of King Vikramasimha in Dakshinapatha. Among five sons born of this union was Meca. Meca had three sons of whom Pedakomatindra was the eldest. By the grace of the gods, he had a son Vemabhupa and he is the hero of this romance. Then follow the expeditions of Vema in all quarters with descriptions of situations full of poetic effusions in language at once melodious and expressive.

---

1. वाणकीकृत्ये काणा खलु सरससपस्याणि कृति जगति रूपस्यां कट्टको दामोदर्युना माहिति

2. See para 128 supra

3. Ed Srirangam DU, XXI 8884 For an epitome in Sanskrit by B. V. Krsnamobharya, see Sahradaya, XVII, for a critique by Ramaningsarma, see Ibid, XIX 170

The genealogy given by Vamana differs slightly from that given by Sivalinga. Bupala, a son of this house, in his commentary on Haradaṭteśārya's Girishṭuti-suktimāla (HR, II xii, 91).

Komati Pola (Prola)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macha (I)</th>
<th>Vema (I)</th>
<th>Dedda</th>
<th>Anna</th>
<th>Mallu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viraśrayana</td>
<td>Fina-Komati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Srigiri Vema (II) Macha (II) Ananādeva Pedda

Komati Sīrūga

Somas Sivalinga

In his Śrīnāṭṭīṭiplakṣa commentary on Amaranāṭaka, Komati Vema (alias Viranarayana) says King Vema, built steps to Śrīśaila temple and his eldest brother Meca (I) had three sons Redipola, Komatindra and Naga (HR, X 68 84-5) SR, II 183-4. On Vema's (Annaśrama's) inscription, see EI, III No 10 and No 39.
To one who has studied Kādambari or Haracacanta, it may seem that Vāmana’s performance is not original. That is not Vāmana’s fault, for in the province of prose Bāna had probably exhausted all feats of poetic art and expression. There is much that is exquisite and appreciable in Vāmana’s work and if it was imitation, it was an imitation by one who was great enough to do it.

483  Devavijayaganī was pupil of Rājajayāsūri of Tapagaccha. His Ramalarita in prose was written at Śrīmālapura in Marasthali or Marved in the year 1652 Samvat (1596 A.D.) in the reign of Akbar. In the composition of his work he followed Hemacandra’s Rāmāyana and “he wrote it in prose, though there was a Ramacantra in verse in the Pākrit as well as Sanskrit, to divert himself and also to put an end to his karman.”

484  Śrīsālā Dīksita or Tīruralacārya was the son of Bhāsyakāra-ācārya and Tīrulvengadamma. He was born in May 1809 at Chinnampatta in Chingleput District. He belonged to the Saptangotra sect of Śrī Vaiṣṇava brahmins of Tīruralāśai and their home is traced to Tīrukandiyur in Tanjore District. His father died when he was a few months old and his mother’s father brought him up as his child. He studied at Trilpican and became proficient in literature and philosophy. His exposition of Śrībhāṣya earned for him the appellation Śrībhāṣyam Tīruralācārya. In his 24th year was born his only son Bhāsyakārācārya. He was tutor to the Kola brothers of Madras, Kṛṣṇa Naidu and Vijayarangam Naidu, and along with them he settled at Bangalore. There he started a Canarese Journal, Karnāṭalāprakāśika under the patronage of Maharaja Kṛṣnaraṇa Wodeyar. He flourished amidst a throng of admiring friends and passed away on 23rd February 1877. He was a great musician and set to lyre the verses of Amarasataka. He was an admirer of Bāṇa and his ardent devotion to literary prose brought him the name Kādambari-Tīruralācārya. He was also good at poetry and among his minor poems are Hanumnānakṣatramālā, Vīrājaneyāstaka and Gopālāryā. Among his minor prose works are Bṛhatīvīlaṇa, an adaptation of Shakespeare’s Comedy of Errors, and Kāverīgadya, a description of his pilgrimage to Tālakāverī in Coorg.
By far the monument of his glory is **SRI KRISHNAHYYUDAYA**. In *exquisite prose*, he narrates in two parts the whole story of *Sri Krsna*, of whom he was a devotee, and his immovable manner of expression, rendered resplendent by the solemnity of the theme, can scarcely be surpassed in literature. Like many poets who as votaries of Krsna wrote about him, his prose seems inspired and by its merit will make up for the scantiness of the volume of Sanskrit prose literature.

485 Tiṃmakavi was the son of Jagga kao of Kaunmanc family and of Kaundinyagotra and lived at Chandrampalayam near Pittapur. His son Venkatrayudu died about 60 years ago. He attained his skill in composition by the grace of Kukkuteswara (near Pitapur) and was proficient in all the Sastras. His **SUJANAMANAH-KUMUDACANDRITA** is a Sanskrit rendering of a Telugu work Raskajanamanobhirama written by his great-grandfather Tiṃmakavi. He story is related by Indra to Mahabhaga of Kerala in which Karalavaktra, a king of Kerala, falls in love with a girl in the course of a hunting expedition and marries her, while attempting to pursue a parrot, which she liked to have, into a Siva's temple, he fell down and died muttering the name of Sankara and thereby obtained salvation.

486 Abhobula Nriṃsra was the son of Ramaṇḍhwarin and grandson of Nāyanasūri of Kāsyapagoṭra a brahmin of Telugu Vegman Sect. He was a family of poets patronised for seven generations by the kings of Mysore. He was in the Court of King Kṛṣṇarāja Odeyar III (born 1795 A.D.) of Mysore. Taunted by one Nārāyaṇapandita with ignorance of Sanskrit poetry, he vowed to produce a work equal to Kādambari which Nārāyaṇa happened at the moment to be teaching his pupils and wrote his Abhinava-Kaḍambari or Ṭrimśrīkalyāṇa. In two parts it relates the adventures of his patron Kṛṣṇa Rāja and is interspersed with verses. The name Abhinava-Kadambari has no meaning except that the poet expected to vie with Bapa in his composition.

---

1. The Puravbhāga has been edited in *Saivaṇya*, XIII and XIX with an introduction where his letters are also printed. The manuscript of the second part is with Mr. B. Ramanarma, 45, Hospital Road, Bangalore to whom the reader is referred for more details on the author’s life.

2. To II 2274. In Veerashaivas Telugu Poets there is a confusion between the two Tiṃmakvam B. Ramanarma (Bharati II 17, 28) places him in the beginning of 17th Century A.D.

Appasastrin was born at Rasivade in Kolhapur in a family of learned Brahmins. Early in his life he completed his studies. His first writings were contributions to the Sanskrit journal Sanskritācandrika of which he later became the editor. Along with it he conducted the paper Sūrīrīvalīsin on general topics, in which he demonstrated the capacity of Sanskrit being a general Vernacular. He bore the titles Vidvācasaśi and Vidvatānskara. He passed away in his 40th year in 1913 AD. He wrote easy commentaries on some plays.

His Lavanyamāyī is a Sanskrit adaptation of Bankim Chandra's Bengali romance of that name.

Krsnamacarya R (M.A.) was the son of Paravastu Rangāṭrava of Srivatsagotra. He lived in 1869-1924. He was superintendent of Sanskrit Studies in Madras. His critiques on Kalidasa's poems are unique and well-known. His Sanskrit prose is enchanting and his writings abound in his Sanskrit Journal, Sahāra. Among his minor prose pieces are Pāṭivrata, Paṃgrahana and Varuruci. His Susilā is a romance expounding social morals on the standards of Hindu ethics.

Anantacharya is a lineal descendant of Mudambi Nambi, one of the seven spiritual successors of Rāmānuja. He was born in 1874 in the house of Pratvadibhayānaka of Kānci. He is learned in all the Sastras and his disciples are all over India, for their instruction he tours round India, lecturing on Vaisnava philosophy and theology on which he has written a number of works. He is the editor of a series of works on Nyāya and Vedānta and a literary journal, Manjubaḥṣa. His Valmikīḥsāvadipta is an exposition in verse of the real spiritual meaning of Rāmāvana with a gloss of his own added to it. His Samsarakakṣa is a Sanskrit rendering in easy prose of a Hindi novel of Jagannāthāprasūda.

Krsnamacarya (R. V.) is the son of Venkatesa of Srivatsagotra. He was born about 1874 and was the chief Sanskrit Pandit in the Government College, Kumbakonam. At a very early age, he became proficient in all the sāstras and Vyākaraṇa is his special

1 For a short account of his life see Sahāraśāya, XVIII 274.
2 Ed., Bombay and Madras.
3 He lived in 1862-1454 AD.
4 For further information about him, see his of tours is not from time to time from Kanchi.
5 Ed., Coimbatore. See page supra.
His discourses in Sanskrit, Tamil and Malavalam have been highly appreciated and in one of the assemblies of Cochin he was awarded the Maharaja's medal and a title Panditaraja. Above all the agility of his prose is unique and by applying it to critical and historical essays, he has demonstrated that the Sanskrit language is capable of expressing modern ideas with as much ease, as did the glossators in their controversial philosophical literature. Trained in an atmosphere of inquiry and research, he has enriched literary history by his tracts on the authorship of Parvati Parṇāya, and Priyadarsīkā, on Vāmana's Kavvālangarasthāvatrīta, on Vasavadatta and on Meghasandesa, prefixed as introduction to the Vani Vilas editions of these works. His abridgments of Kādambarī, Harṣacarita, and Vemabhūpālacakrīta have made these romances accessible to the indolent adult and the unlearned youth. Besides several works on grammar and logic he prepared anthologies Mahākavissubhāṣīta, Subhāṣītasañkṣaṭaka, Bharotpāni-suhāṣita-sangraha, and composed the rhetorical works, Praśūṭānkaravimarsa and śrīnukṣaṇaṅgaka and glosses on Vṛttāvārīتا and Citramāṃsā and the minor poems, Vāqīvīlāpa, Anyapadesa, Kalāπīvīlāpa, Vāya savaisa, Śrī-Desikā-trimsat, Dharmarājavimsat, and Bhāratagita (ode to India) and Cakravarthitavārīmsat (India's coronation song). He wrote commentaries on Vasavadatta, Priyadarsīkā, Acyutaroj-abhyudaya, Vemabhūpālacakrīta, Kīrāṭārjuniya, and Gaḍyatraya. Of these, his commentary on Vasavadatta has evoked much praise and it was described as "an earnest attempt to bring out what Subandhu might have really meant and to minimise the necessity for resorting to forced interpretation." Sāhityarāṣṭramanuṣṭa is a treasury of chosen quotations from various writers on the lines of Bartlett's 'Familiar quotations from English Writers.'

491 Rajagopala Cakravarthī (of Kejandipatti) was born in 1882. His father Cakravarti Gītācārya was a professor of Mimamsā in Sanskrit College, Mysore. Rajagopala inherited the poetic instinct and early in life he visited the courts of several Indian States and was honoured by them with titles and presents. In 1922 he became the head of the Department of Sanskrit Literature in the Central College, Bangalore, the chief insitution of the Mysore University. By the romances of Saivalini and Kumudini, semi-original in plot,
partly based on vernacular tales, his name is well known. These are
also his works in prose, Vilāsakumāri and Sungara, and in verse
Tripod (on the Oracle of Delphi), Paḍtaharacarita, Gangātiranga,
Madhukaradāta and Vīyogvināśa, and līṛthañānam is a poem in
4 chapter's describing his pilgrimage through India. His Kaukāvā-
vidāraṇa is an original work combining literary history and poetic criticism
and incorporates the results of latest historical research. He passed
away in October 1934.

492 Kalyanarama Sastri (P.K.) is the son of Subbalakṣaṇi
and Parṇiyur Kṛṣṇa Sastri, the famous scholar of Rāmāvana of
South India. He is a retired officer the Registration department
in Madras, and now lives at Tanjore. He inherited his father's talents
and among his works a romance KANAKALAI, an adaptation of Shakes-
peare's Lucrece, is a specimen of simple but eloquent expression.

Parṇiyur Kṛṣṇa Sastri, his father, was the second son of Rāma-
svāmī Sāstrī. He was born in 1842 at Kadagimbidi, Tanjore District.
His father and grandfather held high offices in the Tanjore State and
were well known for their piety and learning. He studied under
Vidyārāja Dīkṣita of Sengalipuram. Learned in all the śastras, he
was particularly good in poetic literature. His exposition of Rāmāvana
and Purāṇas was exquisite and he was accorded the highest appreci-
ation. He passed away in 1911. His Rasamāyandini, a commentary
on select passages of Rāmāvana, has preserved for us a glimpse of his
exposition. His KAUMUDISOMAM, a play * themed on love, reflects
Rāmāvana in its grandeur. His Mīnakṣīsattaka Māṁsaśataka, Hanumāt-
sattaka and Lakṣmīśūkhaśātaka are poems of devotion and Kāvilāsas-
mandarpana is satirical.

493 Kapithalam Kṛnamacārya (B.A.) was the son of
Rangācārva of Kausikagōtra of Trupati. His father's brother Kapi-
sthalam Desika Acārya is an authority on dialectics and philosophy.
Kṛnamacārya was born in 1883 and among in 1934 poetic instincts
manifested themselves at a very early age. Besides critical essays on
various topics of Sanskrit Literature, which have been noticed in rele-
vant contexts, he wrote the poem Vilāpaṭarangini and a bhāna
Rasarnavatragini. His romance MANDARAVATI is a loveable com-
position. Modelled on the design of the well-known romances, it has

1 Printed partly in Sahārya and partly in Tanjore
2 Printed, Madras
an originality of narration and description and a graceful blend of classical and modern imagery. He passed away in 1933.

His father Rangācārya was a great rhetorician. He lived from 1856-1918. His Aṅkārasangraha is a lucid exposition of the principles of poetics, and among his poems are Subhāśīnasakā, Śrīgāruñayikātālaka and Pādakāśahāsavatārakaṭhisangrakha. On Godā he wrote a Cūrukkā and like Bhūgovinda, his Rahasyatrayarasatrnatāvali and Sanmatikalpatala is philosophical.¹

494 Jaggu Alwar Aiyangar known otherwise as Kavivara Jaggu Śrī Vakulabhūṣana belongs to the family of "Bala Dhanvi" (Komandur Elayavalli) of Melkote, Mysore. He is the son of Tirumārāyana Alwar who is a living poet of high order. His Jalantīla is a romance like Kādambarī of exquisite beauty written when he was 20. Of his two dramas as Svamantīka and Adbhutāmsukā, the latter is almost an introduction to Veṇīvāhāra. Among his minor poems are Karunārasāntārangini and Hādgavavātūti.

His brother Singrāiyengar wrote Srikṣaṇarajacampū, Yadusailacamī, Kṛṣṇakathārasya, Citrākūtodaṇḍa (Yamaka). His uncle Venkatācārya born in 1873 wrote poems Granthāvvaracarita, Rāmānujanamāṭhaśāvitaśa, Kaverimahāmahāraśi or Srikṣaṇarājaseṭuhandhana (on Kannambadi dam), Yādavagirīmāṭhyasangraha, Vyāghrataśkabhāvivavartana (on Hulike Tunnel works), Kākānyotāṭmālā, Campakānyotāṭmālā, Kāṭbikānyotāṭmālā and some śūtras. His Divyaśārvaśabava is in prose. His grandfather Singrācārya lived in 1831-1885 and wrote Sampatkumārastotrā, Kalyāṇipancaka and Vṛttamuktaśāravalī.

495 Rajamma was born at Bangalore in 1877. She is fifth in descent from Pradhāmī Gopālayya, minister of lippu Sultan of Mysore. Her parents were Gangādharaya and Rāmālakṣmy. She married A Sambasiva Ayyar, a lawyer of Mysore. She is the Sanskrit Pandit in Lady Willingdon Training College, Madras. Her Candramauli is a novel on modern lines depicting social life and evils.²

496 Narayana Sastri Khiṣṭe, Śāhīyācārya, is the son of Bharavanāyaka. He is the librarian of Saraswati-Bhavan at Kasi. He wrote the lives of five great scholars, Vidvatcaritapancaka in simple and elegant prose, interspersed with verses which make a

---

¹ He wrote an exposition on śūnya verse of Rāmāyaṇa
² Printed, Madras.
pleasant reading of imaginative poetry. These pieces were composed about 1928.

(i) Manavalli Gangadharar Sastri C. I. E. was an Andhra Brahmin and son of Nrisimha Sastri. He was born at Yasaragatta near Bangalore in 1854. Nrisimha settled at Kasi and wrote Kavatamasamsodhana. Among the learned men under whom Gangadharar studied were Rajarama Sastri and Bala Sastri whose lives he wrote in exquisite verse. He became a professor of Sanskrit in the College at Kasi in 1879. In a great assembly convened to see his Sataraadhana, he was asked to complete a Samasya.

मनवली गंगधरासङ्ग चैनी प्रर्व...मन्र...मन...मन...नामक...रहित...व्यक्ति...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...अनुप्रयुक्त...वर्ण...विवेचना...करते...

He framed the verse at once, displaying the regular series of Sanskrit consonants and thus illustrated the ductility and pliability of the Sanskrit language.

अनुक्रमणिकारीतिसाधन कविताप्रमाणज्ञान ज्ञानी दया ||
अवगुण गौरव धर्म न पर्याप्त वसी मनुषय घोषितादिति||

Here is the commentary.

संग्रहान्तरे, अनेकां विशेषतः शनीयालक्षिणलिङ्गायत| कविताप्रमाणज्ञान द्वारा अनुप्रयुक्त वर्ण अनुप्रयुक्त, वर्णालक्षिणलिङ्गायत| अनुक्रमणिकारीति साधनान्तरे, अनेकां विशेषतः शनीयालक्षिणलिङ्गायत| कविताप्रमाणज्ञान द्वारा अनुप्रयुक्त वर्ण अनुप्रयुक्त, वर्णालक्षिणलिङ्गायत|

This composition must enchant any reader, as it did that assembly. Later he wrote works on Grammar and a gloss on Rasagangadhara. He became Mahamahopadhyaya in 1887 at Queen Victoria's first Jubilee, and a C. I. E. at King Edward's Coronation. He passed away in 1914.

1 Sar Bhar Series (No. 27), Benares.
(u) **Damodara Sastri** was born in the village Arohana near Kāsi in 1848 AD. He was the son of Bālakṛṣṇa Sāstri of Bhāradvāja gotra. In 1879 he became professor of Vṝkṣaraṇa in Benares Sanskrit College and a Mahāmahopādhyāya in 1899. He passed away in 1909.

(ii) **Kailasacandra** was born in 1830 in Rāḍhiya family of Bhāradvāja gotra in the village of Dātri in Bengal. He was the son of Ghanasyāma and Adaramani. He became professor of Nyāya in Benares Sanskrit College in 1869 and became Mahāmahopādhyāya. He was known generally as Mahāsaya. He passed away in 1908.

(iv) **Sivakumara Sastri** was born at Undi near Kāsi in 1848 AD. He was the son of Rāmasevakamūra and Maṛāṇi. Lākṣmisvaraḍeva, the Chief of Īḍravanga was his patron. The story of the House of Lākṣmisvara from the days of its founder Mahesa Takkura was described by Sivakumara in his poem Lākṣmisvarapratapa. So was the life of the great Yogi Bhāskarānanda in his poem YatindraRVana-cakra. He bore many titles, such as Vidyāmaṛtāndā Panditārāja. He passed away in 1919.

(v) **Ramakrishna Sastri**, known as Ṭāṭya Sāstri, was born in 1846 AD at Nagpur. He was the son of Mahādeva of Pattavarāhā. He lost his parents when yet very young and he was brought up by his uncle Nageswara Bhatta and educated at Kāsi. He was for some time in the Sanskrit College of Lākṣmisvaraḍeva and latterly professor in Benares Sanskrit College. He became Mahāmahopādhyāya in 1909. He wrote works on Grammar and passed away in 1916.

497 **Sesasayee** was a Sanskrit Pandit of Trivadi College and Madura College and died in 1932 at Kumbakonam. He wrote the story Aṣṭāvakriyam in prose.

498 **Srisaila Tatacarya** or Ṭirumalai Ṭāṭācarya, son of Venkatavarāda, lived at Kānci 63 years and died in 1925-6. His genius was versatile. Besides the plays of Yugalāngulīya and Vedāntadesikacaritā, he wrote Īr̲̅ugeśanandini and Kṣaṇiyāramāṇi, translations of Bengali novels.

There is Sanskrit rendering of Indranātha’s Bengali story Gauracandra.
499. Haricarana Bhaltacarya, Vidyaratna, Kāvya-Vyākaranāśītham, was born in March 1879, of a learned Brahmin family of Kanurgaon, Vikrampore in East Bengal. He is Professor of Sanskrit, Metupothan College Calcutta. His father, Pandit Ṣūrgacaraṇa Smṛtiśīthika, settled in Calcutta in 1910 and has since been residing there with his family. His Kapalakundalā composed in 1918 is a Sanskrit translation of the famous Bengali novel of Bankimchandra. Besides, his poems Karnadhara and Rupasururjhara is the rendering of Fitzgerald's version of 'Omar-Khaiyam' in Sanskrit verse in 75 stanzas in the Sārdulabkridīṭa metre is superb. Haricarana has been graciously serving in the Metropolitan Institution founded by the illustrious Pandit Iswarachandra Vidyasagar.

500 Narasimha (acārya) is son of Mahābala of Kotīvara in South Canara, a Brahmin of dvaīta persuasion. He was born in Subhākṛta (1902-3) and having lost his father in childhood he was bred up and educated by his uncles. He is a Sahityasiromani of the Madras University and professor in Sri Chamarajendra Sanskrit College, Bangalore. His novel Saudamini in 8 chapters describes the secret marriage of king Śūrasena of Magadha with Saudāmini, daughter of king Kānāpāla of Vidarbha, the loss of his kingdom at the hands of a rival suitor Vijayavardaman, the wanderings of the married couple in distress, the unswerving loyalty of the princess to her lover in his woes, and the reconquest and restoration to fortune and pleasure. Among other works of this author, are Bhāratakāṭha and a Vyāyoga Praṭīṣṭhā-Bhārgava and an epitome of Kriṣṭārjunīya of Bhāravi.

501 Sarvabhauma's Arthaśastra describes the story of Rāmāyaṇa, but the peculiarity of its composition is that the narration is in the form of qualifying adjectives with instrumental endings in relation to Rāma. Mahābhārata-Kaṭhānaka is a prose summary of the story.

Virinciñathacarita is a long work by Virinciñatha of the Dindra family relating the greatness of the Deity of that name at Virincipuram.

Ravivarastuti is a eulogy in prose of Mṛtyunjayaswāmi of Tirunāva in Malabar and Ravivarman was probably the well-known...
king, who patronised Vāsuḍeva, the poet. He also wrote a poem Damayantīparnayā.

In Samyogitaswayamwara in 6 pairs Parasurāma, surnamed Vaḍyā, describes the marriage of Samyogī, daughter of Jayacandra, a Rastraudha King. He also wrote a small prose piece Parihāsācaryā Varadakānta Vidyāratna wrote Gadyaḍarsā.

Vijayapurakathā, a brief history of the Muhammadan kings of Bijapur and Vellopurisagadya, an account of Vellore and its ruler Kesavāraja are in prose. So is Mahesa Thakur's Sarvadesavīttāntanta-saṅgraha, which contains a history of Akbar's reign.


1 Sah, XIII.
2 Printed Calcutta
3 IO, VII 1573
4 Taylor, I 22
5 GC I 701, IO, VII 1573
6 III 55
7 IV 35.
8 IV 110, 146
9. VI 57.
10 VI 67.
11 VII
12. XIV & XV, by Pandita Saṭṭavaḍhāni Śrīnivāsācārya
13 XIV & XV, by Gopālaśastrīn.
14 XVI 165, 172
15 XXII 226,
16 XXIII, 97.
17. XXIII, 116, XXIV.
18. XXIII, 249
19 XXIII, XVI, 25.
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CHAPTER XX

Gadyakavya—(contd)

502 Curnaka etc. Among minor styles of gadya or prose are Mukţaka, Vṛttagandhi, Utkalikāprāya and Cūrṇakā or Curṇkā. There are defined and illustrated by Viśvanātha.

Chandomanjarī divides Gadya into three classes (i) Vṛttaka (ii) Utkalikāprāya and (iii) Vṛttagandhi and defines them thus

अक्षोरास्वर स्तवस्मात् वृत्तक सत्तु □
तत्त्व पौर्वमेतत्स्त गच्छति वृत्तक सत्तु □
सवेदुक्लिकाषप्य समासायठ वहळासरस □
इत्यादिसंसन्तवामुद्यानगचित्म पुनःस्तत्तु □

and gives the following instances

(i) स हि वयाणेभव जगता गति परमारुकोनोह हस्यदातमयो महाराजीमनि-
वाकोक्य कषणार्हुदयलस्या सारंवतारसपि रामकथाप्रवर्ण्येऽसवितो यहःमेश्ववतार, यथा
प्रस्तुतप्रेच स्तुतोस्वहितो वा गृहीतनामा पुत्रा ससारसागारसाधकसंकेतिति □

(ii) प्रविष्टात्मकसप्रवर्णाचार्यसूत्रदिव्यायामूलि नाथक्रियाकोटिकोटिकोनित्रिविषयस्यायुक-
हण्यारण्यवेदकथाति रामकथामनोविद्रापाययुगलखिससहिताविपयमत्राभवरसरसरसरसर
-प्रस्तुतकरसादारानवतिष्यविपयोत्तितविष्यविपयस्यैंप्रवेषारूसारसागारसाधकारा-
वत्तामानविभस्त भाषाग्रुहाण □

(iii) जय जय जय जनार्दन स्वतित्वमस्तानवत्वाकरणवरह शरणपनन पशा-
परविनित्विनोदराजस्व सास्त्रमाश्च पदमारिषुवारदुकाश्च हरिमालातनाविद्वारारमझुमकुक्रनाय.-
पादारिषुवारदुकाश्च निस्तुवारावत्वारदुकाश्च विद्वारणमनवयोत्तितसमप्रवेषारूसारसागारसाधकारा-
वत्तामानविभस्त भाषाग्रुहाण □

503. Dandakas are abnormal poetic compositions beyond the ken of ordinary versification. They read like prose, but the arrangement of the words follow a melodious setting. Vṛṣṭaraṇākara defines them thus.

शब्दशः मूर्गं ततः सप्त रेयास्तव चण्डकालिग्यापति सावेदकं □
प्रतिचररवर्गात्मकेश्वराय: स्युराराणिणिक्यायांशुरिक्यातः रीतायंसाधवांय: □
प्रतिचररवर्गात्मकेश्वराय: स्युराराणिणिक्यायांशुरिक्यातः रीतायंसाधवांय: □

Narayana in his commentary mentions other classes thus:

(i) नमुनालक्षणस्थलम् कृतीच्छालोचातदा यत् वशयत् पुष्पारोदस्त्रक प्रणीतं
सिद्धिविकात्तनम्।

(ii) यत्र रथवन कविस्वेतंस्य पाठलोकारसपेस्यारोपायस्य धारिष्यंततो दःपको
सच्चातंस्मीलः।

(iii) खुद्दृश कृमण यत्र यत सच्चाते गुहोमिविस्मितं सद्दन्दकस्तनं गतविस्मितं।

(iv) लेख्या रजऽ कृमण साहितेयस्चुदारस्य कवि सद्दन्दकस्तनो जयलोकान्तरी।

(v) सगण सकलः मूलः यत सबेरासमुहः परंदति कुष्टि समस्तकम्।

(vi) यतार्थ कविच्छालोचातदा प्रभुः विद्युतापस्त्रक पद्धक सिद्धिविकात्तनम्।

एव स्मार्याकुकुप्तः कुर्णितं गद्याराजयादिः दःपका प्रभुः शब्दकल्पकारक successes
dकवियोगवा नामारेण स्थले।

504 Syamala-dandakam is a prosa-poetic piece in praise of Sarasvati. Like many works of that species, dandakam, the recital of
it is melodious. The authorship is attributed to Kālidāsa, but in a
manuscript of the work discovered by T S Kuppusami Sastri of
Tanore, Purantaka is distinctly named as the author. Purantaka was
the son of Mādhava. He was the worshipper in the temple of Mahā-
Kāli. When King Bhoja of Dhar vanquished the mlecchas who were
plundering the treasures of the Sankara Math at Dwārakā, he saw this
work of Purantaka and granted him a hundred agrahārams on the
banks of the Narmadā and this was in Sāka 923 (1101 A.D.)*

1 See Andhra Patrika, Annual number (1917-8) 224.
An imitation of this work is Komalādandakam by Varada Kṛṣnamācārya of Valattur, Tanjore District. He died 50 years ago. He also wrote Kacṣatākam and VidHAVĀṣātakam.

505 There are Dandakas relating to Rāma (DC, XVIII 7125), Nymsma (Ibid. 6707, 7034), Ranganātha (Ibid 6840, 7105), Śrīranga (Ibid 7106), Lakmī (Ibid 6872), Komalā (Ibid 6866), Arbujavalī (Ibid 6862), Karigiri (Ibid 6707), Hayagrīva (Ibid 6844, 7208, TC, IV 4642), Gopāla (Ibid 6969), Garuda (Ibid 6705, 6893); Hanumāt (Ibid 6695, TC, III 4129), Ṭyāgarāja (DC, XIX, 7447), Acārya (Ibid 7265, XVIII 6707, 6862), Akulāndanāyaki (TC, IV, 5820), Vedāntadesika (DC, XIX 7266), Varadaḍēśika (Ibid, 7262); Varavaramuni (Ibid 772, TC, IV 4737), Candi (TC, III. 4063), Śūrya (TC, IV 5813), Śiva (Ibid 5451).²

1. A composition in the Dāṇḍaka metre in praise of the goddess Laksāmi.

506 Gadyas Among Gadyas are those relating to Siva (DC, XIX 7557), Mahādeva (Ibid 7507), Namassivāya (Ibid 7502), Mallikesvara (Ibid 7592), Lakṣmī (Ed Bombay), and Gadyas-atkam on Pūrṇaśṭoṣa, Rughuvira, Ādīnātha, Sathagopa, Kurukkāvalli and Śrīvīresa (DC, XIX, 7272, TC, IV 4671), Candraprabha (DC, XVIII, 6735), Mahāvīra (Ibid, 7101), Śrīnvāsa (Ibid, 7168), Pancaprakāśa (Ibid, 6792, 7667), Tīrthaṅkara (Ibid, 7648), Basava (Ibid, 7439, 7687, DC, XVIII 6792, 793, called also Udāharanagadāya), Vedāntadesika (Ibid, 7272, DC, XVIII, 6873), Varadadesika (Ibid, 7261), Akṣaramāla (Ibid, 6799), Ācārya (Ibid, 6862).

507 Curnika (तूर्णिक) There are Curnikas on Devi (DC, XVIII, 6815), Śrīnvāsa (DC, XIX, 7385), Venkatesa (Mys 262 probably by King Tīrumuḷalaraya of Vijayanagar), Nigamāntācārya (DC, XIX, 7272, 7281), Śvetārāṇya (DC, X, XVI, 9771, XIX, 7637), and Anugrahacārapākā (DC, XVIII, 6844, 6815).

508. Tunaka (तूनक) पञ्चासाहित्यिक शब्दकोषित्वानन कष्णातिविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिक वर्गमयः। कष्णातिविदिव्यमूखी पञ्चासाहित्यिक प्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८।

1. The author of this piece Purisa Śrīrangācārya of Tirupati was a great scholar, an authority in dialectics and philosophy. He died about 1927. His Sanskrit rendering of the Tamil lyric Tiruppāval is classical, like which there is another work (DC, XVIII, 7322).

2. अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८। कष्णातिविदिव्यमूखी अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८।

3. The author of this piece Purisa Śrīrangācārya of Tirupati was a great scholar, an authority in dialectics and philosophy. He died about 1927. His Sanskrit rendering of the Tamil lyric Tiruppāval is classical, like which there is another work (DC, XVIII, 7322).

4. अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८। कष्णातिविदिव्यमूखी अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८।

5. अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८। कष्णातिविदिव्यमूखी अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८।

6. अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८। कष्णातिविदिव्यमूखी अय कित सकलधरये विवरणतत्ताननारत्तीत्विन्द्रियप्रियविदिव्यमूखीप्राकृतिकपद्यमत्वायस्य २००८।

7. The author of this piece Purisa Śrīrangācārya of Tirupati was a great scholar, an authority in dialectics and philosophy. He died about 1927. His Sanskrit rendering of the Tamil lyric Tiruppāval is classical, like which there is another work (DC, XVIII, 7322).

510 **Khadgas** (खड़ग) are on Pārvatī (*DC*, XIX 7252, 7666) and Draupadī (*DC*, XXI 5323)

511 In the Sanskrit Texts available in Bali,⁸ there are some stavas in prose, which may probably have also a mystical value. For instance

विषुवत्व

नमोऽतु दुर्स्पौतमाय परमार्त्यपुरुषाणपराक्षमय परमाकान्तकोलकोलिपिताकोलितमहाशान्ताय च जामस्तपवतुपतुपुण्याय नारायणाय नरतिहःवामाय नारायणार्थाय नर्यदयुक्तायान्वयान्तरकरिमाददा जन्युद्वंदनायुक्ताय दैवदानवस्त्राणामस्त्रिवाच्यूतान्यधर्मार्थीयमर्थार்ஃ

1 प्रसो पारिस्थितस्य सूर्ये पवित्रे विशिष्टे श्राविने इहे हैमहण्ये।
कस्मजनपीणे कुलविनातितस्मे कथोज्ज्जानकः राम श्रेयः।
चवर्दहस्यमुच्यन्य चक्रोपंचश्च चक्रोपंचश्च चक्रोपंचश्च।
क्रवर्दहस्यमुच्यन्य चक्रोपंचश्च चक्रोपंचश्च चक्रोपंचश्च।

2 Bāliśvīnāgraṇṭha (*GOS* 67).
CHAPTER XXI

Campu

512 Campu A species of composition with mixed prose and poetry came into vogue about the beginning of the Christian era. We have passages in the Purānas, where prose comes amidst verse, but there is no instance of classical poetry of this recognised class known earlier. A narrative in mixed prose and verse has been called Campu. This variety of composition enlarges the scope and ease of the poet's expression and entertains the reader by the presentation of combina-
tive of varying melodies. Bāna mentions HARICANDRA as a writer in prose, but it is doubtful if the work Bāna had in mind is Jivandhara-campū. The earliest works of this class are not now known, but after the 10th century A.D. Campūs became very popular and they were largely composed in South India.

513 Trivikrama or Simhaditya was the son of Nemadiya (Devadīya) and grandson of Śrīdhara of Śāndilyagoṭra. He was a

1 Bhoja thus praises Campu style of composition

2. Outside of India the commingling of prose and poetry in the same composition is found in the Chinese romance P'ing Chan Ling Yen (Tr Julian), P'ing Chan-Ling-Yen, (Les Loux Femes Filles lettres, 2 Vols., Paris, 1660), In Sa'di's Gulistan, in The Thousand Nights and One Night, in the Old Persian Assasen et Nicolette, in Morse Sagas and in Middle Irish tales and histories (of Windischon, Irische Texte, 3, 447-449, Leipzig, 1891 1897), and in Becassio's L'Amète, as well as in the Satyras Menippae of Marro (cf. MacGillown, Childhood of Fration, London, 1905, pp 490-491"

3 See para 47 supra.

4 M. Duff (Chronology) conjectures that he was probably the sixth ancestor of the astronomer Bhāskara of the court of Bhoja, but this seems to be wrong. Trivikrama composed the inscription in Nausani grant (JBRAS, XVIII, 267).

Trivikrama, author of Kuvalayāvavilāsacampū (printed Granṭharaṭamāla), Trivikrama, author of Vyācaktīśaṭaka (OC, II 147), Trivikrama, author of Rāma kṛṣṇa-Kumudāvali, (PR, III, ap 396), Bhāṣaṭa Trivikrama (Suḥk), Trivikrama, the lexicographer, Trivikrama of Punyāgraṇa, author of Panaśūratapapancabhāṣa (Opp, 9050) and Trivikrama, author of Satabōli (PR, I 119, III. 598) are different persons.
poet of the court of the Rātrakāta King Indra III (914–916 AD) who captured Kanauj and gave the final blow to the Pratihāra dynasty then under King Mahipāla. He mentions Bāna in the introductory verses of his Damayantikathā and is himself quoted by Bhoja in the Sarasvatīkanthābharana. Once during his father’s absence from court, an adversary challenged competition. The king sent for Trivikrama and ordered him to answer. Contemplated with devotion, Sarasvati blessed Trivikrama with the poetic instinct until his father arrived and with this gift he overcame his adversary by composing Nala’s story ex tempore. The father returned while yet the story was incomplete and in that unfinished state, in 7 chapters, the work has come to us and that is Damayantikatha or Nalacampu.

His language is avowedly involved and ordinary expression was in his view not appreciable poetry. His object was in part to illustrate the merit and potency of verbal forms in Sanskrit and in this respect he approved of Subandhu. For the beauty of a particular fancy, he has been known as Yamunā-Trivikrama.

There are commentaries by Candapāla, Ganavīrayagam, Dāmodarabhatta, Nāgadeva, and one anonymous.

---

1. EI, I 840, VII, 80, 86, 49, IX 18 Mys. Arch. Rep (1924) 52; V. Smith, EB, 429, 437

2. There is a Damayantiparīnayakāvyya anonymous (CC, I, 58).

3. फि कैवेतस्य कापेन फि कापेन भवपति।
   परस इतवेद तम न शूर्या मित्र वर्ष।
   आपभारा भावमास अनन्यिगृहेतव।
   सम्यय्य भञ्जुवालयय। कबयो बालका इव। — Nalacampu, I 5, 3.

4. उज्जवलिनिद्वायाय सावदमसापित्ताया.
   भन्तरिति निश्चये श्रजस्वातावलय।
   ज्वयति किमपि तेजा तामार्ति स्वेढमरणे.
   सचिल्लिमित निपिय साहवायणयो। —Ibid VI 1

---

5. He was the son of Yasorāja, PR, IV 86, VI, 334, SJC, 68, IOC, 1530 Ed Bombay. He probably lived about 1290 A.D. See Webel’s Cat. IL, 1906.

6. It was composed in 1590 A.D. He is the same as the author of the commentary on Raghuvamsa and Harināmat Kavi’s Khandaprabhājīvya (Mys 241). He was the pupil of Jayasenafort, who composed his Vīrāṣṭrasamangaha in 1569 (See PR, IV, XXV, IOC, 1924, Tanj. VII, 8056).


8. ETO, 189
   Opp, 241.
Madālasācampū is also attributed to him.

Besides works noted in paras 78-85 Lakṣmīdhara's Nalavāṇana-kavya,Śrīnuvāsa Ṛṣṭhi's Naṣadāhananda, the plays Vidhīvīlasīta and Nalavikrama embrace the story of Nala.

"The earliest reference to Pragvata dynasty of kings is found at the close of Chandapala's commentary on Trivikramabhata's Nalāchampū Speaking of himself the commentator styles himself as the brother of Chandasimha, the eldest son of Yasoraja of the Pragvata dynasty The Guruganaratnakara furnishes some more interesting details about the history of the Pragvata line of kings Their capital is said to be Samadhika in Guzrat The Guruganaratnakara begins the line with Chaitrasimha, the elder brother of the father of the famous Somasundaragami Their genealogy is stated to be as follows (1) Chaitrasimha (2) Indrajit or IIabutada, son of (1), (3) Kala, son of (2), (4) Kala had six sons called (i) Nada, (ii) Veda, (iii) Sadagangude, (iv) Samala, (v) Dhira and (vi) Vira Samala had four sons called (i) Sajjana, (ii) Nimba, (iii) Mana, and (iv) Lampaka. Sajjana is said to have migrated to Malava with the family of Nimba when kings chased and driven out by enemies to hills and caves perished in numbers and when Sajjana was the only protector of the Aryas against the Mahammadan invaders and thieves He resided at Parna Vihara His wife was called Purna-devi (6) Karma, son of (5) married Somi in A.D 1446 He became the head of the Jana Sangha and changed his capital to Agara He had three sons, called (i) Ratna, (ii) Sujesa and (iii) Megha and also three daughters named Kambhi, Manika, and Charukhara Of these Ratna married Revum and had a son called Karma and a daughter named Rahu. Sujesa married Hyaman and had a son called Jiva, while Megha had two daughters Dapu and Ranji Karma is said to have been a more generous king than Vastupala and others He is said to have been honoured even by Khans, Khojas, Murs, and Ummars and to have been ever ready to relieve the distress of the poor by establishing feeding houses When

1 Ed. Bombay, See Weber's Cat, II 1905. 20, I 436. Madaiasa a poetess is quoted by Śāṅgadāhara. On the story of Madaiasa, there are also the plays Madaiasāparāparā (anonymous) and Madaiasānīkaka by Rāmabhata (20, I, 496) and Madaiasa, a romance by Bhavadeva (Printed Bombay) For Madaiasaśūlākana see Markandayapurāṇa (P 430)
2. 20, I 290.
3. See Index for other works.
4. Mentioned in ND.
there was a drought in Malava, Megha is said to have showered his gold among the poor and is also said to have received the title of Maler Malik from the Sultan Ratna, Megha, and others are said to have obtained a Farman (order) from the Sultan and made a pilgrimage to Ratnamala, Iladurga, the capital of Bhanu, Jerkapalli, Arbudachala, Sirohika, and other sacred places of the Janas" (Mys Arch Rep 1929, p 14)

514 Somadeva\(^5\) traces his spiritual descent through Nemiḍe\(^1\)va to Yasodeva\(^6\) and was a Jain. He was patronised by the eldest son of Prince Ankesari of the Calukya race, a feudatory of the Rāstrakūta monarch Kṛṣṇarājadeva\(^7\). He wrote his YASASTILAKACAMP\(\text{Up}\) in Saka 881 (951 A.D.)\(^8\). In seven śvāsas this book relates the story of King Yasoḍhara, Lord of Avanti, with his capital Ujjain, the machinations of his wife, his conversion to Jaina faith, his assassination and rebirth. The last three chapters form a popular hand book of devotion supplementary to, and explanatory of, the sacred texts of Jainism\(^9\).

As a landmark in the history of poetic literature, it is particularly valuable. Somadeva names several authors\(^{10}\) who adored the religion.

---

\(^{5}\) Somadeva, the author of Kaṭharamālagāra and Somadeva, the author of Rasāndnakālamāni, PR, I 81, IV. cxxv and Somadeva, the author of Abhilāṣitarāja-cintāmāni are different persons.

\(^{6}\) See PR, II 83-49, 156 IV cxxv.

\(^{7}\) Ankesari was the patron of the Canarese Jain poet Pampa Bhandarakar (BHD. 56, PR, II 47 49) gives the dates 867, 873 and 875 Saka for this monarch.

\(^{8}\) Ed. Bombay with the commentary of Śrūṭaśrāgāṇṭit.

\(^{9}\) The colophon says...

\(^{10}\) For a complete account of the poem, see PR, IX 83-49.

---

See also Introduction to Kavyarājagāma, S O.S. No. 1, xv.
of Jina and as an incident of the narrative mentions some ancient poets, whose names we have yet to hear elsewhere.

The colophon to his Nītīvākyāṃṭa mentions another work of his, Mahendramātalhaṃṣaṃṭa Nītīvākyāṃṭa follows Cānakaḥ Arthasaṣṭra.

515 Bhoja was the celebrated king of the Paramara dynasty. His capital was Dhāra. He ascended the throne in A.D. 1018 and had a glorious reign till 1063 A.D. He was the son of Sindhula. His father died when young and on account of his minority, his uncle Munja ascended the throne. The young prince became very popular and learned in all arts and sciences. Aggrieved by the prediction of an astrologer that Bhoja would reign for 55 years, Munja conceived the idea of murdering him and ordered his tributary Vatsaraja to carry out the design in the jungle. The latter, unwilling though he was, could not disobey. He took the boy to his house, and concealed him there. So when he presented to the king a sword besmeared with the blood of some animal in proof of his act, the king asked him if the prince said anything before his execution, and he gave a green leaf in which was written a verse in the prince’s hand, portraying the hollowness of

1 PR. III. तभिकीतिविकास, कविकृतिविद्वात, विदर्भसुभ, नीतिकेत, मानवकन्या, कविकृतिविद्वात, अभिमानस्वरूप, अन्यायपिका, करुणापुरुष, सुभाषित, मुर्गलनाके-लिङ्गकृत, विलासितोपचाचकन्या, सरलतीतिर्कतावीकृत, प्रभुषिष्यांगनवोदय।

These names seem to be appellations

2 Cat. O P. XXXI.

3 Bhoja was contemporary of King Anauja of Kashmir (1028-1089 A.D.). See Raj, VII, 190-199, 369. On Bhoja’s time, see inscription (IA, VI, 53) dated Sam. 1078 (1091 A.D.) and Keilhorn’s calculations, IA, XIX 361, also EI, I 232, IA (1907), 170, ibid (1912), 201. On Bhoja generally, see Seshagirī Sastrī, IA, I 340, Lassen, Deutsch fur die, Kundes des Mogh, VII 284, Lites, III 843, IA, (1844), 250, 364, ibid (1851) 261. Banau, Mom sur’ Inde, 301. For copper plate grants of rulers of Malwa, see Transactions of Royal Asiatic society, I 280-290, IAOS, VII, IA, XIX 315, Colbrooke’s Ms Essays, II 207-814, 482.

4 Abdul Fadl in his Aml ankhar says that Bhoja removed his capital from Ujjain to Dhāra. See Seshagirī Sastrī’s account, IA, I 819.

5 On King Munja, see para 396 supra.

6 The prediction ran thus.
temporal fortunes. The king read the verse and fell down struck with grief and when the secret was disclosed, Bhoja was brought to him. He was all repentent. He installed the prince on his throne and entered the forest as an ascetic.

Like his uncle Munja, he cultivated the arts of peace and war. Although his fights with neighboring powers, including the armies of Muhammad of Ghazni, are now forgotten, his fame as a patron of learning and man of letters remains undimmed and he has been regarded as a model king according to the Hindu standards. Works on astronomy, philosophy, architecture, grammar, medicine, trade secrets, law, and general literature, are attributed to him. A mosque at Dharā now occupies the site of the king's Sanskrit college, in a temple dedicated appropriately to Sarasvati, the goddess of learning. "The great Bhojpur lake, a beautiful sheet of water to the southeast of Bhopal, covering an area of 350 sq miles formed by masonic embankments closing the outlet in a circle of hills, was his noblest monument and continued to testify to the skill of his engineers until the 15th century when the dam was cut by order of a Mahammadan king and the water drained off. The bed of the lake is now a fertile plain intersected by the Indian Midland Railway."

The literary merits and patronage of king Bhoja have been well described by Ballāla (Vallabha) in his Bhojarājāntaka. An amusing piece of prosopoeic composition, it purports to commemorate the liberal patronage of Bhoja and introduces a number of celebrities like Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Dandin, and Māgha as interlocutors in short dialogues, in which they display their readiness of wit, briellancy of imagination and beauty of expression. It consists of two parts; the

1. The story is dramatized in the Bhojarājāntaka a piece in one-act by Kundara Viracāghava, TC, II, 3418.
2. For a complete list of his works, see OC, I, 41, II 96. See also E.D.M.G., XXVII, 67, BR (1897), XXXVII, S.K.C, 376. For all quotations from Bhoja's works in the anthologies, see F.W. Thomas, Kan., 69.
5. V. Smith, EH 898.
former describes the events showing how Bhoja succeeded to the throne of Malavas after his uncle Munja, and the latter has a series of anecdotes about Bhoja and his relations with the many poets and literary lights that thronged his Court.

There are works by the name of Bhojaprabandha by Merutunga, Rajaavallabha, Vaṭsarāja, and Subhāśīla, by Padmagupta, and anonymous poem, Bhojaprabandhasāra.

Besides are Bhojacaritra and Bhojarājāsaccariṭa, a play in two acts by Vedāntavīgīsa Bhattācārya.

1. The author is called Vallabha pandita in a Ma (DO, XXI 8166) Published with a French Translation and commentary by T Pavie in JA, IV 210 et seq., and the composition is there assigned to 18th Century A D Ward (History of Religion and Literature of the Hindus, I, 516) calls it a work of Bhoja himself which is obviously wrong. See also Hall (Vasavadatta 7), Lassen, IA, III 836, T Pavie (JAS, LXIV 185 280, LXV 855 431, LXVI 76 105), L Oster (Die Zusammensetzung des Bhojaprabandha, Darmsched), Seshaguri Sastri (On some eminent characters in Sanskrit Literature, IA, I 840), Weber, SL 215, 225 note), see also PR, IV 28, V, 566, G P Quackenbos, (Sanskrit poems of Mayura, Col Un Series, New York, 42) assigns it to 16th century following Aftrech (O Bodil 151).

"In his Bhojaprabandha, Merutunga states that in samvat 1078 when Bhoja ruled over the Malava circle, Bhima, the paramount sovereign of the Chalukya race, governed Gujarat. This cannot be the date of Bhoja's accession. According both to Merutunga and Rajaavallabha, Munja, the uncle and predecessor of Bhoja, crossed the Godavari against the counsel of his aged minister Rudraditya and invaded the dominions of Tailapa, the founder of the later Chalukya dynasty of the Dekkan. He was defeated and taken prisoner. At first he was well treated by his captor, but when secret intrigues for his release were discovered, Tailapa subjected him to indignities and put him to death. The last fact is mentioned in Tailapa's inscriptions. Now Tailapa, we know, died in 930 Saka or after 919 years of the era had elapsed. This corresponds to 998 A.D., whereas Munja must have been slain by Tailapa before that year. A Jain author named Amritagati tells us at the end of his Subhashitaratnasamohā, as was first pointed out by Colebrooke, that he wrote or compiled the work in Samvat 1050 or 994 A.D. while Munja was reigning at Dhaka. Munja therefore must have been put to death by Tailapa between 994 and 998 A.D., or about the year 996. Bhoja was crowned king after him, and since he is said to have reigned for fifty years, he must have died about 1051 A.D."
In Kaviṣamayavlāṣa Revana Ārādhya, the great Vīra Śaiva teacher, who lived about the 10th century A.D., relates humorous stories about poets in Bhoja’s assembly.

Among poetic works said to have been composed by Bhoja, are an Ākhyāyikā Śṛṅgāramanjarī and a poem Vidyāvānoda, a stotra Sivādāṭṭha and a commentary on Sivāotra called Śivatavaramakālīka. Subhāvīta is an anthology Sangītāprakāsa and Śṛṅgāraprakāsa, treatises on music and rhetoric, will be noticed later on.

516 Bhoja’s Ramayana Campu is a very popular work in poetic literature. It embraces the exquisite story of Rāmaṇya and the composition with the blended melody of prose and verse in it has the charm of royalty in it. It is now acknowledged generally that Bhoja’s work extended only to the Kīṣkindhākāndā and that there it was left incomplete, unless the rest of it has been lost. The story of the Yuddhakāndā was made up by Lakṣmanapakāvī later on.

Is this campū the work of king Bhoja of Dhāra? The colophons to manuscripts call the author Vidarbhārāṇa and do not mention the name.

---

1 Mīs, 249
2 These works are mentioned in the introductory portion of Yuktikalpasu
3 The Ms. is preserved in the Jessalmeer Library. See para 451 supra
4 Ed. Bombay and Madras
5 There is no truth in the story that the work was composed jointly by Bhoja and Kālidāsa, unless it can be imagined that Pādmagṛpta alias Pārdmala Kālidāsa had any hand in it.
6 DC, XXI 8907. So says Lakṣmanapakāvī. And Venkatādhvarīn says in his Uṭtaraçampu

71 verses are mentioned in the introductory portion of Yuktikalpasu
72 The Ms. is preserved in the Jessalmeer Library. See para 451 supra
4 Ed. Bombay and Madras
5 There is no truth in the story that the work was composed jointly by Bhoja and Kālidāsa, unless it can be imagined that Pādmagṛpta alias Pārdmala Kālidāsa had any hand in it.
6 DC, XXI 8907. So says Lakṣmanapakāvī. And Venkatādhvarīn says in his Uṭtaraçampu Rāmaṇya,

and Venkatakrṣṇapakāvī in his Uṭtaraçampu Rāmaṇya, Rāmaṇaçānaçान

7 Tanj. VII. 8120 et seq.

56
Bhoja. In the manuscripts of Sarasvatikanthabharama &c. admittedly a work of king Bhoja of Dhara, the name is so mentioned in the colophon Dhara is in Malwa and Vidarbha is Berar. There is therefore the geographical difficulty against the identification. But tradition has associated it in the Bhoja of Malwa and how, if at all, any such confusion has come in, it is not now possible to answer.

517 Laksmana was the son of Gangadhara, and Gangambikā and lived in Sanagara village probably in the Circars. He wrote also the Bharatacampūtilaka, on the story of the Mahābhārata. It is said Anantabhātta criticised this work and himself wrote a Rāmāyana-campū.

Laksmana's father Gangadhara wrote a campū Madrakanyāparṇaya and Gangadhara's father Daśatrey wrote Daśatreyacampū.

518. Besides Laksmana, this work of supplementing the missing story of the Yuddhakanda was done by Rājacudāmānī Dikuta, by Ghanasyāma and by Ekāmranātha.

1. इति श्रीसामहाराजाविराज श्री मोजदेवविरिष्टे सरस्वतीकान्तलांसिरे।
2. इति श्रीसामहाराजाविराज श्री मोजदेवविरिष्टे श्रीकान्तकान्ति।

(TC, IV 4879), Ta y, IX 4099, also Ekāmranātha (TC, IV 4885), Rāmānuja (ibid 5180) Likewise see for other works of his, (TC, IV 4881). Karunākara in his commentary (TC, IV 5459) says that Bhoja wrote this campū to illustrate his views on grammar contained in his Sarvasvatikanthabhārama (TC, IV 4881) But as he couples the name of Bhoja and Kalidāsa, his ideas appear unreliable.

3. For instance, Ghanasyāma (Tan VII 3149) says

4. On several Bhojas, see R. Mitra, JAB, XXXII 98, Weber, IL, 201 note, IST, I 312, Lassen, IAE, III.

5. Laksmapati, in his Kṛṣṇapilasacampu describes the birth of God Višnu kṛṣṇa in Gingee (S. Arcot Dist.) to confer wealth on Kṛṣṇarāja king of that place. He was the son of Rāmānuja (DC, XXI, 8191). There is another work of the same name by Narenuma, son of Anantakāryapya of Ātreyagotra in 18 cantos on the story of Bhāgavata with an anonymous commentary (DC, XXI 8198).

6. DC, XXI 9263.
7. Mys 287, DC, XXII 8285.
8. DC, XXI 8285.
10. NR, III, No 1881.
11. DC, XXI No 9266.
519 There are commentaries on Bhojacampū by Nārāyaṇa, Rāmaṇendra, Kāmeśvara, Mānaveda, Ghanasyāma and one anonymous.

520 The sequel to this work embraces the Uttarakānda of the Rāmāyaṇa.

There are other Uttaracampūs by Śatrīja, Śankarācārya, Harharānanda, by Venkatādhvāra, by Garalapūrī Sastrī, and by Rāghavācārya. They narrate the story of the abandonment of Sītā, the birth of Kusa and Lava, the reappearance of Sītā and the return of Rāma to his divine abode.

Rāghavacārya was the son of Venkatārya and Srīsālāmba of Śrīvaṭṣagotra. He lived at Trivallore, Chenglepat District and was a follower of Rāmānuja. He was probably also the author of the Bhadracala campū, composed at the instance of a local magnate Sundaresa.

1. DO, XXI, 8212 Nārāyaṇa was the son of Nagevarā and disciple of Gopālenārāsasavāṭa. He was the tenth in descent from Mallinātha of Kolacala family and must have therefore lived about the end of the 15th century. He says in prefatory verses that Mallinātha was honored by King Viśarṇa of Varrangal and his grandson Peḍābhattā (Commentator on Naṣada etc.) was bathed in gold by King Sarvagnā (Sunga). At the invitation of King Pratāpa-pratāpavāya of Vijayāner (1414-1446) A D Mallinātha wrote Vaiśvamāsanaḥpānava. Mys, Arch, Rep. (1927), 96. Peḍābhattā's son Kumāramśāmin wrote a commentary on the Pratāpa-pratāpavāya-bhugana. See para 31 supra.

2. DO, XXI, 8218 and TC, II, 1995, 1456 Rāmaṇendra was the son of Kondapandita of Śundilyagotra. He has also commented on Kṛṣṇa-purāṇa (see para 238 supra).

3. TC, II, 2872; III, 8739 Kāmeśvara was the son of Gangādhara of Kōda-martī family, and disciple of Viśvāvara, probably of the Chitras.

4. TC, III, 4020 See para 176 supra.

5. DO, XXI, 8191.

6. HR, III, No 2170.

7. Printed, Mysore. DO, XVI, 8180.

8. NW, 302.

9. NW, 292.

10. NW, 270.

11. Printed, Mysore.

12. Printed, Mysore. His son Kaṇḍyāḷa Aṇyāṭṭha is now living in Mysore.

13. BCE, 248.

14. DO, XXI, 8184.

15. Rāghava of Vindhyamurti family, and author of Śrīgāraṇḍapakabhāṣa was a native of Conjeevaram and was a different person. See DO, XXI, 8284.

16. See DO, XXI, 8282. It describes the importance of Bhadracala, the story of the well-known story of Ramaḍaṇa in the Andhra Country.
521 Abhinavakalidasa (of Vellala family, apparently of the Andhra country) has not left us his real name. His pupil Kavikunjara in his Ràjasekharaacarita mentions him as a poet of the Court of a South Indian King Ràjasekharasa whose capital Vidyànagara was on the Pennakini (north Pennar). Ràjasekharasa’s queen was Bhavání and his contemporaries were Rajendra Cola (1004-1016 or 1016-1064 A.D.) and Vâyayaràma Pândya. If Rajendra Cola flourished in the 11th century A.D. Ràjasekharasa must have also lived about that time. This Abhinava-kalidása wrote Bhágavatàcampa, Abhinavabhàratacampa, Bhagavatà- pàdasaptàti and Kaññidambana.

Thus he begins Bhágavatàcampa:

\[
\text{It is doubtful whether the poet was identical with Krûpamûrţi, son of Sarvasàstrin of Vâsîsthagotra who calls himself Abhinava-Kalidása and wrote the poem Yakṣollása and the bhâga Madanabhûyada.}
\]

522 Padmaraja was a Niyogí Brahmin of the Avasàrâla family of which it is said he was the progenitor. He was the minister to Nîlänî Rao, Chief of Putâpuram (Godavari District) who ruled about 1800 A.D. He is also known as Ambhoja or Varjàdhika Bhoja.

---

1. See JMY, XI, 77.
2. Printed, Bombay. The commentator Akkayásuri of Mokşguna family calls the poet as of the Vellala family (DC, XXI 8282.)
3. Race, 246.
4. This in praise of Śankarācârya.
5. Or. Ms. Library, Madras.
6. See para 819 supra. TC, II 2066.
7. TC, II 2073.
8. Avançhi Râmaśrástra belonging to the family of Padmaraja and wrote commentaries on Bhágavatàcampa, Krûpamahaśyâ and Bhíçarà. He died about 1900 A.D. Râmakâva the commentator also wrote Râmabhûyadayacampa and Sâhiṣṭyasâstra. His brother’s grandson Subbaramiyasâtri died 12 years ago and wrote Râvuvamamuktaival.
His Balabhāgavaṭa, a campa in six cantos, is an exquisite piece of poetry, relieved by flowing lines of prose with a tendency to alliteration which makes the composition musical.

There are commentaries on it by Rāmasvāmi, son of Venkatakṛṣṇa-sūrī and grandson of Rāmanāthasvāmi of Devulapalli family and of Kaundinyagotra and by Rāghavācārya.

Dharmasudhī mentions a work of his, as Balabhāgavatam.

523 There was an Abinavakālidāsa Gopālasastri in the Court of Yuvarāja, a king of Udayarpalayam, 6th ancestor to the present Zamindar He wrote a Bhagavatacampū. Once displeased by having been given a last rank in a levee he wrote this verse:

Other poets bearing this name are, Nṛsimhakavi, author of Nandarajayasaḥobhūṣanta, Madhava, author of Sanksepa-Sāṅkaravijaya and Kāhyugakālidāsa, author of Śṛṅgārasekhārabhāṇa or Śṛṅgārakosabhāṇa.
of Kasyapagotra² Srikantha son of the latter wrote Kandarpadarpamartha. They lived at Kanci and were devotees of Sri EkaMranaatha there³.

524 Somasekhara or Rajasekhara of Kolli family lived at Perur, Godavari District and belonged to a family of physicians. He was grandson of Nariyana great in Minamsa. He was honoured by Peshwa Madhava Rao (1760-1772 A.D.) To vie with Sahityaratnamakara of Dharmasudha, he wrote his Sahityakalpadruma⁴. His Bhagavatamul relates the story of Krishna⁵.

Bhagavatamul of Rajanatha⁶ and of Cidambara⁷ have been noticed elsewhere.

525 Kavikunjara, pupil of Abhinvā-Kālidāsa, wrote Rajasekhara Pancita. It is a work like Bhojabandha. Generally inculcating morals it collects stories said to have been narrated by Rajasekhara, a pupil of Abhinvā-Kālidāsa to his friend Subuddhi quoting fine verses of Navina-Kālidāsa and other poets of King Rajasekhara's Court⁸.

अक्ष खड़ मशतमादित्रकविहितालये संक्रवतेवत्ती विविधतिविश्वविश्वसत्यतिचित्त-रत्नकालिकेऽक मायादुर राजसेकेछोरे नाम। तस्य खड़ वालिमिन हुयादर्मिनांवर्धनामा कृतविशेष हुयानितृपुष्य लम्बन हरिश्चेत्रमणवादीत।

हुयानितृपुष्यासादोवरिन्दुम विचारहृद्।
परिप्रेय भाषा में सलाया रसिकेशेहर ||
तडेतद्द्यमचक्काक्रमेऽर रसिकेशेहर प्रलवादीत। रिविव खड़के यदि तव हुयानितृ-शृङ्गा, तरिह।
राजसेकेछासुवर्मा समार्थ सचुरा गिर।
नवीनकालिसादवागदिता शोभुमहीति ||

इदमक्रमेऽ हुयानितृपुष्य वादीत।

* * * * *

1 TC, I 989, III 3891
2 HR, III No 1683 Tanj, VIII 2375. He refers to his father as Kahyuga Kālidāsa
3 Ed. in part, Amalapur TC, III 3839. There is another anonymous work of that name, Būk, 297
4 TC, III 8145 Introduction gives author's genealogy
5 DC, XXI 8256 The name is differently given in different manuscripts Rāmahadra and Raghunathā (see Tanj, VII 3035 8).
6 DC, XXI, 8258, Tanj, VII. 8092
7 DC, XXI 8167, JMy, XI. 76 79
Among the poets that appear in the course of the narrative are many Durjaya, Sūkṣmamati (palmist), Sāranga, Daivagnavallabha (astrologer), Soma, Kāmalī (poetess), Kāśīpaṭi, Śānanda Ratnākara (of Srīranga), Kutumbakavi (of Madhurā), Lokānanda, Sūkṣṭāgara, Madhurāṅgī and Lāhāṅgī (of Malva), Vimalāṅgī, Kanakavallī, Cātucaṅkavartī Ṛippāvadhānī, Kavirāja, Kuppa and Lingabhatta (of Kanči), Sanṭāna of Kunṭala, Suka, Vasanṭa, Lilākara, Kāntīsindhu, Sunanda, Lakṣmidhara, Bādhavya.

"Like the Bhojacharitra the Rajasekharacharitra also wholly consists of verses composed in various meters in praise of the king by local and foreign poets named above. Apart from these poetical flights describing the fame of the king's generosity and bravery there are no other incidents of the king's life noticed in this Chantra. There is, however, one interesting incident which deserves to be mentioned here, as narrated in this work —

After his arrival at Vidyanagara, Durjaya, a poet of the Chola country, seems to have succeeded in winning the favour of Rajasekhar and becoming the leader of the poets at his court, so much so that no poet would find access to the court without Durjaya's introduction. When finding it hard to get access to Rajasekhara's court through Durjaya, Saranga, Somaka, and other foreign poets left the country for good, some poets headed by Navnī Kalidasā formed a plot to bring disgrace to Durjaya and get him banished from the Court of Rajasekhar. They went in a body to Durjaya and requested him to introduce them to the king as poets worthy of hearing. When asked by Durjaya what they studied, Kalidasā said that they all studied three cantos of Raghuvamsa and four Sāndhis in the Prakṛiyakaumudī. As to their poetical skill, Kalidasā sang the following verse —

**śrutam bāhyavāya śrīṣṭa-kṛṣṇapalabhvato
rajasibhāv tē kārtī puṇa kārkupārādhvato** ||
"Like a white thing, like the bird, like white leprosy, like hen's egg, O! Rājasekhara, thy fame is also like the faces of a crow"

Then Śṛṅgarasekhara sang

सक्रांकनविषय रक्तशिरसिरिच्छृंगवत् ||
प्रतापतपने माति राजेश्वर भूषते ||

"Like the hip of a monkey and like the powder of a red litter thy valour shines, O king Rājasekhara"

Then pretending to be pleased with the poetical flight of the poets under disguise, Durjaya took them to the king and introduced them as types of poets that then generally laid claim to the gift of poetical talent. In reply to the question put by the king about their country and learning Navma Kalidasa said —

"We have been under the patronage of that famous king who is known by the name Puniyakoti, devoted to the performance of Vedic rites, learned in the Mīmāṃsāa Sāstra, a generous patron of learning and now under your protective care. Having heard of your generosity towards learned men and having taken the permission of our patron, we are come here O king Rājasekhara to seek your protection. I am called Navma Kalidasa. The others are Śṛṅgarasekhara, Mandara Lalitalapa, Srikama, Kamalakara, Gunakara, Raiḥamsa, Snidhara and Kavisekhara. As to our learning, we are all capable of composing a drama or a poetical work of the type of the epics in a day, and are well versed in the two Mīmāṃsāa Sāstras, the Sāṅkhya of Kapila, the grammar of Patanjali and also Astronomy and Astrology."

Then pleased with the account of the poets, the king asked Durjaya to read the verses of the poets in the paper which he held in his hand. Accordingly he read the verses ‘suklavat’, etc. mentioned above. When wondering at the difference in tone between what he heard and saw from Navma Kalidasa’s poetical narration and the verses attributed to the poets as read by Durjaya the king turned his eyes towards Kalidasa. The latter said that but for those wretched verses they would have found no access to the king, and Durjaya was so jealous of other poets that he had no scruples to misrepresent them to the king, he misrepresented both Arman and Saranga as poets whose verses would spell untold misery on their own patron and thus got them out of Rājasekhara’s court, and he succeeded in getting rid of Somaka also for the latter’s guilt of association with prostitutes. Then
Rajasekhara was enraged at Durjaya's bad conduct and banished him from his court.

526 Anantabhata is according to tradition a rival of Abhinava Kālidāsa, who wrote Bhāgavatacampū. To vie with his work, Ananta composed a Bhāgavatācampū himself and Bhāratacampū. The latter was quoted freely by Nārāyana Bhattātri of Malabar in his Prabandhas and was commented on by Mānaveḍa Nārāyana and Mānaveḍa flourished in the 16th and 17th century. Ananta must have lived not later than the 15th century and if Abhinava Kālidāsa, lived in the 11th century Ananta must have also lived in the 11th century A.D.

Bhāratacampū has been held on high esteem Ananta is rightly proud of his poetry.

Thus he begins

```
शरदिन्द्रबिकासमन्दवस  सुरादिन्द्रवर्णोचनापारामप ।
अरविन्दसमानस्नद्रायामकविताकतनवर्तीपाते ॥
कल्याणेऽति विषयति कर्तमनुनितकोमलासाखि
प्रभुदोषोहुनणकोलामहारितविनायकवान्तराहर ॥
पत वेंद्रवर तदात्मरितकन्यातुमयोह-
द्राताकुराणिनिनिविनुष्टपण । बृसूपुरसुनष्ट ॥
```

and thus he ends

```
राजा मौधियप्रमरा  चरणयो  पाणी प्रतालयिक
इदिर  राजनयोद्य हि द्रुपा सप्त रसाहारे ।
बाहों तामरलेहन बुधमाता तले किरीत गुदा
कुज्जू बुधमुखवर्णिमस गो पायति स्म प्रगा ॥
```

1 CASB, 62, There is a commentary by Nārāyana
2 See para 174-6 supra.
3. Ananta, author of Saktiyalapavali (OC, I 18), Ananta, author of glos on Candraloka (1685 A.D OC, I 19), Ananta, author of Kamākṣamhā (KO, 396; PR, III 866) are different authors.
4. Printed Madras and Bombay. Here are verses in his praise.

```
उन्मीत्रकुरकुटकोर्मवेंरापूर्वायुनुदयादिदिनिसवानप ।
आयारायुर्याप्रावतामृतोक्तिममारामननंविष्णुकदिदी ॥
```

```
विनिर्दारसुनिर्दारसनिर्दारसविनुपपुर ।
आपूर्तिकृत सरस्वती आपूर्तिकृत सुनारतम ॥
```
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There are commentaries on Campu-Bhārata by (i) Kuravi Rāmalinga, son of Tīrumalāroya of Ātreya gotra (ii) Mallūdi Lakṣmaṇa-swāmin, (iii) Nārāyanaswāmin, (iv) Kumāraṭātārya, (v) Narasimhācārya and (vi) one anonymous.

There are other works on the same theme Bhāratacampūtilaka by Lakṣmana, Mānavedacampūbhārata by Mānaveda, Bharatacaritā of Bhāgavata Kṛṣṇasarmā, Abhinavabhārata by Śrīkantha and Candrasekharā.

527 Cidambara was the son of Anantanārāyaṇa and grandson of Sūryanārāyaṇa. He was patronized by King Venkata I (1586-1614) of Vīzianagar. His Pancakalyāṇacampū and Rāgahavayādavapāṇḍavīya (Kaṭhāṭrayi) have been noticed elsewhere. Bhāgavatacampū relates the story of Bhāgavata by itself. Sabdārthacintāmaṇi narrates the story of Rāmāyana and Bhāgavata at a time. Cidambaravilāsakāvya in 5 cantos describes the tales of Lord Natarāja of Cidambaram. Steṣacintāmaṇi, a small poem, displays his skill in paranomasia.

His pupil Śrīkantha alia Nanjunda, son of Śāmayārya of Ātreya gotra wrote Maḍanamahotsavabhāṇa, staged at the festival at Bālavīghrapuri (Srupulyur).

528 Mitramisra, the author of Viramiḍrodaya, wrote Ananda kandacampū, on the early life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He was a Sannādhya.

---

1 IC, 1528
2 He was a grantee under King Peda Venkata of Penugonda in TC, II. 1097,
3 DC, XXI 8202 1683 A D
4 DC, XXI 8202
5 TC, III 8582, DC, XXI 8204
6 Tamy, VII 8105-15, TC, I 96, DC, XXI 8203. He lived at Kumbakonam.
7 Opp, II. 5240.
8 DC, XXI 8693. He is the same as the author of Yudhakīśaṇa sequel to Bhūracampū
9 TC, II. 2356, DC, XXI 8167 There is a commentary on it, TC, II 2595
10 In TC, III. 8897 there is a Campusankṣeṇa, a summary in verse See para 176 supra
11 Pratīcā, Madras
12 Mys 283
13 See para 93 supra
14 DC, XXI. 8258
15 Tanj VI 2840
16 Ibid VI 2742
17 Ibid VI. 2848
18 DO, XXI 8442
Brahmin and belonged to the Pancha Gauda class. His patron Raja Virasimhaḍev of Orccha ruled in 1605-1627 A.D. and was probably identical with Bir Singh Deo, who is said to have killed Abul Fazal, the scholar of Emperor Akbar.

529 Venkatadhvarin or Venkatācārya was the son of Raghunātha and Sitāmā of the Ātreyagotra. His grand-father Śrīnivāsa known as Appayaguru was the nephew of the great Tatācharya (Pancamatabhanjana Tatācārya) of Conjeevaram, a contemporary of Appayadikṣita. He was a descendant of Pranatārāhara, a disciple of Rāmānuja. The famous Vādhamśāmbara, the teacher of Vedāntaśesaka, was his ancestor too. Venkatādhvarin was born at Arasānipālai near Conjeevaram (Kānci) and lived in Conjeevaram. He was a staunch follower Vedāntaśesaka. His literary activity was coeval with that of Nīlakantha, who lived in the latter half of the 17th century. He was well-versed in all sciences and had a good mistrust for poetry. He was for some time the chief Pandit at the Court of Pralayakāveri. His versatile learning is manifest from the various species of his compositions.

His famous work is Visvagunadarsanam. It is a prosop-poetic composition. Two Gandharvas Visvāvasu and Kṛṣṇa are supposed to take a birdseye view of the countries in their aerial car, the former generous in appreciation of merits, the latter ever censorious. This work was intended to expose the faults of the manners and customs of his time.

Thus it begins:

श्रीराजेविकृत्वम् स्थलगीतसङ्गमार्थत्वार्थत्वन्यलोकः
हीलान्तटिश्यतन्त्री मधुरमक्कः नामिभिः गृहरे ।
अद्वैतकेतुमात्रा द्वियुक्तस्विकृतिशोरानवेष्यमार्या
श्रुद्धामात्रेण दिव्य पय इति विवेचः श्रुद्धामाना पुनातु ॥

* * * * *

1 Princed Sarasvati Bhavan Series, Benares
2 Śrīnivāsa's second son Varaḍa is the author of bhāsa Anangajīvana and a poem Kṛṣṇābhuyāya (DC, XXI. 3842)
3 Ed Bombay. Tr. in English in part, Sahādāya
4. See para 212 supra. This Tatāṭesika lived in 1509-1591 A.D. He adopted his brother's son who is now familiarly known as Kottukayakāḍam Tatācārya (1573—1682 A.D.)
5. In Saddarśana-suḍarśana (To. IV. 5497) the poet's criticisms on Thengalal Vaiṣṇava sect are vindicated
and thus it ends


It is said that in consequence of such censure on the world around
him, he lost his sight and his praises of Lakṣīmi and Viṣṇu in a
thousand verses called Lakṣmisahasram and Śrīnivāsasahasram cured
him. In these poems, the author has excelled in the display of verbal
ingenuity and poetic imagery.

There are commentaries on Viṣvagunadāra by Kuravi Rāma, a
writer of the 19th century who was patronised by the Zamindar of
Karvetnagar, by Prabhākara, son of Lakṣmidhara.

Venkatādhvani's works are many. Yādava-Rāghavīyam, which
relates the story of Rāma and Krṣṇa, at a time, by reading the verses in
their natural and reverse order Uttaracāṇṭā relates the tale of the
banishment of Sita and the birth of Kusa and Lava and was meant to
be sequel to the Rāmāyanacampū of Bhoja. Varadābhyudaya or
Haṣṭagīncampū describes the greatness and religious glory of the
shrine of Devarāja at Kānci. Ācāryapancāsa at is a short panegyric of
Vedāntādesika Śravanānanda is a collection of verses on various topics
and displays much originality. Subhāṣita-Kaustubha is an anthology

---

1 Ed in Telugu (Karvetnagar, 1890) with the commentary by Kaustika
Gopālacārya of Śrīperumbudur. There is also a commentary called Surabhi by
Vireśwarasamy, son of Venkataramy of Devarakonda family TC, III 8048
2. This work is not now traceable
3. His descendant Challaya Sastri was living in 1895 at Inamenamullur in North
Aroor District. He also commented on Campūbhāṣa, Daḷaruṇa and Kuvalayāṇanda.
He wrote other works in Telugu See HR, I (1895) xi
4. TC, IV 4696. The manuscript was completed in Śaka 1817
5. See para 90 supra DC, XX, 7968, with commentary on it DC, XX 7987
6. DC, XXI 8180. Printed in Telugu (Bangalore) with a commentary by
Ṭirumalaśārya, Pandit, Maharajah's College, Mysore
7. DC, XXI, 8281, ND Mysore, 1908 with a commentary by Cakravartī
Ayyangar of Nallāncakravartī family
8. DC, XIX, 7267.
9. Printed, Ji of Mysore Sans College
10. DC, XX 8056
in five chapters, describing the character of ignorance, vice, virtue etc Pradyumnaṇanda is a drama in six Acts and describes the marriage of Pradyumna with Raṣi born as the daughter of the demon Śambara Śṛṅgaradīpikā is a Bhana Subhadraṇāyaṇa is a play of which two acts only are found now at Arasāndalai

530 The device of description planned in Visvaṅgūṇādārṣaṇam has been adopted in some later works Taṭaṅgūṇādārṣaṇa describes the comparative merits of the tenets of Saivism and Vaishnavism in the form of a dialogue between Jaya and Viśaja. The author Annayāraya was the son of Śrīnivāsa Śrītārya of the Śrīśaila family. He was the brother of Śrīnīvāsacārya, the author of Ītramārtāṇda and Yānasādarpaṇa and Pandit of the Court of King Venkata, son of Rāghava of the Kosāla race.

531 Dattatreya Sastra was son of Vāṣudeva and Ambikā. His grandfather was the famous Jānārdana Nigudakara. He lived in the village of Pangrada in Konkana in 1863-1918. In 1891, he was made Principal of Sanskrit College at Rajpur. He bore the title Vidyāraṇa. Besides a poem Raghuvamsasāra, and glosses on Janakhārana, Buddhacarita and Ratnāvali and a play Rukminīharana, he wrote a campū Gangāguṇādārṣa. There on the plan of Visvaṅgūṇādārṣa, demerits and merits of the Ganges are espoused in a dialogue by two Gandharvas, Hāhā and Hūḥū and the greatness of Gangā finally asserted.

532 Rāghavacarīya was the son of Śrīnīvāsacārya and grand grandson of Venkatācārya of Śrīvatsa-gotra. He was a disciple of Ranganātha, apparently a head of the Ahobilam Mutt. The poem teems with alliteration. In Vaikunthāvijayacampū it gives a description of the various shrines visited by Jaya and Viṣaja in the course of a pilgrimage.

533 Nilakantha, was the son of Rāma-bhatta of Kaundinya gotra and a disciple of one who bore the title of Danṭidroṭi-dvāpradīpī. In his Kaśikāṭilakam, two Gandharvas are sent out by

1 DC, XXI 8422 This was composed in the year Prajaṅpaṭṭi which is likely equal to 1671 A.D.
2 DC, XXI 8293 There is a commentary on it by the author himself (Ibid 8226).
3. Printed Bombay
4 DC, XXI 8298
5 TC, III 2768.
Kubera in search of Śiva, who had, as Nārada informed him, gone to Avanukṭapuram, and in the guise of mortals, they visit various sacred shrines, which they describe as they go

534 SAMARPUNGAṆA Ḍikṣāta who was the son of Venkatesa of Vadhulagotra and brother of Suryanārāyaṇa and Dharma. He lived at Tiruvalangadu in North Arcot District, Madras, about the middle of the 17th century. His Tīrṭhayāṭrāprabandham describes the holiness of several sacred shrines and waters visited in the course of a pilgrimage.

535 VENKATAKAVI was the son of Virarāghava of Bālasayana or Ilampalli family and lived at Gīnjee in South Arcot District. He salutes Vedāntadesika and was therefore of the Śrī Vaiṣṇava sect. In Vibhūḍhānandaprabandham he describes various sacred shrines of India visited by two persons Bālapriya and Priyamvada in the course of their journey to Badarikāśrama to attend the marriage there of Śilāvati and Makaranda, son of Kandarpa, king of a place called Kamalmi. The story is a fiction and is narrated in a conversation between two parrots.

536 In Srutakīrtivilāsa-campū SURYANARAYANA of Bhāradvāja-gotra describes the several places visited by a Brahmin Srutakīrti, a native of Vīṁcippūram near Nellore.

537. RAMACANDRA was the son of Kesava and fifth in descent from Raṭnakheta Śīruvasa must have therefore lived the latter half of the 17th century A.D. His Keralabharanam describes the merits and demerits of various countries and their usages in a dialogue of two spies Milinda and Makaranda who were sent out on a tour of inspection, in the course of a debate between Vasistha and Visvāmiṭra in the Council of Indra.

538 SANKARA DISKITA, son of Bālakṛṣṇa of Bhāradvājagotra, was a poet of the Court of King Sabhaśimha of Bundlekand. He died.

---
1 DC, XXI, 8226
2 DC, XXI, 8385
3 DC, XXI, 8598
4 Tāpy, VII 8095 Raṭnakheta had three sons Kesava, Arṇānārāyaṇa and Raṇāudāmaṇi. Kesava's son was Paṭanjali, his son was Kesava, and Kesava's son was Raṇacandra.
5 On Raṭnakheta, see para 151 supra.
Besides the play Pradyumnavijaya, he wrote Gāṅgāvatāracampū on the story of the Ganges and Sankaracetovilāsa, a campū on the life of Maharāja Cetāsimha (Cheytsmgh) who was a magnate of Benares in 1770-1781 A D in the time of Governor-General Warren Hastings.

539 Sonthi Bhadradrī Ramastrāry (1856-1915) was a Velanātī Vaidikī Brahmin of Prithāpur in Cōdvāvari District. He was the son of Gāṅgārāmaya of Gauṭamagotra. A great Sanskrit Scholar and poet, he adorned the Courts of the Zamīndars of Urumī and Lakkavaram. Besides Muktāvahī a drama and Śrīrāmavijaya, a poem, his Sāmbarāsuravijaya, a Campū, is a favourite of pandits as a work of literary art.

540 In Jayarama’s Rādhāmadhavavilāsacampū, the loves of Rāmā and Kṛṣṇa are depicted and in the latter the court life of Sahaṇ Bhosle.

541 On Ramayana Campūrāghava of Āsūrī Anantācārya (Printed, Bezwada composed, in 1868 A D) with the commentary of Āsūrī Venkatanararāśιbhacārya, Rāmayaṇacampū by Sundaravalli, daughter of N. Narasimha Ayyangar, Mysore (Printed, Bangalore composed in 1916 A D), Campūrāmayaṇa of Āyuvīvalla Śrīrāmāśīfrīn of Kākaraparti, Kṛṣṇa District (Printed, Madras), Amogharāghava by Divākara, son of Visvesvara (TC, V 6365).
Raghunāthavijaya by Kṛṣṇa Kavi (Printed, Bombay), Rāmacaryāmṛta by Ṛṣya, Bhagavati (Printed, Mysore), Kusalavacampū by Venkaya Sudhi (Mys 264), Rāmakathāsudhoḍaya by Śrīnivāsa (Ibid 269), Rāmābhiseka by Devarājādesika (Ibid 269 TC, II 21), Śrīvijaya by Ghanāvata (Ibid 272), Rāmacandrācampū (i) by Rāmacandra, son of Patañjali and great-grandson of Ratnakhetra (HR, II vii) and (ii) by Visvanātha [Mitra 1870], Rāmābhuvaduya by Rāma, (TC, II 1818) of Devulapalli

Kākunsthavijaya by Valiśahāya of Vādhūlagotra (JO, 1539), Sīṭhacampū of Gunda Rāmasvāmi Sāstrī of Agastyagotra, Mārutivijaya of Raghunātha (Tanj VII 3115), Hanumadapadana (TC, IV 4397), Anjaneyavrjaya by Nīlsimha (Mys 261) Lakṣmanābbharanīya (Opp II 3361)

Uttarakānda of Rāghava of Śrīvatsagotra (Mys Arch Rep 1918), Rāmacampū of Bandlamudi Rāmasvāmi (Printed, Madras), Uttarakampū (i) of Brahmapandita, (ii) of Rāghavabhata, and (iii) of Bhāgavanja (Tanj VII 3031), Rāmābhiseka of Devarāja, son of Padmanātha (TC, II 2127, Mys 269), Abhinava-Rāmāyaṇa by Laksmīna Daṇḍa composed in Sāka 1789 (Bhandarkar's list, 1893, Part I), Rāmāyaṇa of Rāmānuja of Vādhūlagotra (DC, XXI 5504)

542 On Bhagavata Bhagavataśacampū of Rāmabhadrā (Tanj VII 308), Kṛṣṇacampū (i) of Śrīvasudhi, and (ii) of Paraśurāma (Gough, 106), Ānandadhāmodara of Bhuvanesvara (CASP, 23), Vāsudevanāḍini of Gopālakṛṣṇa (CC, I 161), Praṇayimādhava by Mādhavabhata (Bhandarkar's List (1893), I 110), Mukunḍacārīṇa by Śrīnivāsa (Mys 268), Kṛṣṇānandakanda by Mitramitra (CC, I 258), Ānandabundavana (i) by Paramāṇanāḍaśā (Printed, Benares) (ii) by Kavkaṇnapūra (See para 223, Supra), (iii) by Kesava (NW, X 16) and (iv) by Mādhavananda (Oudh, XXI 92), Bālakṛṣṇacampū by Jivanaśarma (Printed, Bombay), Mādhavacampū by Ciraṇīva and Mandaramanda by Śrīkṛṣṇa (Printed, Bombay), Śrīkṛṣṇacampū (Mys 271), Gopālacampū (i) by Jivara (CC, I 161), (ii) by Kisoravilāsa

1 He died at Velangi near Coonams in 1918-19 He also wrote a play
2 Uṣānapāṇīya
3 He also wrote Kuṭṭāṭrīnīyacampū and Aṣṭamānjarī (CASP, 28 )
4 He completed in Durmaṇ year.
5 The manuscript is with P V Subramanya Sastri, Rajale, Godavari Dt
6 Among his other works there noted are Aṃbādvīṣaṭ, Āryāvargaṇamālikā, Kumārakṛṣṇamṛta, Subhāgāyalahari, Pancadasavarnanālikā and other stāvas,
7 He also wrote Viṣvanomāṣṭarangīṇī (Printed, Calcutta)
543 On Mahabharata Bakavadha (TC, III 0411), Kumārābhuyadaya (TC, III 3521), Subhadraharana (TC, III 3422), Pancendramālīya (TC, III 2340) on the marriage of Draupadī, Kumārāvijaya by Bhāskara, son of Sivasūrya (TC, IV 5818), Kumārodaya (TC, IV 5894), Nayandarsana (Trav 80)

544 On Puranas Vallipannaya of Yajnasubrahmanyam (Printed, Madras), Padmāvatipannaya of Śrīsaila (Printed, Karvetnagar), Madrakanyāpennaya of Gangādhara (Mys 267, DC, XXI 8263), Rukmini-pannaya by Ammal (Mys 270) and by Venkatācārya of Praṇavadhhyankara family (TC, II 3599), Parvatipannaya by Rāmesvara of Kandukūri family (TC, III 4138), Saṭṭaṭṭipannaya by Kṣṇadāsa Gangaya, son of Rāmesvara of Saunakagotra (TC, III 2732)

Kalyāṇavallīkālīyāṇa by Rāmānuja of Vāḍhulagotra (see DC, XXI 8275), Usāparṇaṇaya (DC, XXI 8185), Kalyāṇacampū by Pāpaya-rādhya and Gauripannaya by Pinnavenkataśīrī on Parvati's wedding (TC, V 6575, III 3083); Minākṣipannaya by Ādmārāyana (Mys 267); Rukminīvallabhapannaya by Nṛṣīmatā (Ibid 170), Pāncālīswayamvara (DC, XXI 826), Minākṣikālīyāṇa by Kandukūri Nāganātha of Maḍura (DC, XXI 8270), Padmāvatipannaya by Śrīsaila (Printed Karvetnagar), Damayantīpārṇaṇa (TC, V 6415), Godāpanṇaṇa by Vedādināṭha (DC, XXI 8196)

Ṭrīpuravaiṣyaya (i) by Aṭṭāṭrārayavan and (ii) by Nṛṣimha (Ṭanī, VII 3044-6), Karṇānanda by Kṛṣṇadāsa (Ulwar, 1552), Kalākamudī by Cakrapāṇi (CC, I 777), Kāvyakalāpāṇa by Mahānandadhirā, Kumāra-

1 The author's great-grandfather wrote a commentary on Naiṣadha of which manuscript is dated 1884 AD
2 He was patronised by Amarendra Sobhanāgirī, Zamīndar of Nuzvid
3 About Āndāl of Śrīvilliputtur (Śrīvahnuvayapuri) For a play on the same theme, see DC, XXI 8999
4 See para 1 65 supra For Ṭrīpurāṭāhanacampū, see Ṭanī, VII, 8048
5 See para 154 supra,

Nṛpsimhacampū by (i) Bhattachārava, son of Anañṭa of Laugakṣa family of Punyaśṭamba on the Godāvāri (*Printed Bombay, Tany*, VII, 3079, (u) by Daṇḍayuna Śūrya (*Tany*, VII 3073, see para 96 supra), (ui) by Sankarāṇa (*Tany*, VII 3076), Śambarāṣuravījaya by Bhadra Rāmasāstrīn of Gauṭamagotra, Candraśekharacampū by Rāmanātha (*Printed, Benares and Calcutta*),\(^5\) Dattātreyaacampū by Dattātreya of Āṭreyagotra, (*DC*, XXI 830),\(^5\) Bāsyānudhacampū by Kochunni Tambiran,\(^5\) Viṣṇunasacampū by Nārāyana, son of Gangādhara (*Tany*, VII 3153)\(^5\)


1 This was probably composed by Cokkanakavi (Cokkanāṭha) see *BTO*, 157, CO, I 111

2 It is not known if Kārtavyaprāshānḍha mentioned as Aṣvini Maharāja's in *Trav. Cey. 192 is identical.

3 He died at Coochānda in 1915-16 He also wrote a play Mukṭāvalī. The manuscripts are with his son Gangādhara Śāstrī, City Press, Coochānda

4 It gives the story of the incarnation of Mahādeva in the house of King Poṣya of Brahamāvarīta.

5 See para 180 supra He was Elayarāja of Orangonore and died about the year 1927 He is the brother of the present Elayarāja Kunjunni Tambiran, who is an authority on Naṭyaasāstra, He wrote also Kṛṣṇavatārasanḍika and completed Rāmavāṃsa's Rāmaśāstra with Uṭṭara-Rāmāśāstra of which the manuscript is in the palace at Orangonore On Rāmavāṃsa, see para 177 supra He lived in Kollam 975-1095 and wrote also Valīṇḍbhava (poem) Kunjunni Tambiran wrote commentary on Śītāpāṇḍukāstavā and died 12 years ago Kunhanāṭa wrote commentary on Śīrṣapāṇḍukāstavā and died 14 years ago Rama Varma M. A. of Orangonore wrote a poem Kaṇṇudī, which is an adaptation of Goldsmith's Hermit

6 See para 164 supra, Nārāyana was also another son of Gangādhara son of Ṣryam bāka.
Sūdarsanacampū by Kṛṣṇananda (Printed, Bombay), Śrīnivāsaśālaśa (i) by Venkatesa (Printed, Bombay), (ii) by Śrīkṛṣṇa (Printed, Madras) [He was latter Parakālasvarā, see para 221 supra], Jagadguruvijaya by Yalandur Śrīkantha Sāstri (Printed, Mysore), Indrabhūmydaya by Raghunātha (Mys 264), Kumārabhūrgaviya by Bhānudaṭṭa, son of Ganapati (IO, 1340)


545 Local Mārgasahāyacampū by Navaniṭa of Vādhilagotra on the temple of Mārgasahāya at Vīnicīpuram (DC, XXI, 8265, TC, IV, 5828), Dīvacāpavyaya at Cakravarṭi Venkaṭācārya, on the myths of Dārbhasayanam (DC, iXXI 8232), Vāyūgrālayeṣāstamimahotsava (Ibid, 8301), on the shrine at Vykkom in Travancore, Vajramukutivilasa (i) by Alasnga and (ii) by Yogānanda (Mys 270), and Yadugrihāṣana by Appalācārya (Mys 270), and Sampatkumāravilāsa by Ranganāṭha of Śrīvatsagotra (DC, XXI 8850) on the festivals of Melkote, Jayesotsavā by Venkatasubba (Mys 264), Bhaḍrācalacampū by Rāghava of Sathamarṣagotra (Sah, V), Paḍmanābhacantā by Kṛṣṇa on the shrine at Trivandrum (Trav, 81), Venkatesacampū by Dharmaṇāja (Tam, VII 3160), and Śrīnivāsacampū by Śrīnivāsa, son of Venkatesa of Kauśikagotra (Tam, VII, 3168) on the shrine at Tirupati, Asvatthakṣetrayāga (Trav 79)

546. Biographical Puraḍeṣvacampū of Arhaṭāśā (DC, XXI, 8247, Mys 265) on the life of Jain saint Purudeva, Jamacāryavijaya (DC, XXVI 9746) on the lives of Mallisona and other Jain saints: Ānandaranga by Śrīnivāsa of Śrīvatsagotra on the life of Ānandaranga,

1 On the same shrine, there are poems Venkatesaṃmārdana by Devādāsa (OC, I 600) and Śrīnivāsaśālaśa by Śryambha, son of Paḍmanātha (OC, II 160)
2 Those are poems Bhaḍrācalaśālaśālaśa and Bhaḍrācalakṣetramāla by Veṇuṭām Śrīkṛṣṇa (Printed, Coimbatore and Berwada).
3 He wrote also Sumanoranjana, a poem on Kṛṣṇa. Another Śrīnivāsa wrote a poem Trākaḷvall in 27 verses to which the epithet Saptaṭāra is prefixed "because each verse is composed in such a manner as at first sight it deceives the reader regarding its real meaning." (HR, II, viii).
Dubash of Duplex (DC, XXI 8313), Ḍṭgavacampū by Kavirāja on the hunts of King Victravikrama of Kalatu of Ganjam (TC, IV 3218), Śrīnāvāsacampū by Venkata in praise of a king Śrīnāvāsa (Printed, Granthamālā), Samarādityakathā (Printed, Calcutta), Raṭnasekhara-caritra by Ḍayāvardhanāgaṇa (Printed, Bombav)

Nārāyaṇa's Vikramasenacampū describes the adventures of King Vikramasena of Prātisthāna. He was the son of Gangādhāra and grandson of Śrīnāvakā, who was the minister to King Shahjī (1687-1711 A.D.) of Tanjor. In Anandakanda-campū, Samarapungava Dikṣita treats of the legends of Saiva saints, male and female, their austerities and rewards. Bānesvara composed Citracampū in 1744 A.D. for his patron Citrasena of Vardhamāna. He was son of Rāmādasā and was called Vidyālankāra Bhattācārya.

Kṛṣṇabhūṣāna gives the life of a merchant Kṛṣṇa of Narkedimalī family (DC, XXI 8189)

Maitreyā Rāmānūjācārya's Nāthamunivijaya (DC, XXI, 8241) Ahobulasūrī's Vaṭārājaviṃśāya (DC, XXI 8271) and Rāmānūjādīśa's Rāmānacampū (DC, XXI 8278) are on the life of Rāmānūja and Govindādīsa and Śrīnāvāsamānju wrote Śrīnāvāsanirnayaṭrāvilasa on Śrīnāvāsamuni of the Muniṭraya line of Vaiṣṇava teachers (TC, III 2885, 2892)

Viśākhaṭulāprabandha of A.R. Rāja Rāja Varma, Viśākhsetrayātrāvarṇana of Gaṇapāṭhastrīm and Viśākhākīrtuvilasa of Rāmaswāmi Sāstrī relate to the life of Viśākha Mahārāja of Travancore.

On the history and royalty of Mysore there are the following Mahāsūrabhūṭa-vadhī by K Venkatārāma Śāstrī, Mahiśūradēśabhūtyadaya by Siṭārāmakavī, Saravatījalapāṭavaranam (Jog falls) and Śrīkṛṣṇapodayaprabandha by Kukke Subrahmanyaśārmā, Kṛṣṇa-rajendrayaśovilasa by S. Narasimhasārī, Śrīkṛṣṇarājābbhuyadaya by

1. This work gives the history of dynasties of Vījanagar and the branches of Candragun etc.
2. TC, II 2641, Tanj, VII 8154
3. See para 164 supra
4. IO, 1639.
5. IO, VII 1543, (analysed) This is characterised by a long dream and by an unmitateable intimation of Vaiṣṇavite Vādānham.
6. Trav, 184, see para 180 supra
7. Trav, 184, see para 247 supra.
8. Trav, 81,
Gītācārya² (Printed in Mys Sanskrit College Journal, I-IV) Bhāgavata Kṛṣṇasūtra, wrote the poem Kṛṣṇarājābhuyodaya Yadugiri Anantasācārya wrote Kṛṣṇarājakalodaya

547 Philosophical Juñānakhura by Lakṣminṛsīh, Taṭṭva-guṇādārśa by Anapūrṇa, Taṭṭvārthadārpana by Appayadikṣṭha (Mys. 2652)³

Section 3

548. Udaharana is a species of quasi-musical prosop-poetic composition It appears to have been in vogue in very early ages Kālidāsa mentions it in Vikramorvaśī and Raghuvamśa

Vidyānātha defines it thus

Bharata thus alludes to this mode of composition

It is said in the Purāṇas that when Dakṣa composed stutis called Saptagītā the Gods improved on that composition by the introduction of stobha-aksaras and used them to eulogise Maheśvara after his Tāndava in the form of songs of varying tālas In this class of composition, we have only a piece extant Basavodāhāraṇa of Somanātha (Pātikurika).

1. He is the father of Rājagopala Cakravartin about whom, see previous chapter
2. DO, XXI. 8378 He was son of Bhavanacārya of Vāḍhulagoḍa, His paternal uncle Rāmānāya wrote Kalyāṇavalli-Kalyāṇa, Veṣaḍatāmāyaṇa etc. He probably lived at Travancore, Chingleput District.
Manu, Svayambhu, the emperor of the human world, in days of yore, beseeched his father the Sun to suggest to him some deversion of relief from the cares of sovereignty. Then the Sun related to him a tale — The Creator, soon after creation, approached Mahavishnu with a similar request and at Vishnu's direction the creator went to Siva. Siva commanded Nandi, who has already learnt the Gandharva art from him to teach the creator the principles. The creator came and when he thought of an actor, a mum appeared before him with five disciples. Then in the presence of Sarasvati, Brahma told them to adopt Natya Veda. They studied Natyaveda in its various applications and delighted Brahma with performances replete with songs and sentiments. Brahma pleased with their interest and devotion, conferred on them the boon that they would thereupon be known to the three worlds at Bharatas and that Natyaveda would also be known after their names, that is, Bharatam. Thus informed by the Sun, Manu resorted to Brahma and made his entreaty, Brahma ordered Bharatas to go with Manu to Bharatavarsha and at Ayodhya, they put on boards the various stones relating to Devarshis, as enacted in the theatres of the Gods. The art of the stage was introduced into the various countries of India by the pupils of these Bharatas. Then it was that at the request of Manu that Bharatas embodied a summary of Natyaveda in two works Devadasasahasri and Satsahasri, and this summary has come to be known, after their names, as Bharatam. This is the account given by Saradātanaya of the advent of music into this world.

In the Satsahasri itself, that is the extant Natyasāstra, there is this version of the origin of Natyaveda. "Soon after creation Indra asked Brahma to create a fifth Veda, available for all the castes, because the four Vedas could not be studied by Sudras. Brahma drew upon the Vedas for expression, music, gesture and sentiment respectively and made up the Natyaveda. He then called upon Bharata and his hundred disciples to put it into practice and the first play was then

1. The verb भरत is 2nd person plural of the root भर
staged, with the plot, the destruction of the Danavas by the Devas. So the art progressed in the divine world. When Nahusha occupied the throne of Indra, it was his desire that the art should be imported into his terrestrial dominions and as an obligation, the sons of Bharata were sent down to this world, when they moved up with the population and created a progeny well versed in the theatrical art. It was then that Kohala, Sandilya and other Bharatas, composed 'this Sastra' for the eduction of men.”

“The dramatic representations first invented consisted of three kinds Natya, Nritya, and Nritta, and these were exhibited before the gods by the Gaudharvas and Apsarasas, the spirits and Nymphs of Indra's heaven, who were trained by Bharata to the exhibition. Siva added to these two other styles of performance, the Tandava and Lasya. Of these different modes of representation, only one, the Natya, is properly the dramatic, being defined to be gesticulation with language. The Nritya is gesticulation without language, or pantomime, and the Nritta is simple dancing. The Tandava and Lasya, which appear to be grafts upon the original system, are merely styles of dancing, the former so named from Tandu, one of Siva's attendants, whom the god instructed in it, whilst the Lasya, it is said, was taught by Parvati to the princess Usha, who instructed the Gopis of Dwaraka, the residence of her husband, in the art, by them it was communicated to the women of Surashatra, and from them it passed to the females of various regions.”

“Music, dialogue, gesticulation and imitation were the precursors of Sanskrit drama. Music in its theoretical and practical aspects may be traced in India to the Vedic age. Besides, the dull recitations of Hotrs or the monotonous recitations of Adhvaryus, there was something to charm the people, in the chants of Udgats of the Saman of humns borrowed from Rig Veda and adapted to singing. Dialogue was often employed in the Vedas and the Epics. In Rig Veda we occasionally find conversations between supernatural beings and R̄ṣis, for instance, the dialogue between Yama and Yami and of Indra, Agastya and Maruts. The epics often contain dialogues, the whole of

1 Naṭyaśāstra, I 1-25.
2 See Yamī Yama-samvāḍa (Rg X 10); Pāṣṭi sarana-samvāḍa (Rg X 108); Urvāśī Purnaśīrā-samvāḍa (Rg X 85).
3 "In all likelihood, the germ of the dramatic representations of the Hindus as of the Greeks is to be sought for in public exhibitions of dancing, which consisted at first of simple movements of the body executed in harmony with singing and music.
Mahabharata being composed in the form of a dialogue between Suta and his disciples Upamāṇads contain many dialogues of which the pathetic conversation between Yājñavalkya and his wife Maitreyī on the occasion of their mutual separation, is an instance. In the Mahāvraṭa rite there is “a struggle between a Vaisya, whose color is to be white, and a Sudra black in color, over a round white skin, which ultimately fails to the victorious Vaisya”² It is impossible” says Keith “without ignoring the obvious nature of this rite, not to see in it a mimic contest to gain the sun, the power of lights the Aryan, striving against the darkness, the sudra”³ Hillebrandt⁴ and Konow⁵ asserted that these are indeed ritual dramas, but that they are borrowed by the ritual from the popular mime of the time, which accordingly must have known dialogue, abusive conversation and blows, but of which the chief parts were dance, song and music.

550 Gesticulation or abhinaya is a natural and primary instinct of the human race. Acting embraces the use of gestures, and laws of gesticulation deduce from observation what is appropriate for the expression of particular sentiments of the human mind. Aristotle in his Poetics says

“Epic poetry and Tragedy, Comedy also and Dithyrambic poetry and the music of the flute and of the lyre in most of their forms, are all in their general conception modes of imitation. They differ, however, from one another in three respects, the

Very soon dancing was extended to include pantomime gesticulations accompanied with more elaborate musical performances, and these gesticulations were aided by occasional exclamations between the intervals of singing. Finally natural language took the place of mime and singing, while gesticulation became merely subservient to emphasis in dramatic dialogue” (Monier Williams)

1 See Kaṭhaka Samhitā, XXXIV, 5, Pancaśāṁśa Brāhmaṇa, V, 5, 14 Āpastamba, Śrauta Śūtra, XXI, 19, 3–12

⁴ At the great Mahāvraṭa ceremony, one of the most interesting features of the ritual is the fight of a Sudra and an Aryan on a round, white skin which represents the Sun (vide Kathaka Samhita, XXXIV, 5 and Dr Keith’s Samkhyaṇa Aranyakas p. 78). Now the Kathaka Samhita, which narrates the struggle of the Aryan and the Sudra, expressly says (XI, 6) that the colour of the Vaisya is white and it is recognised that the colour of the Sudra is black, so that it is almost certain that we have here again another form of the strife of winter and summer. In this case, summer or spring represented by the white Aryan prevails over the winter represented by the dark Sudra. The Mahāvraṭa rite is one which continued late in the Sutra ritual and was clearly performed throughout the Vedic Age, being in essence a popular not merely a priestly rite (see Aitareya Aranyakas, I and V, Śrauta Sūtra, XVII and XVIII)⁵

² SD, 24
³ AID, 22.
⁴ ID, 43
⁵ 67
medium, the objects, the manner or mode of imitation, being in each case distinct. For as there are persons who, by conscious art or mere habit, imitate and represent various objects through the medium of color and form, or again by the voice, so in the acts above mentioned, taken as a whole, the imitation is produced by rhythm, language, or ‘harmony’, either singly or combined. Thus in the music of the flute and of the lyre, ‘harmony’ and rhythm alone are employed, also in other acts, such as that of the shepherd’s pipe, which are essentially similar to these. In dancing, rhythm alone is used without ‘harmony’; for even dancing imitates character, emotion, and action, by rhythmic movement.”

Poetry in general seems to have sprung from two causes, each of them lying deep in our nature. First, the instinct of imitation is implanted in man from childhood, one difference between him and other animals being that he is the most imitative of living creatures, and through imitation learns his earliest lessons, and no less universal is the pleasure felt in things imitated. We have evidence of this in the facts of experience. Objects which in themselves we view with pain, we delight to contemn, plate when reproduced with minute fidelity such as the forms of the most ignoble animals and of dead bodies. The cause of this again is, that to learn gives the liveliest pleasure, not only to philosophers but to men in general, whose capacity, however, of learning is more limited. Thus the reason why men enjoy seeing a likeness is, that in contemplating it they find themselves learning or inferring, and saying perhaps, ‘Ah, that is he.’ For if you happen not to have seen the original, the pleasure will be due not to the imitation as such, but to the execution, the colouring or some such other cause.

Imitation, then, is one instinct of our nature. Next, there is the instinct for ‘harmony’ and rhythm, metres being manifestly sections of rhythm. Persons, there fore, starting with this natural gift developed by degrees their special aptitudes, till their rude improvisations gave birth to Poetry.”

Pischel advanced the theory that the Sanskrit drama had its origin in the Puppet play and Luders pointed to the shadow as an essential element in the development of the Sanskrit drama and thought that Saubhikas mentioned by Patanjali spoke in explanation of the moving pictures. But it will be seen that a class of plays, called Chāyānātakam, has come to us without being classified by rhetoricians.

551 The Greek connection

Weber started a theory that the Sanskrit Drama had its beginnings in the influence of the Greeks wielded on the Hindus. E Brandes, the Danish Scholar accepted

1 R Pischel, Die Heimat des Puppenspiels, Halle, Home of the Puppet play, translated by M C Tawney, London.
2 SBAI, (1916), 693, see Hillebrandt, to the contrary ZDMG, LXXII, 280.
3 For Ridgway’s objections, see his Dramas and Dramatic Dances of non-European races.
4 See Keith, SD, 57.
5 IL, 210 n 1st XIV 194 note Zubayi, On the development of the Indian drama and its relation to the Greek drama (In Bohemian) Tu Listy (Hilologike of Prague XIV 1-7, 98-108, 193-205) (Chiefly on the hetairai of the Hindu and the Greek drama.)
this hypothesis and undertook to prove the reality of the internal connection between the ancient plays and the new Attic comedy of the school of Menander as chiefly preserved in the Roman adaptation of Plautus and Terence. After Pischel's repudiation of this theory, in his paper before the Congress of Orientalists held in Berlin in 1882, Windisch elaborated this view of Brandes and collected various texts that attest Greek representation in the Orient after the conquest of Alexander and concluded that the Indian Drama was first developed in the city as a direct result of the intercourse with Alexandria.

Weber laid stress on the use of the words Yavanī and Yavanika, as indicative of the Greek influence. This is well answered by A B Keith. More value attaches to the argument from the use of Yavanika, or its Prakrit form Javanika, for the name of the curtain which covered the inner room and formed the background of the stage. The word primarily is an adjective meaning Ionian, the Greeks with whom India first came into contact. But it was not confined to what was Greek in the strict sense of the word; it applied to anything connected with the Hellenized Persian Empire, Egypt, Syria, Bactria, and therefore cannot be rightly limited to what is Greek. As applied to the curtain it is an adjective, and describes doubtless the material of the curtain (pati, apati) as foreign, possibly as Levi suggests, Persian tapestry brought to India by Greek ships and merchants. The word Yavanika has no special application to the curtain of the theatre, as would be the case, if it were borrowed as a detail of stage arrangement from Greece. Nor in fact was there any curtain in the case of Greek drama, so far as is known, from which it could be borrowed. Windisch's contention merely was that the curtain was called Greek because it took the place of a painted scenery at the back of the Greek stage.

As little can any conclusion of Greek borrowing be drawn from the Yavnats, Greek maidens, who are represented as among the body-
guard of the king, for this the Greek drama offers no parallel, it represents the fondness of the princes of India for the fascinating hetaerae of Greece, and the readiness of Greek traders to make the high profits to be derived from shipping these youthful cargoes”

Levi did not accept the Greek influence and Wilson agrees and has a long examination.

“The Hindu theatre belongs to that division of dramatic composition which modern critics have agreed to term romantiic, in opposition to what some schools have been pleased to call classical. This has not escaped the observation of one of the first dramatic critics of any age, and Schlegel observes, “The Drama of Sakuntala presents, through its oriental brilliancy of colouring, so striking a resemblance, upon the whole, to our romantic drama, that it might be suspected the love of Shakespeare had influenced the translator, if other orientalists had not borne testimony to the fidelity of his translation.” Besides being an entertainment appropriated to the leading or learned members of society, the dramatic entertainments of the Hindus essentially differed from those of modern Europe in the unfrequency of their representation. They seem to have been acted only on solemn or public occasions. In this respect they resembled the dramatic performances of the Athenians, which took place at distant intervals, and especially at the spring and autumnal festivals of Bacchus, the last being usually preferred, as the city was then filled with strangers, the tributaries and allies. According to Hindu authorities, the occasions suitable for dramatic representations are the lunar holidays, a royal coronation, assemblages of people at fairs and religious festivals, marriages, the meeting of friends, taking first possession of a house or a town, and the birth of a son. The most ordinary occasion, however, of a performance was, as will be seen, the season peculiarly sacred to some divinity.

“Like the Greek tragedy, however, the Nataka is to represent worthy or exalted personages only, and the hero must be a monarch, as Dushyanta, a demigod, as Rama, or a divinity, as Krishna. The action, or more properly the passion, should be but one, as love or heroism. The plot should be simple, the incidents consistent, the business should spring direct from the story as a plant from its seed, and should be free from episodical and prolix interruptions. The time should not be protracted, and the duration of an act, according to the

1. TI, I 345 II 60
2. Theatre, I xi et sq
authority, should not exceed one day, but the Sahitya-Darpana extends it to a few days, or even to one year. When the action cannot be comprised within these limits, the less important events may be thrown into narrative or may be communicated to the audience by one of the actors, who holds the character of an interpreter, and explains to the persons of the assembly whatever they may require to know, or what is not conveyed to them by the representation, a rather awkward contrivance to supply the deficiencies of the piece, but one that would sometimes be useful to insinuate the plot into the audiences of more polished communities. The diction of a Nataka should be perspicuous and polished. The piece should consist of not fewer than five acts, and more than ten.

"In many of its characteristics, the Nataka presents an obvious analogy to the tragedy of the Greeks which was, "the imitation of a solemn and perfect action, of adequate importance, told in pleasing language, exhibiting the several elements of dramatic composition in its different parts represented through the instrumentality of agents, not by narration, and purifying the affections of human nature by the influence of pity and terror". In the expansion of this definition in the "poetics," there are money points of affinity, and particularly in the selection of persons and subjects, but there are also differences, some of which merit to be noticed.

"With regard to the Umnes, we have that of action fully recognised and a simplicity of business is enjoined quite in the spirit of the Greek drama. The unity of place is not noticed, as might have been expected from the probable absence of all scenic embellishment. It was impossible to transport the substantial decorations of the Grecian stage from place to place, and therefore the scene was the same throughout, but where everything was left to the imagination, one site was as easily conceivable as another, and the scene might be fancied, one while a garden and another while a palace, as well as it could be imagined to be either. The unity of time is curiously modified, conformably to a principle which may satisfy the most fastidious, and "the time required for the fable elapses invariably between the acts." In practice there is generally less latitude than the rule indicates, and the duration of an act is very commonly that of the representation, or at most "one course of the sun," the night elapsing in the interval. In once piece, the Uttara-Rama-Charitra, indeed, we have a more extensive period, and twelve years are supposed to pass between the first and second acts. This was the unavoidable consequence of the
subject of the play, and affords and analogy to the license of the romantic drama.

"Another important difference from the classical drama, and from that of most countries, is the total absence of the distinction between Tragedy and Comedy. The Hindu plays confine themselves neither to the "crimes nor to the absurdities of mankind," neither "to the momentous changes, nor lighter vicissitudes of life," neither "to the terrors of distress nor the gaieties of prosperity." In this respect they may be classed with much of the Spanish and English drama to which, as Schlegel observes, "the terms Tragedy and Comedy wholly inapplicable, in the sense in which they were employed by the ancients." They are invariably of a mingled web, and blend "seriousness and sorrow with levity and laughter." They never offer, however, a calamitous conclusion, which, as Johnson remarks, was enough to constitute a Tragedy in Shakespeare's days, and although they propose to excite all the emotions of the human breast, terror and pity included, they never effect this object leaving a painful impression upon the mind of the spectator. The Hindus, in fact, have no Tragedy, a defect that subverts the theory that Tragedy necessarily preceded Comedy, because in the infancy of society the stronger passions predominated, and it was not till social intercourse was complicated and refined, that the follies and frivolities of mankind afforded material for satire. The theory is evidently more ingenious than just, for a considerable advance in refinement must have been made before plays were written at all and the days of Æschylus were not those of the fierce and fiery emotions he delineates. In truth, however, the individual and social organisation of the native of India is unfavourable to the development of towering passion, and whatever poets or philosophers may have insinuated to the contrary, there is no doubt that the regions of physical equability have ever been, and still are, those of moral extremes.

"The absence of tragic catastrophe in the Hindu dramas is not merely an unconscious omission, such catastrophe is prohibited by a positive rule, and the death of either the hero or the heroine is never to be announced. With that regard, indeed, for decorum, which even Voltaire thought might be sometimes dispensed with, it is not allowed in any manner "ensanglanter la scène," and death must invariably be inflicted out of the view of the spectators. Attention to bienseance.

is carried even of a serious nature are, hostile defiance, solemn impreca tions exile, degradations, and national calamity, whilst those of a less grave, or comic character, are biting; scratching, kissing; eating, sleeping; the bath, inunction, and the marriage ceremony. Dramatic writers, especially those of a modern date, have sometimes, violated these precepts, but in general the conduct of what may be termed the classical drama of the Hindus is exemplary and dignified. Nor is its moral purport neglected, and one of their writers declares, in an illustration familiar to ancient and modern poetry, that the chief end of the theatre is to disguise, by the insidious sweet, the unpalatable but salutary bitter, of the cup.

"The extent of the Hindu plays is another peculiarity in which they differ from the dramatic writings of other nations, and even the Robbers, or Don Carlos, will suffer in the comparison of length. The Mṛchhakatikā would make at least three of the plays of Æschylus. In actual representation, however, a Hindu play constituted a less unreasonable demand upon the patience of an audience than an Athenian performance, consisting at one sitting of three Tragedies and a Farce. If the Hindu stage exhibited a long play, it exhibited that alone."

Section 2

Besides defining and classifying dramas, Bhāratamuni composed plays in illustration. They were Jāmañjagnayaya (Vyāyoga), Kusuma-sekharavijaya (Īhāmpga) and Sarmañthayayaṭa (Anka). The last of these was enacted before Nāfuṣa while he was holding the position of Mahendra among ṃvas.

To Pitamaha himself are attributed Samudramatḥana (Samavakara) enacted at Indradhvajamahotsava and Tripuradāha (drama) enacted before Paramesvara on the northern slopes of the Himalayas. Sarasvatī wrote Lakṣmīsvayamvara (nātaka) and had it performed in Indra’s theatre by Apsarasas trained by Bhāratamuni himself.

There were other writers on dancing that followed Bhārata who are quasi-divine and quotations from their works are plenty in later rhetorical writings. Their age is anterior to the Christian era, and according to Indian tradition, some of them are far earlier than the kah age. Vāṣyāyana mentions earlier writers of remote ages whose works are lost, save in stray quotations. In describing the recreations of a nāgaraka, the cityman, he says.

1 See chapter on BHARATA, post
Ramayana and Mahabharata refer to nata, nartaka, nataka and sūtradhāra and dances and theatricals in cities and palaces.

552 Harivamsa (8672-4), makes "direct mention of a dramatic treatment (nātakārtha) of the Ramayanam mahakavyam, without indeed connecting therewith the name of Valmiki, but with statements so definite as clearly to show that so far as regards its main elements, our present text of the Ramayana existed even at that time, and already in its Vaishnava form. We are informed, namely, that the renowned actor, to the eulogising of whom the passage in question is devoted, represents in a drama "the birth of the immeasurable Vishnu for the purpose of fulfilling his wish to put to death the prince of the Rakshasas Lomapada (and) Dasaratha (in the drama) caused the great mum Rishyasringa to be fetched, by means of Santa and the courtesans Rama, Lakshmana, Bharata and Sathrughna, Rishyasringa and Santa were personated by actors characteristically dressed."

1 Ramayana (Srirangam Edn)

See also Hopkins, Great Epic of India, 55, Hildebrandt, ZDMG, LXXII 299, n 1; Hugh Nevill, The Ramayana as a play, (Tabrobaman, II 150, 170)

2 See M Winternitz, The Mahabharata and the Drama, JRAS, 1908, 571 Mahābhārata (Kumbakonam Edn)

See also XII 69-60, XII 295-5, IV 22 3, 16, IV. 16-48, I 184-10, III. 20-27, III. 28-12 (as refer to by Hopkins)
During the time of Gautama Buddha, Saugandhikāharana, a rūpaka was enacted at Rājagṛha by his disciples Upāṭṣaya and Mandagalyāyana. Panini refers to Natasūtras (IV iii 110-1) composed by Śūlān and Kṛśāsva.

To Pāṇini are ascribed the plays Kamsavadha and Ballandha Śyāmiśaka mentions Vararuci as a writer on dramaturgy Patañjali, wrote (Mahābhīṣya, BSS, II 36).

This passage has been the theme of controversy among some European scholars, a controversy that often expressed itself in unseemly personal attacks. While according to Keith the drama there represented is essentially religious in origin, Hillebrandt, Grosse, Gray, and Ridgeway say that “the imitation of the happenings of life may have given rise to comedy, a fact, which explains the failure of India to rise to tragedy, the play remaining on its original popular line.” So that according to them the Indian drama had its origin not in religion, but

---

1 S F Oldenburg, Ukazaniye na predstavlennyu buddhsko dramy In Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniya Imp Russkago Arkeologiceskago Obchestva, (IV 393-394) [Mention of a representation of a Buddhist Drama Text from the Avaṇāṇaṭaka 75].

2 (i) Pārāśābhāvītanīya bhūyastutaye

(ii) kṛṣṇa-bhādavā śāyāndiṣi

3 See R G Subrahmanya, Patanjali and Kavya Literature (Pt Or Confer 1924), Swami Saradananda, Poetry and Drama in ancient times (Brahmavadin, III, 446-55)

4 Uber das aufen ge dss ndischen drama

5. Anfänge der Kunst, 214

6 ERE, IV 869

7 The origin of tragedy with special reference to Greek tragedies, Cambridge.
on the primitive mime of the Indian popular strolling actors and their wives.

556. Ridgeway propounds the theory that all religion is to be traced to the reverence shown to the dead and that all drama is born from such reverence, but Keith does not agree and he answers Ridgeway's criticism of his views. The following extracts from an article by A. B. Keith in JRAS, (1916), 335 et seq with enlighten the reader —

"But though the theory of Professor Ridgeway must remain a mere hypothesis, which has no probability, it is important to examine his criticism of the rival theory that the Indian drama is an offshoot from the religious practices of early India. The criticism of this theory as already set out in this Journal [JRAS, 1911, 1001] by me is contained in the following passage (pp 140-2) —

'The slaying of Kansa by Krishna, as we shall soon see, was the subject of the earliest dramatic performance recorded for us in Hindu literature. According to the Mahabhaya, which cannot be later than the first century after Christ, in this performance the Granthkars divided themselves into two parties, those representing the followers of Kansa had their faces blackened, those of Krishna had their faces red, and they expressed the feelings of both sides throughout the struggle from Krishna's birth to the death of Kansa. On this story alone Dr A. B. Keith rests his belief in the theory of the origin of tragedy still held by Sir James Frazer and Dr. Farnell, and with which I have dealt at length on earlier pages (pp 18-21) 'The mention of the colour of the two parties,' he writes, 'is most significant, red men slays black man the spirit of spring and summer prevails over the spirit of the dark winter. The parallel is too striking to be mistaken, we are entitled to say that in India, as in Greece, this dramatic ritual, the slaying of winter, is the source whence drama is derived.' This too is the only reason that he gives for his opinion expressed in the same place 'Ridgeway's theory of the origin of drama from the festivals in honour of the dead seems to be still improbable, an explanation of the origin of tragedy.' But Dr. Keith forgets that the red men who slay black men are themselves led by Krishna 'the black', and thus red men led by black man slay black men, which on his own principle can only mean that winter aided by summer slays winter. Plainly, then, 'winter is divided against himself and commits suicide. The judiciously minded reader will opine that in the slaying of the

1. JRAS, (1911), 1008; JRAS, (1912), 421
negro doctor by Punch without the aid of another gentleman of colour we have really more cogent evidence for Punch and Judy being a drama of summer slaying winter than that on which Dr Keith bases his theory of the origin of the Hindu drama. Moreover, when we recall the fact admitted by Dr Keith himself of the conquest by the fair-complexioned Aryans of the dark aborigines of Hindustan, and their admixture as time went on, and when we are further told that Krishna the Black was quite different in colour from the rest of his race, it is but natural that the Yadavas should be represented with ruddy faces, and the followers of Kansa as dark-skinned aborigines. Dr Keith might just as reasonably see a combat between winter and summer in any of the many battles between British troops and native armies in the long struggle which eventuated in the conquest of India. Krishna, who eventually was made the eighth Avatar of Vishnu, a god regarded by Dr Keith as the sun, must also be held by that scholar to be the sun-god, or at least the spirit of light and spring. But as all traditions agree in making Krishna black, Dr Keith thus represents the sun-god himself as a black man, which may be regarded as the wildest of all the many vagaries of his school.

The judicially minded reader will probably opine that this is excellent fooling, but very bad logic. In Professor Ridgeway's own view we have in the slaying of Kamsa merely a representation of doubtless a real episode in the life of the hero Kṛṣṇa. But how on this hypothesis is the difference of colour to be understood? The account given above by Professor Ridgeway is plainly ludicrous. Kṛṣṇa is quite different in colour from the rest of his race, therefore the Yadavas are made red, Kamsa and his supporters black. But Kamsa was the uncle of Kṛṣṇa, who was a Yadava on both sides, his supporters and he are here represented as of the colour of Kṛṣṇa; but the rest of Kṛṣṇa's race is, Professor Ridgeway argues, quite different from Kṛṣṇa, whence it follows that Kamsa should be red. Accordingly the absurdities of my view are even on Professor Ridgeway's own showing at least no greater than those of his own view. That he should be guilty of such a bad piece of argument is undoubtedly due to his forgetting that Kamsa is the uncle of Kṛṣṇa, and that therefore he cannot be treated as belonging to a different section of the population. The forgetfulness is the more amazing in that Professor Ridgeway has himself given the traditional account of the origin of Kṛṣṇa, an account which he does not and obviously cannot criticize. But there is a more amazing blunder still to chronicle. At p 21
Professor Ridgeway asserts that "Dr A B Keith finds the origin of the Hindu drama in the slaying of the dark Koravas by the fair Pandavas. But Dr Keith omits the important point that in the Hindu story the fair Pandavas were led to victory over the dark Koravas by Krishna, 'the Black,' a fact in itself fatal to his theory." This remarkable assertion, which of course is wholly untrue, is due not to any deliberate desire to mislead his readers on the part of Professor Ridgeway, but to a confusion between Kamsa and the Koravas—a spelling strangely adopted by the author for Kauravas—and between Krishna exploits._per se_and his connexion with the Pāndavas, who are not, it may be added, pale at all, but descendants of a man called Pāndu.

The extraordinary confusion of mind of Professor Ridgeway explains his criticism of my theory, he has overlooked the fact that, so far from not appreciating the question of Kṛṣṇa's name, I was the first to point out the error into which Levi² fell in ascribing to the followers of Kṛṣṇa the colour black, and that I expressly on more than one occasion have refuted the theory that Kṛṣṇa was a sun-god. The fact that Kṛṣṇa is an Avatar of Viṣṇu no more proves that he was originally a sun-god than the fact that the Buddha is also an Avatar of Viṣṇu proves that he was a sun-god. The fact that Kṛṣṇa's company is mentioned as red is of the utmost importance as a piece of evidence of the real character of the ritual, had it not been traditional, the effect of the name Kṛṣṇa would undoubtedly have carried with it the dark colour of his company, for we cannot suppose that at the time when the Mahābhārata relates to us the dramatic performance of the Kamsavadha there was any longer an understanding of the legend in its primitive sense. It was a human drama to the actors, understood in purely historic sense, the slaying by Kṛṣṇa of his wicked uncle, and I have laid stress on the fact that the existence of this drama is the earliest clear proof we have of the stories of the infancy of Kṛṣṇa, a fact which establishes their anteriority to the Christ-child legend. But whereas if we take the story as a mere piece of history we are landed in hopeless difficulties in the explanation of the colours assigned, of which Professor Ridgeway's account affords a perfect specimen, a very clear sense and meaning are obtained if we accept the natural conclusion that in India, as in Greece, we find at the source of drama

1. _JRAS_ (1908), p. 173, n 4
2. _Theatre and Art_, p. 315.
3. _JRAS_, (1908), pp. 169 seq., a view now accepted by Garbe.
the old ritual of the slaying of the vegetation spirit in winter as in India or in summer as in Greece, the differing choice of aspect being the cause of the existence in India of no real tragedy, while in Greece tragedy is predominant.

Professor Ridgeway argues that if Krishna is a sun-god, then his birthday should fall at the winter solstice, but in point of fact he is born according to tradition in July or August. The argument seems singularly without force. Apart from the late date of the tradition of the time of Krishna's birth, it seems inexplicable why a sun-god must be born at the winter's solstice. Professor Ridgeway accepts my proof that the Mahāvrata was celebrated at the winter solstice, but I have not suggested at any time that this festival represents the birth of the sun, it is a period when the strengthening of the sun for its tasks is required, and is provided by sympathetic magic in the ritual by which a light takes place for a symbol of the sun which is eventually taken away from the Sudra. But this ritual, though it is interesting and though it is rightly mentioned in any account of the beginnings of drama as one of the ultimate sources from which drama developed—not of course as in itself drama since the element of mimesis is absent—is not a Krishna ritual at all, a fact which Professor Ridgeway should have remembered, as he cites with approval my express statement that the Mahāvrata has no vegetation spirit in its ritual and that the prominence of such a spirit may have been due to the influence of the aboriginal tribes, even assuming that it was also Aryan in character. In the case of Krishna we have a real vegetation spirit ritual, the killing of a representative of the spirit of vegetation. But we see more than this, we see a conflict in the process of the killing, and curiously enough Professor Ridgeway, who credits me with following Dr Frazer in my views of the vegetation spirit, is ignorant still, it seems, as he was in 1910, of the contents of the paper of Usener, on which, as I have expressly stated, my views of the origin of Indian drama which were first formulated by me in 1908 are based.

The paper of Usener cites instances in which there occurs a mimetic fight intended clearly to secure sunlight and to prosper vegetation. In the case of the Mahāvrata we have this fight in a solar form, in the

1 p 144
2 On this point Professors Ridgeway agrees with me, see pp. 154, 155
3 p 145 Of JRAS, (1909), pp 203, 204.
4 p 142
5, JRAS, (1908), p 172, n, 5
case of Kamsa in a vegetation form, but the fight is an essential feature of both, and it is an essential feature of the drama which is an agon, a contest. Therefore the essence of drama is revealed to us in the very drama of which we have the first distinct record in India, and it is idle sophistry to wave aside this most striking piece of evidence.”

557 Elsewhere A B Keith says [JRAS, (1912), 411]

“The clear evidence of the Mahabhasya proves the connection of the earliest Indian literary form which was clearly dramatic with the contest of the two figures Kamsa and Kṛṣṇa, and the actors coloured their faces, the followers of Kṛṣṇa being Rākṣamukha, those of Kamsa Kalamukha. It is true that Indian tradition tells us that Kamsa was Kṛṣṇa’s uncle, and that we can, if we like, insist that time is a piece of history but such euhemerism is, if at present again fashionable, hardly likely to remain long in vogue. That Kṛṣṇa was divine is, of course, asserted by the earliest texts which refer to him, and the Mahabhasya parallel is of singular importance in that it shows the drama dealing with a subject which reveals itself clearly as one side of the widespread belief in the slaying of the vegetation spirit, which is certainly found also in India.

On its merits, therefore, and apart from the evidence of the Mahabhasya, Aristotle’s account of tragedy seems to demand full adherence. The evidence of that text adds to the theoretical probability of the Aristotelian version, the unexpected parallel of an actual stage in development, which is not directly recorded in Greek literature. The only way to minimise the value of the evidence is to declare that the Mahabhasya which dates probably about 145 B.C., perhaps later, is recording a state of affairs introduced from Greece, and it is as well to point out how many improbabilities are involved in such an assumption. The text recognises the expression of a dramatic theme the death of Kamsa at the hands of the Kṛṣṇa by two parties of “actors,” who do not use action proper, i.e., who are in effect performing a dithyramb, it recognises also the full action, and it knows of actors who are to sing, and on the other hand we have no reliable evidence of any performance of Greek plays, or still less of dithyrambs, in India.

In the Mahabhasya the two parties of Granijjlkas, “reciters,” who represent the feelings of either side, do so by words alone.

---

1 I have never rested my case on the Kamsavadha alone JRAS, 1903, p 172; 1911, p. 1008; 1912, p 425; ZDMG, lxxv. 654 seqq.
(SARDAGRANTHANAMATRAM), that is to say, they do not act as do the SAUBHIKAS. Surely we have here in perfect form the dithyramb on its way to complete drama, as it has regularly been conceived in reconstructing the probable history of drama as sketched by Aristotle. No doubt the drama already existed at the time of the MAHABHASYA, but the dithyrambic form has not disappeared as a species of art."

558 Viewed impartially, Pañājalī's expressions do not admit of any confusion and obscurity. Saubhikas were teachers of the actors and they managed the stage and directed the theatrical operations which included music and dancing and dialogue. It was not a matter only for the eyes but for the ears too. Elsewhere Pañājalī (MB, II 253) says

यदारम्भक रस्स गण्मन्त्र नत्स्व, श्रैष्ट्व।

In Padamanārī, Haradatta speaks of Grānthikas

वैद्य प्रश्न वाचयन्त वसवमाचविन्ते काविका नाम तैंतुत्तिमस्ता बिन्नवति रसादीन वर्णविन्ति, तेत्यापि वर्णविन्ता स्तोत्रवानुरुविन्या तुविन्या मल्लास्फळविन्ति, विच्छिन्नाय वेषां तात्त्विकास्त्र भवति, अत एव व्याकृतितः नववन्ति, नानाप्रकारसाधनम् व्यावहर्ष।

In his Vākyapadīya, (II p 177 Benares Edn) Bhāṛgārī says

श्नदप्रपूर्वकां सुदूरविन्यान्तु स्तम्भु।

Pṛthvaśāmkasādīnā साधनवेत्तां सर्वोपेये। (II 177, Benares Edn)

and Helarājā's gloss is

एव इत्यादिकेन वेश्यविन्ते कस्वादेवाकारं रागश्वं मिलकारेलोकपरिणाम।

"It is the faces of the hearers that change color at hearing the incidents of the story so vividly pictured before them by the reciters, and it is the hearers that feel pity and pleasure during the narration of the incidents."

559. Beyond the ingenuity displayed in attempting to prop up theories assumed a priori and the unity among them all the same in denying its deserved antiquity to the Sanskrit stage, the controversy is futile and to a scholar with an open mind, the only view possible is that long before the days of Pāṇini, Sanskrit drama had become perfected and a science of dramaturgy evolved by rhetoricians for future compositions.

Of the progress of the art of histrionics, for earlier than the dawn of the Christian era, we have instances in the devices used by poets.

1 Also नत्स्व श्रोतिः, मानविकस्त्र श्रोतिः (I iv 29), वज्राचारक (II iv 77) नत्स्व सुल्तन। II 37, वज्रषामना, (III in 127). See also IV i 8 and VI. ii 48.
such as dream (swapna), magic (indrajāla), portrait-painting (citra-lekhanama), inter-drama (anṭarnātika) and the like. In Guṇādhyaśa’s Bṛhat-kathā, which has furnished the theme for many later plays and romances, these devices were used in the progress of the tales.

**SECTION 3**

**The Dramatic Arrangement**

560. Every drama opens with a prelude or introduction, in which the audience are made acquainted with the author, his work, the actors, and such part of the prior events as is necessary for the spectators to know. The actors of the prelude were never more than two, the manager and one of his company, either an actor or actress, and they led immediately into the business of the drama. The first part of this introduction is termed the Purva Ranga and opens with a prayer invoking in a benedictory formula the protection of some deity in favour of the audience. This is termed the Nandi, or that which is the cause of gratification to men and gods. There is a difference of opinion as to who recites the Nandi, and the commentator on the Mudra-Rakṣasa observes, “that it is equally correct to supply the ellipse after Nandyauté by either Patati (reads) or Pravacati (enters), in the former case the Sutradhara reciting the Nandi, and then continuing the induction, in the latter, benediction being pronounced by a different individual Sutradhara, according to the technical description of him, “was to be well-versed in light literature, as narrative, plays and poetry, he should be familiar with various people, experienced in dramatic details and conversant with different mechanical arts.” The prayer is usually often followed by some account of the author of the piece, in which most of the authors “give a long description of their

---


genealogies and of their own attainments, while it is a characteristic of Kahdasa's writings that they all begin with a charmingly modest introduction, marked by great diffidence," and in some places, the mention of the author is little more than the particularisation of his name. "The notice of the author is in general followed by a complimentary appeal to the favour of the audience, and the manager occasionally gives a dramatic representation of himself and his concerns in a dialogue between himself and one of his company, either an actor or an actress, who is termed the Pariparswaka or associate. The conclusion of the prelude, termed the Prastavana, prepares the audience for the entrance of one of the dramatic personages, who is adroitly introduced by some abrupt exclamation of the manager, either by simply naming him as in the Saluntala and Malavkagununtra, or by uttering something he is supposed to overhear, and to which he advances to reply, as in the Mrutchakati and Mudrana Rakshasa. The play being thus opened, is carried forward in scenes and acts, each scene being marked by the entrance of one character, and the exit of another, for in general the stage is never left empty in the course of the act, nor does total change of place often occur. Contrivances have been resorted to, to fill up the seeming chasm which such an interruption as a total change of scene requires, and to avoid such solecism which the entrance of a character, whose approach is unannounced, is considered to be."

**SECTION 4.**

561. "Bharata mentioned ten types of Rūpakas and 14 types of Uparūpakas.** Ditānanjaya accordingly named his work Ḍasaṛūpakas. Kohala named twenty, Sāradāṇayaya, the usual ten and another twenty, Viśvanātha, twenty-eight, and Vema, twenty, Agni Purāṇa gives twenty-seven. The ten Rūpakas are Rasāśrāya or Vākyārthabhinayā and the others Bhāvāṣraya or Padārthābhinnaya. Bharata brings under the former the ten Rūpakas, Nātaka, Prakārata, Dima, Prahasana, Samavakāra, Vyāyoga, Ihamga, Vithī, Uṭṣṭukānka and Bhāna as also Nātukā and Sattaka.

Kohala classifies plays into mārga and desī based on the principle whether song and dance predominate in each of them. Among mārga

---

1. On Vidūṣaka, see J. Hinanga, De Vidūṣaka N het indisch Torneel, (Groningen, 1897, 165) and P. M. Pavlov's review of it, in Studi italiani di filologia indo-iranica, II 86, M. Schuyler, Origin of Vidūṣaka (JACS, XX 386), P. V. Ramunjaswami, Vidūṣaka in Sanskrit plays, (Pr Or confere, 1924)

2. See V. Baghavan, On the name Dasāṛūpakas, JOR, VII 278.
kinds the names of the well-known ten with nāṭikā, prakaraṇika, bhāṇikā, hāsikā, viyogini, dimikā, kalotsāhavatī, chitrā, jugupsitā, citratāla are cited. None of these twenty allow song or dance in them. Under desī plays he gives again dombikā, bhanaka prasthāna, shidgaka, bhāṇika, prerāṇa, ramakṛīḍa, ragakāvya, hallīsa, rāsaka. Among these the last six are fascinating only as rapturous dances of delicate or wild type (sukumāra or uddhata).

Dattilā names 16 of the latter kind as saṭṭaka, toṭaka, goshtī, blindaka, śilpaka, prekshaṇa, sallāpaka, hallīsa, rāsakā, ullāpya, sri-gadita, nāṭyarāsaka, durmalī, prasthāna, kāvya and lāṣikā. Thus it will be seen that all those which are exhibited before audience are classed as plays only figuratively; Saradātanaya gives support to this view, तेषां रूपसंहारी प्रायो दस्यत्वं जन्मितः।
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the play</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Kohala's Uparupaka</th>
<th>Hero and his nature</th>
<th>Extent in acts</th>
<th>Unity (Sandhīs)</th>
<th>Vṛti</th>
<th>Rasa</th>
<th>Specialities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. नाटक</td>
<td>Well-known and Puramo.</td>
<td>नाटिका</td>
<td>Heroic and noble or दिल्ल</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>5 Unities of 64 angas.</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>All rasas</td>
<td>High and noble type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. महान</td>
<td>Created by the poet (उल्लास)</td>
<td>महानिका</td>
<td>Excluding divine beings Brahmna, Kahaśivas and Valsyas</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Civilised and worldly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. समवक ा</td>
<td>Known (स्वात)</td>
<td>चिन्तन</td>
<td>Devīs and Rākṣasas. Udātta heroes (twelve)</td>
<td>3 in 3 nights total 19½ hours</td>
<td>All the four except बिनस.</td>
<td>All the four except कालिक.</td>
<td>All rasas</td>
<td>Fight, decent, यूज्या and विधियंगास may be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. इंद्रपुष्प</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>इन्द्रपुष्प</td>
<td>Divine being for a Divine heroine.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 Unities</td>
<td>आरभाति.</td>
<td>आरभाति</td>
<td>Forceful abduction, fight etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. प्रशसन</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>प्रशसन</td>
<td>Well known heroine (16 heroes)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 except बिनस.</td>
<td>सावली and आरभाति</td>
<td>आरभाति</td>
<td>Fight, beating, bullying etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. व्यापोन</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>व्यापोन</td>
<td>Known Uddhata. Feminine characters are very few</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Unities.</td>
<td>आरभाति</td>
<td>विज्या and हाय्या</td>
<td>Grief of women etc, despondency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. उस्तदिकाक</td>
<td>Well-known or created by the poet</td>
<td>उस्तदिकाक</td>
<td>No divine beings,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>First and the last unities.</td>
<td>बहारी</td>
<td>कुरु</td>
<td>Worldly life not very vulgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. सार</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>सार</td>
<td>Sannyasi, sage, Brahmin, Vaśīka, vīta etc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Sṛṅgāra and Lāsya and Gāngas allow. Vīra (only to be suggested) by question and repetition, अंगा specially thirteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. बाण</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>बाण</td>
<td>Single character vīta / dhuntra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Touch of Sṛṅgāra, अंगा specially thirteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. बैरी</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>बैरी</td>
<td>One or two characters, vīta or dhuntra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Touch of Sṛṅgāra, अंगा specially thirteen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
563. Sanskrit plays have been classified very elaborately under various sub-divisions, and Visvanatha in his Sahityadarpana, divides them into his great classes, viz. 1. **Rupaka**, ‘principal dramas,’ of ten species, 2. **Upa Rupaka**, ‘minor dramas’ of eighteen

A 1 The Nataka, or ‘principal play,’ should consist of from five to ten acts (Anka) and should have a celebrated story (such as the history of Rama) for its plot (Vastu). It should represent heroic or godlike characters, and good deeds, should be written in an elaborate style, and be full of noble sentiments. Moreover, it should contain all the five ‘joints’ or ‘junctures’ (Sandhi) of the plot the four kinds of action (Vr̥tti), the sixty-four members (Anga) or peculiar properties and the thirty-six distinctive marks (Lakshana). The hero or leading character (Nayaka) should be of the kind described as high-spirited but firm, being either a royal sage of high family (as Dushyantha in the Sakuntala), or a god (as Krishna), or a demigod (Dwyadvya), who, though a god (like Ramachandra) thinks himself a man. The principal sentiment or flavour (Rasa) should be either the erotic (Srmagara) or heroic (Vira), and in the conclusion (Nirvahana) the marvellous (Adbhuta). It should be composed like the end of a cow’s tail (Go-Pucchagra), i.e., so that each of the acts is gradually made shorter. If it also contain the four Pataka-sthanka or ‘striking points’ and the number of its acts Anka be ten, it is entitled to be called a Maha-Nataka. An example of the Nataka is the Sakuntala, and of the Maha-Nataka is the Bala-Ramayana.

2 Prakarana should resemble the Nataka in the number of its acts as well as in other respects, but the plot must be founded on some mundane or human story, invented by the poet, and have love for its principal sentiment, the hero or leading character being either a brahman (as in the Mrdc-chabatka), or a minister (as in the Malati-madhava), or a merchant (as in the Pushpa-bhusika), of the description called firm and mild (Dhva-Prasanta), while the heroine (Nayika) is sometimes a woman of good family, sometimes a courtesan, or both.

3 Bhana, in one act, should consist of a variety of incidents, not progressively developed, the plot being invented by the poet. It should only have the opening and concluding juncture. An example is the Lala Madhukara.

1 M. Wilson, IV, 470. Saraṭhatamaya call a Bhānukā as Dombi and adds some classes of Upatupakas, Bhāna, Mallika, Kalpavalli and Parįṭṭaka. For a complete account of classifications of dramas, see Int to Bhānaprakāsa (GCS), by Yadugiri Yāṭaṇa. Jēswami.
4 Vyavoga, in one act, should have a well known story for its plot, and few females in its Dramatis Personae. Its hero should be some celebrated personage of the class called firm and haughty (Viroddha) Its principal sentiments or flavours should be the comic (Hasya), the erotic (Srngara), and the unimpassioned (Santa).

5 Samavakara, in four acts, in which a great variety of subjects are mixed together (Samavakryante), it dramatizes a well-known story, relating to gods and demons, e.g. Samudramathanama, Abdhimathana or Payodhimathana.

6 Dima, in four acts, founded on some celebrated story, its principal sentiment should be the terrible (Raudra), it should have heroes (a god, a Yasksha, a Rakshasa, a serpent, goblin &c) e.g. is Tripuradaha, Tarakoddharana, Vtroddharana, VrhabhaSravynmbhana, Manmathonmathana.

7 Ihamriga, in four acts, founded on a mixed story (Misra-vritta), partly popular, and partly invented, the hero and rival hero (Pratmaya) should be enter a mortal or a god. According to some it should have six heroes. It derives its name from this, that the hero seeks (Jhati) a divine female, who is unattainable as a deer. Mriga e.g. Urmasekhathayana, Mayakurangika, Viruvatjaya.

8 Anka or Utsrishtikanka, in one act, should have ordinary men Prakritanarah for its heroes, its principle sentiment should be the pathetic (Karuna), and its form (Srishti) should transgress (Utkranta) the usual rules, e.g. Sarmsythayati, Karunakandala, Gangabhagiratha, Saktu amanuma.

9 Vifthi, in some act, is so called because it forms a kind of garland (Vithi) of various sentiments, and is supposed to contain thirteen members (Anga) or peculiar properties, e.g. Maahavi Indulekha, Malati, Vaknlavithka and Kamadatta, and Premabharama of Rawpati Tripuranataka.

10 Prahasana, properly in one act, is a sort of farce representing reprobate characters (Nma) and the story is invented by the poet, the principal sentiment being the comic (Hasya), it may be either pure (Suddha), of which the Kandarpake, 'love-sports,' is an example.

---

1 Mentioned by Bhrupamistha in his commentary on Dasarupa
2 The original is lost, but there is the Telugu Translation Kritdabhramam of Vallabha. See Andhra Sah. Par Patraka, II, 369 and Bharats (1927), 21.
or mixed (Sankrana), like the Dhurtacarita 'advantages of a rogue, or it may represent characters transformed (Vikrita) by various disguises'.

B The eighteen Upa rupakas' names are as follows:

1. नाटिका, which is of two kinds, Natika pure, and Prakaranika differing little from the Nata and Prakarana e.g. Ratnavah.

2. दोषकम, in five, seven, eight, or nine acts, the plot should be founded on the story of a demi-god, and the Vidushaka or 'Jesting Brahman' should be introduced into every act e.g. Vikramorvasi, Stambhitarambhaka, Madalekha, Menakânahusa.

3. गोशी, e.g. Ravaâmadanikâ.

4. लक्ष, e.g. Anandasantari, Carparamanjari.

5. नायङ्गलक, e.g. Narmavaâti, Vilasavati.

6. प्रवाह, e.g. Śringâratulaka.

7. उद्याप, e.g. Devimahâdeva (Devimahodaya ?), Udâttakunjara.

8. काव्य e.g. Gaudaviyâya, Sugrivakelana, Yadavodaya.

9. प्रेमु, e.g. Tripuramardana, Nrisimhaviyâya, Vâlivadha.

10. रास, e.g. Menakâhitâ.

11. खासप, e.g. Mayâkapâlikâ.

12. श्रोतित, e.g. Râmânanda, Krîdârasâlala.

13. बिलक, e.g. Kanakavatimâdhava.

14. विछलका.

15. हर्षिका, e.g. Bindunâti.

16. मकणी.

17. हि, e.g. Keśaâvatâka.

18. माणिक, e.g. Vinâvaâti, Râmadatâ, Danakelikamudi.

SARADATANAYA ADDS NEW CLASSES OF UPARUPAKAS

19. पारिजातलाल, e.g. Gangâtarangikâ.

20. कलवधी, e.g. Mûukyavallikâ.

21. वैचित्र्य, e.g. Guṇamâla, Cûdâmaṇi.

22. साण, e.g. Nandimaṇi, Śringâramanjari.

These examples are mentioned in Abhnavabhairâti (AB), Sarasvatî-kanthâbharama (SK), Śringâraprâkâsa (SP), Ďasârûpa (DR) and Nâtya-gharapâpa (ND) and are mostly known only by name."
564. **Harsa,** very likely Sri Harṣādeva, King of Ujjain, lived about the 6th century B.C. and commented on Bharaṭa's Nāyāsāstra. Sāradātanaya quotes his classification:

- नाय्येति विभागादी कषीनान्त पितामह
- वर्मादिसाधन नाय्य सर्वें व्यापनषदम्
- आसेवंं तत्त्त्वस्यस्यानु तु नाटकम्
- विन्यमाःसारेऽर्घस्य तत्रहृदेयविद्वके
- तदेव तोरक तेदो नाटकस्यतिः हर्षवाच्च

**Bhāvaprakāśa, Baroda Edn p 238**

565 **Subandhu** was an ancient playwright and rhetorician. According to Sāradātanaya he divides nātaka into five kinds, Pūrṇa, Prasānta, Bhāṣvara, Lalita and Samagra:

- अनुभवार्तस्यापि काक्ष्ण प्राण पद्याः
- पूर्ण वैस प्रशान्त सायनर भविष्यति तथा
- समासासिति विसेय नाटके पतिता जयाः

*(Ibid 238)*

As an example of Samagranātaka i.e., in the fullest form, he mentions Kṛṣṇārāvaṇa (now lost) and names such a play Nṛṭapāra (or Nāṭyapāra). To illustrate this class Subandhu wrote a play Vāsavādaṭṭhā-nāṭyapāra obviously on the story of Vastarāja and Vāsavādaṭṭhā. It is this Subandhu that is alluded to by Āndun thus:

- युक्त नित्यान्ते बिन्दुसारस बन्धनातुः
- बलसारोज

**Avanṭusundarikathā**

It is quite likely that Āndun’s verse

- सूतिति भेल संगमतु यथा व मरण स्तुति
- तैपासकी मया रथवा कपालेत्त नमानि

is taken from Nṛṭyapāra.

Vāmana *(KŚV, III 21)* quotes a verse in part:

- सत्तिः शरीरः सन्तुलसत्तमाः चन्द्रमकाशो युवा
- जातो सूपतिराशयः कठिनय दिक्षाः कठीर्यसामः
- आश्रयः कठिनयक्रिया च कुस्तसातिकाठौ भरतास्त तातिकाठ्यसः

1. He was older than Bāhunīkara.
2. The word Nṛṭyagṛhāc, as tall usually read, is an error for Nṛṭyapāra.
3. The reading Vasaṃdhun is obviously wrong, and the manuscript No 4/B 820 of the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, gives the reading Subandhu only. See Bangaswami Sarasvati, Subandhu or Vasaṃdhun *(JMys)*.
Abhinavagupta (AB, XXII) thus comments on Nāṭyāyatā which he says elsewhere is a synonym of Nṛtta-pāra or Nāṭyapāra.

(a) सः स्त्रातार तत्तात्प्रयत, स्त्रातातिरिक्तान्योहेन वा भक्तेकक्षमातिरित्वा वा शर्मा तत्तात्प्रयतम्। तत्राः भक्तेकक्षमातिरित् भक्तेकक्षमातिरितम् तत्रात्प्रयतसका -
दायम् महाकालिशुद्दाबि, यस्मात् तत्तात्प्रयाये । घरात्मकः अर्थात् असात्
पुदयो नासवदनाये।

पुष्प चार्यः—सतिसिंह सूक्ष्मरूपेण टटे हुक्कासे सत्तिते। अतिवैतसमयातु न पदसिद्धः
एकास, स्त्रे गुम्बे उठाशिते। तत्र हुक्कासे सामाजिकिहे दखारायोगः।
तत्र हुक्कारेन जयते। तत्र उदयनः। सत्तिता। इति साद्वै लिखितः—
एकास, किं काटकविन्दुष्यादि देशोहि एककुण्डसपुद्यान सुखालके।
यौग-ब्राह्मण समानाय राजपुरसे तत्र हुक्कासे गतस्मान पसारः॥ XXII 45

(b) नायायित त्व नासवदनाभ्याने सतितिधिते। XXII 47

(c) सार्विकहु त्व सतिसिंहनायनिति। यथा नासवदतास्तुपारे कत्सराजस
सतिते। XVIII 21 sl

Bindusāra, son of Candragupta Maurya, ruled according to the Purāṇas in 1501-1473 BC and according to modern historians in 4th century BC.

1 In the same work and in a different chapter Abhinava speaks of Vāsavadatta nṛt̄tapāra only as a synonym. “In the fourth and fifth quotations nṛt̄tapāra and nāṭyapāra are mentioned to show that in nāṭyayatā characters on the stage in one drama are represented to sit as audience in some other sub-drama exhibited in the development of the main theme as in the Bālārāmāyaṇa of Rājasekharā. In Nāṭyapāra of Subandhu the main character, the hero Udayana, is made to witness the dramatic performance of his own story played by Bindusāra. When the latter extols the glorious deeds of Udayana the hero suddenly forgets his being the audience of the drama and exclaims his own miserable state of separation from Vāsavadatā before her mother.”

2 On this controversy, see Introduction. On the birth of Bindusāra, Buddhist works give a story “Hearing an attempt at poisoning by his enemies, Canakya fed him with small doses of poison without his knowledge, so as to keep him immune of poison. One day, the Queen who was in full pregnancy, and within 7 days of delivery was about to swallow the food sent to the king with whom she was about to partake the food containing poison. As the child in the womb would be destroyed by the effects of poison, if the Queen swallowed the food of which a morsel was put into her mouth, Canakya who only entered the apartment just then, cut the head of the Queen by a sword before she swallowed the morsel. The child was removed from the womb, and kept in the stomach of goats successively for seven days to complete the full term of gestation. The child was then delivered to a female slave and was nourished and reared by her. In consequence of the spot left on the person of the child by the blood of goats, he was called Bindusāra.”
It is not unlikely it was this Subandhu that wrote an Ākhyāyikā Viṣavadaṭṭā that is instanced by Paṭanjali ²

566 Ramila and Saumila were probably brothers The works of Rāmila and Saumila are not now available Rājasekhara calls them the joint authors of Śūdrakakāthā

They are Kaviputra mentioned by Kālidāsa ²

In Āṭmabodhendrasarasvati’s commentary on Gururaṭnamālakā, there is a quotation for Rāmila’s play Maniprabhā

There it is said that these poets were contemporaries of Arbhaka-Śāṅkara the 20th in descent from Ādi Śāṅkara in the Kāmakotipeetha

1. See para 470 supra.
2. There is a Śūdrakakāthā of Paṇḍukāśha mentioned in KS of Hemaśandra (p 285) under their joint names Vallabhadeva quotes

3. There it is said that Rāmila and Mentha was the keepers of the horses and elephants of Emperor Harṣa. See para 87 supra, where Mentha’s verse about this Śāṅkara is quoted.
567. **Bhāsa** Antiquity of Bhāsa goes to an age so removed that he has been called a Muni. Kālidāsa refers to the glory of ancient poets like Bhāsa, Saumila, Kaviputra, and contrasts his own work as new. Bāna describes the fame attained by Bhāsa by his dramas commenced by Śūtradhāra, and displaying various characters. Dandān praises the scientific perfection of his dramas which are said to be the embodiment of his glory. Jayadeva calls Bhāsa, the Smile of Sarasvati. Rājaśekhara mentions a tradition that the merit of Bhāsa's Svapnavāsavadatata was manifest, when even fire would not consume it.
Abhinavagupta mentions Bhāsa and quotes a verse from a drama which the theme was the story of Rāma. Somadeva quotes two verses under Bhāsa’s name. The anthologies have preserved some verses too. Bhāsa’s language possessed a peculiar grace, his dramas were well designed and variety of characters was their feature and in versatility of imagery and originality of conception, he attained a name.

568 The antiquity of time attributed to Bhāsa is seen from a tradition which represents Bhāsa as a rival of Vyāsa and his poem Viṣṇudharma, as having triumphed over Vyāsa’s work of the same name. T S Narayanāsastri, in his introduction to Raṭnāvah propounded the opinion that Bhāsa was the later name of Ṭhāvaka alias Ghatakarpapa and he lived in the days of Sri Harśa Vikramadeva who flourished according to him in the beginning of the 6th century B.C. He relied

1. Abhinavabhāṣāyī, Adhy. VI.
2. This verse is not found in the publication of the Trivandrum Sanskrit series.
3. Yaśōsillakacampu.
4. Peterson Subh. 80—1
5. In Prathvīraṇajīvaya Mahākavya written by Jayānaka in 12th century A.D., there is a verse,

In commenting on this verse Jonarka says that to test the relative merits of Bhāsa and Vyāsa, who were then rivalling, one work of each was thrown into the fire and fire did not consume the excellent work of Bhāsa (कंघोत्तम: कविय) called Viṣṇudharma (See IA. XLII. 523). In fact there are now two works of this name, both professing to be Purāṇas (See IA. XIX. 408). It is probably on account of this tradition that Vākpati in his Gaudāvahā has मात्रस्य जन्मन्त्रां (V. 800) “Bhāsa, friend of fire”.

T Ganapati Sastri (Int. to Prathvīraṇajīvaka. P 10, note) ignores the reference in the above verse to a Kavya called Viṣṇudharma, and says विष्णुस्मरितप्राकान्तानांनिन्दनि-नेन दर्षवान्.
on passages in Rājasekharā's Kavivimarśa and Hemacandra's Kavya-
nusāsana to say that Dhāvaka was a washerman by birth and he com-
posed a number of dramas among which he sold one to King Harsa, it
is this sale that is mentioned in Mammata's Kavyaprakāśa. It is un-
fortunate that Kavivimarśa is not anywhere traceable and in Kavya-
nusāsana now in print, the passage cannot be discovered.

Rājasekharā in his Kavivimarśa wrote:

Māsī rāmaścāmīlī vṛttaścānāṁsāhāyadārśakājñānaḥ śānti
mṛgyati vṛtiścācānāṁśaścānāṁśaścānāṁśaścānāṁśaścānāṁśa
bhūtham vṛttaścānāṁśaścānāṁśaścānāṁśaścānāṁśa

And Hemacandra in Kavyānusāsana (commentary on Dandin's Kavibhādaya):

Sūtrānti prāto kāśāyamādhānānāṁ prāśeṇa mṛtāṁśa śāriyadāsa
vibhūtā ca

1. See Int to Ray's Ṭīkā of Raṇāvali,
Elsewhere the following verse is quoted as Bhasa's

एको हि दोषो गुणसाधियाते निम्प्ताको किरेगीनिवायठः

न्यून न दल कवितापि तेन दारिद्रयदोषो गुणराशिनाहि॥

569. T. S Narayana Sastri, High Court Vakil, Madras, was an ardent student of Sanskrit literature and his Age of Sankara in which he attempted to collect the results of his research was left unfinished owing to his premature demise. He thus summed up his conclusions

(i) That a comparative study of works akin to the plays of Sri Harsha shows (a) that there is a close identity of plot between the Malavikagnimitra on the one hand and the Ratnavali on the other and that if the Malavikagnimitra were the earlier, it is difficult to explain how the other two ever came to be written, (b) that 'Sri Harsha' was not as a matter of fact indebted to Kalidasa for his plots, but to certain accounts and traditions about historical personages, which were afterwards embodied in the Brihatkatha of Gunadhya and that his plays follow a certain order of sequence and had their origin in connection with certain popular historical characters, (c) that Kalidasa in his Malavikagnimitra and nowhere else makes reference to poets before him, and that the manner of such reference, coupled with his allusion to the tales of Udayana in his Meghaduta, can have meaning only when taken as applying to writers whom he was in some way trying to excel,

(ii) That Bhasa is mentioned by a long list of eminent writers as one of the greatest of Sanskrit poets, as a dramatist of the highest reputation and as the author of the Ratnavali, Priyadarsika, and Nagananda and a host of other plays,

(iii) That by 'Sri Harsha' is meant Sri Harsha Vikramaditya of Ujjain, not Harshavardhana of Kanouj, and that it is by identifying the former with the latter that scholars have fallen into the great error of ascribing the plays in question either to Bana or to some other poet of Harshavardhana's court,

(iv) That this Sri Harsha must have lived in the 6th century B.C. as borne out by a host of references to him in our ancient works.

1. For a criticism of these views by R.V Krushnamacharya, see his Introduction to Priyadarsika, when the arguments, are elaborately set out in lucid Sanskrit prose. See also S. P Ray's Int to Ratnavali.
It was in the year 1910 that Mahamahopadhyaya T. Gananath Sastri of Travancore discovered a collection of 13 plays, with a similarity of expression and construction and declared that they were Bhasa's composition. In his introduction to Svapnavasavadatta he says "it is usual in Natakas to begin with Nandi and then to state the name only: But the Natakas in this collection as a rule begin with the stage direction नान्दिने श्रृणारे. Then instead of the word Prastavana these Natakas use the word .unknown word. Thirdly, in the Natakas of Sudraka, Kalidasa and others, in the Prastavana mention is made of the name of the author and of his works and in some instances in terms of praise. But in the plays before us in the Sthapanas, not even the name is brought in, either of the works or of the author. In the Bharatavakya or the closing sentence of everyone of these plays, invariably occurs the

1 Mahalinga Sastri has written a fine prose summary of the story of these plays, Prented, Madras. For an English translation of these plays, see edition by Ashtakar & Co., Poona.

2 These arguments have been thus summarised by B. Vasudevasarma in the Hindu, 2nd Feb 1937, where he answers objections to the view

(1) That there is in these plays discernible a distinct departure from the rules of dramaturgy as laid down by Bharata in making his stage manager enter after the "nandi" or the benedictory invocatory song, in the non mention of the name of the author, in calling the prologue a "sthapana" and not a "prastavana", in representing death, sleep and fight on the stage and in closing without a Bharatavakya pronounced by one of the characters, all leading to the inference that these plays belonged to Pre-Bharatican days.

(3) That Bhatta Bana, Bhamaha, Vaman and other ancient rhetoricians have referred to him in unmistakable terms as a poet of ancient renown.

(4) That Kauthya quoted him, thus fixing him up to the pre-Kauthyan age.

(5) That Bhasa uses un Paninian archaic forms, arguing a pre Paniniian date.

(6) That he was a Puranamuni according to Kaldas and Jousara.

(7) That by virtue of his writings being characterised by an intensity of race and by a marvellously exquisite flow of language, he was comparable to Valmin and Vyasa and so was possibly contemporaneous with them.

Sakuntala was an elaborate commentary on Sakuntala an unknown author (about 800 years old) mentions all these plays, but without the author's names, as well as Trivikrama, Vatsarajauanta, Vinavasavadatta & co (See Kuppusamiastri's Rep. 1919) &

3 But these three characteristics are found in some other plays discovered later viz., Bhagadajyota, Trivikrama, Nakshayudaya, Vinavasavadatta (whose last benedictory verse mentions King Rama Varma), Padmaprabhata, Ubbhayashikhi, Dhrutavijayamada and a Bhana nicknamed Kundappali Bhana.
player “May our greatest of kings or may our King rule the land.”
In all these plays there is in the end a sentence announcing such and
such a Nataka is finished and the name of the work is given .......

Besides a structural similarity, these plays also contain several
passages in common e.g., तुमायर्यमिश्रान विज्ञापनमि, अग्रे किं तु सबै सरिय विज्ञापनव्याये
क्षण स्व घ्यपे. ¹ The Sloka हिन्दूतीवत् तमोज्ञानि etc., appears in the 1st Act
both of Carudaṭṭha and Bālacānta. The passage कव्यतीति इत्य परिवर्तित मे
occurs in the 6th Act of Svapananatāka and also in the 4th Act of
Abhisekanatāka. The part गर्गस्नेहान्तरे न्यस्तं of a sloka is seen in both
Praṭāma and Abhisekanatāka. Many more points of similarity of this
kind can be observed in the plays.

571 The common characteristics of the technique in these plays
are not as pointed out in the notes below peculiarly their own and cannot
by themselves lead to the conclusion that they are all the works of the
same author. But much must be said in regard to the six plays which
contain the expression Rājasimha in the ending verse and probably of
Praṭāma also, where that ending verse is almost of a similar form and
which contains a passage common with Abhisekanatāka, ⁸ that they may
be fathered on the same poet and if one of them, Svapananatāka, is
definitely known to be the work of Bhāsa, the other works may also be
ascribed to him. But to say the same of other plays in the group, we
shall have to await further evidence.

¹ The former is found at the end of Svapanāvasavadata, Bālacānta and Duttavākya
and a slight modification of it but containing the word Rājasimha is found at the end
of Praṭīgna, Aṇimāntaka Abhiseka and Pāncarājya.

These verses are not found at the end of Duttaghatotkāsa, Madhyamavyṣyoga,
Karṇabhāra and Urabhanga. The latter is found only in Praṭīgna Carudatta as
found is incomplete though the manuscript says it is finished.

⁸ But this very expression is used in Ubbhayābhāseśākā, Pāḍatāṭika and
Āsrayanudāmaṇi.

⁹ This when compared with the Nāṇḍī of the Antarāntaka in Viniāvasavadata, would
lead to an inference that the latter is a work of Bhāsa, for it contains besides
other characteristics of technique referred to by T. Ganapatiṣasta. But Viniāvasavadata
is the work of Sudraka (For this, see under Sudraka).
T Ganapatisastri considers that Bhāsa refers to the Nyāyasāstra of Medhātithī, Pāmini, an ancient sage prior to Bhārata, Kauṭilya, Guṇḍīhyā, Bhāmaha and Sudraka, and GIORNALE on these considerations places him not later than the 5th century B.C.

On the authenticity of this attribution of authorship opinion is divided

1 See Int to Praṭumānātaka, xxv-xxvi Bhāsa's verse of unpāṁśeun words is discussed
2 Ibid xxxi-xxi, where it is said that Bhāsa does not follow Bhārata's rules of dramatizing, and must have followed earlier works of Kṛṣṇaśva etc. On this simple question scholars differ S Levi says "the Trivandrum Bhāsa conforms scrupulously to the classical rules of the Indian Aristotle Bhārata" (Vasavadatta, par Albert Baston, Preface in) and Harapramadastri (JASB, 1912) says "Bhāsa (of the Trivandrum series) disregards altogether the rules of drama hereby laid down in Bharata"
3 T Ganapatisastri says that the verse वन दुर्गर्व नमु, found in the fourth act of Praṭumānasūngundharaśyana is quoted by Kauṭilya in his Arthasāstra (See Int to Svapnavāsadaśa, xxvii) But in the commentary on Arthasāstra by Mādhava-miśra, it is stated that it is a quotation from Manusmṛti so that it would follow that the author borrowed the verse from the same source, if Bhāsa had not borrowed it from Kauṭilya
4 According to T Ganapatisastri, Guṇḍīhyā lived in the 1st century A.D. (i.e., xxvii)
5 According to T Ganapatisastri, Bhāmaha lived not later than 3rd or 2nd century B.C (i.e., xxvii).
6 Lesuy (EDMG, 1918, 208) and Wintermizt (Festschrift for Ernst Kuhn, 8, 301) and Banerjee (JRAS, 1921, 268) on their examination of the Prakrit passages conclude that these plays are older than Kalidāsa (6th century A.D.), but younger than Arṣyaghoṣa (3rd century A.D.) Keith (SD, 98) gives 800 A.D Sukthankar (JAOS, XL, 241, XII, 107) says Bhāsa was later than Pāmini and discusses the prakrit passages Antiquity of these passages is established also by G Morgenstern and W Prinz (lo) P Chordum (Mod. Rev., XIV 882) discusses T Ganapatisastri's views. See also Belloni Fillipi, Vasavadatta of Bhāsa (JOS, XXVII
7 Jacobi, Vasavadatta, Jolly (Göttingen Nachschonen, 1916, 359), Wintermizt (GIL, III 186, 946), Keith (LA, LII, 59, SD, 92-9), M Baston (Tr. of Vasavadatta); Snall (Giornale della Soc. As Italiana, XXV 111), Pavoliii (Ibid.) Lesuy, (EDMG, LXXII 208-8) Lindenau, Bhāsa studien, G, Morgenstern, Coradotta and Motlchakatlka, Loopey, Lacote (JA, XIII, 493), F W Thomas, (JRAS, 1922, 79), Prinz (Bhāsa’s Prahṛṣ, Trumport, A M.), and A Banerjee, (JRAS, 1921, 387) Among scholars of the negative view are L D BARNET (JRAS, 1919, 288 1921, 587-9) on the ground that Rajasimha referred to is a Pandyan King Teramaran Rajasimha) of 7th century A.D., and that these plays resemble Māṭjavālīsprahāsana Ramavatasaśrama (Śurādī, Allahabad, 1st Part I) says that verses quoted in anthologies are not found in this group and the Nāḍī is not dedicated to Śīva, but Bhāsa was a devotee of Śīva BHATTANATHA swami (LA, XLV 169) for which see note under Svapnavasavadatta post. K Ghawasamy (Int. to translation of Meghaduta in Gujarāt, Bombay) assigns Bhāsa to the time of
Of these dramas, Pratītya is Íhamiga, Pāncarātra is Sama-vākāra, Úrubhanga is Utśrūtikāṅka, Cārudaṭṭa is Prakarana, Dūtavākya, Madhyama, Kārṣabāra and Dūta-Ghatotkaca are mostly Vyāyogas, and the rest Nātakas.

Swapnavasavadatta is a drama in six Acts, and is really a continuation of the Pratītya-augandharaya. Having heard a prediction from a sage that Udayana Vaṭārāja would marry Padmāvaṭī, sister of King Darsakā and with his help would recover his lost dominions, Udayana’s minister Vaṅgandharaya with intent to hasten the marriage with Padmāvaṭī resorted to a stratagem. He gave

King Chandragūpta in 3rd century B.C. and Kalidāsa to the Court of King Aghunmitta about B.C. The Introduction is a valuable essay on Bhāsa and Kalidāsa. Then Konow (JAC, XLIII 66) put Bhāsa not before 3rd or 4th century A.D. K. Rama Prabhatī denies the correctness of the attribution to Bhāsa and goes to the extent of saying that Bhāsa was the author of a Swapnavasavadatta and that quotations from Swapnavasavadattā by various authors not found in the present edition show the existence of these works. Moreover, Shama’s Madras, V 179-186, Bull of Or. Studies, III 107

A. Ragasamī Sarasvatī (JMy, XIII 636) says that Rājasūmya referred the Pallava King Nārāyaṇhavasaman II, who was also known as Rājasūmya and who lived in the last decade of the 8th century A.D. In his Introduction to his own editions of several of these plays, T. Ganapatīsastri has attempted to answer these objections and has done so in a separate monograph.

For a complete discussion of the question, see Jyotiscandra Ghatak’s Dramas of Bhāsa (Jubilee Research Prize Thesis, Calcutta University, 1923) For an examination of the criticisms by R. Vasudevasarma and R. Mahadevasarma, see The Hindu, Madras, 1927 Feb 2nd and 9th.

Sukthankar, The Bhāsa Riddle, (JBRAS, I 137), Hirnandeesastry, Bhāsa and authorship of the 13 plays, Studies in Bhāsa (JAC, XL Oct., XLI April.), Lesley, On the Prakrit of Bhāsa (ZDMG, 1918), C. R. Devadhar, Plays ascribed to Bhāsa (Annals, VII 29, VII 17-42), P. V. Kane, Kundamala and Bhāsa (Annals, XI 155) K. Krishnamacharya, Bhāsa, a study (C. H. Coll Mag, Oct 1917) and Durvodhana as portrayed by Bhāsa (Collegium, March 1914), R. Vasudevasarma, On Tamil Influences on Bhāsa (The Hindu, 19th June 1928) See also Levi, JA, (1928), 193 and JRAS, (1928) 100, Cal Rev (1924), 290

1. Ed TSS, Trvandrum by T. Ganapatī Sastri with an elaborate introduction and again with a commentary Ed by Lakshmana Sarup, Lahore Translated by K. Pisharodi (JMy X, 184 203, 272), by L H. Gray (New York), by Baslow (Paris) and into verse by Pannalal (Allahabad), and by H B Bhidé (Allahabad) Ed with translation by C. R. Deodhar, Bombay, See C R Deodhar, Swapnavasavadatta, (Annals, VI).

2. P V Gune in Prodyota, Udayana etc., in Jam Legend (Annals, 1920-21, July) collects different allusions of the story of Udayana and the essay is very interesting with the titular verse of Meghadūta

Phoṣasa visticitar bantaragana jhe hōm saṃhitumanyasūchanaṃ tathāvar rākṣa
Janmādāya: Kjha nālimārṣṭamālaktaḥ dargāhāṃkāraṇadāsyati jhā yāvānāmbhyāh

71
out that Udayana’s queen Vāsavadattā (daughter of King Mahāsena of Avantī) was lost in a conflagration and disguising her as his sister whose husband was away, he donned the garb of a Muni and approaching Padmāvatī entrusted her to Padmāvatī’s care under the pseudonym of Avantikā. Then Udayana married Padmāvatī. Once when asleep Vāsavadattā came to his side and when she touched him he opened his eyes, but before he could get hold of her, she flew away. This made Udayana all the more dejected. As he was diverting himself with a picture of Vāsavadattā in her wedding attire, Padmāvatī mentioned to him that in her harem there was a lass called Avantikā quite like the image in the picture, entrusted to her care by a brahmin. Then Vāsavadattā was brought before him and the lovers met once again and all was well when the secret was divulged.

574 References in rhetorical works are as follow

(i) DANDIN in Kāvyāḍārśa (II 280) has

In commenting on this Tarunavacāspī says

and Bhoja says (SP. Ch X) that Avanti here means Vāsavadatta. In this edition Vāsavadattā is called Avanti or Avantikā by Vaugandhānāyana when she was entrusted to Padmāvatī

[NB—M R Kavi points out that this verse is found in Tapasa-
vaṭsarṣaṇā when Vatsaraṇā attempted suicide in Yamunā and Vāsava-
daṭṭā appears then in the scene.]

(ii) VAMANA’s quotation (V. 1 3)

is found in this edition

(iii) BHOJA writes thus

This description agrees with the story in the present edition

(iv) ŚARADAJANAYA mentions the sandhis in Svapnavāsavadatta. Of these first verse is found in the Trivandrum edition, but the 2nd and 3rd stages are absent.
The following verse quoted by Abhinavagupta in Dhvanyaloka as from Svapnavasavadatta is not found in the Trivandrum Edn.

Nor is the verse quoted by Rāmacandra in Nātyadārpanā:

Nor is the following quoted by Sāgaranandin in Nātakalakṣana-rāṇakosa:

(v) Sarvananda (who lived about 1159 A.D.) in his commentary on Amarakosa in commenting on the Sloka नन्दिकारंकणा etc., says that लविज्ञातामानसांविनिविदथनयस्य पद्यांप्रांपरिपूर्वसूक्ताय लघुबासवदेवे नवा वसवदप्रांप्रांपरिनय कामश्रुताय and this description tallies with the story in the present edtion Bhattanāthhaswāmi (I.A, XIV 101) thinks that the work referred to by Sarvananda must be different. He finds an allusion to the story in Mālaṛi-Madhava and says that the main theme of Svapnavāsavadatta of Bhāsa was the marriage of Vāsavadātṛ and not Padmavati, whereas the present play deals with the events subsequent to the marriage of Vāsavadātṛ, that is, the marriage of Padmāvatī.
575 Pratignayaugandharayana, is a Natikā in four Acts. In the course of an elephant hunt Vatsarāja sees a false elephant, prepared and stationed in the forest at the orders of King Pradyota, and when unknowingly attempting to tame it with his Vinā, Pradyota’s soldiers overpower him, and take him prisoner. Then Pradyota’s minister Tānakāyana intervenes and hands him over to Pradyota. Pradyota takes the Vinā and gives it to his daughter Vāsavatātā and imprisons Vatsarāja in his own house. Vatsarāja and Vāsavatātā meet each other and soon Vatsarāja happy in his love forgets all thought of his own kingdom. Meanwhile, Vaugandharāyana, his minister, discovers Vatsarāja’s predicament. He arranges by careful espionage that all his army in disguise pervades the capital of Pradyota and himself in the garb of a madman begins to run through the streets, watching an opportunity. At the appointed signal the army rises up and in trying to take away Vatsarāja and Vāsavatātā on an elephant by force, Vaugandharāyana is subdued and caught. But Pradyota is pleased with the minister’s sagacity and he sends him back home in royal state with Vatsarāja and the princess.

576 Carudatta is a fragment in four Acts without the initial or final verses. Carudatta, a merchant, impoverished by his generosity, fell in love with a hetāra Vasanṭasena. Pursued by the king’s brother-in-law Samstāhana she took refuge in Carudatta’s house and left her jewels in his care. The jewels were stolen away at night by a thief Sajalaka in order to purchase the freedom of a slave girl of Vasanṭasena. In the morning Carudatta offered his wife’s necklace to Vasanṭasena in lieu of the lost jewels, but Vasanṭasena handed the slave girl to Sajalaka and herself went to Carudatta. Here the play

1. Vāmāna quotes a line यो मत्तिपिण्डस कृत्व न युद्धाति (Adhyāya II) This is found in this drama. In Kumudimahotsava there is reference to the names of Vatsarāja, and his horse Sundarapātala and his servant Kātyāyana.

In the same connection, Pratignayaugandharāyana mentions the name Sundara pīṭhala (page 19)

देवी कीठा अमावजी आ अरकण्ड्यावसिष्य सुंदरपाटिर अस्तित

2. Bhāmaha (IV, 40) remarks that Vatsarāja could not have been deceived by an artificial elephant and if caught, his life would not have been spared by the enemy. He gives this as an instance of unnaturalness or Nyāyavimodha.

वेदतते कैसावर्त्त विनिमय व | विदेश ब्रह्मादिक कृत्व ि द ि तु द ताद ||

3. Ed. TSS, with commentary by T. Ganapathisastri (Trivandrum). Of dramas having similar plots, one Udāyanaśastra and Viṅgāvavasadāṭa. For these analogies, see M. Ramakrishnakavi’s introduction to Viṅgāvavasadāṭa (Madras).
ends abruptly and "it seems as if Carudatta were accused of theft and that Vasantasesa herself is in grave danger of her life." 1

577 Pratimanataka* begins with banishment of Rāma to the woods and the miserable condition of Dasaratha ending in his death Bharata infers the death of his father from the statue of his father erected in the statue house of the family and from this the play takes its name Bharata then interviews Rāma in the forest and returns back to the capital with his sandals to be crowned in his stead. Then follows the story of the abduction of Sītā by Rāvana and the war with Rāvana ending in his destruction and Rāma's return with Sītā to his hermitage, where Bharata and the queens go to receive him and Rāma is crowned on the spot. In this play the author has often copied expressions from Rāmāyana. 8

1 Edited by T. Gauapati Sasit, (TSS) Trivandrum, and again with his own commentary Sec K V Vasudevasarma, The Source of Daridra-Carudatika in The Hindu, Madras, June 6th, 1928 Vāmāna in his Nāyānkarasūtra (V I, 5) quotes a verse (I. 2).

2 Ed Trivandrum (TSS) with an elaborate and valuable introduction by T. Ganapataswēti Translated by Rama Pisharoti with critical notes (JMy, XII 58, 375, XIII 595, XIV 39, XI 853), Ed with translation by S.M Paranjapa, Bombay.

3. Here is a nice description of an identity.

Rāma—Aye, Ayaśayam rāma! Nāth hūpalaśvatam ।
Prasatam tāvastāya kṣaṭaḥ kṣaṭabhiḥ sarvāṃ pratīsam śadvikā ।
Dvātipītratāntā-jāto 'pitarāvaśāṅgāyā nāmāh 'nāmāh rājanām ।

---


dhūlītāta bhūtātā dhūlītātāsāśramādyātābhāvānām ।

(Adhyāya XIX).
578 **Balacarita** in five acts describes the birth of Krishna and his miraculous performances from sucking out of the life of Pūjāna and the killing of Cāṇūra to the killing of Kāliya and Rāabhāṣura, the destruction of Kamsa, and the coronation of Ugrasena.

579 **Urubhanga** begins with a prologue describing the actual fight between Bhima and Duryodhana in which Duryodhana is struck with a mallet on his thigh and falls down disabled. The scene follows in which Dhṛtarāṣṭra and his wife go to see the last dying son and Duryodhana recovers his sense of rectitude and commends a life of friendship. The last scene introduces the furious Asvatthāman and his violent vow to destroy the last scion of the Pandava race. The play ends with the passing away of Duryodhana in the stage and the renunciation of Dhṛtarāṣṭra.

580. **Pancaratra** The play takes its name from the period of five nights referred to in the plot, which is briefly as follows — "After wandering for twelve years in the forest the Pandavas were living incognito in the thirteenth year Drona, the family preceptor of the Kurus, knew the reluctance of Duryodhana and others to give a bit of land even to the Pandavas. Hence he apprehended a fratricidal war. To avoid such a calamity he was looking for an opportune moment to unite the brothers. At the instance of Drona, he (Duryodhana) performed a sacrifice. At the end of the sacrifice he performed his bath and wanted to render Gurudaksma. Drona cleverly demanded half of the kingdom for the Pandavas. Duryodhana assented to it on the condition that Drona would bring within five nights..."
the news of the whereabouts of the Pandavas. Drona found out Bhima
from the news of Kichaka’s being slain in secret in the capital of
Virata. Bhisma induced the Kauravas to carry off the cattle of Virata
under the pretext of ministering him for his absenting himself from
the sacrifice. Thus he located the Pandavas. And half the kingdom
was given to the Pandavas.”

581 Rama Datta Pant’s Aparapancarāṭra is based on this
play. He was professor of Sanskrit in Bareilley college. He lived in
Almora District in 1861-1928 A.D. He also wrote Lekhiniyapāna
and Dipasaṭaka.

582 Dutavyakya is an one-Act drama. “This is woven
from the Mahabharata story of Krishna acting as an ambassador
of the Pandavas. Kancuki intimated the arrival of Krishna to Duryodhana
saying: ‘Purushottama is come.’ Just then Duryodhana was holding
his ministerial council. He corrected Kancuki’s language telling
him to name Krishna as Kamsabhṛtya Damodara. As an evil omen
Duryodhana fell from his seat at the advent of Vasudeva. Krishna
When Vasudeva was seated in Duryodhana’s council hall, he found
there a picture of Draupadi’s Kesakarsana. Vasudeva then demanded
the division of the paternal property. Duryodhana pointed to Pandu’s
remaining free from intercourse with females and there was a curse
from a sage and refused any division of property. Vasudeva also then
pointed out that Vicitrawrya got Phisus Pulmonals and that Dhrita-
rastra was born on Ambika through the agency of Vyasa and that
therefore he also, on the same ground as Duryodhana held out,

---

1 Ed. Trivandrum and again with his own commentary and an elaborate Introduction by T. Ganapati Sastrī. As summed by J. Ghatak (I c)
2 Here is a description of prious brahmins

and of Abhimanyu’s chariot

and of Abhimanyu’s chariot.

and of Abhimanyu’s chariot.

---

1 Ed. Trivandrum and again with his own commentary and an elaborate Introduction by T. Ganapati Sastrī. As summed by J. Ghatak (I c)
2 Here is a description of prious brahmins

and of Abhimanyu’s chariot.

and of Abhimanyu’s chariot.

---
could not claim paternal property. Then Duryodhana tried to use force, when Vasudeva took his Visvarupa, and the former found him everywhere in every possible shape and size. Sudarsana, the discus of Vasudeva, was called in by the latter into action and there came Sudarsana, Kaumodaki, Pancajanya and all other weapons in the train. Duryodhana's fear and bewilderment were highest when Vasudeva again cooled down. Just then Dhritarashtra came on the scene, and fell at the feet of Vasudeva, to atone for the fault of his sons. The Lord Vasudeva complied with his request.  

583 Madhyamavyayogam "Bhimasena rescues a Brahmin family from the hands of Ghatotkaca. Ghatotkaca and his mother Hidimbi wanted human food and caught sight of a group of brahmans, an old man, his wife and three sons and it was after some discussion arranged to give up the middle son. Just then Bhimasena came on the scene and in the course of the fighting with Ghatotkaca, they recognised each other as father and son, and the victim was rescued."

584 Karnabharam begins with the relation by Karna of the story of a curse that just at the moment of need his weapons would prove ineffectual. On his way to battle against Arjuna, Indra encounters him in the garb of a poor brahmin and asks for a gift. Karna with his characteristic generosity promises anything that he desired. Indra asks for his armour and earrings and walks away with the gifts. The plays ends with the gift of an invulnerable Sakti by Indra to Karna in lieu of the extortion he had committed.

1 Ed. Trivandram and again with his own commentary by T. Ganapati Sastri As summarised by J. Ghatek (1 e)

2 अवे ' अपि पान्चजन्य, प्रसाद —  
पुराणद्रुक्कमा दीदरहारगीररायणानस्फोटकलाताद्: ||  
गद्य लेन गद्यसागरचोपत्तुल्य गाम्य निरंभयन्य निपतन्त्यसराज्ञानात् ||
अवे ' इत्य सूक्ष्ट्वी प्रसाद——  
मणिनकविविचित्र विस्मालकेरीया हुररिपयरिपािके जाततः ||  
मितिवसलसमु हरिवारातातिहारेश नसिदे श्रीम सेवान्तवात् नाधानात् ||

3 Ed. Trivandram, and again with his commentary and an introduction by T. Ganapati Sastri. Translated by S. P. Janvier, Myrore, with introduction and notes. There is a stage adaptation of this drama called Haldimba Vaidyadhyya by T.S. Narayana Sastri with an introduction on Bhāsa and Kālidāsa (Madras). Pavolini, (GSAl, XXIX 1) points out that Bakavāccha of Mahābhīrata has been adopted here for the plot.

4 Ed Trivandram It is also called Kavaśkundalākharahāpanam in some manuscripts.
The nāndī here is fine

585 **Duta-Ghatotkacam** When Abhimanyu was killed by the Dhātarrāstras cruelly and illegally, Gāndhāri, Dhṛtarāstra and Dussala repudiated the conduct of the Kauravas. Ghatotkaca was sent on a mission of peace by the Pāṇḍavas to the Kaurava camp, but he was insulted. Ghatotkaca became defiant. Dhṛtarāstra interfered and appeased him.*

586 **Abhisekanatakam** is based on the story of Rāma in Kīkindhā, Sundāra and Yuddha Kāndas. It begins with the fight with Vāli and runs through the plot until the fall of Rāvana and Sītā’s ordeal of fire. Then follows a charming eulogy.*

587 **Avimaraka** "Viṣṇusena, the king of Sauvīra, became a candāla for a year, along with his family by the curse of Dirghaṭap as. While thus living in Kuntibhoja town incognito he killed an Asura named Avi, and became known as Avi-māraka. One day he rescued his maternal uncle’s daughter Kurangi from the clutches of an infuriated elephant. On hearing this, the father of Kurangi, Kuntibhoja intended to marry her to Avimaraka, but he could not do so, as Avimaraka was of a very low caste. But Kurangi and Avi met, grew in mutual amour, and the love reached a climax. Through Dhātri’s contrivance Avimaraka once entered Kurangi’s chamber. Coming out and finding no help out of the difficulty, he resolved to die by throwing himself down from a hill. At that time a Vidyādha met him, and gave him a ring by whose power he could secretly enjoy the companionship of Kurangi every night with a buffoon of his as his comrade. Kuntibhoja on finding him there became perplexed, and thought of marrying her to Jayavarman, another nephew of his on the sister’s side. But Narada intervened and married the couple publicly with celebrations.”*

---

1. Ed. Trivandrum
2. Ed. Trivandrum and again with his own commentary by T. Ganapati Sastri
3. Here is Rāma’s news to Sītā about his coronation
4. The story is found in Kādasastgraha. It is alluded to by Viṣṇuṣyana in Kāmasutra and in Kaumudī-mahosvādaya.
Here is a fine description of night-fall

व्यामृणस्तिंको वितलोहालो नाधलयो मृत्युमोहर्वशात् ||

and of the darknight

तिमिकस्व वहनि भार्तस्य विफित्तनिमा प्रतिभाति हम्मम्माला ||

588 Damaka and Traivikrama are two peculiar pieces of dramatic composition. There are too short even to last for a half hour and for parity of diction and structure, they have been called 'Two more dramas of Bhasa'. In Damaka, says V. Venkatram Sastri, "the sentences, slokas, and even words occurring herein are to be found in the Swapnavasavadatta and other dramas, in the Maltavilasa, Kautilya's Arthasastra, Kumarasambhava of Kaushika and in such other books, the only exception being the Bharatavakyat at the end of the play. The nandi verse can be seen in the arthasastra, the anustubh in the middle occurs in Kumarasambhava, while in the body of the play there is the drama named Karnabharata of so-called Bhasa."

Damaka is a friend of Karna, king of Anga and acts as a Vidushaka. He accompanies Karna to the hermitage of Parasurama during his sojourn there for learning missiles in archery. He finds himself ill at

1. Paper read at Or Confes., Madras, 1924, by M. R. Kavi
2. Ed, Punjab Sans series, Lahore, with Translation and Introduction by V. Venkataram.
ease in the many royal comforts which he is forced to enjoy in the king's company and is upset, and says

मम उस्मानाभिेसे श्रीमद प्राचीन, दक्षिणे श्रीमान, मूलति कह खुश खुशीमि गच्छ श्रवणार्याणां। अन्तर्कारपूर्विताश्च नासुपूर्वि परशारि। रैथयुस- 

The description of āśrama is picturesque. The main story relates how Karna got initiated into the mysteries of the bow on the false representation that he was not a śatāriya and how when Paraśurāma discovered the fraud by chance he cursed Karna “Let your Astras prove futile in need”

This plot appears a complement of Karnabhāra, where Karna's kundalas were taken away on the pretext of a gift and if clubbed with Karnabhāra may rightly fit in a dramatisation of Mahābhārata

589 **Bodhayana's Bhagavadajjuka**, a prahasana, is so named because Bhagavān namely Parivrāt or Yogin and Ajjukā a hataera play the roll. Of the three commentators, one attributes it to Bodhāyana, another to Bharata and a third leaves it anonymous. A poet Bodhayana is praised by Sukumāra in his Raghuviracarita, a play of the 12th century. In the Māmāndur inscription of Mahendravikramavarma dated 610 A.D., Bhagavadajjuka is mentioned. A quotation in it from

---

1 Ed *JBOBS* Ed by Prabhakarasastri, Madras Ed by Anujanaohan, Sendamangalam, with the commentary of Nārāyana (TC, IV 5492, 4895).

2 *Ed* by Prabhakarasastri, Madras *Ed* by Anujanaohan, Sendamangalam, with the commentary of Nārāyana (TC, IV 5492, 4895).

3 This shows that Nārāyana also wrote commentaries on Bhavabhuti's plays. Another commentary by Aṣyāschaya's pupil Nāma is yet unprinted. For an anonymous commentary, see *DC*, XXI 5487.

---

3 See under Mahendravikramavarma, post.
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Tatvasamasa, one of the oldest and basic works on Sāṁkhya philosophy and a classification of dramas in an ancient mode* amply attest its antiquity. In any view the work must have belonged to about the beginning of the 1st century A.D or earlier and never later than the 4th century A.D.

This play was "apparently intended by its author to bring into ridicule the doctrines of Buddhism—a method, among others, which the Brahmins employed to stem the rising tide of that religion. The chief characters in the play are a Panvrajaka, or saint, his disciple Sandilya, and a young and beautiful courtezan. The play opens with a discussion between the master and the pupil on Hindu Dharma, but the attention of the latter is all for the young woman in the adjacent garden. As this one-sided discussion proceeds, the woman suddenly falls down dead from snake-bite. The young man is very much affected, but the older one seizes the opportunity to demonstrate to his pupil the powers of Yoga and transfers his soul into the body of the courtezan who presently rises up and continues the philosophic discussion. The beholders are very much surprised, but their astonishment is not diminished when the body of the Panvrajaka, which had fallen lifeless, starts up again and talks and behaves as the courtezan used to do. For, the agents of Yama had made a mistake in taking the Jiva of the girl and had returned to restore it, but finding her body alive, infused her Jiva into the Panvrajaka's frame."

590 To the beginning of the Christian era or earlier must be referred, four bhāṇas edited as a collection, CAIURBHANI. Tradition has coupled them as anterior to Kālidāsa.

वर्षाविरि क्रयद्वसंयासिंहकन्जुर्कक चतवार।
पर्यंत सापाद बमुः का शक्ति कालिदासस्॥

and it is not unlikely that these four poets are named in order of time. Parity of motifs, likeness in humour and unity in aesthetics display their proximity and intimacy. References to Kaṭantra school of grammar, to Dātaka's Vaisāka sūtras and to the stories of Pātaliputra justify the inference of their antiquity.

1. दृष्टिरः——
अनेक में सितन्त्र | अर्थ हु नाटककरणोऽवश्य पारेः गुणावपितमहमकार्ल्योगमांगः।
क्षितपुरस्वस्तिकूलसादनानात्र | दक्षजातिस्य नामवर्षेतु हास्यवेक प्रशासनिति पत्रसमि॥

2. See Asokamath Bhatacarya, Bhagavadajjuka and some new problems, (Pr. Or. Conze, 1926), and Prabhakaramssiri, Bhagav, I 47.
591 Vararuci is mentioned as a poet by Patanjali. Sāmilaka mentions him as a writer on rhetoric also. In Udbhavabhisarika Vararuci describes the lives of Kuberadatta and Narayanadatta.

592 Isvaradatta or Vireśvaradatta wrote bhāna Dhurtavītāsamvada. The scene is laid in Pataliputra and in the guise of a conversation the poet propounds the tenets of Kāmāśāstra in all intricacies. The play is quoted by Bhoja and unlike many other plays of the class has a sociological value.

1 S K. De gives date, 6 and 7th century Keith places them in 1000 A D and later and W Thomas (Centenary sup to JRAS, 126-86, & JRAS (1924), 762) in the time of Harṣa of Kanauj.

Here is an instance of fine humour emanating from a damsels and a philosophising lover:

के अथुथ, वृद्धशय्यविधिकाय तस्मात समाध्यत्सुक्ष रूपसि अतिरिथ्रूपः

भगवति तुम्भमैवद्। कुटः—

वच्य ते तद्रायतासि दक्षिणा रूपायते तथा

सामान्य तत् वैकन मुच्छनस्ततातीति कस्मां ते।

सत्यायरस्य समया यस्तहितायुष्मयति अन्नः यस्ताक्रियाश्रयति तैः

वेगते तत्त्वमेविनिश्चित्याःसृसृस्यनिमित्ताः

II

2 Is he the same as King Isvarasena?

In a Nazik inscription in Arch Sur of Western India, IV, 109, king Isvarasena, son of Ābhira Sivadarśa is mentioned as a ruling sovereign and is thought to have reigned in the 3rd century A.D. Besides Mahākālapāpa Isvaradatta is considered on reasonable grounds to have been an Ābhir and his coins show that he reigned sometime between circa 286 and 289 A C. These dates are surmised by H. C. Chakravart in his Studies in Kamasutra of Pāṇiniya (p. 31). See also Bhagavanlal Indradā, The Western Kshatriyas (JRAS, 1890, 559) and El. P. Pageon, Catalogue of Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, 0xxxv D R. Bhandarkar assigns Isvaradatta to A.D. 188-190 (Arch Sur India, Annual Rep. 1913-4, p. 290), and see also his papers on The Gurjaras (JRAS, XXI. 480).

3. For instance here are some questions answered.

(i) काम्यमानाः बेंगः कथ कविहाति ?

(ii) प्रछण्डसमासम्: केन कारणेण सोहुकुषापारदि ?

(iii) कथ केवलावननें न अनुदात्कामुक् ?

(iv) द्वेशमानेवनेन कथ अनुदात्युपप्यम् ?

Here is something lamentatory of the society of Vējra.

प्रागग ह्म स्थानोपैव्य वधातन्यिनो वार्तकेव तन्द्रीरणि

निविधाय अन्येतुधुरायाविनिष्टेऽस्तस्मानत्विदुः

विविधातृष्टिकाहरि: सत्वांविमण्ये हृद्यकायम् जानी

शान्तोत्साहित्वा वेंदे वैद्वस्यव्रतेन सुधी जीविति।
593. **Syamilaka** was the son of Īśvaradatta or Vīresvaradatta. He calls himself an Udyeya. His Padatadiaka is quoted by Abhinavagupta, Kṣemendra, Vallabhadeva and others. It describes the foolish actions of Viṣṇunāga an orthodox Brahmin employed as Registrar of Royal Inscriptions and is intended as a satire of urban society. The scene is laid in Sārvabhaumendrapuram in Sourastra country Viṣṇunāga was hit on his head by a courtesan with her feet and he sought expiation for it from an assembly of debauchees and they prescribe a hit with her other foot as the remedy.

594 Bāna praises Ādiyāraja's plays of variety of characters.

Uṭsāha is a species of dramatic composition. The commentary says,

उत्साहे ृत्ते तार्किकाम्। उदारसानगिनिर्मायनदीपंचारात्मकाह्युतसाहै इत्येव केवित्।

The scene is laid in Sārvabhaumendrapuram in Sourastra country Viṣṇunāga was hit on his head by a courtesan with her feet and he sought expiation for it from an assembly of debauchees and they prescribe a hit with her other foot as the remedy.

595 **Sudraka**, known as Indrāṇīgupta, was a Brahmin of the Asmaka country. He was brought up along with a prince called Śvāti. Śvāti quarrelled with him while at game in boyhood and the ill-feeling was nurtured as he grew in age. Among Sudraka's friends was one

---

1. Ed by M. Ramakrishna Kavi, Madras. F. W. Thomas, JRAŚ, (1904)
2. Also written as Symilaka or Syāmala. It is not likely that he was the same as the teacher of Mahimābhatta or Bāna's paternal uncle's son mentioned in Harṣacarita. Śyāmalīka refers to poets Rudravarman and Āyarakaśita and Āryaka.
3. Viṣṇunāga thus deplores the incident

4. Ed by M. Ramakrishna Kavi, Madras. F. W. Thomas, JRAŚ, (1904)
5. Also written as Symilaka or Syāmala. It is not likely that he was the same as the teacher of Mahimābhatta or Bāna's paternal uncle's son mentioned in Harṣacarita. Śyāmalīka refers to poets Rudravarman and Āyarakaśita and Āryaka.
6. It is not likely that he was the same as the teacher of Mahimābhatta or Bāna's paternal uncle's son mentioned in Harṣacarita. Śyāmalīka refers to poets Rudravarman and Āyarakaśita and Āryaka.
7. For the identification of Ādhyaṭāja with Harṣadeva, see R. Pischell, Nachrichten Phil., Lit., Klassen (1901), 285.
Bandhudaṭṭha. When once a Buddhist mendicant Sanghālīka inveigled Śūdraka into a solitary cave and attempted assassination, Śūdraka overpowered the mendicant, killed him and escaped. Then he visited various cities, like Vedisā, Ujjain and Maṭhurā and his adventures were many. He seized the kingdom of Ujjain and became its king, but in grateful recollection of youthful associations he spared the life of the old king Śvādiś. He was well versed in the Rk and Sama Vedas, in mathematics, in the art of dancing girls and in taming elephants. He was a votary of Śiva, who favoured him with his boons. He won many wars and had a glorious reign. He performed Asvamedha, lived for 100 years and ten days and immolated his frame in fire, having duly annointed his son as sovereign. Śūdraka’s name as sovereign and poet has acquired a traditional dignity. His exploits and adventures are as glorious and charming as those attributed to Vikramādiṭṭha and universal interest in their narration has contributed to gather around them many tales almost of a legendary nature.

The celebrity of Śūdraka’s reign has commended his name into a hereditary appellation in later royal dynasties such as the Ganga and Pallava and in this respect also he bears an analogy to Vikramādiṭṭha. Some lexicographers quote Śūdraka, Vikramādiṭṭha, Sahasāṇka etc., as synonymous.

596 Kathāśarītsāgara represents him as king of Šobhāvatī and saved from imminent death by a Brahmin who gave up his life to assure the king a life of a hundred years. So says Vetalapancāvimśaṭi which calls him King of Vardhamāṇa, Dāsakumaracariṇa alludes to his adventures in successive incarnations, Harṣacarita makes him an enemy of Candraketu, prince of Cakora, and Kaḍambarī describes him as the king of Vedisā. Rājatarangini mentions him as the type of firmness and as predecessor of Vikramādiṭṭha.

The story of his life has been the theme of several works: Śūdrakacarita, an Akhyāyīka, Śūdrakakathā of Rāmila and Saṃmita, etc.

1 This information is given in the prologue to Myōhakatō.
2 For the Founder of the Vikrama Era (JMy, XII. 206, XIII. 306) A. Bangaswamy Sarasvatī, has now propounded the theory that the founder of Vikramadeśiya era was Śūdraka.
3 Raj III, 343, Lasa, 107
4 ZDMG, XXVIII, 117, Keith, SD,
5 Mentioned by Vādīganabhāla in his commentary on Kavyādārī.
6 Rājasekhara names it

तामसुक्रक्षाकारी कथी रामिलामिलिक: ||
योद्द्धयो काव्यास्रीचन्द्रेनारथोपप || Sukṣumukṭāvah
Sudrakakatha (prakrit poem) of Pancaśikha, Vikranta-Sudraka (a play)

597 In Viracanṭa, a heroic poem in 30 adhyayas ANANTAKAṆI narrates the events supposed to have taken place at Pratisthana (Pauhān) on the Godāvari in connection with Śālivāhana (the conqueror of Vikramādiśa of Ujjain) and his son Śāṅkumāra Sudraka is described as the friend and afterwards co-regent of Śālivāhana and of his son and when the latter attempted to disembarass himself of his influence, he was overthrown and Sudraka himself became king.

598 When did Sudraka live? On this question, as usual in the studies of Orientalists, views are various. But the synchronism mentioned in Avantisundarikātha that Sudraka was a contemporary of Svāti is a new standard for consideration, though this again depends on the unsettled chronology of the Andhra dynasty of Magadha. According to Purāṇas and Kaliyuga Śā vatānta, Simhaka Śri Śā tākarna, read variously as Sipraka, Ksipraka, Śindhuka and Sisuka founded the dynasty in 2305th year after Yudhisthira's coronation and the dynasty ruled for 506 years. The 24th in the line was Śivasvāti, the son of Mahendraśātakarṇi and he reigned for 28 years from 2705th year of Yudhishthira's coronation, that is, 434 to 409 B.C. But Puranic chronology is discredited by modern scholarship! Pargiter who now seems to be the authority whom modern historians adore gives 'on the footing of inscriptions' to Andhra kings 230 B.C. to 225 A.D. Purāṇas give a list of 32 kings of whom the last that bore a name ending in Śavāti was Śivasvāti, the 27th king of the line. Śivasvāti was the earliest bearing the appellation after Hāla, who was first in the line Hāla, alias Śātavāhana, inaugura-

1. Mentioned by Bhoja in Śrṅgārāprakāśa (XXVIII) and also (Ibid XXX), and by Hemacandra in Kāvyānusāsana (Bom. Edn., 388)

2. Mentioned by Bhoja and Abhinavagupta.

3. See para 203 supra. For an account of Śālivāhana, see also the poem Śālivāhanakatha by Śivadīsa (para 204 supra).

ted the Kataptra School of grammar and at his instance Sarvavarma wrote the Kataptra system for speedy and easy instruction in grammar by the grace of God Kartikeya. If Satavahana Hala, the 18th in the Andhra line of kings, lived according to Pargiter about the beginning of the 1st century A.D., it is likely that Sudraka who thought it fit to ridicule Kataptra grammar was a contemporary of a king Svati of Andhra dynasty, that king was Sivasvati who ruled about 81 A.D. Sivasvati ruled for 28 years. On this consideration Sudraka may be assigned to the end of the 1st century A.D.

According to Puranas, Sudraka ruled in the middle of the 5th century B.C. as Sivasvati ruled in 462-434 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purana's dates</th>
<th>Pargiter's dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834-811</td>
<td>811-793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793-783</td>
<td>783-765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. BKR, (1875-8), 74, Belvalkar (Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, 81) accepts the date 1st century A.D. for the origin of this School.

2. See T.S. Narayana Sastry, Age of Sankara, Part I D, 92-100, where also, see for sources and names of kings.

Wilson (Theatre I, 6) gives 150 A.D. on the authority of Skanda Purana, which says Sudraka would reign 3298 years after Kali. A local Mahatmya of Palibana sva he founded a dynasty there in 372 A.D. (Arch. Sur. of Western India, III. 56). Other accounts make him the first of the Andhra Kings and say that the names given as Siddhaka Suruika or Siddhaka elsewhere is an error for Sudraka (JBRAS, XIII 816).

Lassen (Alt., II 966) is uncertain but is inclined towards 150 A.D. Ferguson (Indian and Eastern Arch, 117, JRAS, (N.S.), IV. 123) gives 81 B.C. Willard (As Res, IX, 101) gives between 1st and 3rd century B.C. and Prinsep (Useful tables, Arch. Sur. of Western India, II, 133) 21 B.C. Segurad (1st to 6th, Paris) says Buddhism was then prevalent and assigns between 250-600 A.D. rather than the first. Weber (IL, 906) refers to the use of the word Nana (MSI, I, 28) as a term borrowed from the name of Kanerki who reigned in 40 A.D., and gives Sudraka a subsequent date. M. Williams (IV, 471) gives 1st century A.D. Fischel (Into to Svarapalika) bases his view on the verse दिन्तक्ति तमोन्नाति and makes Sudraka contemporary of Dandin and Dandin is the real author Mrohakatika. Macdonell (BL, 801) agrees with Fischel and gives date 6th century A.D. See also Peterson (Subh 180). Note this verse now known in Bhasa's Carnta and Balsamita. For criticism of these opinions, see K.P. Parab's Introduction to Mrohakatika (Bombay) N Chatur- padhyaya, Mrohakatika, a study, Bombay and Mysore, M. Nyayaratma, On the authorship of Mrohakatika (JASB, 193 200). For articles in other languages, see Schuyler, Bibl, 83-9 and Bhurap (1934); 37 K. C, Mehendale [Date of Sudraka's Mrohakatika] assigns Sudraka to the middle of 6th century A.D. J C Ghatak (Date of Mrohakatika from astrological data) fixes the date latest 3rd century B.C.
5 Sri Šaṭakaṁ 765—709
6 Skanda Śvāmūn 709—691
7 Lambodara 691—678
8 Āpiṭaka 678—661
9 Meghaśvātī 661—643
10 Śātasvātī 643—631
11 Skandaśvātikarna 625—618
12 Mṛgaṇḍa Śvāṭikarna 618—615
13 Kuntala Śvāṭikarna 615—607
14 Saumya Śvāṭikarna 607—595
15 Śātavatikarna 595—594
16 Puloma Šāṭakarṇi or Puloman I 594—553
17. Megha Šāṭakarṇi 555—520
18 Arṣṭa Šāṭakarṇi 520—495
19 Hāla 495—490
20 Puruṣadasa or Purukasena 486—464 59
21 Mandalaka 490—485
22 Sundara Šāṭakarṇi 464—469 80
23. Cakorn Šāṭakarṇi 469 81
24 Mahendra Šāṭakarṇi 462
25 Śvastakarṇa or Śvastevatī 462—454 81
26 Gauṭamīṇḍra 462—409 109
27. Puloman II 409—377 135
28 Śvastakarṇi 377—370 106
29 Śivasandra Śāṭakarṇi 369—363 170
30. Yagnasīrī Śāṭakarṇi 362—344 173
31. Vajayātri Śāṭakarṇi 344—338 205
32 Candraśī Śāṭakarṇi 338—325 208
33 Puloman III 325—322 218

599 Mrcehakatika, a play in 10 acts, describes the loves of Ćaruḍāṭṭa and Vasanṭasena. Ćaruḍāṭṭa was a virtuous Brahman of affluence. He lost his fortune but did not forsake his piety. Vasanṭasena, a courtesan, was enamoured of him and his qualities, and sent valuable jewels to him covered up in a cart used by his child Šakāra, the brother-in-law of the reigning king Palaka, was in love with Vasanṭasena. But Vasanṭasena did not reciprocate the love Šakāra assaulted Vasanṭasena as a result of which she fell down stunned and unconscious. Thereupon Šakāra accused Ćaruḍāṭṭa as the murderer and the prosecution ended in a sentence of execution. In the meantime Vasanṭasena had recovered and she appeared on the scene of execution just in time to save Ćaruḍāṭṭa. About the same time, a revolution is said to have occurred in the state. Āryaka, whom Ćaruḍāṭṭa rescued
from prison, marched upon Ujjain deposed king Pālaka and installed himself on the throne and Cărudaṭṭa was in grateful appreciation of the kindness made one of his chief officers.

600 There are commentaries on the play by Gaṇapaṭṭa,* by Prthvīdhara,* by Rāmamayasaran, by Lallāḍikṣaṭa,* by Sṛṅivāsa- cārya, by Vidyāsāgara,* by Dharananda.*

601 "The Mṛcchakatuka" says Wilson "is in many respects the most human of all the Sanskrit plays. There is something strikingly Shakesperian in the skilful drawing of characters, the energy and life of the large number of personages in the play, and in the directness and clearness of the plot itself. It is a ten-act prakarana or comedy of middle class life, and the scene is laid in the city of Ujjain. The subject of the plot is the love and marriage of Carudatta, a brahman merchant reduced to poverty by his generosity and Vasantasena, a rich courtesan. In the third act there is a long and humorous account of a burglary in which stealing is treated as an art or science provided with rules and conventional procedure. The chief value of the Mṛcchakatuka, aside from its interest as a drama, lies in the graphic picture it presents of a very interesting phase of everyday life in ancient India. The elaborate description of the hero's palace in the fourth act gives us a glimpse of what was considered luxury in those days. The name 'Clay Cart' is taken from an episode in the sixth act, which leads to the finding of herome's jewels in the terra cotta cart of the hero's little son and to their use as circumstantial evidence in a trial. This complicates the plot until all is resolved in the denouement."

602. The discovery of the play Carudatta, and its attribution to Bhāsa has led to very serious conjectures in literary history on the originality of this play, on the identity of Bhāsa and of Śūdraka and of the

---

1 Ed. with various commentaries everywhere. Translated into English prose and verse by A. W. Rider with an introduction (HOS, Harward), by Wilson, Theatre, I, 182 and partly by K. B. Parab (Bombay). For translation into various other European languages, see Schuyler, Boll 87.
2 CC, I 485.
3 Ed. by N. B. Godabole, also by K. B. Parab (Bombay).
4 Ed. by V. Minumdar (Calcutta).
5 Ed. by N. B. Godabole (Bombay).
6 Ed. Madras.
7 Ed. Calcutta.
8 DC, XXI, 3475. He was son of Bṛhadāra. It was composed by 1814 A.D.
condition of the classical literature before the Christian era. Caruḍatṭa, as extant, extends only to 4 acts and it is there incomplete and so far as these four acts go Mrčchakatika is about a copy of it. The first acts of the two plays differ very little except that Vasantasena is pursued by two persons in Caruḍatṭa, while she is pursued in Mrčchakatika by three persons, namely Vīta, Cheta and Sakara. In the second Act of Caruḍatṭa are not found the characters Madhura, Dyuntakara and Darduka of Mrčchakatika and the sham Vasantasena to turn a parivrat, but not a Sakya Samanaka as in Mrčchakatika. In the third Act the plot is the same in both the plays. In the fourth, where Vasantasena has overheard the conversation between Madana and Sajjalaka, Vidushaka has stepped in to carry out his mission, and Sajjalaka appears before Vasantasena only after Vidushaka is gone unlike in Mrčchakatika."

The light thrown on the life of Sūdraka by Avanṭisundarīkathasūra helps to trace the real intent and import of the Mrčchakatikā Āryaka appears to be Sūdraka and Caruḍatṭa to be Sūdraka's friend Bandhudatta.6

603. Vasarasajacaritram, or Vīpāvāsavatattam, does not give the name of its author but it resembles in dramatic character the plays attributed to Bhāsa. "In a manuscript of Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣitavali preserved in the Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras, the nāndī verse

1. While advocates of authorship of Caruḍatṭa say that Mrčchakatika was a later enlargement of Caruḍatṭa, the opponents say that Caruḍatṭa was an abridgment of Mrčchakatika. There are now springing up scholars who think Bhāsa was a poet of the Court of Sūdraka.

2. As summarised by T. Ganapathi Sastri in his Introduction to Caruḍatṭa. In his introduction to Svāmavasāvata (xxxviii et seq.), he gives instances of common and similar passages.

3. A Rangasami Saravati (JMy, XII 274) also suggests that Vasantasena means Malayavatī, who was hurt by Kuntalāśakarṇī (See Kamasutra) and the latter may mean Sakāra. The known epigraphical date for Purkasena (30th Anūhara king) in 90 A.D. and Kuntalā śakarṇī (13th Anūhara King) lived according to the Purāṇas 197 years before Purkasena. That would place Kuntalā's accession about 80 B.C.

K. P. Jayaswal, Bhandarkar, and P. D. Gune also attempted to extract historical information from Mrčchakatikā. According to them king Pradyota of Ujjain had two sons Gopīlaka and Palaka and a daughter Vāsavadattā. Palaka appears to have ascended the throne after his brother either because his eldest brother abdicated or he died leaving his son young. This child Āryaka of the play later on dethroned Palaka, probably with the help of his aunt's husband Udayana, who thus gained power and influence over Ujjain.

4. TC, III, 3995. So says the author of Āryaka (in O.M. Library)
is quoted under Südraka. This reference coupled with the graceful language and the similarity of style where the word “Kuvalaya” is often used (a character of Südraka’s works), lends an authority to Vallabhadeva’s citation. Mahasena, King of Ujjain, had a daughter Vasavadatta of marriageable age. Instructed to marry her to a suitable prince, he did penance and Siva, pleased with it, blessed her with a husband of specified qualities, all of them excellent. The king was at a loss to know who that prince was and when his ministers assembled rejected the names of several contemporary kings, Darsaka of Magadha, Satamanyu of Matsya, Subahu of Sindhu and others the minister Vasuvarma lighted upon Vatsaraja of Kausambi, as the object of Siva’s description. But Vatsaraja was proud and inaccessible. They thought of means of bringing him round. Because Vatsaraja in the garb of an elephant threw dust on a sage and was cursed to be imprisoned through an elephant, the minister devised the stratagem by alluring him by an artificial elephant, for in the capture of elephants Vatsaraja was an expert. So the elephant was made and stationed in the woods. The perfection of its form baffled all reality. News reached Vatsaraja that a splendid elephant had entered his forest and off went he to capture it with the aid of his Veena Ghoṣavati. As he approached the elephant, then came out hidden warriors and Vatsaraja was overpowered and taken to Ujjain where he was kept an honourable captive. His minister Yaugandharayana affected much pain at the loss of Vatsaraja and proclaimed his proposed immolation in fire at once. In the presence of the bewailing population, Yaugandharayana entered the fire, but by the help of Tirasakariṇi-vr̥daya, became invisible. He put on the garb of a lunatic and entered the city of Kausambi at night, in the description of which the poet cannot be too far appreciated. In the meantime Yaugandharayana contrived to let loose an elephant in rut from Kausambi on Ujjain and when none there was to prevent its havoc, Vatsaraja was temporarily let out for its subjugation. Thus he did with ease and he saw Vasavadatta watching his movements from the apartments of the palace. The dawn of love was instantaneous. The impression that she made on Vatsaraja is exquisitely delineated. The lovers were pining. Mahasena’s minister Subahu noticed the

1 यमन्वंदज्ञ पप्पोऽवनाहसस्त्रस्यनवर्षस्वामथैव चिन्तनं ||
बिराजीते केन व रुखवस्व पुष्करां बलसिन्धुकैवेक्षणयेत || embedding Gāyatrīmantra

2 उपागांत भावविविध विद्याकैवल्लभ निधित्सलिङ परिप्रकाशितमिचिन्तय ||
परिभ्रमितपरितम्ने शरदेऽनेत्तरस्तीव वैदिन्तय ||
inclination and suggested to the king that Vatsarāja should be made to instruct Vāsavadattā in Vīṇā. Yaugandharāyana by this time was able to interview Vatsarāja and moved by the sight of his sorrows blessed him with a near victory. Day by day the association of the lovers in the course of musical instruction was fanning the fire of love and in a short time the mutual enchantment was in a climax. Here follows an Antarnātakā, with a regular Prastāvāna. Then follows a scene in which Vāsavadattā having reached the perfection of her tuition, exhibits her art in music and dancing. The bewitching poses and movements tended to enslave Vatsarāja’s mind and there remained only an open expression of the mutual fascination. This was accompanied by messages of the maids and exchange of a ring. On a day when the townsmen were regaling themselves in a festival on the Narmada bank and when the king was out on a hunting excursion, Yaugandharāyana by the merit of his charms created an apparent fire in the palace and in the midst of the confusion of attempted escapes, the lovers escape to Kausāmbi on their favourable elephants Nalagīrī and Bhadrāvati to the amazing joy of his subjects and a Bharatavakya is its own. The play is available in full only for the first three acts and for the rest there is only the collection of verses, so that it is not possible to say what was the theme of the sub-play. It closes with the expression of Vatsarāja’s devotion to Vāsavadattā, a description of her charms and a diversion on the Vīṇā.” Here are verses worthy of Śūdraka.

604 In Kṣemendra’s Auciṭyavancaracarcā (p 152), there is a quotation from some work of a poet Dipaka in which Vinayavāṭi figures. (दीपाकस्—)

अथ विरुद्ध-विविषिष्टा कहरूर्व तत्तात सपि निपि तत्ते पादव्यक्षिकाया।

सम्पर्कान्तिपरिपालकक्रमंग-परिपरिपरित्तमिति लक्षत तेन नैवालकस्य।

अथ विनयवक्तः। सुचिरास्माकांत लक्षातनकोहेकामप्रवचनसन्य सर्वसा सत्यसिद्धस्याः

वैद्यप्रविधिमानस्योपस्तन्त्रय।
We have seen that Dandin expressed that Sudraka, after his conquest, compiled a work, in which he described his own experiences. It is conjectured that Vasavadatā represented Vinayavati, Yaugandharaya personated Bandhudatta and the story of Vatsaraja and his amours with Vasavadattā while in confinement in Mahāsenā's palace have been suggested by Sudraka's love of Vinayavatī, engendered while imprisoned in the days of King Swāti and by his elopement with the help of his friend Bandhudatta.*

605 Padmaprabhrtaka,* a humorous Bhāpa, describes the amours of Müllerdeva⁶ and Devadattā and their successful union through

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drṣyakāvyā</th>
<th>Avantisundarikāṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For a detailed account of this play by M Ramakrishna Kavi, see Kalā I, parts 8, 9, 10 and 12.

2 Ed by M Ramakrishna Kavi in Caturbhāṣā (Mrochur) with a valuable introduction TC, III 889, Hemacandra quotes the verse

3 Mulādeva was according to Avantisundarikāṭha a friend of Vimalahāpur (Aśālapūr). There are many legends about Mulādeva. Kṛṣṇarśaṅka (Svānta, 89, 124) gives an account of him as the friend of Vākmāśiga and as having won a bride at Pataliputra. Kṛṣṇa's Kalavilāsa proceed as if related by Mulādeva. Mulādeva was also known as in Karajñata, Karāṇī, Mulabhādra and Kharapata. In Maṭṭavilāsa Kapālika says⁶ that Mulādeva's exploits in mind.

In Kāḍaṃbarī, Bāṇa speaks of Vinābyātavi Kuṇḍitkāṭevā that is involved in the story.

Vīpuluḥ is Devadattā's sister in this play Padmaprabhrtaka and Śrīsā is a friend of Mulādeva. Harṣaśāṇa (VI) says that Kṛṣṇa's Kalavilāsa has a verse for Mulādeva. (See on this paper by A Rangaswami Saraswati, JMy, XIV, 95XVI, 11. Mattavilāsaprabhasana alludes to a work of Mulādeva on that. In Mrochurāvata where Sarvalika the burglar dilates upon the intricacies of the art of housebreaking Sudraka must have had Mulādeva's exploits in mind. Avantisundarikāṭha has a verse

In Āgniveshāya means Śabdasāstra. Tātreśa...

The rest of the line is lost which probably alluded to some work of Mulādeva. Mulādeva is also known to have been a poet. Müllerakāṭha (Ādka X) says that he was a wicked prince of Pataliputra, who having been banished regained favour of the king through the good offices of a prostitute Devadattā.
the endeavours his friend Sasa Sanghalika a rival lover is introduced, and a person of this name appears in Avanṭisundarikaṭhā as plotting to kill king Südraka. One of the characters Datākalasī condemns the Kātāntra School of grammarians as against the school of Pāṇini. Reference is made to Daṭṭaka, author of Vaisikasūtras, who began his work with the syllable Om. This play is a fine specimen of poetic art and distinctly ranks among the best known works in Sanskrit literature.

606 Puspadusitaka, or Puṣpabhaṣṭiṭaka is a prakarana, in which the heroine is a kulajā. It is mentioned by Abhinavagupta and Dhanika and a fairly good summary of the plot is given by Kuntaka.

---

1 See for instance, the verse from which the play got its name

The description of a ball play is fine

The descent of an amorous damsel.

and so is the first lapse of an amorous damsel.

---

Samudradatta, a friend of Muladeva, won over a concubine of the latter and Muladeva vowed to seduce the wife of Samudradatta. Samudradatta secretly married Nandayanti. Muladeva proclaimed by māvā that Nandayanti was married to him and on his complaint Samudradatta was banished. His wife was kept in a cell, but Samudradatta managed to visit her in nights and when her pregnancy was known she was suspected by her father of unchastity and sent out. She took shelter in the house of a Sabara, Samudradatta returned and his marriage was proved, but when he hesitated to accept her on account of the pregnancy, his servant Katāha proved to him that on the night of his visit, he gave a ring to Nandayanti at the conjunction of the constellations Punarvasū and Puṣva and the boy was born in Visākha. Samudradatta was convinced, and he and Muladeva again became friends and all ends well.

607 **Harsa or Harsha-Vardhana** was the son of Prabhākaravardhana and Yasomati. He bore titles Pratāpasita and Hara. See JORS, IV 78. For a collection of his verses, see F. W. Thomas, *Kav* 64, and Peterson, *Svbh* 64, and see Burn, *JAS*, (1906), 845.
Srīśāntīya. His capital was Dhaneswar and Kanauj. His father attained considerable success in his wars against the neighbouring countries of Malawas, Gurjaras and Huns. Rājavarman was his elder brother and Rājasaṅgī his sister. In an expedition against the king of Malwa to weak his vengeance for wrongfully confining Rājasaṅgī, Rājavarman was though successful treacherously slain by the vanquished king's ally, Sasanka, king of Bengal. Harsa ascended the throne in 604 A.D. and started an era in his name. Having recovered his sister, Harsa overran Northern India in five years and reigned happily till 647 A.D. Within six years of his accession, Harsa came to hold sway over the whole of the Ganges basin including Nepal and over the whole of the Hindustan including Orissa. His attempt to become overlord of South India was frustrated by his defeat at the hands of Čiṅkya Pulakesin.

Himself a great poet, his court was the resort of learned men on whom he conferred munificent gifts. The Chinese traveller Hieun Tsang visited his capital during his Indian tour and he gives an excellent account of his court and administration. Bāna, Divākara and Mayūra were poets of his court and in his Harśacarita Bāna describes the life and greatness of his patron.

1. For the genealogy of the family, see Gupta Ins. No. 52, I 11, IV 208, I 67, JRAS (1906), 845, ibid (1909), 446. For a full account, see C. V. Vaidya's MI, II 160 and Parekh's Life of Harsha (in māhārājī).
2. For inscriptions dated in this era, see Hellborn, LA XXVI 32, also E1, V App. Nos. 226, 47.
5. For inscriptions relating to Harsa, see LA VII 196, XI 898, XII 294, XIII, 70, 421, XVII 146, XV 40, 151, XIV 119, and generally see Aufrecht, ZDMG, XXVII. 98, CC, I 764, Petesch, PR, IV 188, JRAS, X 38, XVI 179, Bhandarkar, BE, (1897), XX 11, Fleet, OII, III 951, 171. For all verses quoted in the anthologies see F. W. Thomas, Kau 117, 122.
6. Faṅmagūpta in Navasahṣaṅkanakaritā (II) says

विचित्रविचित्रितद्विग्राहिरोकोपिते। श्रीहर्षसेव संस्ति चक्षे बाणमयूर्ये।

A verse is quoted as Rājaśekhara's in Jāmbha's Suktānukṣṭāvalī (JRAS, XVII, 67 71).
It is a matter of controversy whether king Harsavardhana was the author of or at least the patron of the author of the three dramas Ratnavali, Nagānanda and Priyadarsikā. It is said in Mammata’s Kavyaprakāsa that one of the objects of poetry is wealth and as an illustration is added श्रीहर्षदिवेगिणिः (धवाका) स्वामिनव धनवस्। From this it has been suggested that ‘Bāna’ or ‘Dhāvaka,’ according to the readings taken, was the real author and the king purchased the authorship from them for a price. This statement of Mammata may be correct so far as it goes, but there is very little other evidence that these dramas particularly were written by Dhāvaka or Bāna and were so paid for. It may be that in appreciation of some good poetry written by these poets, the king showed his munificence.

In the absence of definite evidence that king Harsavardhana was the author or proprietor by purchase of these works from Bāna or Dhāvaka, it is a matter for consideration, who was the Harsadeva mentioned in the prologues of these plays as their author.

So far as it is known, King Harsavardhana has not been called Harsadeva in any of his inscriptions or by Bāna in his Haracarita. Even in the anthologies, the name Harsadeva is used and the verses there are quoted from these three dramas and verses quoted under the name of Harsavardhana are not traceable in these dramas. Kalhaṇa mentions king Harsa-Vikramaśītya of Ujjain, as the patron of Mātṛgupta. If there is no cogent connection between king Harsa-

1 Among commentators on Kavyaprakāsa, who read ‘Dhāvaka’ are Jayarāma Vadyaṅātha, Nagoji, Paramāṇanda, Narasimha and Acyutārāyya (See Vamanāryya’s edition of Kavyaprakāsa, 89 Brāhma and Parāṇjpe (Introduction to Nagānanda); H. H. Wilson (Theatre, II 269, 846) and Pischel, GGA, XXXIX, 1236. 41 accept this view. F. Hall, (JASB, XXXI, 11 18, Int to Vasav) says that Bāna’s claim is as good as Dhāvaka’s. E. P. Cowell (Prof. to Boyd’s Nagānanda) and Macdonell (SL 562) say Bāna was author of Ratnavali and Dhāvaka of Nagānanda. Weber (IL, 204, 207, 212, 218) attributes Ratnavali to Bāna. Henry (Int Lit 395-512), Ettinghausen (1 c 98-102), S Kow (Das Indische Drama 78 4), M. Winternitz (Ind Lit III, 226), Levi (Ht, 184 196), and E. Windisch, (Tr of Int Cretail Congress (1894) II, 93-96), accept Harsa’s authorship. For a summary of these views, see Int to Priyadarsika (Col. Un Series), xxxi.

2 See for a learned discussion, by Saradacaran Ray, Int to Ratnavali (Calcutta.)

3 See F W Thomas, Kau. 1117 and Peterson, Subh. 139.

4 See para 555 supra.
vardhana, and these dramas, it is quite likely that this Harṣadeva was that king Harṣa-Vikramādiṭṭya. Abhinavagupta, Sāradātānaya, and Bahurupamisra quote verses from a commentary on Nāṭyasastra by a Harṣa. It is equally likely that Harṣa, the writer on dramaturgy, was the author of these plays.

A king Harṣa is mentioned as a great poet by several writers of successive centuries. Bāṇa eulogises Harṣa’s poetic genius. It is likely that the king Silādiṭṭya versified the story of Bodhisatva Jinnatavāhana, he had it performed by a band accompanied by dancing and acting and thus popularised it in his time. Soddhala enumerates Vikramādiṭṭya, Sri Harṣa, Munja, Bhojadeva &c, as Kavindras and eulogises Harṣa. Jayadeva cites Harṣa along with Bāṇa, Rāmila Saumilā etc. Dāmodārāgupta gives excerpts from Ratnāvali and calls it the work of a royal author.

Besides verses from the three plays, about a dozen verses, are also quoted in the anthologies as Harṣa’s. Two Buddhist poems of devotion Suprabhāṣṭra in 24 verses and Astamahāśriśaṭya-samskaraśṭra (in 5 verses) are also attributed to him.

---

In Bhoja’s Śrīgānaṇaprabhāśa (chap xx) there is the following verse quoted:

\[ \text{कृतिस्वरुपं हर्षसप्ताहकुलना देवर्य तत्त्वात्} \]
\[ \text{वाचातुवदीरितशक्तण्डखण्डुधन्याक्षेत} \]
\[ \text{तावचाकुवल्लकाण्डुकृत्येत् स स स्वर्य ददौ} \]
\[ \text{लक्ष्म राजस्मालिन्न सदजलमालिन्यगप्त गजम्} \]

So in Sāradātānaya’s Bhāva-prakāśa (VII)

\[ \text{दिश्मानाशवयोगे ललायोदिवकृष्टे} \]
\[ \text{तदेव नोभवे मेदो नाटकरिवुद्वकृष्टे} \]

1. See Priyadarśika (GOS Int xii)
2. Kāyakathal **** समृतमुखसम्मतः अपीतात्मकृतिस्वरूपभाव न पर्यातिबिषय. ||
3. Harṣacarita (Bombay Edn ) 79, 86
4. A record of the Buddhist Religion in India and the Malay Archipelago (Tr. by Takaküe, 163).
5. Udāyasundari, (GOS), 150
6. Bhoja’s Harṣa-aritam (Bombay Edn), 79, 86
7. Thomas, Kav 117-30
8. Harṣa-carita (Bombay Edn), 79, 86

---
610 Ratnavali, a natkā in four acts, describes the secret loves of King Udayana and Sāgarika, an attendant on the queen Vasavadatā. Private intrigues are arranged but discovered by the queen. "After may vicissitudes the heroine turns out to be Ratnavali, a Ceylon princess, whom a shipwreck has brought to Udayana’s court. The plot is unconnected with mythology, but is based on a historical or epic tradition, which recurs in a somewhat different form in Soma-deva’s Kathasaritsagara. As concerned with the second marriage of the King, it forms a sequel to the popular love-story of Vasavadatā. It is impossible to say whether the poet modified the main outlines of traditional story, but the character of a magician who conjures up a vision of the gods and a conflagration is his invention, as well as the incidents which are entirely of a domestic nature."

There are commentaries by (Bhimasena, Mudgaladeva), Govinda, Prākritacārya, J Vidyāsāgara, K N Nyāyapancānana, S C Chakravarti, Siva, Lakṣmaṇāśūri, R V Kṛṣnamācārya, S Ray, V S Aiyar and by Nārāyaṇasastri Nigudkar.

611 Ksemendra’s drama Lalitaraṇamālā appears to have had a similar plot. There is this quotation in his Auciṣyavīcāracaritā (pp 140-2)

---

1 Ed everywhere On Ratnāvall generally, see R C Dutta, Cuv II 265. M Williams, IW, 505, G Buhler On the authorship of the Ratnavalis (IA, II 127). E Hall Int. to Vasavadatā, 15-16, J J Mayer (Damodaragupta’s Kuttinimatam, Leipzig, S C Vidyabhushan, Date of Ratnavalis, Mahabodhi, 12), R V Krishnamachārya, Int. to Edn (Srirangam), it is a very elaborate introduction, M Schuyler, Buhl 9, Buhler, On the authorship of Ratnavalis, IA, II 127), Weber, II 207; Sarasravanjan Ray’s Int to Ed (Calcutta) contains a valuable introduction. See also ISbr I. 866 Tr into English by Sarasravanjan Ray (Calcutta), by S C Chakravarti (Dacca), by Wilson, Theatre, II 255-319, by Bidhu B Goswami (Calcutta). For translations into other languages, see Schuyler, Buhl, 40.

2 Macdonell, SL, 363.

3 CC, I 493.

4 Ed Bombay.

5 CC. II 115.

6 Ed Calcutta.

7 Ed Calcutta.

8 Ed Dacca.

9 HR, III 34. 187. He was son of Tryambaka.

10 Ed Calcutta.

11 Ed Madras.

12 Ed Srirangam.

13 Ed. Kumbakonam.

If

Ratnavali Pndhavarman, King of the Angas, having betrothed his daughter Pnyadarsika to King Udayana prepares to take her to him. Meanwhile the Kalinga King overcomes and imprisons him Pnya-
darsika after some vicissitudes is admitted to the harem of Udayana by his commander, under the name of Áranyikā, a maid-servant to the queen. The king is enamoured of her and his secret intrigues are as usual discovered by the Queen Áranyikā is imprisoned by her, but not long after this, she is recognised as the Anga princess Priyadarśikā, her own maternal cousin. Bitten by a serpent the heroine is in a swoon and the king revives her. The story ends with her happy presentation to the king by the queen herself.

There is a commentary by R V. Kṛṣṇamācārya.

613 Nagananda in four acts "describes the story exactly as related in the Kathasangītasastra (Taranga XXII) of Jimutavahana, a prince of the Vidyadharas, who, swayed by sentiments of universal love, relinquishes his kingdom to serve his parents in the forest. There in the Malaya mountain he falls in love with the daughter of the Gandharva King, and roaming about by chance, fresh from the wedding, he hears that the King of Serpents has made peace with Garuda and stipulated to offer a serpent each day to the kite. The heart of the prince is moved. He resolves to save the life of that day's victim even at the

---

1. On Priyadarśikā generally G Sreerhly Int to Edn (Paris) F Cummino (o c. XXXI 1-18) R V Krishnamacharya Int to Edn (Srinangam No. 3), M Schuyler Ed 2


3. In a manuscript preserved in the Patan Library dated Samvat 1558, the name of the author is given as Śrī Harṣa (see PB, V ).
risk of his own. Garuda finds out that by mistake he has harmed the
disguised prince and overpowered with grief learns that abstinence
from cruelty is the highest virtue on earth. The play ends with the
appearance of the Goddess Gauri, who revives the prince to life.

There are commentaries by Atmārāmā, by N C Kaviratna, by
Sivarāma and by Srinivasācārja. There is a poem called Nāgānanda.

Other dramas composed on a similar purpose and style of com-
position are the Lokānanda of Candragomin and Sāntacarita of
unknown authorship.

614 "From the invocation to Buddha in the Nāndi and the circum-
stance that the play describes the incidents of Buddha's life in his work
as jīmūtavāhana, it is possible to say that the play has a Buddhistic
coloring, but it may be too soon to affirm that the main purpose of it
is to illustrate a Buddhistic doctrine of universal humaneness. The
rule of compassion is inculcated in all ancient Hindu Ethical literature
and is essentially pre-Buddhist in its origin. Garuda is an Aryan God
and the appearance of the goddess Gauri and shower of nectar
marking the happy culmination are Hindu in their core."

On Nāgānanda generally, see S Beal (The Academy, XXIV 217, F Cimmino,
Proc 13th Int Cong of Orientalists, Leiden (1902), 81, S G Bhavan Int to Edn.
(Bombay) G B Brahme and S M Paranjape, Int to Edn. (London), S C Raj
Int to Edn. (Calcutta), M Schuyler, Bibli 9 Weber, LL, 207 Burgess (ID, I 140)
gives an excellent English summary Tr into English by N C Valdyaratna
(Calcutta), by P Boyd (London), by S C Ray (Calcutta) and by Vasudevachariar
(Madras) with a summary of the plot, by R D Karmakar (Poona) with notes and
introduction and by L V Ramachandra Iyer, Madras and by P V Ramaswamy
with Int. Trn and notes, Madras.

1 CC, I 289 He is probably different from the commentator, Rāma in DC,
XXI 8414
2 Ed Calcutta
3 Ed by T. Ganapatī Sastri, TSS, Trivandrum He has also commented on
Subhadrādhanañaya and Tapaṭī-Samvānā
4 He was the San knit Pandit, St Joseph's College, Trichinopoly
5 Trav.
6 For similar Jain plays, see Levi, 824
7. Levi, App 80 See para 260 supra
8 Levi, App, 81
9. It looks likely that the name and matter were suggested by Lokānanda (Levi
App 80, 824) Of this there is a Tibetan translation (see l o 56)
Kalidasa, as a dramatist, has attained universal admiration. His talents stand unique and rarely has any other been recognised as his equal.

Dandin wrote

रिन्ता संज्ञुबुधेनसन्तं युस्य निरिबिधा निरर ||
तेन पि बर्मै भैंद्यं कातिदासं जधृतितु ||

Baga said

निन्धसातु न वा कुश कातिदासंक्षु कित्तु ||
अत्तिन्थुपरसात्तु सन्नेकीन्धं बालयतु ||

In his tract, Kalidasa, the moralist, Ravindranath Tagore writes

"Kalidasa has shown that while infatuation leads to failure, beneficence achieves complete fruition, that beauty is constant only when...

---

1 For verses quoted in anthologies as Kalidasa's (not traceable in any known works), see Aufrecht ZDMG, XXXIX 806 and Peterson, Subh 28.

Some of these verses are very fine.

1 Woodhouse Hephaistopaxhe paryenmente vinatad-\, ntravirchya sapakindemukharamphalal ||
नियासिक्कारा वर्णध्यातित श्रीकास्तुकूचे-\, तिते केरळकामिनीकृयकाते खळसशेषनेवःति ||
न बयति गेमदे न हि परिरस्न रचयति\, तिती तस्य तत्त्वा करकम्चल्लोलो न सहति ||
सितवण्टविनाकार हल्लालाललुल नैच कुबे\, तथापयन्त श्रीवि वुपुषु कुलकोक्षा कथयति ||

2 This is in Bengali. Translated into English Mod Rev XIV.

On Kalidasa generally G Bendall, Kalidasa in Ceylon, (JRAS, (1880), 440), G A Grierson, Are Kalidasa's heroes monogamists? (JASB, XLVI 89), Some notes on Kalidasa, (JASB, XLVIII 82 49), G S Leonard, Further proof of the polygamy of Kalidasa's heroes, (JASB, XLVI 160) Prannath Pandit, Morals of Kalidasa, (Ibid XLV 852), A V Jackson, Legend of Kalidasa preserved at Ujjain, (JAOS, XXI 331), Time Analysis of the dramas of Kalidasa, (Ibid XX 341 59), Bibliography of Kalidasa's plays, (Ibid XXI, 897, XXIII 897), R V Tuula, Traditional account of Kalidasa, (I& VII 115), Hoernle, Kalidasa and Kambanakas, (I& XII, 156), J B. Chakravarti, Kalidasa, the Great Indian Poet, (JMy, VIII. 361), R A,
upheld by virtue, that the highest from of love is the tranquil, controlled and beneficent form, that in regulation lies the true charm and lawless excess the speedy corruption of beauty  He refuses to acknow-

ledge passion as the supreme glory of love, he proclaims goodness as the final goal of love.”

There are three dramas¹ that are acknowledged to be his, Sakuntalā or more fully Abhināna-Sākuntalā, Mālavikāgnimitra and Vikramorvasiyya. These plays attracted the attention of foreign savants more than two centuries ago and Goethe thus sang of Sakuntalā:

Would'st thou the young year's blossoms and the fruits of its decline
And all by which the soul is charmed, enaptured, fed,
Would'st thou the Earth and Heaven itself in one sole name combine?
I name thee, O Sakuntala! and all at once is said

It is the quintessence of Kālidāsa's poetry.²

616 Sakuntalā “King Dushyanta of the Lunar race, pursues a gazelle in the vicinity of Kanva's hermitage. Here he espies Sakuntalā, watering her tender nursery with her favourite friends. Struck by her beauty he begs for an interview. He overhears the reciprocation of love by Sakuntalā, meets and marries her. He gives her his ring and with a promise to fetch her soon he returns to his palace. In a thoughtless mood, she fails to greet an irascible sage Dūrvasas and his impatient curse obliterates the memory of her lover, until the spell could pass away at the sight of a ring. Some time passes and Kanva resolves to send her to her husband. She takes leave of her lovely friends, the inanimate plants and the marisculate deer. She reaches the court of the king, she loses the ring and her exhortations are in vain. The king has no recollection of the amorous incident at the sylvan park. Sakuntalā laments her fate and is borne off by her mother Urvasi to the abode of the celestials. The ring is recovered by a fisherman from the stomach of a fish, and as an accused thief he is brought to judgment. Its sight dispels the gloom and the king recollects his former love. His regrets are wasted. Time passes and Indra seeks his help against his foes. Then while driving in Indra's car he sees a young boy, his own.

1. Rājaś kharā made a pun

2. Here is the traditional verse:

Here Kālidāsājrayi means these three plays of Kālidāsa and the poet indirectly suggests the existence of three Kālidās.
dear son Bharata, playing with a cub and soon he finds his Sakuntala not to leave her again".

S̄akuntalā was recently staged at Melbourne from a translation made by Jawbonce Bunvon and the adaptation of the music is thus described.

"The overture opens with the King's love singing theme, given first in the low register of the orchestra. This is continued by the higher strings and wood wind to a climax, with a first hint of the curse motive. A bridge passage for strings and wood wind leads to Sakuntala's love-singing theme played by the violon, this works up to a repeat of the same given in the higher octave by the flutes and oboes. A tremolo passage for strings, with a further hint of the curse motive, is followed by the development of the King's theme working to a full climax of both the King's and Šakuntalā's themes leading straight to the curse motive at full orchestral strength. A quiet passage for strings ending with a cadenza for the oboe is followed by the golden peak theme given by the flute in its highest register. The overture foreshadows the entire development of the drama (the sublimation of the earthly unstable love to the universally significant reunion at the mystic's retreat in the Himalaya Mountains.) The incidents of the drama are limited in the use of the curse and other motives. Before and during part four, an off-shoot of the Golden Peak theme will be heard, suggestive of the nymphs, who sing their farewell to Sakuntala."

617 The popularity of the play has unconsciously done immense harm to the preservation of its original text. It is now extant in three or

1 Edited everywhere.


four recessions called the Bengali, Devanagari, Kashmir, and South Indian. The latest collation of the second recession and an attempt at a critical edition is perhaps that of Prof S Ray of Calcutta.

618 There are commentaries by Rāghava, Kātayavema, Srinivāsa, Ghanasyāma, Abhirāma, (Krṣṇanātha Pancānana, Candrasēkharā, Damaruvallabha, Prākṛtśācārya, Nārāyana, Rāmalīhadra, Sankara) Premacandra, D V Panta, Vidyāśāgara, Venkatācārya, Sri Krṣṇanātha, Bālagovinda, by Ṣakṣāvartanātha, Rāmavarman and Rāmā Prisharat, and five anonymous.

619 Srinivasadiksita was the son of Ṭīmmayarya and was known also Venkatesa. He was an archaka of the Vaikhānas sect and Kāsyapagotra, at the temple of Tirupati (Chittoor District). He had the title of Cakrāyudha and lived about 1850. He is a prolix writer and his commentary is probably the longest and the most discursive. He has written a commentary on Vaikhānasasūtras and Ramāyana and the manuscript of the latter is said to be at a village called Oralti, South Arcot, Madras Presidency.

1 Represented by Premacandra’s Edn (Calcutta) and Pischel’s Edn (Kiel).
2. Represented by Isvarachandra Vidyasagara’s Edn (Calcutta) and M. William’s Edn (Oxford).
3. Represented by N. B Godabola’s Edn (Bombay) and by A R Rajarajavarman’s Edn (Trivandrum).
4. See BEK, XXXV.
5. Ed. Bombay. He was son of Prthvīdhara, an authority on Nyaya and Mīmāṁsa. DO, XXI, 8870 Ed. Bombay with English notes.
14. See P N Patankar’s Int. to Sakuntala (Poona) and JAOS, XXII, 287.
15. TC, IV 4940. He was son of Śankarapandita who was the guru of Vandebhupāla of Hanguta town and patronised by the latter. This is an epitome of Srimvāsa’s commentary.
16. TC, III 3992.
17. Ed. Trivohur. This Rāmavarman is Parīśē Kujjumul Tamburan, now alive at Cranganore.
18. DO, XXI, 8873, 8874, TC, III, 3490, 3995.
Kataya Vema was the son of Kāta, grandson of Māra and great-grandson of Kātaya. He married the daughter of Anapola, the Reddi king of Kondavidu and was at the helm of administration during the reign of Anapola's son Komāragrī (1381-1403 A.D.). He was a great warrior and scholar and at the request of Komāragrī he wrote commentaries called Komāragrīyam on the plays of Kāhḍāsa. He had three wives and from two of them, he had a son Komāragiri and a daughter Anitalli. In appreciation of his services to the state, Komāragrī bestowed on him the sovereignty of Rajamahendrapuram. He died about 1416 A.D. His son ruled only for 4 years, after which the descendants of Anitalli became the rulers.

Malavikagnimitra is "a conventional dramatisation of harem intrigue in the court of King Agnimitra of Vidisa, probably of the Sunga dynasty. The play discloses the loves of this king Agnimitra and of Malavika one of the attendants of the queen, who jealously keeps her out of the king’s sight on account of her great beauty. The various endeavours of the king to see and converse with Malavika give rise to numerous intrigues. In the course of these Agnimitra nowhere appears to be a despot, but acts with much delicate consideration for the feelings of her spouses. It finally turns out that Malavika is by birth a princess, who had only come to be an attendant at Agnimitra’s court through having fallen into the hands of robbers. There being now no objection to her union with the king, all ends happily."

There are commentaries by Kātaya Vema, Nilakantha, Vira-

---

1 For an account of Kātaya Vema, see Veturi Prabhakara Sastri’s Sṛngara-Sṛṇaṁatha, 56 and for inscription of Kātaya Vema, see EL, IV 921, 926, 929, 930, dated from 1391 to 1416 A.D.
2 Macdonell, SL, 990.

On Malavikāgnimitra generally F. Bollens (ZDMG, XIII 488), Cappeller, Alternativ ad Kāhḍasa Malavikāgnimitram, (Konigburg), S J Pandit, Int to Ed (BSS), M Schuyler, (JAOS, XXIII 98), M A Williams, (IW, 497), C Varadacarya, Malavikāgnimitra na a drama (Bharati, VI 8), V Subbaroydun, (Ibid, 714, 489) Translated into English by Ch. Tawney (Calcutta) by G R Nanjikaran (Poona), by A S Krishnasa (Madras) For criticisms and translations into other languages, see Schuyler, Bibl 48

3 Ed. Bombay and Poona.

4 Ed. Bombay. Composed in Samvat 1712 (1666 A.D.) at Kāśi. The author was son of Bālakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa of Sṛi Venkaramaṇi family. He lived at Vyomakesapura.
raghava, Mṛtyunjaya Nussanka, Ṭarkavacapati, Srikanta, Parikṣat Kunjunni Raja.

622 Vikramorvasī represents events partly terrestrial and partly celestial. King Pururavas rescues the nymph Urvasī from the hands of demons and wins her love by his heroism. She parts with him on a summons from Indra and the king becomes disconsolate in his love. She drops a letter before him unseen confirming her own love and as ill luck would have it, this letter is picked up by the queen and she waxes wild. In the meantime Urvasī was acting as Lakṣmī at the celestial theatre at the staging of the play of Lakṣmīsvayamvara and with her mind all engrossed by Pururavas she answers Pururavas in a colloquy, when her answer was to be Purūsottama. Her teacher Bharata curses her to go to the lower world and Indra mitigates the effect of the curse by ordering her stay on earth till she gets an offspring from Pururavas. In their secret wanderings Urvasī trespasses on the forbidden grounds of Kanva’s park and becomes transformed into a creeper. The king becomes maddened and under the influence of a magic stone, she is restored. They have a son Ayus and when time comes for Urvasī to return, Indra allows her to remain with him for good, in grateful recollection of the aid received in the destruction of demons.

This play is in two recensions, in N India and S India.

1. CO, II, 104, 217
2. Ed Madras
3. Ed Calcutta
4. TC, II 920, 2570 Probably the same as the author of Kandarpadarpanabhāga (HR, III No 1688) and son of Abhinava Kālidāsa, of Nāyapagotra, the author of Śrīgālagobhāna (TC, II 989). He is different from another Abhinava Kālidāsa of Vasīṭhagotra, who is the author of Yakṣollāsa (TC, II 2066)
5. He is now alive at Cranganore
6. Ed Pischell (Berlin) and J Vidyasagara (Calcutta)
7. Ed ESS, Bombay
8. On Vikramorvasī generally, L B Leav Apparatus criticus ad Urvāsam fabulam Caldeas (Berlin) M Schuyler (JAJS, XXIII 98-101) S P Pandit Int to Ed (Bombay) Macdonell SL, 258 For an appreciation, see JMy, XI Translated into English by H H Wilson (Theatre) I 188-274, by E B Cowell (Hertford), by Brajendranath De, (Calcutta Review, 884 in part only into verse), by A Gnoe (Bombay, into verse) For translations into other languages, see M. Schuyler, Bible 59.
There are commentaries by Kātava Vema, Ranganātha (Abhayacarana, Rāmamāya), Tārānta, N R Kale.

623 "Kalidasa is the great, the supreme poet of the senses, of aesthetic beauty, of sensuous emotion. His main achievement is to have taken every poetic element, all great poetical forms, and subdued them to a harmony of artistic perfection set in the key of sensuous beauty. In continuous gift of seizing an object and creating it to the eye he has no rival in literature. A strong visualising faculty such as the greatest poets have in their most inspired descriptive movements, was with Kalidasa an abiding and unfailing power, and the concrete presentation which this definiteness of vision demanded, suffused with an intimate and sovereign feeling for all sensuous beauty of colour and form, constitutes the characteristic Kalidasaian manner. He is besides a consummate artist, profound in conception and suave in execution, a master of sound and language who has moulded for himself out of the infinite possibilities of the Sanskrit tongue a verse and diction which are absolutely the grandest, most puissant and most full-bodied of any human speech, a language of the Gods. The note struck by Kalidasa when he built Sanskrit into that palace of noble sound, is the note which meets us throughout all this last great millennium of Aryan literature. Its characteristic features are brevity, gravity and majesty, a noble harmony of verse, a strong lucid beauty and chiselled prose, above all an epic precision of phrase, weighty, sparing and yet full of colour and sweetness. Moreover it is admirably flexible, suiting itself to all forms from the epic to the lyric but most triumphantly to the two greatest, the epic and the drama. In his epic style Kalidasa adds to these permanent features a more than Miltonic fulness and grandiose pitch of sound and expression, in his dramatic and extraordinary grace and suavity which makes it adaptable to conversation and the expression of dramatic shade and subtly blended emotion."

"The flourishing of the plastic arts had prepared surroundings of great external beauty for Kalidasa's poetic work to move in. The appreciation of beauty in nature, of the grandeur of mountain and forest, the loveliness of lakes and rivers, the charm of bird and beast,
life had become a part of contemporary culture. These and the sensitive appreciation of these and plants and hills as living things, the sentimental feeling of brotherhood with animals which had influenced and been encouraged by Buddhism, the romantic mythological world still farther romanticised by Kalidasa’s warm humanism and fine poetic sensibility, gave him exquisite grace and grandeur of background and scenic variety. The delight of the eye, the delight of the ear, smell, palate, touch, the satisfaction of the imagination and taste are the texture of his poetical creation, and into this he has worked the most beautiful flowers of emotion and sensuous ideality. The scenery of his work is a universal paradise of beautiful things. All therein obeys one law of earthly grace, morality is aestheticised, intellectual suffused and governed with the sense of beauty. And yet this poetry does not swim in languor, does not dissolve itself in sensuous weakness, it is not heavy with its own dissoluteness, heavy of curl and heavy of eyelid, cloyed by its own sweets, as the poetry of the senses usually is. Kalidasa is saved from this by the chastity of his style, his aim at burdened precision and energy of phrase, his unseeping artistic vigilance.”

624 Asvaghosa’s Sāriputraprakaraṇa, a drama in nine Acts, “deals with the events which led up to the conversion of the young Maudgalyayana and Sariputra by the Buddha, and some of the incidents are certain. Sariputra had an interview with Asvajit, then he discussed the question of the claims of the Buddha to be a teacher with his friend, the Vīdusaka, who raised the objection that a brahmin like his master should not accept the teaching of a Kshatriya, Sariputra repels the objection by reminding his friend that medicine aids the sick though given by one of inferior caste, as does water one in thirst. Maudgalyayana greets Sariputra, inquiring of him the cause of his glad appearance and learns his reasons. The two go to Buddha who receives them and who foretells to them that they will be the highest in knowledge and magic power of his disciples. The end of the play is marked by a philosophic dialogue between Sariputra and the Buddha, which includes a solemn argument in the existence of a permanent self, it terminates in a praise of his two new disciples by the Buddha and a formal benediction.”

“The same manuscript contains portions of two other dramas, also likely the works of Asvaghosha. The first of these is an allegorical

1. Ed by Luders, SPAW, (1911), 888, Keith, SL, 60.
play like Prabodhacandrodava, and the characters are Buddhī, Kirtī, Dhritī etc. The second though primarily religious in intent has much that is amorous. The relations between Magadhavati, a hetaera, Somadatta, a rogue and Dhananjāva, probably a prince are depicted, but nothing can be said about the play, as what is available is very fragmentary.

625 **Candraka** is mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his commentary of Nāṭyasāstra (Adh XIX) as a playwright of Kashmir. His identity with Candragomin is not clear, and it is more likely that Candragomin lived for earlier.

Kalhana says that Candraka was a great poet, who composed plays, pleasing all kinds of audience. He flourished in the Court of King Ṣunjunā of Kashmir who ruled about 103 A.D or according to Cunningham in 319 A.D.

625 **Kaumudimahotsava** At the coronation of King Kalyāṇavarman of Pataliputra a play was enacted in which is the story of defeat and death of Kalyāṇavarman's father Sundaravarman at the hands of Candesena, King of Licchavis and the reinstatement of Kalyāṇavarman on the throne of Magadha by the efforts of minister Mantragupta. The name of the drama is not mentioned in the work, but the editors, rather discoverers, of it have christened it as Kaumudi-mahōṣava, from a possible pun in an expression used by the Sūtraitāra. Unluckily in the manuscript that has been traced the first letters of the name of the author are ant-eaten and from the letters (क्ष्य) and from a significant mention of Vijaya in the verse

\[ जयति प्रथम विजया जयति देशास्त्रय महादेव। \]
\[ श्रीमान्ती समवनिलकन्तनारायणी सम्पर्क। \] (iv 19)

the editors guess that a woman must be the author and that that woman is likely Vijukā. Vijukā or Vijukā is a prakritised form of Vijaya.

---

1 See para 260 supra
2 The verses quoted in Subhāṣītvālī appear to be the Nāṇḍīs of his various plays. See Keith, SD, 169.
(Vidya?) Vrijika's poetry has been preserved in the anthologies\(^1\) and it is of very high order, and if this play were her work the language here is of the same merit. Kanmudimahotsava as an autumnal moonlight festival celebrated at Pataliputra and elsewhere is mentioned in several works such as Ratnakali and Mudrarakshasa. Several passages here show an imitation the expressions of Kālidāsa. The reference to Saunaka and Avimāraka in the following verse

\[ 
\text{शौनकस्य कथन तु शुद्धिः कुमारस्वामिकरः कुर्वीकूरः |}
\[ 
\text{अत्थि कृतिश्रीव कान्त फल्याणवर्माणम्} \| (m 15)
\]

suggests also the idea that the author of this play must have seen Dandin's Avantisundari and Bhasa's Avimāraka where we find stories of Saunaka and Avimāraka. If Vrijika was he queen of king Candrādiya of the 7th century\(^2\) it is the likely date for the composition of this work. But it is not impossible that these similes about Saunaka and Avimāraka were an independent thought of the author of this play. The reference to Dattaka, Gampāputra and Mālaṇeva makes as feel that this play belongs to the same period as Caturbhāni, the four bhanas aforesaid, where similar thoughts and references are abundantly discerned. Udayana's tales were much admired in the centuries just preceding and coming after the Christian era. Kālidāsa says so and the several dramas that have for their plots the story of Vatsrāja, Udayana must have been composed at that period of popularity. If this latter surmise is correct, Vrijika or the real author must have flourished far earlier than the 5th or 6th centuries. The plot of the drama\(^3\) is as summarised by the editors.

"Chandasena, the military commandant of Sundaravarman, a king of Magadha, conspired with the Licchavis, the hereditary enemies of his lord and brought about their attack on Pataliputra. In the contest between Sundaravarman and the Licchavis, the former died on the battlefield Chandasena became the king. Mantragupta, the minister of Sundaravarman, secreted the prince Kalyanavarman with a few minister's sons at a place called Pampa in the Vindhyas, while he himself in various disguises watched an opportunity to regain the throne for the prince. Some years passed before he could muster forces and"

---

1. See para 87a supra
2. Ibid
3. Edited by M. Ramakrishna Kavi and S.K. Ramanatha Sastrī with an introduction, Madras
defeat the traitor At last Kalīṇāvarman was installed on the Magadha throne The drama was staged on the occasion of his coronation

...An amorous incident covers up the political stratagem of Mantragupta. Kīrtimatī, the daughter of Kīrtisena, the king of the Sūrasenas, accompanied one Yogasiddhi, a nun, who was proceeding to worship Vindhyavāsini in the Vindhās. The nun was once the nurse to Kalyāṇavarman at Pātaliputra and since the death of his father, Sundaravarman, she renounced all worldly ties and spent her days in various holy places. When she came to Mathura the royal household treated her most kindly and even entrusted their daughter, Kīrtimatī to her care in her pilgrimage to Vindhyavāsini. During their stay at Pampa the prince and princess met each other by accident and their first sight slowly developed into love. Yogasiddhi saw their portraits as drawn by the goddess and identified between the couple the child growing into prime youth once nursed by her. She fell into a reverse of old reminiscences. Meanwhile Mantragupta killed the usurper and proclaimed Kalyāṇavarman as king of Magadha. The nun and the princess went back to Souriṣṭrā, and her father Kīrtisena was doubly pleased to receive the intelligence of Kalyāṇavarman’s prosperity and his daughter’s overtures of love and sent an ambassador with a pearl-necklace which had a heroic history behind it and with the proposals of marriage of his daughter to the royal youth. Kalyāṇavarman was only too glad to reject such an offer of friendly alliance and prop of life.”

627 K. P. Jayaswal (/BORS, XIX. 113 ff seq) discusses historical data in this drama.

“The Guptas appear about 275 A.D. somewhere in Magadha. Gupta, the first Raja, rises as a feudatory prince. As later we find the early Guptas connected with Allahabad (Prayaga) and Oudh (Saketa). Maharaja Gupta’s fief seems to have been near about Allahabad. His son was Ghatotkacha, and Ghatotkacha’s son was the first prince who turned the name of his ancestor Gupta into a dynastic title. His name was Chandra. At the time of the rise of Chandra, called by the Prakrit name Chandasena in the Kaumudi-mahotsava, the king of Magadha at Pataliputra was Sundaravarman, ruling from his palace...

1 In this connection Jayaswal refers (at page 88) Bhāvaśataka of Nāgaraja (Sri Ganapati Nāgaraja) to this period and identifies him with king Ganapati Naga of the Tak Nāga race now living near Jammu and the Purnab. He quotes a correct verse as found in Cat of Mithila Miss II 105.

On Bhāvaśataka, see para 849 supra.
called Su-Ganga This palace is named in the inscription of Khara-vela as the Su-Gangiya and in the Mudra-Rakshasa as the Su-Ganga. The capital city of Pataniputra thus came down with its ancient palace intact to the period of King Sundaravarman and Chandra. King Sundaravarman was an old man, having a child of a few years of age yet in charge of a nurse. Chandra and Chandra's son has been adopted as his son by the king of Magadha, evidently before the birth of the young prince. Chandra regarded himself as the heir, being the elder, though a Kritaka son. He entered into a marriage alliance with the Lichchhavis who are described as the enemy of the Magadha dynasty in the same drama Kaumudi-mahotsava. The Lichchhavis with a large army and Chandra laid a siege to Pataniputra. A battle was fought in which the old king Sundara-varman died. The young prince Kalyanavarman was carried away to the Kishkunda hills by the faithful ministers. Chandra founded a royal dynasty (raja kula). The angry author of the drama calls the Lichchhavis 'Mlechchhas' and Chandra-sena a Karaskara, implying a casteless or a low-caste man, not fit for royalty.

The position of the Madraka Jats was probably not very low at the time, for had it been very low, King Sundaravarman would not have thought of making Chandra-sena his adopted son. His original intention seems to have been to bequeath the kingdom to Chandra. And it was only due to the birth of Kalyanavarman from some younger queen (Kalyana-varma) is said to have several step-mothers—'matarah') that the breach between the adoptive father and the adopted son occurred. The real cause of the opposition from the public, which was very pronounced, seems to be a dislike for the social system of the Karaskaras who were not subject to the fourfold-varnasramism of the orthodox system. It is the same dislike which is expressed in the Maha-Bharata against the Madrakas. They had one caste amongst them with social equality and freedom, which did not agree with the settled rules of the Gangetic society. The compliment was mutually exchanged the Kaumudi-mahotsava taunted at the Karaskara caste as rulers, the Guptas replied 'we shall abolish the Kshatriyas'.

11+ Now we know from the Puranic history that in the reign of Kanishka (and probably also of his successor), Vanaspara imported some Madrakas for administrative purposes. But the Punjab military dress of Chandra Gupta I on his coins would suggest that the family had migrated recently in the Bharasiva period after the liberation of
the Madraka country by the latter. Very likely a Bharasiva king gave Gupta a sief, having border-land between Bihar and Kausambi, for it was to suppress a rebellion of the Savaras that Chandra Gupta I had gone to his frontier when the City Council of Pataliputra pronounced a decree of deposition against him.

115 Chandra Gupta I, having his caste against him and being somewhat of a usurper, was disliked by the Magadhans of his day, particularly as he failed to adapt himself to the traditional Hindu way of Government. He showed a hostile, repressive attitude to the people of Magadha. The Kaumudi-mahotsava records that Chanda-sena had put leading citizens into prison. The people of Magadha looked down upon him as something like a patricide. Chandra Gupta I had thus several elements arrayed against him. A cry was raised that he was not a Kshatriya, he had practically killed his aged adoptive father on the battlefield, he had called in the aid of the hereditary enemies of Magadha—the Lichchhavis, he had married a lady who was neither a Magadhan nor a Brahmanical Hindu. To this we should add that he had defied the imperial authority of the Brahmin Emperor Pravarasena I.

116 With the aid of the Lichchhavi power and protection he trampled upon the liberties of the people of Magadha and put the leading citizens into prison. Alberuni therefore recorded a true and historical tradition when he said that the king or kings associated with the Gupta-kala (era) were cruel and wicked. The Hindus had the constitutional law laid down in their codes to destroy the king who acted as a tyrant or whose hands had the marks of the blood of his parents. They planned and rose, called in Prince Kalyanavarman from the Vakataka territory (Pampasara) and crowned him king at the Su-Ganga Palace at Pataliputra. The authoress of the Kaumudi-mahotsava exultantly said—‘the law of Varna is restored, the royal family of Chanda-sena is abolished.’ This happened while Chandra Gupta was on his campaign somewhere between Rohtas and Amarkantak fighting the rebellious Savaras. The outlandish monarch was ousted in or about 340 A.D., for Kalyana varman was of full age to receive Hindu royal coronation at the time. In the year of his coronation Kalavarna was married to the daughter of the king of Mathura.”

1. See also K P Jayaswal, Historical Data in the drama Kammudi mahotsara (Annals, XII 50) See K Raghavacharlu, AMQ 139 Vijaya is mentioned in Gadjarakshata’s Rasikajivana, composed about 1650 A D (Annals, XII 399)

For Lichchhavis, see IA, XXXII 293, XXXVII 78 On Lichchhavi dynasty of Nepal, see IA, IX 178, XIV 860 and Fleet, GI, Int 185, 184, 191.
628 Dhiranaga (Bhadanta) lived at Aralapura, sometime earlier than the 5th century A.D. His *Kundamala*, a play in 6 acts, describes the later history of Rama after the coronation, that is, the story of banishment of Sita and her discovery and reunion. In depicting the sentiment of Karuna, he is a precursor of Bhavabhuti, who wrote Uṣṭararāmacarita on the same theme and rightly so, he was mentioned with appreciation by Bhoja and other writers on rhetoric. Verses quoted as his by Vallabhadeva and Sridharadāsa are not found in this play.

629 Viśakhadatta² was the son of Ṛttha Mahārāja and grandson of Vateśvaradatta, a Sāmanta. His play *Mudrarakṣasā*, in

1 Ed. by M. Ramakrishna Kavi, Madras. His mention of Dingnāga as the author is now acknowledged to be an error. See F. W. Thomas (JRAS, 1924), D. R. Mankad, *Pratimā and Kundamāla* (Annals XII 97). K. Gopalakrishna Satre, *Kundamāla vimarsā* (Jl, Mys. Sans Col V 166) Anjnt (OC, i, 109) mention Nāgayya's *Kundamāla* as from Burelī is erroneous. In Tavy VIII 1379, the colophon is अवपुरावेक्ष कविप्रियलिगस्य कृति कुद्रमालानाम नाटक सामान्यम् ||

2 See Peterson, *Subh Lat* 49 and for his philosophical verses

सामासिक्ययुक्ते पितापुविषकहलतविविद्य सत्तवत्वाणि ||

धुत हालापूपः पिताय नपान्वमिति ||

अमेध्यकृतादेण पर्यथ च रमते स्वर्णसिद्धोऽभिमिति

महापार्शवरानां किमिव कर्मणि त्रिगंगात् ||

प्रेमतं कृष्णस्वरूपन्तः कृष्णकृष्णसिद्धोऽभिमिति

ह्यात्ततप्रसिद्धपरतमानमणि विविद्य नियततः ||

सिद्धाकारिण्यनवस्त्रिति तनाशियः प्रार्थनाः

कथ तस्विन कावे सुमगवस्नातोदसमवारः ||

Subh 3888-9

3 Some manuscripts read Viśakhadeva *DO*, XXI 8162, Wilford (*As Rev V* 208) called the author of the work Ananta and quotes him as declaring that he lived on the banks of the Godāvari. But none of the extant commentators contain this reference.

चूजपारां—अध्यात्मिकमर वाज्ज्ञातिसर्वमरां, यथाच तथा सामन्तानं श्रवं—

दशपालक सहराजयदम्यामपयुवानो कृतेविशालात्सय चतुर्मितिव युद्धादासानाम नाटकः

नाटिपित्युद्विद्याति ||

4 Wilson (*Theatre*, II 129) suggests that he might be identical with the Chohan Chief of Ajmir Prthu Rn Telang (int to Edn page 12) points out the distinction that Prthu the father of Viśakhadatta is specially called Mahārāja, while Prthu of Ajmir is only Prthurā or Prthurāj.
seven acts, has for its theme the reconciliation of Rāksasa, the hostile minister of Nanda, the late king of Pālsora to the individuals by whom or on whose behalf his sovereign was murdered, the Brahmin Canakya and the prince Candragupta. With this view he is rendered by the contrivance of Canakya an object of suspicion to the prince with whom he has taken refuge and is consequently dismissed by him. In this deserted condition, he learns the imminent danger of a dear friend, whom Canakya is about to put to death, and in order to effect his liberation, surrenders himself to his enemies. They offer him contrary to his expectations the rank and power of prime minister and the parties become friends."

राङ्ग—क्रिमत पर ग्रिङ्गस्तिः ।
राङ्ग्सेन सम मैत्री राज्ये चारोपिता वषयः ।
नन्दाक्रोण्युलिता सर्वं कि कर्म्यमहं ग्रिङ्गम् ॥

630 The date of Visākhadatta is as usual subject to much speculation. The concluding verse of benediction refers to a king Candragupta.

राङ्ग—त्थापादमस्तु (भरतवाङ्पम)—
वाराहिमात्सयोनेतमसनवधानवास्थितिसंयायणः (एकुप्पा)
यस्म प्राप्तंकीटिपथसपरिणा मिविग्येत्वृत्तिहोतः ।
स्त्रेण्जैवेक्षणात्मा अनुज्युगगुणा सुविद्यता राजसूतेनः
स श्रीमद्दक्षिणभिरभवतु महं पार्श्ववशन्त्राः ॥

It is possible that the plot of the play as connected with Candragupta was suggested by the identical name of the then reigning king and his victories over the marauding attacks of the

1 Ed by A Hillebrandt (Breslaw) See Review of it by Sten Konow, IA, XLIII 64. For an account of the plot and the antecedent events, see introductory verses in Dhunādhūrāya's commentary (Ed Bombay).
2 Wilson, o o 127. There are English Translations by Wilson, (Theatre, II 125-254) and by M A Kala, Bombay. For translations in other languages, see Schuyler, Bbl 95.
3 The readings are different पार्श्ववशन्त्राः and पार्श्ववशन्त्राः Several reliable South Indian Manuscripts have the words पार्श्ववशन्त्राः दातित्राः. If this is the correct reading then Dāntivarman was a Pallava king who ruled between 779-830 A.D. See O J Dubravčík, Ancient History of the Deccan, Ed.; The Pallavas, 64, 65, 72, T A Gopanatha Rao, The Pallavas and the Ganga Pallavas, (Christian College Magazine, 1907, April), Venkayya, EI, VIII 291, Fleet's Carnatic Dynasties, 82, A, Bangasami Sarasvati, JMy, XII, 686, EI, IV. 180.
Huns and the king mentioned there is Candragupta Vikramaditya II, 'who died in 413' "The play knows the Hunas of a time when they had not yet acquired any territory in India, and the annoyance caused to the country by the Mlechas at the time of the composition of this drama, would refer, if the composition, as it seems probable, took place after the suppression of the Western Satrap (390 A D), to the Kushanas or to the new element of the Huns, who might have already made some invasions, probably with the Kushanas about the last year of Chandragupta's reign."

The scene of the play is laid in the city of Kusumapura or Patalseputra. The several indictions of geographical facts show that the city was then in flourishing condition. While Fa Hian the earlier Chinese Traveller described the city as the capital of Magadha, Huen Tsang, the later traveller, found the city in ruins, the foundations of which still covered a very large area. Again in the last act the morality of the Buddhists is alluded to and the references to Buddhism must have belonged to a period long prior to the decay of Buddhism in India and in the time of Fa Hian had attained the zenith of its glory. These several considerations suggest that the play might have been composed about the beginning of the 5th century A D.

1 Jayaswal (IA, XL. 265 fl) suspects a defence of the scandalous murder of the Saka Satrap in the story put forward in the Mudra Raksa of the destruction of the Patalaika (Philippos) by Candragupta Maurya through the alleged agency of the Visvakanyā. The Vayu Purāna referred to the attempt at the uprooting of the Yaksas in Malva and Raputana in the early decades of the Gupta rule. He also refers to the passage in Harṣavardana VI अरिद्धे न परक्कल्लकायुक कमिनिकिसिस्टथ कन्युतालकस-कपिलसमनाधिपति.|| He thinks Malayakṣu (Malavakṣu) a miswritten of Sālayakṣu (Seleucous).

2 The play treats these as interchangeable (See Telang's Edn pp 187, 190, 198, 205). As to these names see Cunningham, Arch Rep XIV, 1, JASB, XVII 49, Beal's Fa Hian, p 70, JBRAS (n.s.) VI 297, Burgess, Arch Surv Rep V 43, Hall's Int to Vasu vādatta, 35

3 Telang's Ed (o c) 154, 211-14
4 Between 393-414 A.D. See Wilson, (o c) 36, Beal's Fa Hian, 108, JBRAS, III 158, JBRAS, XVII 126, IA, VI 191
5 See Elphinstone's, History of India, 292.
6 Act VII 5, Telang's Int (o c 26)
7 Beal’s Fa Hian, Int, lx1
8 Wilson (o c) 127 interprets the trouble by the Mlechas as meaning the Pattan princes and considers the application of the word Kṣapaśaka to the Jaina Jivasigdhi as a characteristic of a period subsequent to the disappearance of the Buddhists from India. He therefore assigns the composition of the drama to 11 or 13th century A D. See Weber (SL, 207 note), Cunningham (Arch. Sur., VIII. 22, JASB, XIV, 140,
631 Muqarraksasa is unique in Sanskrit literature “To the entire exclusion of love, the plot is wholly of a political character and represents a series of machiavellian stratagems, influencing public events of considerable importance and as a historical record or as a picture of it possesses no ordinary claims on our attention. There is in fact but one female character introduced and not however to suggest any scene of tenderness but only of sacrifice.” The language is vigorous, but the verse never loses a melodious flow. The allusion to Varāhāvāṭāra and the simile “pearls spotless like snow” render it probable that the author was quite familiar with, if not a native of Northern India. The work has been held in high esteem, but without an idea of the historical events precedent to the plot of the work it may be hard to follow the course of the play.

LA, II 145 VI 114 note) accepts the view. Telang however (ο c 16 ff) remarks that the Mlecha trouble might mean the early Mohammedan depredations of the 6th century and that the word Kaṣpanaka is not exclusively applied to the Bandhas. He reads the last verse as mentioning Avantivarman who might be identical with the father of the Maukhari King Gravharvarman, the husband of the sister of Harṣavardhana of Kanouj and on this basis assigns the work to the 7th century A.D. tentatively. For this Avantivarman, see Cunningham’s Arch. Surv Rep XV 165, XVI 73 and Harṣacarita, 103. There is king Avantivarman of Kashmir for which see Rajatarangini (V, 1 127) and JBRAS, Sp No. 74. Another Avantivarman is mentioned with no date in JASE, XXX 321. Macdonnel (SL, 365) and Rapson (JRAS 1900, 538) agree with Telang Jacobi (VOJ, II 213 216) says that the play was enacted before King Avantivarman of Kashmir on 2nd December 880 A.D. Hildebrandt, Speyer and Tawney (JBRAS, 1908 1910) affirm it to be much older, anterior to the first recension of the Pancatantra and to Bhātyahari who died in 651 A.D. and suggest the accuracy of Jayaswal’s view. See V Smith, (History of India, 48 note) Schuylar (Bob 10) gives the date 1000 A.D. J. Antani (LA LI 49) gives date 7th century A.D. after Yaśōčhārman who ruled 645 A.D. For other references see Peterson, Subh 128, Dhuva’s Age of Vāśakaḍāṭta (N2KM, V, 26-56), F. Hagg on Vāśakaḍāṭta (Burndore), Hildebrandt’s Edn. (Breslaw) and review of it by Sten Konow in IA, XLIII and Keith, Date of Muḍrakṣāsas and Brhaṅkatha in JBRAS, (1909) 145, R C Dutt, Cvt II 281, M Williams IV, 507 Vāśakaḍāṭta’s characters, (Sahadaya, IV 61). Two stanzas of this play are found in Bhartrihari’s Subhashita, for which see Telang’s Preface to his Edn. of Bhartrihari, 21. For a critique, see Sahadaya, IV 15 and Bhārata (1927) Aug.

1. आयिन्त्रासिद्धान्तस्वस्तिन्द्रदौष्टिकारात्मकात्
   तीरात्माचैररागसुप्रितिप्राप्तो दक्षिणस्मारकः

2. See Telang’s Introduction (ο.ο., 18)
There are several commentaries on the work Vatesvaramisra, son of Gauripatmisra of Miṭhila, attempted to give a double interpretation to this composition and to present it as a system of polity as well as a play. Dhumndhirāja, son of Lakṣmana, wrote his commentary in the reign of King Sarabhōji of Tanjore in the year 1713 A D. He gives a short poetical introduction describing the story of the Nandas leading to the accession of Candragupta and the events of the play. Other commentaries are by Śwāmi Sāstī, a native of Anantaśāgara or Solavandān, by T Tarkavacaspāṭī, by (Mahesvara, Vateśvara Prakūcārya, Kesava-upādhyāya and Abhirāma), by Grahesvara, by J Vidyāsāgara, by Śarabhabhūpa.

There is a prose version of the story by Anantapandita, and a poetical epitome, Mudrārākṣasakathāsara by Ravikarṣana.

Ananta, son of Balapandita, lived at Punyāstamba on the Godāvan in the middle of the 17th century. He wrote also commentaries on Govardhana’s Saptāsāti and Rasamanjari.

In Vallabhadeva’s Subhāntavali, there are verses attributed to Visakhaḍeva, not traceable in Mudrārākṣasa. There are probably taken from some of his lost works.

1. CC, II 160, 218
2. Ed Calcutta, Mysore, Bombay, Ahmedabad.
3. DC XXI 8469
4. Printed Calcutta Śrūgārasarvasvabhāṣa (DC, XXI 8518) enacted at the festival of Māṭrhoṭāśvara at Trichinopoly (Trisurabpur). The author is said to have been rewarded by King Ramācaṇḍra.
5. CC, I 461, II, 106, 218; III 99
6. DC, XXI 8472, OC, III 99. He styles himself Mahāmohapāḍhyāya and son of Śudhaisvara of Śrivāṣaṭa and gives his genealogy.
7. Ed Calcutta
8. Tanj VIII 8474, it is the Tanjore king Sarabhōji
9. CO, I 461. See also Sahājāya XIX
10. Printed at Calcutta and with a short gloss by Rūjagopāla of Māṭuṇa (Madras). He is called Ruvinarjaka in DC, XXI 8156. He says he proposes to render into verse the story of Cāṇakaṇya which was in prose (which apparently is now lost).
11. CC, I. 13. These two latter were composed in 1646 and 1685 A D.
634 Visakhadeva's Devicandragupta is of at least five acts, as inferred from the various quotations from the work made by Bhoja in his Śṛgukāprakāsa and by Rāmacandra in his Nātyadārapaṇa, mentioning the names of Dhruvadevi, Candragupta, Madhavasena. The plot of the play appears to be alluded to by Bāṇa in his Haracarita.

In Devicandragupta the heroine Dhruvadevi when she was in her husband's camp with a small retinue who enjoyed their summer in the cool abodes of the Himalayan frontier, was carried away by an unprincipled foreigner a Saka by birth and was much tormented to accept his hand. A brother of Chandragupta II who was her husband in the disguise of a courtesan formed a dramatic company and approached the licentious Saka. By a series of political stratagems Kumarachandragupta makes Dhruvadevi escape and takes her place in a female garb. When the Saka prince almost became mad of his love to Dhruvadevi and self-sufficiency blinded him to the probable dangers from an offended enemy, he allowed himself to meet in a secret chamber the enemy in the disguise of his favourite object which he sought for. He had his emoluments for his accumulated follies. He is no more pitied than Kīchaka repaid by Bhima. In this the amorous adventure is entirely subsidiary.

Far beyond the Mudrārāksasa, those fragments of splendid poetry and prose reveal a beauty of language and plot, not unequal to Bhaṣa's or Kālidāsa's. Is it possible that Visakhadeva was a contemporary of king Chandragupta of the Gupta dynasty and he wrote a drama with

---

1 For instance

1 तथा विश्वासदेवदत्रे देवीचन्द्रगुप्ते माधवेशने समुद्धित्व कुमारवंश युतोलकः—
अन्नदार्जुलध विश्वासदेवदत्रे माधवेशने समुद्धित्व कुमारवंश युतोलकः।
कुमारवंश विश्वासदेवदत्रे माधवेशने समुद्धित्व कुमारवंश युतोलकः।

tva rastram pañca ṇīrṇaṃ ca kṛṣṇāyavāhikā nītā vṛkṣā
tatālopaṇatanā rāhutārīsā yuvātā chañāṇī kha
tānā yāṃ cakṣāntāhānā yām chenaṃ puṣa sāto
kṛṣṇāyavāhikā tānāyānī dharmātīrṇaṁ kṣetreṇām tānāyātī।

11 Ithamāpi deṣṭi vistingaḥ, pāṇi—

Rṣya chaṭṭaṛthaśārīri ca kṛṣṇāyavāhikā nītā vṛkṣā
tatālopaṇatanā rāhutārīsā yuvātā chañāṇī kha
tānā yāṃ cakṣāntāhānā yām chenaṃ puṣa sāto
kṛṣṇāyavāhikā tānāyānī dharmātīrṇaṁ kṣetreṇām tānāyātī।

For other quotations, see (GOS) p 71, 84, 86, 118, 141, 193, 194.
his king as the hero and another with his namesake of the Maurya dynasty? There is no record that directly conflicts with this attribution of that antiquity to Visakhadeva, but the last verse of benediction on King Candragupta lends full support to it.

Rājaśekhara quotes a verse in which Candragupta’s rescue of his wife caught in his enemy’s camp:

उ वज्रध्वंसकालम् कृतियोऽधिकारितात
इयतसामुद्रितसाहसो निविवृते श्रीकम्बुरसो नुप ।
तत्तिमनो हिमालय्ये रथयुक्तकोणनकारतिकुरे
गौयन्ते तव कार्तिकेयनगरस्यागेः कौरदेः ॥

Kāvyamāṃsā, p. 46

635 Abhisarikavancitaka or Abhisārikābandhitaka is mentioned as Visakhadeva’s play by Bhoja and Abhinavagupta and there are the references

I कदानिकनास्तुपथयमान अक्षोलक्षणातु विचेषितिताद उपजायते। नदरागमला-
गायन न ततो सथित। यथा विशाखसदेववते अभिसाराकवितिके वसेश्वरस्य पदात्तिके महास्वरी।
बेष्यापार्शवरस्यातु हृदयेकतितातु काम प्रवासिता। (अखोदित? ?)—

Abhinavabhārāfī

II कोचो यथा—श्रीविशालदेववते अभिसाराकविते वत्सराजः सम्माहितुद्रवयाये
पश्चात्ले कुकु। | तथा ज अन्यथादत—

मुद्दोधमाही सत्तिमवादः श्रवस्य–
dupālīनशालां पठकमुक्ताकोणानितरोः।
फाणां नारमस्यु परिचयों कौरणविताः
विष्णुवालागाः विष्णुवालागाः दुस्थ्याः।

I—Śrṅgūraprakūśa

“These two extracts furnish us with some material from which we may make some surmises as to the significance of the title and the nature of the plot. It is well known that Udayana was a love-hero of the daksīna type. It is also known how the minister Yaugandharaṇa lulled the king into the belief that Vāsavadatta was burnt, and persuaded him to marry Padmāvari. In the same way a mischievous character in this play, might have, with the determined purpose of

1 See Jl, (1928), 181, JMy, XV. 269.
bringing about an estrangement between the king and Padmāvatī, set afloat the rumour that Padmāvatī killed Udayana's son and that she was a murderess. Udayana had many wives and we do not know whether Padmāvatī, as the rumour had it, killed the son of Udavana born of Vāsavadattā or somebody else, but we may hazard a guess, namely, that it might be Udayana's son through Vāsavadattā. Mutual jealousy and hatred are not unusual features where polygamy prevails and the capricious king probably gave full credence to the prevailing rumour. He lost his self-control. His deep love turned into deep hatred. Rage and fury took possession of him. He saw in Padmāvatī not the nymph of celestial beauty but a "serpent woman glowing with flames of poison." He rebuked Padmāvatī in menacing tones. Poor Padmāvatī, a victim to slander, found that she had lost the love of Udayana. She tried to regain it. To go and plead before the king and to vindicate her innocence would be useless and futile. Hence she hit upon the following plan. Dressed as a charming huntress she attracted the attention of the tenderminded Udayana. As time rolled on, Udayana found himself completely enmeshed in her love. When Padmāvatī found that the love of the king was genuine, she revealed her identity. Probably then she explained her innocence. Thus there is the नदिरस्त्रकालबन्धन as said in the Abhimañvabhāraṇī. This then explains the significance of the title. By a clever impersonation of a huntress Padmāvatī in the roll of an Abhisārikā decover the king and regains her lost love.

636 Ramesvara was the son of Rāmadeva Ṭarkavāgīśa. He was a native of Vanga and flourished in the first half of the 18th century. His patron Citrasena, King of Mana. His Candrabhiseka is a drama in seven acts and describes the story of the destruction of Nandas by Cānakya and the coronation of Candragupta. The scene in the seventh act is interesting where Rākṣasa receives a letter that the Nandas are at the point of death owing to a burning fever produced by a Yoga commenced by Cānakya. The style resembles Visākhadafta's as also the plot. But the tricks of policy, that are so amazing in the latter, are not so original or prominent in Rāmesvara's work.

1. R Ramamurti in JOR, Madras
2. CC, I 182
637 Bhatta Narayana\(^2\) or shortly Nārāyaṇa was of Sāndilya family. He was surnamed Mṛgaraja. Traditionally he was one of the Brahmans that immigrated from Kanouj to Bengal at the invitation of Adisūra, king of Bengal\(^8\) who reigned in the first half of the 7th century A D. He is called Niśa-Nārāyaṇa by anthologists because of his beautiful description of the night (mūḍā)\(^3\) In a manuscript\(^4\) of the Nīti, a commentary on Dharmakirti's Rūpāvatāra, it is stated that at the request of Bāna Bhatta, Bhatta Nārāyaṇa became pupil of a Buddhist monk, learnt from him all the tenets of Buddhist philosophy and defeated Dharmakīrti and that Rūpāvatāra is the joint work of Bhatta Nārāyaṇa and Dharmakīrti. It may therefore be inferred that Bhatta Nārāyaṇa lived in the first half of the 7th century A D

638 In his Avanśīndarikathā, Dandin praises Nārāyaṇa\(^5\) as well as Bāna and Mayūra and refers to the former as having composed three works. It is quite likely that Dandin refers in this verse to Bhatta Nārāyaṇa.

\[\text{A quotation in the Subhāṣītāvali appears to be the nāndi of a drama with the sentiment of love in it} \]


2. Adisura is supposed to have lived in 3rd century B C. But Abul Fazl makes him the 28th ancestor of Ballal Sen who reigned 1170 A D (See V Smith, *EH* 403, 419 JASB xi, 400 Imp Gaz under Rampāl, N N Vasu, *Proc of ASB*, (1902) 207, *Int to Modern Buddhism and its followers* in *Orosia*, 15, Arch Survey, *Mayura bhanja* (1911) I, lxxiv note, and Ballālīcanta, *Bibl Ind*) Writers on Brahmanical geneology, particularly Harimīra and Pāo Misra place Adisura shortly before the Pālas and state that shortly after the arrival of the five Bānas from Kanouj, the kingdom of Gour (Cap Laksūvil of Lakanāvatāli) became subject to the Pālas. See V Smith, *EH* 897, U C Bātavīya, *JASB*, LXII, 411. This date of 6th century A D for Bhsa Nārāyaṇa is approved by Weber (IL, 207) and Grill, *Int Cent BL* (1972-612). The story current in Benares that he went from Kāṇyakūbra to Vanga in Saka 999 seems to be incorrect.

3. See Jalāṅga’s *Subhāṣītavalī*

4. This manuscript has been acquired for the *Oriental Manuscripts Library*, Madras, and I am informed by M Ramakrishna Kavi that the leaf is half lost.

5. This verse is not found in the printed edition of Subhāṣītavali, but in a manuscript recently acquired from the *Oriental Manuscripts Library*, Madras, Kuppusamy Sastri’s *Rep* (1916-9), 40. See para 373 supra.
His *Venisamhara*, a drama in 6 acts, alludes to a sensational incident in the Sabhāparvan of Mahābhārata, viz, the forcible exposure of Draupadi's hair and garment by Dussāsana in the public assembly of Duryodhana's court and to the consequent vow of Bhīmasena that the locks of hair would not be braided again save by his own hands wet with the blood of the infamous king.* The play takes through the battle of the Bhaṛaṭa war and negotiations prior to it and culminates in the coronation of Yudhishthira.

Traces of Pāncarātra tenets are visible in the work and his ridicule of the Ārvāka doctrine of materialism shows the religious tendency of his age. As a heroic piece, with the ruling sentiment of valour (vīrārasa), the play is very popular among writers on rhetoric. For admixture of humour and pathos, in dignity of thought and ease of expression the last Act commands high appreciation.

Among the earliest writers, Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta quote Veṣīsamhāra as the most appropriate illustrations of canons of dramaturgy.*

1. Called also Veṣīsamvarana Trans into English by S M Tagore (Calcutta) and by M R Kale (Bombay). See generally, G Narasimyya and N Veeraraghavayya, Bhaṛata, VI 406, 576, 578; Wilson, Theatre, II. 885, R C Dutt OsW II 251, Muktam Vadyabaglahl, Int to Edn. (Calcutta), L R Vaidya, Int to Edn. (Poona) Keith, SD, 212, M R Kale (Int to Edn) gives date 7th or 8th century.

2. The vow is expressed thus —

चन्द्रदुभज्ञजीवितचंद्रगतिष्ठतस्यन्युक्तम्यते युगलस्य युज्योतिष्ठ ।
स्यानांश्च तदन्योगितांधनिष्ठावतीके वन्धनमेव गृहे. ॥

3. Anandavardhana flourished in the court of King Avantivarman (556-894 AD). This is sufficient to refute the identification of the author of Vēṇīsamhāra with one Bhattanārayana, the donee under a copper-plate grant of 840 AD (Khalunpur copper plate EI, IV 259) Macdowell (SL 386) and M Duff (Chronology) rely on this plate and say Bhattanārayana's son Adga Ojha was patronised by king Dharmapāla who reigned about 500 and 840 AD (See V Smith, EI, 898, Watters, II, 67, Beal, II, 62, 86 and IA, XV 304, ibid XX 308. On this grant, see IA, XX, 108, ibid XXI, 93, 264.

4. For quotations in Subhaṣītāvalī etc. see Pet. Int. 60-51.
DRŞYAKÄVYA

There are commentaries by Jagaddhara, Jaganmohana Tarkä-
lankāra, Tarkavācaspaṭi, CR Tīvra, Ghanasāma, and Lakśma-
sūri. There is a summary in prose by Anantācārya.

640 This play appears to have travelled to Java very early. In his introduction to Sanskrit Texts from Bali (GOS, xiii) S Levi writes:

“The Mahabharata was translated into (Old) Javanese at the end of the Xth century AD under the reign of King Śri Dharmmavamsa teguh Anantavikrama Deva who was ruling in Eastern Java, and, rivaling the Sumatranese empire of Śrīvijaya, endeavoured to promote the study of Sanskrit literature. Only some parts of the whole translation have been preserved, and in Bali only Kern had published, as early as 1871, a notice on the Adiparva with the text of the Pausyacarita (Verhand K Akad Wet, Amsterdam, afd Lett dl XI 1877).

The Adiparva begins with three Sanskrit stanzas, the first is clearly an arāya, the second stanza is rather unexpectedly the well known benedictory verse of Bhatta Narayana’s Venisamhara

| जयति सनासिले ग्राहोऽनन्यशङ्करास्वामी ||
| दामोदरो निजोदग़हरनिक्षोच्यावनम् ||

The point is of a particular importance on account of its bearing to the origin of the Javanese shadow-theatre (Wayang). The first mention of the Wayang occurs just some years later than the Javanese translation of the Mahabharata, in the Javanese Arjunavivaha written under the great king Airlanga, who had succeeded Śri Dharmmavamsa. During the IXth and Xth centuries the connection between Bengal and Indonesia was very active, I refer here only to the Pala inscription at Nalanda (Epigr Ind, 1924, 310-327). If the Venisamhara was known to the Javanese translator of the Mahabharata, it follows that the

1. Ed Poona.
2. Ed Calcutta
3. Ed Calcutta
4. Ed Benares
5. BR, III, (1905) xi
6. Ed Madras
7. Sah, xix, 165
Sanskrit theatre had reached Sri Dhammavamsa's court, and the
Wayang may have been born under the influence of the Sanskrit plays.”

641 Bhavabhuti² whose real name was Srikantha was the son
of Nilakantha and Jatukarni. He was born at Padmapura³ in the country
of Vidarbhas, the modern Berars, "somewhere near Chanda in the
Nagpur territories where there are still many families of Maharati
Desastha Brahmans of the Black Yajurveda with Apastamba for their
sutras." He gives us a short account of himself and his family in the
prologues of his plays. His ancestors were Brahmans surnamed
Udumbara tracing their lineage from Sage Kâsyapa. They were
"teachers of their charana, so learned and pure as to be fit to purify
by their association those receiving purification, the keepers of the five
sacrificial fires, faithful to their religious vows, drinkers of Soma, and
students of theology.” His grandfather Bhatta Gopâla performed the
sacrifice of Vâjapeya Bhavabhûti therefore belonged to a family of
Vedic scholars. He is a Vedic bard with Vedic ideas and expressions
which unconsciously get in and abound in the writings ⁴ Jañanâdhi was
his guru, a name which looks as one assumed by persons of the monastic
order. Unlike other dramatists he develops the marriage of Mâlaṭi
and Mâdhava on lines peculiar to his own study. He follows
Gauṭama and holds the mind and the eye as the sole guide in the
choice of a bride. The atheistic Sânkhya and theistic yoga philoso-

---

1 As Ghanâsîma says the name Bhavabhuti was given to him from his
composition Sâmbhu Punâtaî Sambhuti (See TO, II 1728)
or as the commentator Virarâghava says

गिरिजायास्तनिए चन्दे संभृतिपिठलत्तिए ।
तपस्वी का गतोज्ञस्य अवति स्वरानानविव ||

Two other poets Aluri Tîrumalâkâvi and Râṭnakarbâdikstîta bore the titles Abhinava-
Bhavabhûti. On the description of Pañmâvati, see Khajara inscription EI, I 149

2 M.V. Lele in his book on Malati-Madhâvâ vasavadhara (in Maharati) at
page 5 identifies Pañmâvati with the modern village Pâvâya or Pola-pavaya north-east
of Narwar in Gwalior state and Cunningham with Narwar (Nalapura) itself [Arch. Rep.
(1889-9) II 807] Other identifications are (i) near Amaravâli (ii) Kasavinâpura
(Kohapur) (iii) Ujjain (iv) Pampur in Kashmir. Belvâkar denies the identity of
Pañmâvati and Pañmapura (Introduction to Uttaramachardita, Harward Oriental
series). It must be said however that the oldest extant manuscript of the dated Nevari
Samvat 278 (1156 A.D.) does not mention the province viz "Viḍârabhasu" [Nepal,

3 Bhandarkar’s Int to Mal note to Act I, line 81

4 See A B Keith, Brahmânu and the Vedas, JBAS, (1914), 729.
phies were known to him. He was perhaps a wanderer in his youth intimate with actors and it is not improbable that he himself acted on the stage.* In his middle life he attached himself to the court of Kanouj, and there standing by king Yasovarman in his vicissitudes followed him to Kashmir. On his way he visited Buddhist Viharas and observed the variety of Pāśanda worship and human sacrifices offered to Cāmundā to which he often alludes in his works.

As a poet he had his reverses in his early days and apparently his critics were severe on him. He slyly refers to them when he says "As of women, so of compositions, people are malicious as to their purity." That accounts for his pessimism which went so far as to flout the opinion of his contemporary "world. He was conscious that his poetry was good and he left it for future generations to appreciate it. He wrote that a "spirit kindred to mine will some day be born; for time is endless and the world is wide."*

He was conscious of his merit and he expressed that "Goddess of speech attends on him as on Brahma like a submissive hand-maid." Vākpaṭi describes the excellences of Bhavabhūti's compositions as shining like particles of liquid nectar of poetry. Rājaśekhara fancies him as Vālmiki himself reincarnate. Bhavabhūti was an admirer of Kālidāsa. When the love-lorn Mādhava wandered in quest of Mālaṅ, or when the desperate Mādhava sent a cloud as messenger to his beloved, Bhavabhūti had in his mind the distracted Purūravas and the Yakṣa. He was however not a mere imitator. He was the master of the sentiment of pathos* and his mode of dramatic composition was original.* Tradition couples the name of Bhavabhūti with that of

---

1. Belvalkar thinks (10 page 101 note) that Bhavabhūti played the part of Vālmiki in the Uttarārāmacarṇa.

2. यथा भौर्ण तथा बाच्याः सायुः पुरुषी जनम ||
3. ये नाम कैवल्यद ॥ प्रवर्तन्यवश्व ||
   जनानि ते किमसि तातु श्राति नैष युन ||
   उत्पत्ति: मय ॥ कौधम प्रमाणान्यवश्व ||
   कालेश्व निरबिच्छिन्ना च पुष्टि ||

4. Uttarārāmacarṇa Act. I 2 य भावाणिय देसी बास्यवान्नवति ||
5. Gaudavaho, 799
7. According to him Karuṇa is the only rasa एको रस करण पूर्व ||
8. For a critical appreciation of Bhavabhūti's poetic merits, see Adarka Kumārājīnāryā's Bhavabhūti bhārāja (Madras), T Suryanarayana Rao, Bhave bhārāja and his masterly genius (Poona).
Kālidāsa They are mentioned together in the Bhojacaritra of Ballāla along with others as the poets of Bhoja's court, but Kālidāsa of the dramatic fame must have long preceded our poet. Kalhaṇa mentions Yasovarman King of Kanouj as the patron of Bhavabhūti and Vākpatī as a poet in the same court. Yasovarman was subdued by Lalitāditya of Kashmir who ruled between 699 and 735 A.D.

On Bhavabhūti generally, see K M Banerjee, Bhavabhūti in English Garb (I4, I 149), Kale, Int to Utīlamācharitra (Bombay), A Borooah, Bhavabhūti, his place in Sanskrit literature (Calcutta), Bandarkar, Bhavabhūti's quotation from the Ramayana (I4, 129), Schuyler, A Bull of Bhavabhūti (I4OS, XXV 189), Aufricht, ZDMG, XXVII 83 4, CC, I 998, Peterson, PR, IV lxxv, 77 8, Subh 77, F W Thomas, Kav 60 2, Wilson, Theatre, II 1 6, Macdonell, SL, 862.

1 On Ballāla's work see under Bhoja poet and Index.

2 Belvākār (o o p xxxix) says that Bhavabhūti's name is grouped with others as the 9 gems of the court of the king Vikramāditya of Ujjain. This seems to be a mistake, for in the well known stanza (see para 14 supra) the name of Bhavabhūti is not mentioned.

3. कविवास्तिराजायौ ममात्मम जन्मबद्धिते।

On Belvākār, see S K Belvākār (HOS) l. a. iii, R C Bhandharkar, Int of Malavi, xii.

5 According to Dutt (Ou. II 284) Yasovarman ruled 700-750 A.D. See V. Smith, The History of the City of Kanauj and of King Yasovarman, [JRAI (1908), 765 98], ERE, 879. See also C. V. Vaidya, History of Mediaeval India, (Poona), 808-814, 834-42, Belvākār's (o o 43), M. Duff, (Chronology) gives Yasovarman underdate 890 A.D. Lassen gives him A.D. 695-788.

6 According to Kalhaṇa, Lalitāditya ruled 635 732 A.D. Cunningham,
Bhavabhūti’s works belong to a later period\(^1\) when a new style of the period of Dandin, Subandhu and Bāṇa, all poets of a school to which Ojas (powerful expression) is the soul of elegant style Bhavabhūti flourished about the close of the 7th century or in the beginning of the 8th century A.D.\(^2\)

In the colophon to a manuscript of Mālāti-Mādhava\(^3\) it is stated that the drama was composed by ‘a pupil of Bhatta Kumārila’ Kumārila was a professor of Mīmāṃsāa and flourished between 590 650 A.D.\(^4\) It has been said that the family of Bhavabhūti was renowned for sacrifices and vedic rites and study of Mīmāṃsā is indispensable for an orthodox exegesis of the Vedas. It is possible therefore that there is some truth in the tradition that Kumārila was a teacher of Bhavabhūti.

\(^{(Ancient Geography of India, 90 92)\text{ adopts a correction of }31\text{ years after 696 A.D} and dates Lālītādītya’s accession in A.D. 727. Buhler follows this view and so does Max Muller (p. 384 note 1). For a discussion of Cunningham’s view, see S. P. Pundit’s, *Int to Gaudavaha* c.c p lxxvi and lxxxvi et seq. S.P. Pundit gives the date 695 to 722 A.D. For Cunningham’s earlier view (693 729 A.D.), see Arch. Survey of India, (1879), III 125 and Pnunsep’s Indian Antiquities, XI 245. As to Lalītādītya’s date, see Bhandarkar, *Int to Mal,* 9, Dutt (c.c II 178). See also Buhler’s paper in WZKM II 329, Jacob’s paper in Gottinger Gele Antiquen (1889), No. 2, page 58 and VOJ, II 321, Stein’s *Int to Raj* and notes on IV 129, 134, Levi and Chavannes, *Itinerare d’Ou Kong* [JA, (1895) 858], fix the date of Yaśovarman’s defeat between 736 and 747 A.D. See also Prabandhakārthak of Rajatēkhara (composed 1405 1849 A.D.), Prabhāvakarita of Prabhāsaṇḍha and Tīrthaṅkalpa of Jina-prabhasūri (composed 1864 1808 A.D.)

1 For a full account of these works, see J. K. Belvarkar (BOS) I.c Introduction.
2 Peterson, *JBRAS, XVIII* 109, Bhandarkar’s, *Int to Mal,* iv and *JBRAS, XVII* 572, Keith, *SD,* 156.
3 See Lala, *Mal* (c c 84), S. P. Pundit, *Int to Gaudavaha* (c c ccc), Bhandarkar, *Mal.* (c c viii).
4, S.P. Pundit (c c) K. B. Pathak (JBRAS, XVIII 213) assigns Kumārila to 700 A.D.
5 K. T. Telang (JBRAS, XVIII 159) and Buhler (VOJ, II 383) are against this view. Belvarkar (c c xli) remarks “Unfortunately the colophon to act vi complicates the matter by giving the name of that pupil as Umvekacharya. It follows either that this was an alias of Bhavabhūti or else that the Māl Madh is a composite work and that while the other eight acts are by Bhavabhūti, acts III and VI are by Umvekacharya, perhaps a substitution of his own version of these two acts in place of Bhavabhūti’s original version which this pupil of Kumārila did not like. Obviously we are giving undue weight to the testimony of a single manuscript. A solitary manuscript of the Utiṣaramacharita gives Bhavabhūti’s original name as Neelakanta instead of Śrīkantha and the oldest extant manuscript of the Māl Madh (A.D. 1156) says after the colophon to act X Kirtirgum Māhakāver Bhugarbhaya. Is Bhugarbha another alias of Bhavabhūti? Perhaps all this confusion means only that our poet was not so well and widely known as we might like to think.”
Mandana became an ascetic and assumed the name of Suresvarācārya. There is a controversy whether Mandanamisra and Suresvarācārya were identical. In Madhava's Sankaravijaya, they are treated as synonymous and in the Vīvāranaprameyasangraha, Madhava quotes from the Bhādraranyakavartika of Suresvaracharya (Ed Vīzianagaram, p 92) but names the author as Visvarupacarya. Madhava therefore considered them identical (For further particulars on this identity, see T Ganapati Sastrī, Int to Yagnavalkyasmṛti, TSS, No 74). There the statement is quoted from the Bhādhramukhādhyāya of Suresvaracharya (Ed. Vīmanagaram, p 92) but names the author as Visvarupacarya. Madhava therefore considered them identical (For further particulars on this identity, see T Ganapati Sastrī, Int to Yagnavalkyasmṛti, TSS, No 74).

In the colophon to a manuscript of the Malatimadhava it was written at the end of Act III (composed by the pupil of Kumārila, at the end of Act X (composed by Bhaṭṭācārya), and at the end of Act VI, (composed by Bhaṭṭācārya)) the name of that pupil is mentioned as Umbeka. Umbeka is a very respected name in Mīmāṃsā literature. He is quoted by Ānandapūrṇa in his commentaries on Khandana of Śrīharṣa, by Rāmakṛṣṇa in his commentary on Śaṭrādīpikā, by Nārāyana in his commentary Viṣaya on Aṣṭa, a commentary on Ānṭravārtika, and by Paramesvara in his Gopālikā, a commentary on Kāśikā (which is a commentary on Śīloka-vaṭṭikā). He severely attacks Prabhākara who was Kumārila’s adversary in Citsukha’s Tattvānurādhikā (Ed Bombay, 265) he quotes the poet Umbeka and commenting on that passage Pratyakṣaṇaprabhāgavān in his Nayanaprasādini (Ed 1 c) says that Umbeka is Bhavabhūti. Umbeka has written a commentary on Kumārila’s Śīloka-vaṭṭikā up to Vanavāda and the rest of it is commented upon by Jayamśra, son of Kumārila. If Bhavabhūti and his ancestors were, as he says in his

1. See D C Bhattacarya, IHS, VII 809 where Mandana is said to be different.
prologues, learned in the Mimamsa, this is another indication that Umbeka and Bhavabhuti might be identical. Above all a strong proof of the identity of Umbeka with Bhavabhuti is furnished by a commentary which begins with Bhavabhuti's well-known verse, ये नाम केचिदिध न प्रयनववनार्य।

In Madhava's Śankaravijaya (VII. 113-16) it is said that Umbeka was the name of Mandanamisra (also called there Visvarūpa)

अय च पत्था यदि ते प्रकाश्य सुवीत्रिठो सम्भवित्वनार्य।
दिगतविश्रात्यशा विजेये मिरसंत्र जिते सर्वित्व जित स्वात्।
सदा वदन् योगपथ व संवत स विश्रुः सत्र्वित्वो सहीतः।
महाभृःती वैदिकमकर्मपर अर्धिशाहे निरत सुकर्ष।
निमिर्दिशाले न हातादर सत सशाह्यायण केना नीरयात्।
पश्च गत तत संभवनोर तदनंतर गच्छतु सा चिर सवात्।
उदेक्ष इत्यहिशतश हि तथा तेकेरुभी बान्धवन्येतिधिवस्यामान्।
हेतो कुचिदिधेश वाद्य सुवाशिभवत दुर्योगिताजनि वृङ्गैः वर्मयाराति।

644 The works of Bhavabhuti have always been regarded as a standard for dramatic study, but only three dramas have come down to us. Stanzas are ascribed to him in various anthologies which are not traceable in the extant works. It is therefore presumable that other works or works of his have now been lost to us. Guparatana, a treasury of thirteen verses, is ascribed to Bhavabhuti.

645 Bhavabhuti is a worthy peer of Kālidāsa in merit and fame. Kālidāsa is terse and brief in his expression and working upon the reader's feelings puts to exercise his full imagination. Bhavabhuti's language is comparatively diffused and a redundancy of ideas often makes a strong impression on the reader's mind. In short, Bhavabhuti expresses in the vācyā sense what Kālidāsa does in the svangya sense. In describing human emotions of Pathos and Heroism, Bhavabhuti surpasses his rival. Kālidāsa's style is graceful, Bhavabhuti's sounds grand. In delineations of nature and chivalry Bhavabhuti feels at home. "Bhavabhuti is skilful in detecting beauty even in ordinary things and actions and in distinguishing the nicer shades of feelings. He is a master of style and expression and his cleverness in adapting his words

1. See Peterson, Subh 77 78, Jalhepa's Sūk for which see PR, (1887 1891) xxxv, also appendix II of Harvard University Series Vol xxxvi (It is not known whether this volume has yet been printed).
2 Printed, Haebertm, SKE, 292.
to sentiment is unsurpassed." Like Kālidāsa's, Bhavabhūti's language is full of melody and lyrical beauty. In religion Kālidāsa is a man of the city teeming with amorous intrigues. Bhavabhūti is rural. True to his lineage he would not lose sight of the minutest ceremony; his guest would not be allowed to depart without madhuparka. ¹

646 Malati-Madhava is a prakarana in ten acts.² The scene is laid in Ujjain, and the subject is (a fiction and is) the love-story of Malati, daughter of a minister of the country and Madhava, a young scholar of the city and son of the minister of another state. Skilfully interwoven with this main story are the fortunes of Makaranda, a friend of Madhava and Madayanti, a sister of the king's favourite. Malati and Madhava meet and fall in love, but the king has determined that the heroine shall marry his favourite, whom she detests. This plan is frustrated by Makaranda, who personating Malati goes through the wedding ceremony with the bride-groom. The lovers, aided in their projects by two amiable Buddhist nuns, are finally united. ³

The poet displays here an all-round learning and develops the love of Malati and Madhava, as it were, to illustrate the tenets of Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra.

There is an epitome of Malatīmadhava in verse called Rjulaghvī by Maithilasarmaṇa⁴ and commentaries on it by Ṯhārānanda,⁵ Jagaddhara,⁶

¹ Here is a traditional verse, attributed to Kālidāsa himself

abhavato svarṣāpy sam ca sambhrūṣṭa sāṁghita

utukṣaṣāraṣṭyṣa śrāksitāḥ tasya laviṣyanti l

girair vēśi śāsnaśubhāsūtraśātyakṣālaśašvika-

māvīmāyāyē śrīpiṣṭa pariṇāṃ māyavī lī

² Ed BSS by R G Bhandarkar. There are several other editions in different languages

³ Macdonnel, SL 364, Wilson, Theatre, II, 166 Schwyler, Bull. 29, gives the translations in foreign languages. For a short sketch, see SR. II, 69, B C Dutt, CI II 264, 270 and M Williams, JW 502. Tr into English by Wilson, Theatre, II 1128 and by M R Kale, Bombay

⁴ CC, I 458

⁵ PR, Y

⁶ Ed BSS Bombay and elsewhere and by M R Telang (Bombay)
Tripurârî, 1 (Mânänka, 2 Râghababhata, Nârâyana, Prâkârita), J. Vidyâñâgara, 3 Pûrânarasavatsi 4 and Kunjâvârî 5

647, Mahaviracarita describes in seven acts the life of Râma as a warrior. The plot follows Râmâyana with slight variations meant to show Râma’s heroism in relief. The last act describes the country traversed by Râma and Sita on their way to Ayodhya in the aerial car. 7

“The situation and sentiment of the drama” says Wilson, “are of a stirring and martial description and the language is adapted with singular facility to the subjects from which it springs. It is sonorous and masculine, more vigorous than musical, and although highly elaborate and sometimes rigid is in general chaste and always classical and stately”.

For long years the manuscript of the work beyond Act V, 46 was not available. 6 The lost portion was completed by Subrahmanya Later

---

1 Ed Madras. Tripurârî was the son of Parvatânapâtha of Bhrâdâyâjagotra. His commentary extended only to 7 acts and the rest is continued by his pupil Nânyâdeva son of Haricandra of Salahabhâttaya family SR, II 73. Nânyâdeva has written a commentary on the whole drama too (TC, II, 2220). He is probably identical with the king Nânyâdeva of Tirhut who is said to have been subjugated by Vîjâyasena of Bengal about 1200 A.D. and founded Simran in 1057 A.D. and afterwards established a Kanâtaka dynasty in the valley of Nepal. See Smith, BH, 418 19, S. Levi, Le Nepal, II 193, Keilhorn, EI, I 818, note 57. See also IA, XI 188

2 Mânänka was a royal author and flourished about the 18th century A.D. He is quoted by Royamukuta in his commentary on Amara composed in 1431 A.D. His Bhrâdavanakâvya relates the life of Krsna and Meghâbhyudaya is a highly artificial poem PR, III 11, 291. In BR, II (1907) there is a commentary on it by Lakshmînarasa where author is called Sâyankeli. He wrote commentaries on Gîtagovinda and Mâlatâmâghava.

3 CO, I 458, II 104
4. Ed Calcutta
5 TC, III 4118
6 Ed Calcutta
7 Macdonnell, SL, 364; Weber, LL, 207; Wilson, Theatre, II 238 234; B.C. Dutt, Cus, 274; M. Williams, IW, 502
8 Dhrâsrâstrâdârâmi etc., the last time was made up by Mahâdeva hânta prakrût daksinâ vâyasitâ bhûnâsyaâvâsîh vishnuh, and by Mûdâdurâmâ hânta prakrût daksinâ, it is made up of Sûndarârâma Sûndarârâma, by Sûndarârâma, and by Mûdâdurâmâ. See also IA, XI 188

9. There is a manuscript in the Tanjore Library No 10708 (Tanj VIII 9454) in which is said Rajeshvaradârâshâhâ, which indicates a tradition that Rajashekhar had the manuscripts of Mahâviracarita destroyed. In Tanj VII 443-5, it is said Shvetâbhâcha samâsrîthamâkapînâ vîrâcîh mahâyaîrârâhârîh itâm nabhamaîtâvastivârî, âdhaḥ vâstras, kîrîk pâra mahâbhrâma praśsâdhâ,.
however, the later portion was discovered. Subrahmanya was probably identical with the author of the drama Sītāvijayendirāparimāya, which likewise in seven Acts describes the marriage of Rāma with Sītā. Subrahmanya was the son of Kṛṣṇasūrya of Kāsyapagotra. He lived in Southern India in the 17th century A.D.

This is a commentary on the play by Vīrārāghava.

648 Uttarārāmacaritṛa describes in seven Acts the story of Uttarakaṇḍa of Rāma, that is, the abandonment of Sītā, her residence at the hermitage of Vālmiku, the birth of Kusa and Lava and there the union of Sītā and Rāma. "The catastrophe is differently brought about," says Wilson "in the Ramayana and the Raghuvamśa, and the poetical account of Rama and his race closes in a different manner. Rama discovers his sons in consequence of their recital of the Ramayana at his sacrifice and Sita upon her innocence being recognised by the people is suddenly carried off by the goddess of Earth, and disappears for ever. The denouement is very judiciously altered to her reunion with her sons and husband in the play."*

This play holds a high place in the theatrical literature of the world. In the expression of genuine pathos (Karuṇa) and the description of wild scenery, it has rarely been surpassed anywhere.

---

1 Ed Bombay 1892 (in which both the versions are given), with the commentary of Vīrārāghava, Ed Todarmall, Lahore, Ed F H Trithen, (London), Ed by A Boorah, Bombay with Com and notes Trans into English by J. Pickford (London)

2 DC, XXI 8513

3 The manuscripts of Mahāvīrascanta in South India (e.g., DC, XXI, 8151) were found incomplete and stopped with V 46 So it was that Vīrārāghava in his commentary could get at only the incomplete work and for the rest had to continue the commentary on Subrahmaṇya’s supplement. Apart from the name Subrahmaṇya, this is another indication that Subrahmaṇya was a native of South India.

Vīrārāghava was son of Nṛsimha, a descendent of Dāmasrī of Vādhulagotra and resident of Bhumārupara or Tīrnapilasai near Poonamalai, Chengleput District. He was called Amāvappangār.

4 For an introductory account and translation see Wilson, Theatre, I 275 894, Tr into English by H Mukhopadhyaya (Calcutta), by O H Tawney (Calcutta), by K K Bhattacharya (Calcutta) by S K Belvalkar, Harward (HOS), by V S Patwardhan (Nagpur). For translations into other languages, see Schwyler, 381. For a general account, see M Williams, IV, 509 and R.C Dutt, Cwp, II, 275. For a full critique see Venkataramasastri, Sahradaya, XXIV 7 and K Subhasastri, Uttarārāmacaritṛa-svarasvaratā, Bharatī, VI Juy and the same by B. Venkataramasastri, (Jl of Andh Sāh Par, XXI, 81).
There are commentaries on the play by Virarāghava, 1 Ātmārāma, 2 Lakṣmanasūri, 3 A Borooah, 4 Vidyāśāgara, Abhirāma, 5 Premacandra Tarkavāgīsa, 6 Bhotajusāstrī, 7 Ṭīrūkumāracakravartin, 8 Rāmacandra, 9 B S Ghate, 10 Ghanasyāma, 11 Lakṣminārāma Tātācārya, 12 Rāghavācārya, 13 Purnārasaṅvati, 14 and Nārāyanabhatta, 15 and one anonymous 16

Lakṣminārāma Tātācārya known as Kavibhūṣana was son of Tiruvencata of Śathamārangotra. He was a High Priest and lived at Tīrpliçane, Madras. He passed away in 1923. He wrote facile poetry and among his various poems are Bhavabhūtibhārati, Pādukastuti, Subhāṣīraṇāni and Rāmabāna. Besides a commentary on Acyutasataka (prakūṭ) he attempts to show in his commentary on Uṭtarārāmacarita, that the prevailing sentiment there is not Karuna but Vipralambha-sāṅgāra.

Virarāghava, popularly known as Anūpavappangār, was the son of Nārāyanam and descendant of Pāsārathu of Vādhūlagotra. He was born at Tirumālaśat (Bhūsārapuri) in Chingleput District, Madras, about 1770 AD and lived for 48 years. He was much respected in Mysore and other provinces. He wrote a commentary on Mahāvīracarita, the drama Malayājāpatnayā, a poem Bhaktisārodaya, and other philosophical works. He had no son and his daughter’s grandson R Alasingarāchār now lives in the same town. It is not known whether these works are now available there.

1 Ed Bombay
2 TO, III 1599, 1601 Ātmārāma was father of Nīlakanṭha Dīkṣita and son of Acārīśīta. He also wrote a commentary on Śāhīyāraṣṭākara.
3 Ed Kumbhakonam. About the author, see para 246 supra
4 Ed Calcutta
5 TO, III, 2938
6 Ed Calcutta with a preface by E. B. Cowell
7 Ed Nagpur by V S Pattavardhan.
8 Ed. Calcutta, with a preface by B P Mujumdar
9 Ed Madras
10 Ed Nagpur
11 TO, III 1720 Ed Bombay by P V Kane. On Ghanasyāma, see para 166 supra
12 The manuscripts are with his son S A T Singarācārya, Tīrpliçane, Madras.
13 CC, I 68
14 About the author, see index post
15 See Sah XX 248 He was a Malabar Brahmin who wrote at the instance of Aluvanrer Tamprakkal (Netrārāyaṅa) Nambuḍrī
16 TO, III 9509, 9886, CC, I 68
The story of Bhavabhūti's plays has been summarized by V. Anantācārya in Nātakakathāsangraha. Uttarārāmacaritākāvya is a poem in 5 cantos on the theme of the later life of Rāma. It is a sequel to Rāmapāṇivada's Rāghaviya and was probably composed by Meppathur (Nārāyan) Bhāṭṭāṭṭiṇ.

651. King Yasovarman wrote the play Rāmābhūvudaya on the whole story of Rāmāyana Sāradātanaṇaya says it was in 6 acts

and quotes incidents for illustration. Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Dvānāloka mentions Yasovarman as its author

652. Rajasekhara was the son of Durduka and Silavati. His family name was Yayāvara. His father Durduka was a high priest. His great-grand father Akālajalada was a great poet. He was married to Avanṭisundari, an accomplished Rajaput princess. She was proficient in poetics and Rajasekhara quotes her views with regard. He appears to have belonged to the Maharatta country i.e. the Vidarbha and Kuntala.

1. Printed, Allahabad.
2. Ed. Annamalai University by K R Pisharodi There is Uttarārāghaviya-kāvya (DO, XX 7694).
3. Rajasekhara was himself called "Yayāvara" or the Yayāvara Kavi. He is so called in Tilakāmanjarī and Uḍayesundari (see Int to Kavyamimāṃsā, Gaekwad's Oriental series, xii) He is also referred to as Bālakāva and Kavivāla (see Karp L 9).
4. His name is referred to in Jālhaṇa's Suktimukēvallī and his verses are there said to have been plagiarized by Rājāmbaratama in his drama. For his verses in Sūry see Peterson, Subh 102 F W Thomas, Kav 80.
5. On account of this marriage with a Rajput princess Durghaprasad and Kono doubt whether Rajasekhara was a Brahmun or a Kṣatriya.
6. See Kavyamimāṃsā, (O C 46, 87).
7. Nārāyanapāda Dīkṣita in his commentary on Viḍhāsālīabhāṣyākāṭī says that Rajasekhara declared himself in the Bālārāmāyana as a native of Mahārastra and that to a large extent he made use of the language of that country. In the colophon to the Bombay Edn. of Karpuramanjarī the poet is styled Mahārastra-vācapsa, but in the Suktimukēvallī, Saruṇanda any ancestor of Rajasekhara is called Orāmmandalāmandanam that is the ornament of the country of the Čedis.
He must have travelled all over India and his knowledge of south India is particularly remarkable.

In the prologues to his plays Rāja-sekhara calls himself the spiritual teacher of King Mahendrapāla and that he was patronised by his son and successor Mahipala. The Sydons inscription mentions Mahendrapala reigning in 903 and 907 A D and Mahipala in 917 A D. In Viddhasālābhājanīkā Rāja-sekhara refers to Yuvarājadeva who is probably the Kālacuri being Keyura-vara Yuvarajadeva I, who had his capital at Tripuri, the modern Gavar near Jubbulpore.

653. In the Sankaravijaya of Mādhavacārya Rāja-sekhara is called a king of Kerala and it is stated that he presented three natakas of his own composition to the great Sankaracārya. In Sadāṣvabrahmendra's Jagadgururatriṣṭimālaśṭava composed in the latter half of the 16th century A D, Rāja-sekhara is said to have been easily cured of his blindness by Gangādhara, third in descent from Abhunavasānkara. In Trav Arch series II 8-13, there is an inscription of king Rāja-sekhara dated on paleographical grounds as of 9-10th century A D and a learned discussion on the identity of that king with the author of these plays. The conclusion there arrived at is that Rāja-sekhara, the author of the dramas, was a successor of king Rāja-sekhara of the inscription, very likely also his nephew.

1 V S Apte (Raja-sekhara and his writings, Poona, 20) shows that Raja-sekhara is specially acquainted with southern customs and places and often alludes to southern rivers as the Kāveri and Tamraparni. The stanza 'Karnata-dasaneukhati, in Keśandri's Atamāvyōjārasāraka (V 27) covers a range from Cambay to Cape Comorin.

2 EI I 163 79, IX, 1 10 Copper plates bearing dates 57f. in the Gupta era, that is 899 and 900 A D. See also EI I 173, 242, IA XII 190 EI, IX I 180 EI, II 304, IA, XV 105 XVIII 90. For all references to inscriptions, see JRAS (1909), 70-75. See also The Amt Inscription of Mahipala (IA, XVI 173) comes from a locality only 90 miles south east of Kanouj, which is now unidentified with Mahoṭaya referred to in Raja-sekhara's dramas. It is dated Sam 674-917 A D.

3 See the Bilhadi Inscription (EI, I 251, 265) particularly verse 75 which refers to Raja-sekhara, Vasita kav Raja-sekhara stutīā and Kielhorn's List of Northern Inscriptions, Nos 186, 407, 416 and 419. E Hultzsch justifies the identity by the fact that the hero of the Viddhasālābhājanīkā is called Karpuravārā, a name strongly reminding us of the name Karpuravārē. See also M. Duff, Chronology, 299, Konow (Int to Karpuramanjaya, BOS) Harward, IV 186 suggests that he may be Yuvarajadeva, a contemporary of King Vākpati of Malwa, See also IA, XXXIV 177.

4 On this the commentary of Atmabodhendrārasasāravaḥ mentions the names of the plays.
654. Rājasekhara praises Bhavabhūti as Vālmiki re-born,¹ and quotes the poet Vākpatirāja, and the rhetoricians Udbhata,² and Ānandavardhana³ He is referred to by Somadeva,⁴ and Dhananjaya,⁵ and eulogised by Soddhala⁶ From these references it appears safe to say that the poet flourished about 900 A D ⁷

655 In the prologue to Bālaramayana, Rājasekhara himself says that he wrote six works Four dramas are known and Rāṭaṇanjanari⁸ a nāṭkā is probably also his work⁹ Hemacandra instances Rājasekhara's

1 Bālaramayana, I
2 Udbhata was the counsellor of King Jayāpida of Kashmir (779-813 A.D.)
3 He flourished in the reign of Avāntivarman of Kashmir (857-894 A.D.)
4 His Yaṇḍāśilaka-caṇḍamu was finished in 960 A.D
5 He was in the Court of King Mūma of Dhar (974-998 A.D.)
6 His Uḍṣasuṇḍara, was composed about 990 A.D

7. As to the date of Rājasekhara, opinions are various Fleet (LA, XVI 178), and Kleinborn (EI, I 162, Nachrichten von der K. Ges der Wiss. Zu Gottingen, 1904. 204 ff), give the end of the 9th and beginning of the 10th Century A.D. Aufricht (ZDMG, XXV 1-150) says he was the immediate predecessor of Jayadeva See also (OC I 503 and III 107) Bhāndarkar (BR, 1882), 44 called him predecessor of Mahendra-pāla who flourished about the 10th century A. Board (OC, 17) makes him contemporary of Śāṅkara and assigns him to the 7th century A.D. Pischell (Review of Candakausika) gives the 10th or the 11th century A.D. Peterson (Subh 101) gives the middle of the 8th century A.D. This is established by the fact that Kṛṣṇarāma who wrote a commentary on the Amarakosa and who was the teacher of Kashmir (750 A.D.) quotes a verse from the Vīddhasalabhānu in his note on Amara I vii, 4 and that King Mahendrapāla to whom Rājasekhara himself refers as a pupil of his own was reigning in 761 A.D This king Mahendrapāla is the one referred to in the Dīgha-Dubanli plate dated Harsha-Samvat 155 (= A.D. 761-9) edited LA, XVI 105 Cunningham adopts this view (Arch. Journ. XIII 85) Aufricht, on other hand (ZDMG, XXVIII 101) states that Kṛṣṇarāma must have lived in 11th century A.D. since he quotes Bhoja and is quoted by Vṛdhahāmaṇa Fleet discusses the Dīgha-Dubanli plate in LA, XVI 175 Durgaprasad and Parab (Kanyamala No & Int.) gives the date 964-969 A.D. and H.H. Wilson (Theatre, II 362) the beginning of the 12th century A.D and Bhandarkar about the 10th century A.D [BR, (1882), 44 and (1897), 84] Max Muller, India, What can it teach us? 339 confounds him with the younger Rājasekhara, the author of the Pratandhakośa (1847 A.D.) A A. discusses all these views and places him between the 7th and the 10th centuries, probably the end of the 8th century Fleet Hall in his paper on the "Vestiges of the Three Royal Lines of Kanyakubja, (JASE, XXI 1) gives the dates V Samvat 980, 964, 100b and mentions two Mahendra-pālas See also JBRAS XVI 177, EI, (1917 Part V) on Partabgarh Inscription dated Samvat 1003, JAOS, XXVII 1 Levi, Theatre, 1947, Klein, Geschichte des Dramas, III, Henry, SL, 813

8 A E Gough Records, 308

9 See Andhra Patrika, Annual number (1980), 78, by E, V Viraraghavacarya
Haravilasa\(^1\) as containing the poet’s anka, and for asih, Ujjvaladatta quotes from Haravilasa\(^2\) Bhoja mentions an Āstapatradalakamala as Rājasekharā’s\(^3\)

It is possible that many laudatory verses about poets quoted in Jalhana’s Sūtīmuktāvali under the name of Rājasekharā may be found in this lost treasure Rājasekharā’s knowledge of geography was embodied in a work called Bhuvanakosa\(^4\) Rājasekharā belonged to a family of poets. From that family dawned\(^5\) the great men Surānanda,\(^6\) Tarala\(^7\) and Kāvira (He mentions Aparājita\(^8\) and Sānkaravarma,\(^9\) as his

---

1. लनामाण्डता यथा राजशेखरस हरविलासे।
2. आशीर्यम् हरविलासे—
3. मोचितस्वास्त्र नाह धृतीनि युक्तमारम्।
4. सता स्मृतिस्थितिः निपुनर्मयम्॥
5. हरविलासेः—
6. इतस्ततः सचो यूर्वि न परोपिवर्धवण्।
7. अवतारयो किंचित्सेवं इतस्तस्त।
8. दानानिर्विन्यस्यम्यं विपिन्यस्य।
9. क्वाचिं दातायो हरविलासे।
10. राता व्याधिराज्याविविध्यावपको क्षापकारा
11. राकाग्रंथमेयाविविधं वधं
12. सापतिकुस्तिः।
13. निर्द्देशयवात्मकम् पावापुर्वायमि।
14. अस्पृश्यक्रिये वेदाध्यक्षमाजुम्।
15. नदीना वेड़ुम्बरात नूपाणा रणविमह।
16. क्वाचिं व हुरान्तदेवदित्वविलम्बन्।

---

5. Ragangrha is the title of a Cedi prince Śankaragana who lived in 10th century
6. Jalhana’s Sūtīmuktāvali
7. Rājasekharā (1-0) wrote
8. Karpūramanjarī (1-8) calls him ’Mrīgāṅkaḥbhāsālāra’ Subhāṣītāvali gives ‘Kṣīṭṣāmaṇe ete’ (verse 1024) as his Padyāvali quotes some other verses.
9. Mentioned in Jalhana’s Sūtīmuktāvali
contemporaries and Vasukalpa and Abhinanda were also of the same age.

656 **Balaramayana** relates in ten Acts the whole story of Rāmāyana. The narration often deviates from Rāmāyana and the effect of such deviation has had a good dramatic effect. Rāvana is from the beginning represented as a rival of Rāma for the hand of Sīta and his love and longing are more prominent than his ferocity. In describing the tale of Rāma Rājasekhara might call himself an incarnation of Vālmiki, Mentha and Bhavabhūti.

There are commentaries by J. Vidvāsāgara, and Lakṣmanaśuri, and one anonymous.

657 **Balabharata** or Pracanda-Pundava is incomplete. The two acts now available describe with vividity the marriage of Draupadi, the loss of kingdom at dice, the public insult of Draupadi and the departure of the Pāndavas to the forest.

658 **Viddhasalabhamkam**, is a nātika in four acts. King Candrarvarman of Lāta having no sons tries to pass his daughter Mrgankavati as a boy and sends her to the queen of King Vidyadhara of the Keralas. This leads as anticipated to a real marriage in secret between the king and the princess and the confidence was suddenly disclosed by a messenger who brings news of the birth of a son to Candrarvarman.

There are commentary on it by Nārāyaṇa, by Gahanavyāma and by

---

1. This must be Gaudābhīnanda, the author of the Kādambarīkathāsāra, see para 60 supra.
2. Ed. by G. D. Satro Benares. The Acts are all named in the Mahānātiṣa.
3. ब्रह्मव वल्लीकर व विपर तत्र धैर्यम् महोऽपृष्टां ।
   स्रियत्व इति सब्याः सत्त्वाते सत्यते सर्वत्रेक राजेपूर ॥
5. Ed. Tanjore.
6. Tanj. VIII. 585.
9. Ed. Poona. He was the son of Rāmānātha and lived in 18th century. He also commented on Mālaṭī-Mādhava, Hanumānātaka and Vāsavēṭṭio (CC, I. 293); *Tanj,* VIII. 8664-8.
his wives Surdari and Kamalā,² by Satyavrata,³ by J. Vidyāsāgara,⁴ and by a pupil of Karunākara,⁴ and by Vāsudeva ⁵

659 Karpuramanjari,⁶ a Sattaka (in prakrit), in 4 acts, describes the vicissitudes of the loves of King Candrapāla with a princess of Kuntala the jealousy of the queen with the consequent impediments, the secret meetings of the lovers and the final marriage. The drama was enacted at the instance of his patron king for the pleasure of his own consort Avanti.

There are commentaries by (Kānarāja, Dharmāsya, Pitāmbara, Dharmacandra),⁷ Vāsudeva,⁸ by J. Vidyāsāgara ⁹ Kṛṣṇasūri,¹⁰ Nṛṣimharāja,¹¹ and Anantadāsa.¹²

Rudrādāsa’s Candralekha is a similar Sattaka in four acts describing the story of the marriage between Candralekha and Manavedarāja. He was pupil of Śrīkantha of Malabar.¹³

660 Jalhaṇa quotes Rājasekharā’s eulogies of śilācana, Gana-paṭi, Pradynma, Bhimata, Mājurāja and Kādambarārāma. These poets must have lived before the 6 or 7th century AD.

Aṣṭādaśāngavatī सन्:१० नू पत्ति:ः सिन्धुः kasandī में सिन्धुः kasandī में सिन्धुः ।
 eradgasasamadhī राजसंवित्ति वन्दे महामोदविदाधिविनयः
विवाहवार्ताश्रैः पूज्येते कुणगाजिते ।

---

1. See para 166 supra.
2. Ed. Calcutta.
5. TC III 8970. He was also called Sāhityamalla and was resident of Malabar. He was pupil of Karunākara.
6. On this play, see Konow’s Int to Edn (HOS, Harvard) Tr into English by O. R. Lanman. See Schuyler, Bibi 176 77. There is another play of this name by Rajaivallabha (OC I 82).
7. In the colophon of two manuscripts the play is ascribed to a Vācanāsārya, pupil of Jinasāgara who is styled the “sun in the sky of Kharatara.” Jinasāgara was the first high-priest of a new branch of the Kharatara sect which was established in Samvat 1686 or 1630 AD. (See IA, XI 250).
8. OC, I 82, II 15, III 18, PR, IV 25, V 428.
11. DC, XXI 855.
12. TC, III 382. He was the son of Samudrabandhāyayāvan who wrote a commentary on the Setubandhā.
13. TC, III 3835. He was pupil of Kṛṣṇadānkaraguru, probably of Malabar.
14. OML, R No. 3207.
Trilocana's verses quoted by Sāngadhara allude to Bāṇa and Mayūra

Extracts from his Parthavājaya, a play on the exploits of Arjuna, are given in Śrṅgāraprakāśa and Nātyadarpaṇa. Ganapati's Mahāmoda was probably a play. Pradyumna's plays are lost. Kadambarīrāma is also unknown, unless he is identical with Kadāmbarī Rāma Kṛṣṇa, the author of the play Aḍīṭikundalāharapāṇa.

Bhimata or Bhimadeva was king of Kālinjara, a place 100 miles north-west of Prayāga. He wrote five dramas, all of which are now lost. Among them are Svapnadāsaṇana, Prāṭīṭhācāyaṇa, and

---

1. See JOR, II. 248, for an account of the play by R. Ramamurti
2. OG, I. 2
3. These are mentioned by Bhoja and Abhinavagupta and Rāmacandra who gives extracts from the last ND, p. 144
4. See R. Ramamurti, in Udyanapatrika.
Manorama-Vatsaraja His son Vasunaga wrote the play Praśmāni-ruddha.

663 Mayuraja (Mātraṇa) Anangahar-a was a Kalachuri king who ruled over Cedi country, with his capital Māhā-mati. He was the son of Narendravardhana. The word Māyurāja seems to be a version of the prākīṭ Mā-u-rāja (Māyurāja) and Soddhala refers to him along with Vākpati and Visākhadeva.

"Sāmandaśā ṛvaṅgitajātra-jaṅgabālābādhyayadvesaprañāṃtīm" Dāmodaragupta deplores the demise of Anangaharva a patron actresses. Murāri derrdes Mahīśmati and its king Anangaharṣa.

Abhinavagupta, Bhoja, Dhanika, Hemacandra, Rāmacandra, Kun-taka and Sarvāṇanda refer to and quote from Māyurāja’s plays Udāṭrāghava and Tāpasavatārāja.

1 Mentioned by Rāmacandra in ND, (p 115-6) and Abhinavagupta in AB Chap 19
2 On Māyurāja see M. R. Kavi, JAH, I 155, Bhattacharāwami, IA XLI, 199 There are quotations by Viśvanātha in his SD, p 285, 310
3 Mahīśmati is "Mahesvara or Mahes on the right bank of the Warbuda, 10 miles south of Indore. It was the capital of Hāthaya or Anupadesa, the kingdom of the myna headed Kartaviryaśuvarana of the Purana." N L Day’s Geographical Dictionary, 65 Cedi country embraces Behar and North Central Provinces
4 Later the capital was changed to Ṭrūpa, modern Tewar near Jubbulpore
5 वयवपि हेमसकेतनमनहस्तेण गते निदिव्वलोकम् ||
आचितवन्तो गतया तीर्थेशानानुरोचन || (777)
हह तु कस्ततितिक्षुन्दरचितिरोशामिश्रवः निषतितां ||
रत्नवक्ष्मेता विद्यवति करपादविष्क्रमम् || (77)
Kutūkṛtavātā

See para 310 supra Bur N L Mehta (JBORS, XIV 359) says that Ananga harṣa' is only a titular name given to Harṣa, another of Parmarākṣi from the verse

अन्तर्यंत्रस्यलपितम निन्दितपति तुवम् ||
गदनेन न समप्रांतः पाणिवर्णेऽवस्तव ||

6. See under Murān
7. Pūrṇāraṅgaḥविश्रवाते रसस्तात्तिनोनतुस्त्रिप्रस्थत्व यथा तापसवतसरे Abhinavaharṣa

In illustrating āhaka in poems, Hemaśāvara bhāsya in Kāvyamūlāsana (p 336), Hemaśāvara gives illustration to kāvyaśāstra. See para 3.2 supra Bur N L Mehta (JBORS, XIV 359) says that Ananga harṣa' is only a titular name given to Harṣa, another of Parmarākṣi from the verse

अन्तर्यंत्रस्यलपितम निन्दितपति तुवम् ||
गदनेन न समप्रांतः पाणिवर्णेऽवस्तव ||
Udāṭtaraghava in based on Rāmāvana Tāpasavatsarāja relates the story of the life of Udayana, king of Kausambi in Vatsas, the second half of it narrated in 2nd and 3rd Lambhakas of Kaṭhāsanta-sāgara. The first half is the story of Vāsavadatā and the second of Padmāvatī.²

"To strengthen the suggestion that Tāpasavatsarāja might be an older work than Ratnavahī arguments are not wanting. Before Śri Harsha, the themes of the marriages of Vāsavadatta and Padmāvatī were exhausted by Subandhu, Śūdra, Bhāsa, and probably Māyurāja and hence Ratnavahī who took the place of Padmāvatī in the original story of Udayana has been newly invented while the marriage of Padmāvatī, the central theme of this work exists even in Bhātakatha. If the Kashmirian version is thought as an improvement upon later dramas in Sanskrit, the Nepalese version also contains it.

Bhābhoja quotes a verse probably from Udāṭtaraghava whose latter half coincides with the latter portion of a verse at the end of the first act in our drama. This shows that even if Udāṭtaraghava is not his work there must be another yet not available to us.
Natyadipa quotes from it as भास्करे स्वप्नवासवदत्ते and Bhoja gives the explanation of the word Svapnavasavadatta as

स्वप्नवासवदत्ते पशावतीसर्वथा दृष्टि राजा तमुदुग्रहक गत वासवदत्ताः स्वप्नवासवदत्ते

There is a drama called Manoi amavatsaraya written by Bhima who according to Rājasēkhara was the author of five dramas in which Svapnavasavadana is mentioned by Bhōja. We know that Manōrama was the handmaid of Priyadarsika who was set to put on the character of Udayana in the inter drama in it Visākhadēva, now assigned to the court of Chandragupta II, wrote three dramas (Mudrarakshasa, Devīchantraquptta and Abhiskekavancitaka) and in the last of these Padmāvati's characterised as murderess of Udayana's son. This terrible characterisation of Padmāvati was probably borrowed from the Buddhist Jataka stones where Mālandika or Anupama, an envious creature, dupes Udayana.

664 Saktibhadra belonged to Dakṣināpatha (Deccan). Beyond this general statement in the prologue there is nothing to indicate the place of his birth or sojourn. He is held the high esteem in Malabar and his play Cudāmam is known to the Sākṣar, professional players of Malabar along with some of the plays attributed to Bhāsa, with which it exhibits similar peculiarities of dramaturgy. Tradition says that he was a pupil of Sankarācārya. Leaving aside Ādi Sankara of pre-Christian period Śankarācāryas of equal fame flourished in the 8th and 9th centuries and if Saktibhadra was a disciple of an Ācārya of that period, he might have lived about 800 A.D. The surprise expressed in the prologue that the south produced a dramatic work shows that other plays of merit had not been known then in Malabar and from this it is inferred that Kulasekhara's plays of about the 10th century were of a later date. There is parity of idea and expression in some verses of Cudāmam and Bhattanārayana's Veṇīsamhāra which may show that Saktibhadra was well familiar with Veṇīsamhāra. These considerations

1 M R Kavi, Int to Edn., c. c.
2 अधिकारण्यमथानसर्वमथस्वयंचूडामणि नाम नाटकमिनयाणिविठतसौतमायमविष-\n   लिङ्गम विति।
3 In a manuscript in the Oriental Manuscript Library, D.C., XX 5889 Ouddamaqi is found written along with Abhiseka and Pratimā.
4 The play begins with नाट्यसति तत्र शृंगारत धृत्यारां the word धृत्या is used instead of पद्यावती.
make the end of the 8th and beginning of the 9th century a likely date for Saktibhadra.

1 S Kuppusami Sa in sums up these arguments in his introduction to edn

R Vasudevasarma (Hindu 2nd Feb 1947) thus summarises the views of S Kuppusami Sastr, on the connection between Saktibhadra and "Bhisa's" plays and refutes them.

The arguments of Professor S Kuppuswami Sastr are —(1) That these plays are what are called "Chaikkar plays" and being such are relegated to the last place in the "Attpakram" where 14 plays are being treated of the order adopted being 1 and 2 "Tapatisamvarana" and Subhadradhansavaya" of Kulasekhara Varma; 3 "Naganart" of Sri Harsha 4 Ascaryavadaman of Saktibhadra 5 "Kalyana saugandhika" of Nilakantha, 6 an anonymous poet's Krishnaanta and 7 to 14 being eight plays ascribed to Bhasa, thereby indicating the contemporaneity or, may be, a chronology as evidenced by the order of mention.

(2) That the oldest Sanskrit play in South India was possibly "Ascaryavadaman" by Saktibhadra as in his "Skhapan" to that play Saktibhadra himself distinctly says "Sir! Novel indeed is it to hear that a dramatic composition should hail from the south! Likelier still that the horizon should burst to blooms and the sands yield some oil".

(3) That Saktibhadra announces himself as the author of an "Unmada Vasavadatta and other works, this might be the same as the present "Pratignayaangadhanyana,

(4) That inasmuch as "Ascaryavadaman" was found written alongside of "Abhisheka" and "Pratirnata"a" in manuscript they were all written by the same author, viz., Saktibhadra,

(5) That the departure from the injunctions of Bharata were not peculiar to these dramas, as in fact all the South Indian dramas exhibited the same characteristic (vide "Bhashavadajjyam" "Matsyvlasaprabhasam" etc.),

(6) That Bhama might have referred to Brahmatatha and not necessarily to the "Pratignayaangadhanyana",

(7) That Kauthya is found quoting from a work called "Manugita" as is disclosed by Madhavayyan's "Nayanadrika",

(8) That the quotation by Abhinavagupta beginning with "Sanautapkshmakavalam" taken expressly from Svapnavaasadatta is not to be found in the Trivandrum drama,

(9) That there is no "krida" or sport in the "Svapnavaasadatta" which according to Abhinavagupta's, "Abhinavabharati" should be characteristic of that drama,

(10) That quotations in anthologies ascribed to Bhasa by name are not to be found in the published plays,

(11) That "Carudatta" is but a crude abridgment of Sudraka's "Minochakavaka",

(12) That Mahasena's queen behaved much like a latter day Malayalee lady and used "Sambandham" in the sense of marriage (Pratignya p 37 and 73) quite as they are used to day in Malayalam,

(13) That "Avmaraka" uses "Vicantam" in the vernacular sense of "enquired",

(14) and that "exceptional degree of solicitude and respect for 'matula' (uncle) shown in the duplicated "abhidivana" (salutation) bears the influence of 'Marmakattayam custom'
In the play Ascaryacudāmāṇi, the introduction of Ascaryacudāmāṇi and Adbhutāṅguliṇyaka to act as a charm to detect fraud and disguise in the creation of fictitious Rāma, Sītā and Laksmanā acts as the main proof of the sentiment.

"The seven acts which compose the play present in dramatic form episodes of the Ramayana—the coming of Surpanakha into Rāma's hut, her mutilation by Rama, the rape of Sītā by Ravana, his passion for her in Lanka, Hanuman's visit to Lanka, and the final scenes where Rāma, after his victory over Ravana, ascertains Sītā's purity by the fire-ordeal and a message delivered by Narada and it takes its name from the miraculous crest-jewel and ring given to Rāma and Sītā by the hermits."

Here are some of his fine ideas

The arguments advanced by Mr Hirananda Sastri are much in the same strain, additional reasons being

(15) That the patron Rajasimha referred to by Bhāsa might be some Pallava prince of the 6th or 7th century A.D.

(16) That the Pratimaṇḍu in the Pratimaṇṭaka might have been borrowed from the sculptured rocks of Mahabalipuram of the 6th century A.D.

(17) That the great resemblances, coincidences to the extent of expressions, and casts even, must be due to plagiarism.

(18) And that possibly there might have been two "Svāpnaśaṇḍita nātakas" and two "Balacāntas", the other unrecovered one being Bhāsa's.

1 Ed by S Kuppusami Sastri Madras, with a valuable introduction where he incidentally says that the plays attributed to Bhāsa are not his.

On Saktibhadra, see A Krishna Pisharoti, Bhāsa's works (Sndhara Press, Trivandrum) and A Krishna Pisharoti and A Rama Pisharoti, Bhāsa's works, Are they genuine? (Bull of London Sch of Or Studies, III 107-117)

The prologue calls Saktibhadra, author of Unmāḍavaśaṇḍita and other Kāvyas, but there are not now available.

See articles by T K, Krishna Menon in Annals, VIII 43.

2 F. Thomas, review in JRAS, (1927), 352.
The description of Kānci is enchanting

The description of Kānci is enchanting

and so is the devout obeisance of Bhimesvara to the Sapta-Godāvari and to Māhākālā of Ujjain and to Ganga

The description of Kānci is enchanting

and so is the devout obeisance of Bhimesvara to the Sapta-Godāvari and to Māhākālā of Ujjain and to Ganga
665 Murari was the son of Vardhamana and Tantuma of Moudgalyagotra. On the age of Murari, there is some uncertainty. Ratnakara in his Haravijaya has a verse, where there is a punning reference to Murari as a playwright, and Ratnakara was in the Court of King Avantivarman of Kashmir (855-884 AD). In the course of Rama's aerial car on his way back to Ayodhya, Murari describes among other cities Māhismati, the capital of the Kalacuri dynasty and of the Cedeterritory, and by the middle of the 8th century AD Kalacuri kings had left Māhismati and became settled in two lines at the capitals Tippuri and Raṭnapura. On these considerations Murari may be assigned to the end of the eighth century AD and to the beginning of the 9th century AD.

666 His Anargharaghava in 7 acts is an elaborate play on the story of Rāmāyana and for his merit and eloquence he has been called Bāla Vālmiki and from the beauty of a particular verse he is known as Indru Murāri. His diction is chaste and learned and though sometimes not very perspicuous displays an impressive scholarship. To a mind saturated with the conventional similitude, his similes,
often original, strike as peculiar, but they are quite natural all the same. Many of his verses show lyrical harmony, but his style must generally be characterised as magnificent. He is one of those poets whom European critics have been unable to appreciate, but the fault is on the side of the critics only, for none will agree with Wilson's thought that Hindu pandits have shown Murāri an unjust preference, for "the Hindus of these days are little able to estimate purity of conception, delicacy of feeling or brilliancy of fancy." But these are the very qualities with which Anaragārāghava is replete. The play has been considered a standard for poetic criticism and grammatical learning. In his Siddhānta-Kaumudi, Nagojibhatta cites Murāri's expressions as authority.

There are commentaries on the play by Pūrṇasarasvatī, Harhara, Mānāvukrama, Rucipatidatta, Dharmānanda, Kṛṣṇa, son of Varada, Lakṣmidhara alias Rāmānandārāma, Vīṇunandita, Visnuḥatta, son of Muktaṅātha, Lakṣmaṇāsūri, Jinaḥarsagani, (Śrīnīghī, Purusottama, Tripūrā), Naracandra, (Abhirāma, by Bhāvanāthamītra), and by Dhanesvara, son Udaya and one anonymous.

1 So it is said युरारिपिदविन्नादेषमदद नाचे मार्ति कुश।
युरारिपिदविन्नाचे ||
युरारिपिदविन्नायेम बजूलस्तु का यथा।
साधृतिपरिलव्य हुरारिपिदरवक ||

2 Here is a verse in praise of Murāri—
भवभूतिनवल निर्वाणमशिति मथा।
युरारिपिदविन्नासमिदवायवायलेन नम || सुर्यदारापदिधाति

8 TC, III. 8880
4 Tanj. VIII. 8815
5 TC, II. 2690
6 Ed. Bombay Of Khaukula family Written at the instance of King Bhrava alias Harinaṅgaya, son of Narasimha-deva, probably of Orissa who ruled also 1286 A D
7 Son of Rāmahala of Bharatpur DC, XXI. 8935
8 DC, XXI. 8857 Tanj. VIII. 8822. SR, II 67, 209 TC, II. 1450
9. DC, XXI. 8859 Tanj. VIII. 8819
10 DC, XXI. 8860.
11 Ibid. 8861.
12 Ed. Madras.
13 PR, IV 26
14 OC, I 15.
15 Ibid. S. E. 77
16 Mentioned in Int to Bombay Edn.
Lakṣṇudhara was son of Yagnesvara and brother of Čerukun Kondubhatta. After he became svanās, he was named Rāmānandāsvaṁi. Kondubhatta’s son Yagnesvara wrote Alankārarāghava, Alankārasūrvodaya, and commented on his son Venkatesvara’s Citrabandharāmāyāna composed in Saka 1557 (1635 AD).

667 Mahānātaka traditionally known as the work of Hanumāna himself was for long lost, until fragments of it were washed ashore from the sea on inscribed slabs and restored during the reign of king Bhoja of Dhar. It is said that Valmīkī became alarmed that with the rival work of Hanumāna his own poem would go to the shade and with the leave of Hanumāna, cast off Mahānātaka into the sea. Bhojacaritra records an anecdote of some verses attributed to Hanumāna being discovered by a merchant engraved on rocks on the seashore and Bhoja deciphered the verses on the spot a verse which is found in the present drama. In the form in which we have it, it is a voluminous work, more a poem than a play and often we discover verses of other authors freely imported into it. The sentiments are lofty and ideas fanciful.

A poet Hanumāna has written Khandapraṇāstī, a series of stotras on Visnū’s incarnation on which there are commentaries by Gāṅgādāsa, Raghunātha, Jayasomagana and Gūṇavijayagana.

Sāradātanāya, who wrote Bhavaprakāsa in 12-13 century A.D instances (at p 245) Mahānātaka as a drama of Samagra (full) type

We may therefore assign the composition of this play latest to the days of king Bhoja in the 10th century A.D.

The work as it is, is found in two recensions wholly different from each other, in contents and extent. Of these the one by Davodara seems to be the earlier. It was probably made up during

---

1. See para 841 supra
2. Bhav, pp 200, 212, 282, 287 See article by R Ramamurti in Ugyanapatsrākā.
3. Mitra V
4. Sāradātanāya’s approval of this play indicates that the recension he had with him was considered to be an original drama worthy of citation by a rhetorician. It is therefore possible that verses of other authors found in the present editions might have been later interpolations.
5. Schuyler, Bībī 357
the reign of Bhoja himself and is quoted by name in his Sarasvatī-
kantābharana. Damodara was the compiler or restorer. His work
is in 14 acts dealing with the whole story of the Rāmāyana in it
With two verses of benediction the play opens and continues and
there is not the prelude or the mention of the Sūtradhārā

There are commentaries on it by Mohanadasa and by R Siromani.
The second recension in the work of Madhusūdana's It has
only 9 acts and is short in narrative.

There are commentaries on it by (Candrasekhara, Nārāyaṇa) and Mohanadaśa.

Mahānātaka-Sudhāndhi is in the nature of an anthology of the
story of Rāmāyana, composed by king Imādī Devaraya V of Vijy-
nagar.

668 Hastumalla, son of Govinda of Srivatsagotra, became a Jain
Ayyapārya says in his Jīnendrakalyāṇacampha composed in Sam
1375 that Hastumalla was so named because he fought with an elephant
For this act of prowess he was eulogised by the Pandya King in a
hundred verses in open assembly His father was a remote disciple of
Guptabhadra, the disciple of Jinasena who lived about Saka 705

1 See JBAS, (1897), 287 ff
2 Śrīrājitaśinghulūnāga vāśīṃśākāvyaṃ
nigīraṃmūrtiśvāno prākramhānātmak tadū
guṇabhadrapatīṣājōnaśārvāt takṣaṃ
pravijyastu vīśvā sākṣatādārāṃ

Dāmodara, author of the play Kamsavadha (OC, I 77) and author Vānībhusāna
(a work on prosody, SKC, 55) and Dāmodara son of Vīśvanātha author of Bhagavat-
prasadācarka (SKC 871) are different. Schuyler (Bitt) makes the author of Vānībhu-
sāna identical with the author of Mahānātaka.
3 Tr into English by K. K. Bahadur (Calcutta).
4 Ed Bombay.
5 Calcutta.
6 Ed Calcutta DC, XXI 8449
7 OC, I 488, II 100, 215
8 Ed Bombay.
9 Tanch VIII 870, TC, I 879 II 2115. See SII, I 110
10 See para 269 supra. For discussion on the date of Sundesarapāṇḍya Jātavar
maṇ see IA, XXII. 219. On Pandya rules see IA, XLII 155, 221, XLIV, 165, 189,
245. K V Subrahmanya Ayyar, Earliest manuscripts of the Pandya country and
their inscriptions.
Haṣṭimalla probably lived in the 9th century A.D. Besides the poem Ādirṣṭa, Putarāti and Udayanārājakāvya, Haṣṭimalla wrote several dramas of which the known are Arjunarāja, Bharatarāja, Meghesvara, Maithiliparinaṇa, Subhadraharana, Anjanāpavananjaya and Vikrantikaurava.

669 Kṣemisvara was the grand nephew of Vījayaprakosha and votary of Śiva. He was a poet of the Court of King Mahipaladeva who ruled at Kanouj (9-10th century A.D.). His Candakaitsika, a play in 5 acts, describes the story of Hariscandra and his truthful stand against Visvāmitra's persecutions. "The play presents a vivid picture of the workings of a curse uttered by an angry priest Kausika against an upright king who had innocently offended him. The king forfeits his realm, and loses his wife and child, the latter by death and his consort by being sold into slavery. Though tried to the utmost the job-like patience of the righteous monarch never fails and in the end he has his wife, his son and his kingdom restored to him by divine intervention so that all ends in happiness." Kṣemisvara was probably the author of the play Nasadhananda on the story of Nala.

670 Ksemendra wrote some dramas two of which are quoted in his Aucśyaavicaracarcarc. Of these Lalitaratnamalā has been noticed and Citrabhārata is another.

1. Op II 315, CO, I 80
2. Op II 325
3. Op II 326
4. Printed Bombay There is a play Maithilinātaka by a Jain author mentioned in Ras 804
5. Mys 287 There is a Śrīgaṇita of this name by Mādhavabhatta (Printed, Bombay) There are plays named Subhadra-parinaṇa by Raghuvaśāhāṣṭra (Op 726, 2125) and a Cāyānātaka by Rāmadeva (CO, I 728) and a play Subhadra-vijaya (Op 870)
6. Mys OML, 272
7. Ed by Mohanlal, Bombay, with an introduction TO, II 1688
8. Ed Bombay, Mysore, Calcutta (with a commentary by Tarkālanka and and again with a commentary by Vidyāsagar) On Kṣemisvara and the play, see M. Schuyler, Bibl 12, 66
9. Other plays dealing with the story of Hariscandra are Hariscandraśāśangīśa of unknown authorship (COI, 751) and Rāmacandra's Satya-Hariscandra.
10. PR, III 21, 340.
11. See para 69 supra
12. It is also quoted in Kavikanṭhābhārana p. 180,
Kanakajñanakī was also his play and is quoted in his Kaviyakītābha- bharatam (p 131)

671 Vigrāharāja Adeva (IV) or Viṣaladeva, (Cahamana of Sakambhari or Samibhar was son and successor of Arnorāja. He successfully waged war against Musalmān invaders. His play Harakeli represents the story of the fight between Arjuna and Śiva (that is, Kṛītārjuna) and the gift of the mystical weapon, Pāṣupata. The play is inscribed on stone at Ajmer above date Sanvat 1210 (1153 AD). There is a verse of Vigrāharāja Adeva quoted in Subhāṣītāvalī. In honour of this king, Somadeva composed the plays Lalitavigrāharāja, also inscribed there in stone. It treats of the love of the king to Desaladevi, daughter and successor of king Vasanta-pāla at Indrapura. There is a reference to the battle with Hammira, but the battle does not take place.

672 Ramacandra was the famous one-eyed pupil of Hemacandra and lived in 12th century. Two legends are connected with regard to this circumstance. According to them, Ramacandra was

1 This is according to Pṛthvīrajavijaya, but according to Siwalik pillar inscription, Dehlī (Id, XIX 215) his father was Avallaḍeva
2 See IA XXI 218
3 For extracts and accounts by Kielhorn, see IA, XIX 215, XX. 201-212 (at Ajmer dated Sam 1210—22nd Nov, 1155 A D). Trubner's Recál, II 65-66; Got Nach XIII 552-560, VOJ, VII 191
4 Somevāravara, author of Kaṁbhāsarottiegara, was a different poet. So also Somevāra, author of Rāmāyaṇamañaka (OC, I. 524)
5 Ramacandra, author of Aṁdāvānamāda, a play in 8 acts on the story of Yāyāī (Tay VIII 884) was the son of Sīrthaga and patronised by a Canda king of Bengal, Rāmacandra, author of Vasaṅtila (OC, I. 556, III, 190) was a different author
unruly and when taken before the sage Jayanar he made him have a single eye to the furthering of the Jain faith. On this Ramacandra lost one of his bodily eyes. According to the other legend the loss was the punishment for criticism passed by Ramacandra in spite of the warning of his teacher on a poem of Sripala's. He is reported to be the author of a hundred works, of which only a few are now available. Of these some are dramas, Nalavilas, Raghuvilas, Raabhavabhyudaya, Yadavabhuvudava, Nirbhayabhima, Vanamalika, Mallikamakaranda, Satyahariscandra, and Kaumudimitrananda.

Ramacandra along with Guacandra wrote a treatise on dramas, Natyadarpana. It is valuable in literary history for its quotations from various works of great merit, now lost to us.


673 Devacandra was a pupil of Hemacandra. In the Court of King Kumārapāla, he wrote the play Candralekhabhuvajayaprakaraṇa, in 5 acts, enacted at the spring festival of Ajītaśāthā. At the end of it is a praśasti mentioning Kumārapala's victory over Argorāja.

1 PR, IV 16, V 144, Buhler's Hemacandra, 19, 48
2 PR, IV vi
3 OC, III 60, 104, 107, 103, I 283
4 Anarghamacanta is a play on Nala's story by Sudarśanācārya of Panceenda (Trivandri, Tanjore District)
5 Printed, Bombay, Ibd by Mario Valladri at Florence with an Italian translation
6 Printed, Bhownagar
7 Ibd GOS with an elaborate introduction
8 Jes, Cat, 64
674 Jayadeva was the son of Mahādeva and Sumitrā of Kauṇḍinya gotra and pupil of Ḥarīṣṭra. He was probably a native of Vidarbha in Northern India. For the excellence of his poetic composition, he was called Piyāna. Though a Śaivite in religion, he was an ardent devotee of Rāma. Among his works are Sitāśibā, Prasannarāghava and Candraloka. In the prologue to his play Prasannarāghava, Jayadeva eulogises Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bāna, Māyāra and Cora. Verses from this drama are quoted in Jalhana's Sūktamukṭāvali (composed on 1247 A.D.). Seeing that Bhoja does not mention this work, it may be safe to assign its composition to the 12th century A.D.

The tradition current in Bengal on the identity of this Jayadeva with the logician of that name who bore the title Pakṣadhara may be true.

"In the Prologue, it is said that the manager had a brother named Gunarama, that he objected to being called 'prince of players' owing to the fact that his elder brother was living, that the title should be conferred on the latter and that he wrote a drama called Haracaparopana which was acted at the court of a king called Ratujanaka and obtained a great fame as an actor. A contemptible player stealthily assumed the title of Gunarama and misappropriated the fame to himself. Having heard this, the real Gunarama went to the south and secured the alliance of a singer named Sukantha and began to fight against his enemy at the courts of the kings of Southern India.

While we can clearly see in the above statements, an allusion to the story of Ravana carrying off Sītā, the wife of Rāma, and the latter allying himself with the monkey leader Sugriva and fighting with Ravana to recover his wife, we cannot help thinking of the probability of a reference to Appayyadiksita's modification of the Candraloka and commenting upon the work Jayadeva might have considered this to be a plagiarism and resorted perhaps to the court of a king of

1. See Peterson, Subh 87 Auflrecht ZDMG, XXVII 207 identifies this Jayadeva, with the author of Gitagovinda. This is a mistake apparent from the names of their respective parents.
2. See Peterson, Tc 39.
3. DCG, VIII No 8998 CC, I 728.
4. I 22 Cora does not mean Bīlīhāna as has been commonly supposed.
5. See S.M. Paranjpe, Int. to Edn. Poema.
6. Jayadeva is described as a logician in the prologue to this drama. His Āloka is the earliest commentary on Taṭvācintamani of Gangeśa. Gangeśa lived about 1190 A.D. for Gangeśa mentions Udayana, Nyāyadhāvatikāra (Vallabha) and Śrī Harṣa. These dates make the identity probable.
Southern India where Appayyadiksita was living to expose the plagiarism before the king and the people assembled”.

675 **Prasanna-Raghava** is a drama in seven acts, embracing the story of Rāmāyaṇa. The author has introduced several alterations in the original story to give to his work an extraordinary dramatic effect. The first act is very amusing where the demons Bana and Rāvana are brought together as Sītā’s suitors and ridiculed. The last act introduces a pair of Vidyādharas, who describe the battle and the purification and restoration of Sītā. The return in the serial car and the coronation of Rāma conclude the story.

There are commentaries on it by Laksṇidhara, by Venkatārya, by Raghunandana, by Lakṣmana, by Narasimha or Rājarāya.

676 **Prahladana** was the son of Yabodhavala and brother of Dhārādhavala, of the Paramāra dynasty of Mt. Abu whose capital was at Chandravatī. When Yuvarāja under his brother he distinguished himself as a man of arms as well as letters. He assisted Vasūpūla in repelling the attack of armies from Delhi and independently too put to work the forces of Kumārapāla and Prithviraj. He predeceased his brother and could not ascend the throne. He was working as Yuvarāja in Sam 1220 and was living till Sam, 1265. He built the city of Palanpur, the capital of the state of that name in Gujarat. As a poet famed for felicity and lucidity of expression Prahlādana is praised in Kirīṭkaumudi and is quoted in Śūkṣmuktavāli.
His Parihaparakrama, a Vyāyoga of one act, describes the exploits of Arjuna in rescuing the cattle of the Vīraṭa from the hands of the Kaurava Army—the story of the Gograhapa in the Vīraṭa Parvan of the Mahābhārata, and was enacted on the occasion of the festival of the investiture of Acaleśwara, the literary God of the Parmāras at Mt Abu with the sacred thread.

677 The same story has also been dramatised in the Dhananjayavijaya, likewise a Vyāyoga by Kancanācārīva, son of Nārāyaṇa of the race of Kappāmuni Owing to his skill in composing plays, he was patronised by king Jayadeva of Kanōja whom he mentions in the prologue and who flourished in the 12th century A.D. The mode of narration is however indirect and the spectacle of the battle is described in a dialogue between Indra and his attendants The drama was enacted before an assembly of the learned, presented over by a great Gāḍādharamaśra.

The model of Prahlādana's play was adopted by Vyāsa Mokādīva in his drama, Bhīmaparākrama. He was the son of Bhīma and pupil of Hanhara and composed his work in Sam 1385 (1328 A.D.)

678 Madana was the preceptor of King Arjunavarman of Paramāra dynasty. His Pārijatamanarī, a nāṭikā of extreme beauty, of which only two acts are now available in fragments, was inscribed on stone at Dhārā in 1213 A.D. It describes the loves of Arjunavarman and a damsel Pārijātamanarī, long kept secret from his queen Sarvakalā. The heroine was the daughter of a Calukya king of Gujrat whom Arjunavarman defeated, who having given up her life in the struggle was born as a cluster of Pārijāta flowers, which became afterwards transformed into a beautiful woman Pārijātamanarī.

---
1 Schuyler (Bibl 97) confuses this Yuvārāja Prahlādana with Yuvārāja alias Rāmavarma of Orangann, the author of Rasasadanabhāna.
2 Edited with an elaborate preface by O D Dalal, GOS No 4.
3 Printed Bombay. There is a commentary by Rāmakṛṣṇa (OC III 59). For a short account, see Wilson's Theatre, II 374. It is quoted in the Rasāravasaṃbhākara of the 14th century A.D. See SR, I 6, 10. There is Dhananjayavijaya of Yāsoḍhāna (OC, I 266).
4 Cat S Mes of Br Museum. It is called by Schuyler (Bibl 71) as Bhima vikrama.
5 Arjunavarman was the son of Subhatavarman and grandson of Vinābhavarman. His grants are dated Samvat 1267, 1270, 1272 (See JAOS, VII 25, 32, JBAS, V 879). See also for a discussion of these grants by Kielhorn, IA XIX 841, Colebrooke's Misc. Es. II 297–314 and Transactions of Royal Asiatic Society, I 280–289 Arjunavarman wrote a commentary on Amaruka Jalhaya in Sutjamuktāvali quotes a verse of his. See Peterson, Subh 5.
6 Ed. by Holtsoh, Leipzig, See IA, XXXV 236.
679 Ramabhadra or Rāma, the Jaina monk and poet, was the disciple of Jayaprabhaṣṭiri who was the disciple of Vādidevasūri according to Prabhāvaṃka-caṇṭra. Vādideva died in Sam 1226 (1272 A.D.) His play Prabuḍṭha-Raṅkineyam was enacted at the festival of Śrīyāgādeva in a temple constructed by Chahamana chief Yasovīra ande Ajayapāla, sons of Pārvacandra, whose munificence is recorded in inscriptions bearing dates Sam 1242, 1268. The poet therefore flourished about the last quarter of the 13th century A.D.

680 Ravivarman Śrīgaurīḍhira of Jayatunganādu was born in A.D. 1266-7. He was the son of King Jayasimha Virakerala and Umādevi and belonged to the Yādava family. "After defeating his adversaries, he married a Pandya princess and when 33 years of age took possession of Kerala (which he ruled as he did his town of Kolamba). He defeated a certain Viṭapāṇya, made the Pāṇḍyas and the Colas subject to the Keralas, and at the age of 46 (about 1312-3) was crowned on the banks of the Vēgavaṭī (at Kānci). He made munificent donations to temples and upheld religion. He was a poet himself and patronised learning. He was an expert in the science of music. He was called Dakṣāya-Bhoja Samudrabandha, the commentator on Alankārasaṛvasva, was a poet of his court. His Pradvyumna-bhūdaya is a drama in five acts describing the destruction of Vairanābha, king of Vajrapura, and the marriage of Pradumna with the princess Prabhāvaṭī. The interdrama Rambhabhisaraṇam is interesting and shows a nice device for the first aspect of the lovers at a theatre.

681 Rudradeva ahas Pratapa-Rudradeva was the king of Ekacila (Warrangal) and ruled over an extensive country in 1268-1319 A.D. He was a great patron of poets and a poet himself of a high order. His name has been commemorated in the most popular work on Rhetoric, Prataparudra-Yasobhāṣana of Vidyānātha (Agastya). Agastya's nephew Visvanātha was in his court. Of his writings, only

1 Printed at Bhownagar, with an introduction
2 Ibid. Introduction See inscription at Jalordurga, printed in Prachina Jainal kha-sangraha
3 Tr., Arch. Series, II 53 IV 89 and inscriptions, in EI, IV 145 52, VIII 9
4 Ed. TSS, Trivandrum
5 Ibid. It is not known whether the manuscript in CC, I. 283 is the same work. Pradyumnavijaya of Śaṅkaraḍikṣita and Pradyumnavanda of Venkatādhvari have the same theme.
6 On Kabtiya History, see K. V. Subrahmanya Ayyar "Historical sketches of ancient Deccan," Andhra Patrika Annual Number (1923-24), Tailor's Oriental Historical Manuscripts (Madras) 82, "Veerabhadra's" History of the Andhras.
two have survived to us, a nāṭikā, Uṣāragodāvā, relating the loves of Usi and Aniruddha and Yayāticānta, a drama in 7 acts describing the loves of Yayāti and Sarmisthā as her servant with a thousand other female attendants. "Devayāni married the king Yayāti. At the time of her marriage Sukra obtained the king's promise that he would never take Sarmisthā to his bed, but after some interval the king met her, fell in love and espoused her privately. The intrigue continued secret, until Yayāti had two sons by Devayāni and three by Sarmisthā, when it was discovered by the former, and excited her resentment as well as that of her father. The violation of the king's promise was punished by premature decay, as denounced upon him by Sukra, with permission, however, to transfer his infirmities to any one who would accept them. Yayāti appealed to his sons of whom the youngest alone, Puru, consented to assume the burden. After a sufficient period Yayāti took his decrepitude back again, and left the sovereignty of the world to Puru in reward of his filial piety. All the sons of Yayāti were the founders of the distinguished races Yadu gave birth to the Yadavas, Turvasu to the Yavanas, Druhyu was the ancestor of the Bhojas, and Anu of the Mlechchhas. The Pauravas were the descendants of Puru, in whose line the Kaurava and Pandava families were comprised."

682 The same story has been handled by other poets. Vallisahāyana of Vadhalagoṭra lived at Virmāṇipuram near Vellore. He wrote a biography of Śaṅkara styled Ācāryādīgyavaya. His Yayāti-Tarunānanda is a drama in five acts was enacted at the vernal festival of God Margasahāya at Virmāṇipuram. His Rocanānanda is a fragment of a drama probably in five acts, describing the loves of Aniruddha and Rocana.

Yayāti-Devayānīcānta is an anonymous play, having the same plot but with no division into acts. Sarmisthā-Yayāti and Yayāticānta are mentioned in Sāhityadārpaṇa. There is a play Sarmisthā-Yayāti

1 This is a commentary on the Prabodhacandrodaya by Budradeva (CBoI, 281)
2 (C) I 71 Analysed by Wilson, Theatre II. 888, Mitra's Notes on III 192
3 Probably the same as Sarmisthā-Yayāti mentioned in Sāhityadārpaṇa. Mitra's Notes, III 192
4 Wilson, Theatre, II. 888
5 (C) XX. 8907.
6 (C) XXI. 8477
7. (C) XXI. 8469.
8. (C) XXI. 8479

DRSYAKĀVYA
composed by Bhāgavaṇa Kṛṣṇa Kavi 2 Sarvasattvāvijaya of Nārāyaṇa Saśṭrūṇ will be noticed elsewhere

683 Manika, son of Rājavardhana, was the pupil of Natesvara, an expert in dramaturgy His Bhadravānanda is a secular drama, the hero being Bhairava and the heroine Madanavati, a celestial damsel cursed by a Rāsi to become human. The drama was enacted at the marriage of Jayadharma Malla Deva, the son of Jayasāhiti Malla and Rajalla Devi. “He came apparently from Mithila, a place of learning, and so he had cultivated a fine literary taste for the display of which his new position as king of Nepal afforded him ample opportunities. The birth ceremony of his son, the same Dharma Malla, was celebrated by the performance of a four act Ramayana Dharma Gupta, son of Rāmādaya, probably Rāmānkanātaka in 1310 A.D., and was probably a king of Simroan as the epithet used is Surakikulakamalakaravikasanaikabhāskara, i.e., he helped in the establishment of the Surki dynasty of Jaunpore. The troubles in the then eastern (Shurq) dominion of Delhi commenced at the end of the reign of Sultan Firoz Shah of Delhi, 1368, and Yutha Simha appears to be one of those Hindu Rajas who helped Malik Sharwar, a Khauja, to establish himself as Malik-us-shurb. Yutha Simha seems to have been a contemporary and a relative of Jayasthiti who, by marrying Rajalla Devi, made himself master of Nepal.”

684 Jayarana Malla Deva was the husband of Nathalla Devi, the rightful heir to the throne of Nepal and the son of Vijaya Malla. His Pandavavijaya, also called Sabbaparvanātaka, represents the events of that part of Mahābhārata.

685 Jyotirīvara, surnamed Kaviśekharācārya, was the son of Dhīreswara and great-grandfather of Viṣṇyāpaṭi. He was the lord of the village of Palljanna. He was a friend of king Harisimha of Simroan who ruled about 1324 A.D and at the conclusion of his war with a Muhamadan Sultan wrote a prahasana, Dhūrtasamāgama, 6 which

---

1  CC, I 688 The identification may not be correct Kṛṣṇa Kavi may be identical with Sesakṛṣṇa, who flourished during the reign of Emperor Akbar.
2  About this king and his literary tastes, see Appendix by Bendall, p. 11-14.
3  Bendall’s, Cam Cat 87
4  Bendall’s Preface, 19, 115
5  Ed by C Cappeller (Jena) Analysed by Wilson, Theatre, II, 408. For other editions and translations in France and Italy, see Schuyler, Bll, 48-44. Mahavara’s Dhūrtavisambhana is a simily play.
was staged at the victory festivals. "Viswanaguru, Jangama or mendicant of a particular class, quarrels with his disciples for the possession of Anangasena, a courtesan. They refer the case to Asajjati-Misra, a Brahmin, who lives by solving knotty points of law, and he decrees that until it can be decided to which the damsel belongs, she shall remain under the protection of himself as umpire."

In his Pancasāyaka, a work on erotics in five parts, of exquisite lyrical beauty, he purports to epitomise all that is said in the standard works on Kāmasāstra.

Munditaprahasaṇa, a farce in 3 acts, is probably his work.

686 Bhaskara's Unmatṛa-Rāghava was composed to entertain an assembly of learned men met together to pay homage to Vidyāraṇya. If this latter were identical with the famous scholar of Vijnanagar, then the work must be assigned to the middle of the 14th century. This piece of a single act describes the maddened soliloquies of Rāma on the sudden disappearance of Sītā in the recesses of a shady garden, where, on account of the curse of Durvāsas, blossom-collection was prohibited on pain of the trespasser being turned to a deer. Agāṣṭya understands the mistake and restores Sītā to Rāma, freed from the
effects of the unconscious curse  The story is a close imitation of the fourth act of Vikramorvasī

687  Gangadhara.² was the son of Agastya's³ sister He is said to have composed a play visualising the story of the Mahābhārata.⁴ He was probably also the author and the two plays Candravilāsa,⁵ Raghavā bhyudaya⁶ The former has an imaginary story on the union of Candra and Kumudini Gangadhara had two sons Narasimha and Visvanātha

688  Narasimha dramatised the story of Kādambarī in his Kādambarikālyāna⁷ in eight acts, as related by Bāna in his famous romance The poetry is very imaginative and excels in the description of nature and pathos An Antarnālīkā is introduced in the 5th act to bring Kādambarī in the presence of Candrapūda

689  Visvanātha lived at Warrangal under the patronage of Pratāpa Rudra Deva (1294–1325 A.D.) Left as an orphan while yet a child, he was educated by his maternal uncle Agastya Called upon to entertain an assembly of Pandits at the Warrangal durbar, he wrote

1, Gangādhara, father of Lakṣmanasuri (DC, XXI 8263) and Gangādhara, son of Daññapraya of Uḍaya family were different persons. The latter wrote the Madrakanyā parnāyacampu celebrating the marriage of Krishṇa with Lakṣmi, daughter of Bhāratasena, King of Madras (DC, XXI 8265) So also was Gangādhara, the author of Gangādāra-pratāpavilāsa, a play in 5 acts, on the life of King Gangādhara Bhuvallabha Pratāpa deva of Campakapura (Champaran) in Guzerat. It takes us to the Court of King Sultan Muhammad of Ahmadabad (1443 1451 A D) IO, VII. 1508 14, analysed in abd 4194)
2, See para 126 supra
3, So says Gangādevi

स्तुत्स्तमपर व्यास ग्रहायरसलहाकविषेषः।
नालक्षक्षेत्रां द्यां यज्ञे सारता क्षणः॥

Mathurāvyāya, I 15

4 OC, II 36
5 OC, II 36 There are other dramas of this name by Bhāgavantarāya (OC, IL 117), by Bāmacandra (OC, III 107) and by Venkatesvaras (OC, I 500)
6 TC, III 3689 This work is quoted in the Sāhityaśaṅkhaṇi by Vemabhan- pāla (about 1400 A.D) See also M Ramakrishnakavi, Andharā Patrika, Annual Number (1918), 101. The 1st verse of this play bears a close resemblance to the first verse in Kanakālekā of Vēmanabbattā Bāna and this leads Kuppusami Sastry to suspect whether the real name of Vēmanabbattā is Narasimha See his report of tour (1913) Narasimhamiśa, the author of the play Śivanārāyaṇabhānatehoḍaya, (OC, III 184) is a different author.
Occupying but a short interval, the dramatic piece has only one continued scene, forming a long vehement altercation between Bhima and Hanuman. The plot is based on the story of Mahābhārata, wherein Draupadi, enamoured of the beauty of the flower brought by a Gandharva, requests Bhima to fetch some more and when the incognito brothers were about to come to blows, Kubera intercedes and squares up the feud by explanation and by direct presentation of a cluster of flowers to Yudhishthira. The speeches are throughout very vigorous and insinuating. Gangadevi, author of Maṭhurāvijaya, was his pupil.

690  Jivarama Yājñika describes in Murārvijaya of 5 acts the early life of Kṛṣṇa as related in 10th section of Śrī Bhāgavata. It was probably composed in Samvat 1541 (1483 A.D.). There is another play of the same name and theme by Visvarūpa Kṛṣṇabhātta, son of Nyāsīmha.

691  Ramanandaraya was a follower of Cauṭinva. By order of King Prataparudra of Orissa (1480 A.D.) he wrote Jagannāthaballabhakata in 5 acts, in which the main theme is the curbing of the spirit of Rādhā. Govindavallabha is probably his work. It is a play in 5 acts describing the youthful sports of Kṛṣṇa, “designed like the Persian plays of Europe, to place the early life of the deity as an attractive spectacle.

692  Sesa Narasimha lived near the Godāvari and later in his life settled at Benares about the 1st half of the 18th century under the

---

1 Ed. Kavyamala, Bombay.
2 She says: "चिर से विजयी भूयादि-बनाथ कवि-श्रे"।
3 CSO (1903), 148
4 PR, III 21, 849
5 Ed. Murshidabad. Mitra, IV 1665, CO, I 196
6 Ibid. 1672, CO, I 169
7 See B P V Ranganathaswami 'On the Seshas of Benares' (Id, XLI 245). Sesa Kamalākara and Sesa Rāṣṭrākara who commented on Gitagovinda, Sesa Govinda who commented on Amaraṅṭaka, and wrote Vinaṭānaṇḍavāyāyoga and Gopālaṭīlār.
patronage of king Govindaacandra of Tandava. At his instance he wrote Govindaçāvya, a work on Dharmaśāstra. He was a great grammarian and originated the famous Benares School of Grammar, to which Bhattoji and Nagoji belonged.

Narasimha had two sons, Cintāmani and Kṛṣṇa. Cintāmani wrote the play Rukminiharanara, the Rasamanjarī-Parimala. Kṛṣṇa had two sons Viresvara and Nārāyaṇa. Of these Viresvara was the tutor to Panditaṛa, Bhattoji and Annambhata.

Kṛṣṇa's patron was Govardhanadhārī, son of Todar, "the ornament of the race of Tandava and disciple of Girdharmath." Todarmal was the famous finance minister of Emperor Akbar who died in 1586 A.D. Girdharmath was the grandson of Vallabha who founded the Gokulasṛṣa goswamins early in the 16th century A.D. His works are many. Kamsavadha, enacted at the festival of Visvesvara at Benares in seven acts, embraces the story of the destruction of Kamsa as related in the 10th Skanda of the Bhāgavata and ends with the coronation of Gṛḍhasena, father of Kamsa in the sovereignty of Mathurā. He wrote the plays Murārvijaya, Mukt Ścanta, Sajyābhamapannaya, Navabhāṣa (CO, I 103, 676) and Śeṣa Rāmacandra who commented on Naśaśāstra and Belvalkar’s Kavamsānavā kiḍaša (See IA, XLII 252).

1. See Belvalkar, I c 46-50 Nagcā wrote commentary on Aḍhyātya Rāmāyaṇa ascribed to his person his 1714 A.D
2. CO, I 527
3. For his other works, see CO, I 77
4. He was author of Suktaraṇākara, a rare commentary on Mahābhāṣya
5. See Dec College Mem No 183, (1882 S),
6. It is not known whether Kṛṣṇakavisēkhar, who wrote Kuvalayaṇaṁūtikā before 1642 A.D was identical with this author (CO, I 77 , IO, VII 4154)
7. In Sam 1697 (1631 A.D) Kṛṣṇa's pupil Jayanta wrote an abridgment Tāṭya-śāstra of Kṛṣṇa's Prakriyāśaṁuḍi which was composed for the benefit of Prince Kalyāṇa, son of a petty chief of Patrabhuj in the duab between Ganges and Jumna. Prakriyāśaṁuḍi gives the genealogy of the kings of Antarvedi with capital Patrabhuj for five generations ending with Kalyāṇa. See Belvalkar’s Sys Sk Gr 45
8. Ed Kavyanama, Bombay Analyzed by Wilson, Theatre II 400 There is an anonymous commentary on it, CO, I 77, II 15, III 17. There is another play of this name by a poet Damodara, CO, I 77 The first play of this name is mentioned by Paṭaṇjali, see para 554 supra
9. CO, I. 462, II 106, PR, III 21, App. 837
10. PR, IV. xxi
the campus Pārījataharana,¹ Usāparṇīyaya and Satvābhāmāvīlāsa,² Kriyāgopanarāmāyana³

693 **Gokulanatha** was the son of Umadevi and Pitambara, a brahmin of Phanadaha family of Mithila of Srivatsagotra. He flourished in the court of king Fatteh Saha of Srinagara in the 16th century A.D. At the king's instance he composed Kośavalih, a work on metrics and there he says

इष्टसागरलतानि सरसुद्ध्वल निरिता ||
एकादशी द्वीसह तेर रगे खट्तयनी "

His only daughter Kādambari was drowned, when yet a child, in the Ganges and in her memory he composed the poem Kundakādambari. There he wrote

आराम्बाव मर्क्तिक्रयणा बाध्मिर्धमणनानि
विकोवार करणवचन गुट्टी कादनुरीति ||
कोज्ज्य लोक क इव विषय कि पुर को विवास
वृत्तसमासिद्धाब्रह्मा तय नित्ये वितासि "

At a ripe age of 90, he passed away at Kāsi. Besides a gloss of Kāvyaparakāśa and the poem Sivastūti,⁴ he wrote the plays Mūrita-Madalasa in 7 acts on the marriage of Madālasā, daughter of Visvāvasu and Kuvalayāsava, and Amptodaya, an allegorical play illustrating the ills of Samsāra.⁵

694 **Laksmanamanickyadeva** was ruler of Noakhali during the reign of Emperor Akbar (1556-1605 A.D.)⁶ He was a poet and patron of letters. He is said to have written several dramas, but only two are now available, Kuvalayāsvacanita on the loves of Kuvalayāsva and Madālasa, and Vikhyātajivaya⁶ in six acts depicting the battle between Nakula and Kauravas.

---

¹ Ed. Bombay This was written at the instance of king Naroṭṭama, brother of king Tandavapura near Kāsi.
² Opp II 2888
³ See para 346 supra
⁴ Printed, Bombay
⁵ DC, XXI. 8444, 8446 (where there is an anonymous commentary)
⁶ Printed, Bombay
⁷ DC, III 25. Other dramas on the subject are by Vamāmani and Kṛṣṇa-daśī (DG, I 118, DC, III. 88) On Vamāmani, see para 299 supra
⁸ DC, III 120, HSR, (1904)
Mahesvara Pandita, flourished in the Court of Bahadur Shah of Gujarat (1526-1537 AD). In his play Svarnamuktavivada, he describes a dispute between gold and pearl and king Balabhadradeva of Srínagarī acts as referee.

695 Balakavi lived in Mullandrum in N. Arcot District. He was son of Kalahasti of Bhāradvājagotra. He must have been related to Dindimas. In the prologue to Nalacantanataka, Nilakantha has praised him. He was a contemporary of Uddanda. He was in the court of King Rāmavarman of Cochin, who abdicated in 1537 AD in favour of his brother Godāvarman (1537-1561 AD). This story of the abdication and pilgrimage to Benares is described in his Rāmavarmavilāsa, and in the play Ratanaketūdaya he traces the fortunes of that king till the abdication.

Godāvarman appears to have ruled along with Ravivarman. After them came Virakeralavarman (1561-1565 AD). In his court flourished the poet Nilakantha. He was probably the same as Nilakantha of Sangamagrama (Kudalur) in Nārerī near Pattāmī in Malabar and of a well-known Nambudri Brahmin family. In his Kamalikalahamsa, a play in facts, he describes the marriage of Kamalini with Kalahamsa.

696 Vilinatha was son of Kanakasabhapati and grandson of Yagnanārāyaṇa of Kausikagotra. He lived in Vīsnupuram in Tanjore District and in the court of King Acyuta (1577-1614 AD) was enacted his play Maḍanamanjarimahotsava. It describes the destruction of king Candravarman of Pātaliputra by Rudra in mortal form to help his devotee king Parākrama Bhāskara of Pāncāla. The following is typical of his style and orthodoxy.

(Pañcimālākṣṇi) जा कथायदृयकृत्वा भगवानार्थलाबालिः द्विजानामातारुपविशेषव वल्लोर वर्णलालिः।

1. IO, 1628
2. See para 164 supra.
3. See para 169 supra
4. JOR, VII 141.
5. Nilakantha of Muktisthala who commented on Vāsudēva’s Saṅkīrtana (DO, XXI 848b) is different.
6. DO, XXI 8890. For his commentary on Mahāvaṁśa, see DO, XXI 8497.
697 Bhudeva Sukla was the son of Sukadeva and pupil of Srikanthadikshita. He lived at Jambusaras in Kashmir about the beginning of the 17th century A.D. In Dharmavijaya, a play in 5 acts, he demonstrated the merits of a life regulated by spiritual ordinances and meant it as a corrective of the several lapses from religion rampant during the time of Emperor Aurangazeb and his successors. His Rasavilasa is a work on poetics.

698 Sathakopa was a famous Pontiff of the Ahobila Mutt of Southern India. He was seventh in apostolic descent from the founder of the Mutt of a like name and was the immediate successor of (Sastha) Paramhamsa, who was a contemporary of Aliya Ramaraja of Vijayanagar. He himself lived in the days of Sri Rangaraja of Vijayanagar. He was the son of Sri Nivasa Sai of Bhairadwajagotra of Lankadu (Balavana) village. His original name was Irumala and bore the title Kavitarikakangitharava. His Vasantikaparinaya is a drama in five acts of splendid poetry, describing the marriage of Ahobila Narasimha with Vasanthika, a wood nymph. He was capable of dictating poetry to 100 persons at a time and was praised by a poet Vahlipat.

699 Kumara Tatacarya (Satakrantha) was son of Venkatacarya and grandson of Sri Nivasa of Sathamara analegatra. He was a descendant of Srisailapurna the preceptor of Ramana. Srisailapurna's line branched off over various parts of the Madras Presidency. Lakshmikumara Patacarya represents the line that stayed in Kanchi and there are other lines at Kumbakonam and the Circars etc. This poet belongs to the family that settled itself at Tirupati and its progenitor is

1. Printed Bombay and Benares. See Mitra's Notes, I 37. There is a commentary on it by his disciple Bhavanishankara (10 VIII 418)
2. See Int to Edn Sarasvati Bhavan Sarcas
3. CC, I 496, II 110, III 105. For his other works, see CC, 1. 414.
4. Sources of Vijnagar History. He was adored by Mukunda deya, a Gajapati prince of the 16th century. CC, XXI, 8800
5. See para 212 supra.
called Tolappācārya Kumāra was the High Priest of Raghunātha Naik and Vijayarāghava Naik of Thanjore who ruled from 1614 A.D. His Panjatanātaka in five acts is based on the story of Pāryātaharana.

700 Jagannatha, son of Piṭāmbara, was a Brahmin of Mithila and contemporary of Gokulanātha 1 to delight the feudatory chiefs who were assembled at the court of Fateh Shah, he composed the play Atandracandrika, early in 17th century A.D.

701 Mathurādasa was pupil of Kṛṣṇadāsa. He was a Kāyastha of the city of Suvarnasekhara on the banks of the Jumna. His Vṛṣabhānuja is a nāhīṇi describing the loves of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, daughter of Vṛṣabhānu. 4

702 Madhusudana, son of Narayana of Sūndilyagotra and disciple of Kṛṣṇasarasvatī, wrote play Kṛṣṇakuṭūṭhala, and is different from the famous Madhusudana Sarasvatī. 5

703 Madhusudana (Sarasvatī) whose original name was Kamalanayana was a Gauda Kanōja brahmin of Kāśyapagotra. He was the son of Purandara Yādavānanda was his brother. It is said that Yādava's son Mādhava, contemporary of Pratīpāditya (16-17 century A.D.), bore the title of Avalambasarasvatī, for extempore poetry. With his two sons, Purandara once went to the Court of Mādhava Pāsa in Barisal District, and exhibited the extraordinary faculties of Madhusudana. The chief was delighted but refused to grant a site on which Purandara wanted to build a hut. Madhusudana was much grieved and took his father's leave to renounce the world.

---

1 The statement in para 146 and the footnote (8) there that Kumāra Tāṭācārya was a resident of Kancl is an error, due to the confusion between his name and that of Lākṣānukumāra Tāṭācārya Kumāra Tāṭācārya alias Aparyāptamrta who commented on Caṃpabhārata (TO, III. 8593) was the great great grandson of Lākṣānukumāra of Kancl. See also DC, XXI, 8904.

2 TC, II 2874, SV 954.

3 PR, II 22.

4 Ed Bombay. See Mitra’s Notes (1875).

5 CO, I. 119. There are poems Kṛṣṇakṛṣṭa by Kesavārka (Orf 340), Kṛṣṇakāṇṭhala, anonymous (CO, I 119) and Kṛṣṇakāṇṭhala by Rāmaśānta Bhatta (Pandit, VI. 108).

6 See P O. Divanji’s Int to Siddhantabandhu (gos, Baroda p. xi), Abhayankara’s Int to Siddhantabandhu (Govt. Or. Serses, Class A No. 2, p 27).

7 See under Chanaīta post.

8 The kingdom was called Candraśīva and kings Candra kings (See XI, XII, No. 19).
He went to Benares and was initiated into Brahmacādya by Visvesvara Sarasvatī. There he composed his famous Advartasiddhi Tulasīdāsa, the poet to whom we owe the Hindi masterpiece Rāmacaritaṁanasa, was his friend, whom he praised thus:

अन्नदकानने कायया तुलसीकथसतयः |
कवितामण्डपी यत्स्य रामायणकथिता ||

In Kotalipara near Fandpur in Eastern Bengal there is still a village known as Purandaravatikd and a shrine attached to it of Śrī Daksṇāmūrti and Kālikā said to have been built by Purandara. In Bhavabhūmi or history of Kotalipara, composed by Raghavendra Kaviśokhara says Madhusūdana was brother of Purandara and not the son Emperor Akbar (1556–1605 AD) invited Madhusūdana to his Court and after pleasant disputations held with the learned men of that court he was well honoured there Madhusūdana⁴ must therefore be referred to the 16–17th century AD. Besides several works⁴ on Bhakti cult and Advaita philosophy he wrote commentaries on Vedasūta, Mahimṇaṣṭotra,⁴ probably Bhāgavata,⁴ and Harिलल,⁴ and a poem Anandamandakini⁶ on Kṛṣṇa.

704 Ramanuja was the son of Saranamacarya and grandson of Rāmānuja of Vādhulagotra and lived at Trivellore, Chingleput District. They trace descent from Dāsarāthi or Mudaliyandana Saranamacarya was the fourth in descent from Rangarāja who was honoured by Kṛṣṇarāya of Vijayāngar (1509–1529 AD). Rāmānuja wrote the Vasulakṣmikālāya⁹ on the marriage of god Ranganātha.

---

1 See lāvanachandra’s int to Harihārīveteśa, where he takes the information, from Vaidikāvadaśavāra, a family chronicle of the Western Vaidika brahmans of Kāśyapagotra Das Gupta’s History of Indian Philosophy, 420, Prabhad C Divanji’s Madhusudana Sarasvatī, his life and works, Annals, VIII, 140, IX 318, and Int to S dāhanabindhu (GOS), Kashtronāandha Chaittopādhya, Ibid, VIII 325, §N Tadpatnikär, A work on Arthasastra, by Madhusudana, Ibid VII 33, Cuntaharan Chakravarti , Ibid, IX 304
2 OC, I 427
3 Printed, Bombay and Calcutta
4 Printed, Bombay. His commentary on the 1st verse (printed, Brundavan) is classical. There is another interpretation of this verse in 100 meanings by Vamśīchāra (Printed, Bombay)
5 Calcutta Oriental Series, Calcutta Harilā is anukramānti by Bopađeva for Bhāgavata R Knshnaswami Sastri, Madhusudanarasasvas (Annals, XI 192, JBRAS, II 9). K T Tolang, Note on the date of Madhusudana, (JBRAS, XXX 368)
6 Printed Bombay. See Gopinath Kaviraj on his date, Saras. Bhav Series, VII.177
7 DC, XXI 8504
with Vāsulaksmī, well known as Goddess Urayur Načhìyar and was enacted at the vernal festival of Vīrānghava at Trivellore His other works are Vīrārāghavakanakavallīvivāha, Vedapūrāmāyana, Rāmāyana-campū, Vārāhikanyāpamānaya He must have lived early in the 17th century A.D.

Rāmānuja’s brother was Bhāvanārāyaṇa His son Rāmānuja wrote the Rāmānujacampū on the life of Rāmānuja Rāmānuja’s paternal uncle was Varadaguru His pupil was Kuṇāra Venkatārya of Ātreya-goḍra and his son Varadārya wrote Rāha Anangabrahmaṇḍavīlaṇa intended to be enacted at the festival at Trichinopoly.

705 Ramabhadra’s Diksita’s Janakipamānaya is very popular It is framed as a comedy of errors Two sets of characters are brought to action, the one genuine and the other disguised, so that a confusion arises among themselves when they are made to meet each other Vidyujjha, Ravana and Sarana appear respectively as Kansika, Rama and Lakshmana and so do Lataka and Sita. The marriage of Rama and Sita comes up not at Mithila but at the hermitage of Visvamitra. Most noteworthy is an inter-drama, enacted at Ravana’s Durbar. The sub-plot begins with Rama’s search for Sita and closes with Vali’s warfare. The last act brings up the culmination of the mischief of the Rakshasas. Surpanakha shows herself to Bharata in the disguise of a Tapasi and leads him to a misapprehension of Rama’s death. Just when Bharata was prepared to mount the funeral pile, Rama’s arrival is announced and all ends happily with the coronation of Rama.” The drama must be considered a masterpiece of Ramabhadra. The style is learned and amusing. The poetry is not intricate and the whole story of the Rāmāyana is run over with rapidity without omitting reference to any important detail.

706 Venkatesvara was the son of Dharmarāja of Naidhru-
vakṣyapragotra of Manalur and lived in the Court of Kings Shahaji and Serfojee of Tanjore (1684-1710, 1711-1728 A.D.). Besides Bhosala-vamsāvali, a history of that royal dynasty, he wrote the dramas Rāghavānanda, Nīlāparnāya, and Sāthāpativilāsa and a prahāsana Unmattakavikalas.

707 Sankara (Dīkṣi) was son of Bālakṣna and grandson of Dhundiraj, probably the same as Vṛṣṇayajvan, who lived about 1713 A.D. He wrote the play Prādēmukṣiyajvan for performance at the coronation of Sābhāmundra. Ravi of Pannan, the grandson of the celebrated Chitrāsl of BUNDLEKAND.

Dhundirāja's pupil Visvanātha wrote the nāṭīka Śrṅgāravāntikā on the loves of Candral eli, king of Avantī and Kāntimati, daughter of king of Campāvati.

708 Jagannatha was the son of minister Bālakṣna and Lakṣmi and pupil of Kamesvara. He was in the Court of King Serfojee of Tanjore (1711-1728 A.D.). His Raṭīmanmatī is a drama on Raṭī and Manmatha, and Vasumattiparnā is another drama on the marriage of Vasumati.

Rāmacandrāsekhara performed Paundarikāyāga and was proficient in grammar. At the behest of King Tulaja of Tanjore (1765-1787) he wrote the play Kalānandika on the story of the separation of Kalāvati and Nāndaka and their reunion. Nāndaka is said to be a prince born of a royal pair as a gift of Rāmabhadra, the deity of Bhadṛcāla.

709 Krsnadatta was the son of Sadārāma and Anandadeva. He was the brahmin of the village of Tramatiya in the Vajjada district in Mithila, and lived about the middle of the 18th century. His Puranjanantarā, a drama in five acts, relates the story of Puranjanā.

---

1. See para 168 supra Tanj VII 3287
2. Tanj VIII 3496, 3518, 3415
3. Tanj VIII 3616 Otherwise called Lambojaraprasahana (Printed Madras)
4. See para 103 supra Śankaramiśra, who wrote the play Gaurijāgambhara (CC, III 37) is different
5. CO, I 352 Analysed by Wilson, Theatre II, 402
6. CO, I 274
7. Tanj VIII 3490
8. CO, I 557
9. Tanj, VIII, 3361
10. PR, IV xx1, Schuyler, Dibl, 63 gives first part of the 17th century A.D.
of Bhāgavata Purāṇa, a drama in seven acts, relates the loves of a Vedic student and a maiden Mādāśā, and Śāndra-
kutūhala is an entertaining farce. In his Rādhārahasyāvāya he relates the amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, in 22 long cantos, and it is accompanied by his own commentary. He wrote a commentary on Gitagovinda and a poem Gitaganapati in imitation of it. Candīcaritācandrika is also attributed to him.

(710) Visvanātha, son of Trimaladevā, originally lived on the banks of the Godāvari and subsequently migrated to Benares where he composed the nāṭīkā Mṛgāṅkalekha which was enacted at the festival of Viṣvesvāra about the end of 18th century. In four acts it describes the marriage of Mṛgāṅkalekha and Karpurtulaka. "Mṛgāṅkalekha is the daughter of the king of Kamarupa, or Assam, she has been beheld by Karpurtulaka, king of Kalinga whilst hunting, and the parties are mutually enamoured. The obstacle to their union is the love of Sankhapala, a demon, to oppose whose supernatural agency the minister of the king of Kalinga, who alone is aware of the circumstance, invites to the palace a benevolent magician, Śiddhayoginī, and Mṛgāṅkalekha is also lodged in the palace as the friend of the queen Viṣvasavati. Notwithstanding these precautions, she is carried off by Sankhapala to the temple of Kali, when the Raja wandering disconsolate beyond his garden bounds comes to the spot, rescues her and kills Sankhapala. He is then united to Mṛgāṅkalekha in the presence of her father and brother, and with the consent of his queen, killing also, before the conclusion of the rite, the brother of Sankhapala, who comes to revenge him in the form of a wild elephant, but is encountered and slain by the king."

Though imitating Ratnāvalī in plot, the poet has an enchanting style and fancy.

Though imitating Ratnāvalī in plot, the poet has an enchanting style and fancy.

---

1 CO, I 889. It was composed in Śaka 1701.
2 CO, I 111.
3 PR, III. App 359, 362, CO, I 707. In the prologue he mentions king Dharmavarman as dead.
4 See para 298 supra.
5 CO, 120.
6 CSC, (1908), 152. Printed, Sarasvati Bhavan Series, Benares.
7 Wilson, Theatre, II 391.
711 **Kisnanatha** Sārvabhauma, Bhattācārya, was son of Durgādāsa Cakravarti. His *Anandatilaka*, in 5 kustimas, is really a collection of poetry, descriptive and narrative interspersed with dialogues and quasi stage directions. He probably lived in Guzarat in the 18th century.

712 **Devaraja** was son of Sesādri and belonged to a brahmi family that migrated from Pattamadai in Tinnevelly District and settled at Āśrama, a village near Śucinḍram in Travancore which was gifted to twelve brahmins in 940 M.E. He was a poet of the Court of King Mārtandasvarman (1729-1758 AD) of Travancore. In his play *Balamartandavijayam* in 5 acts, he describes the victorious marches of his patron, acquisition of wealth and the renovation of the shrine of Śri Padmanābha at Trivandrum. In the prologue he mentions his name by means of a conundrum:

```
परस्परादेशतया मदुकहर्षणकत्वाद्धतवदेवरूपम् ।
लक्ष्मीनामाशपद वहन्त बले कृष्ण वैतस हि राजचूरूपः ॥
```

and the series of royal presents with which he was honoured:

```
पुक्ता भूषणभृत्यस्थितरा भाषिक्षणहोरिल्लका
कैशेियाधराधारणीयमपरा नामीकराध्या परा ।
एषा वेंटचतुष्यी मणिमयी सत्यालिता ते मया
भीमद्र सामपश्चानमनकरितास्मातु पञ्चवातानात् ॥
```

713 **Ramavarma Vanci Yuvaraja** known as Asvini Mahārāja was the then Yuvarāja of Travancore and lived in 1757-1789 AD. He wrote the plays *Rukminipariṇāya* and *Śṛngārasudhākara* and *campūs Kāṭavīryavijaya* and *Sanṭānagopāla* and *VanciSaṣṭava*.

1. *IO, 243* He wrote also *Rāmaśyanāla* For his other works see *CC, I 121*.
2. *There is one Anandatilakabhāna (Opp 1824) Kṛṣṇānatha Panůrana who commented on Sakunāla (Opp 8882) is different.
3. *Printed TSS, Trivandrum* His commentary on *Bhāravi* is printed partly in *Jit Sam Sah Pt Calcutta*.
5. *Trav, 79 There is Śṛngārasundarabhāna by Lāvārāśarma (1 c.)*
6. *Printed, Bombay. Trav, 80*
Godavarman Yuvaraja, or Yuvaraja merely, was a prince of Cranganore and lived in 1800-1871 A.D. Besides the poem Rāmacarita, he wrote the dhāna Rājasūdandam, and poems Srupadi-saptaka, Murarinpustra, and Sudhānandadaharī.

Godavarman (Yuvarāja) known as Kaviśrīvalbhauma Kochuni Tampuran was a younger member of the royal family of Cranganore and lived in 1858-1926. He had five brothers versed in all the sciences. He was the recipient of a kritt from the Prince of Wales on the eve of his visit to India. His poem Tripuradaham shows exquisite poetry. His Anangavijaya and Vitarajavijaya are bhātas replete with pleasant sentiments. Among his other works are Vallyudhava, Viprasandesa, Devadevesvarasatika, Uttarārāma, and Jānakālapidā. He completed Rāmacarita which was left unfinished (up to Aryanālanda) by Rāmavarman (Godavarman). He wrote a summary of Devisaptasati of Markandeyapurāṇa.

Closely related to him was another Rāmāvarman known as Mahākavi Kunjikuttan Tampuran of Cranganore (1805-1913). He wrote Vāyogas, Kirātarjuniya and Jarasandhavadhā.

Another Rāmāvarman was the nephew of Rāmāvarman, Rāja of Kollam and Keralāvarman. His Caudrikākalāpīdā is a drama in five acts describing the marriage of Caudrika and Kandarpasekhara. The drama was to be enacted at the Cāitra festival of Nīlakantha in Cellur in Malabar.

In Subālāvajrātunda, a drama in 5 acts, Rāmakavi, a royal prince of Malabar, describes the story of the killing of a serpent called Rāktāṅgada by a rat named Vajrātunda for having carried off his beloved Subālā, as his prey.

1. Printed, Kāvyamāla, Bombay — See introduction there for other works. See para 177 supra. Rāmāvarma MĀ a young member of that family, born 1901 February, has written Kammudai, a poem in 9 sargas, (an adaptation of Goldsmith's Hermit) and Devipāḍāpikāasotram in about 60 slokas. He informs me that this author's name was Govavarman and not Rāmāvarman.
2. See para 180 supra.
3. Printed, Trichur.
4. DC, XX 7845. See para 177 supra.
5. Printed, Salt Madias.
6. Rāmāvarmakulahasakkhara, son of Umaśrīman Rāṇi, wrote a poem Rāmayana sangīha (Trav 91).
7. Travis, Sāthi. Māmavrama Kaviśrīvalbhauma wrote poems Visākhavijayavallān, Mandalopa sangīha, Rajasūdandam, and lived about 1900 A.D. (Trav 191, 189).
8. DC, XXI, 855.
717 Venkatasubramanya was the son of Venkatesvaramahān and was the fifth in descent from Śrisaṅkhasaṅkha. In honor of his patron king Rāma Varman of Travancore (1758 to 1798), he composed a drama Vasulakṣmikālāyāṇam, describing his marriage with Vasulakṣmī, a Sindhu princess, to secure a political alliance.

718 Varada Acarya was son of Ghatikāsata Sudarsana. He lived at Kanci and was a contemporary of Rāmabhadrā Dīkṣita in the latter half of the 18th century. He was fifth in descent from Nādādūr Aṃmāl (Varada) who was grandson of Sudarsana, nephew of Rāmaṇuja. He wrote Vasantālālākāra called Aṃmāl Bhāna, wherein there are descriptions of magic shows, snake charmers and the like. His Vedāṇṭāvīlāsa or Yatirājāvījaya, a play in 6 acts, describes the life of Rāmaṇuja.

719 Perurāṇi was the son of Venkata of Kausikagotra. His Vasumangalanāṭaka with an anonymous commentary on it is in five acts and describes the marriage of Upancaravasu and Girikā, daughter of Marut Kolāhala, and was to be staged at the festival of Minakṣi in Madura. The prologue refers to his other works, Rāmacandramāyana, Bharatābhyanḍaya, Venkalabhana and Cakorasandesa. He lived in 18th century A.D.

720 Aṟṟhapancakānāṭaka in five acts of unknown authorship describes how Manmatha was reborn as the son of Saurīṇḍa, the deity that is worshipped at Kṛṣṇapuram (Irūkkannapuram), Tanjore District, how as an infant he was cast into the sea by Śambarāsura, how the servants of Śambara found the infant in the belly of a fish and how Rati, the daughter of Śambara, enamoured of him, had him tended well, and in the end he married her after killing Śambara.

---

1 Trav 78 For a description, see Trav Aras Series, V 22-25 wherein the genealogy of the author is also given. Vasalakṣmikālāyāṇa of Rāmaṇuja is a different work (DC, VIII 8501)
2 See para 160 supra
3 Printed Madras, Keith, SD, 263.
4 DC, XXI, 8630 Printed Madras
5 DC, XXI 8497
6 DC, XXI 8877 It is called Arthapancaka because it embodies five things.
721 Sundararaja Acarya, son of Varādāraja of Ātreya-goṭra, was a native of Elathur Agraharam in Travancore. He was born in the year Plava in Kollam year 1016 (1841 AD) and lived on for 63 years. He had the control of Mārūtīmantra with which he was able at will to command the presence of the energies of Hanumān in predicaments of distress. Venkatālakṣmī was his wife. He was proficient in all Sāstras and was a born poet. He was patronised by the rulers of Travancore and Ettiyapuram and was a friend of the royal poet Keralavarman of Travancore. His writings are many. Among Campūs are Godāparṇyataya, Kamsavadha, Rāmabhadravijaya and Sṛṃivāsa-duṣṭendracanṭa. Among poems are Niṭrāmāyana, Rāmabhadrādvisa-veva, Snu-āvijaya, Hanumadvijaya and Rasikarājana. He wrote commentaries on Keralavarman’s Kamsavadhacampū, Swāmīdīkṣatā’s Vallipārṇyataya and Godāparṇyataya. His brother’s grandson Varadarāja wrote his biography in a campū.

722 Vaidyanatha Vacaspatī Bhattacarya lived at Nuddea about the middle of the 19th century AD. He wrote his Cāttrayagyna in five acts at the instance of Īsvaracandra, Rajah of Nuddea. It depicts the legend of Dāsā’s sacrifice in all its details, the assemblage and reception of the Gods and the ceremonial of the sacrifice.

723 Viraraghava was the son of Īsvara and Kāmākṣi and of Kaundinyagotra. He lived in Sahajmahārājapuram (Iruvakomallur) and was patronised by a King called Sivendra, Śivaji of Tanjore (1835-1865 AD). His Rāmārājyabhiseka is a drama in seven Acts describing the story of the Rāmāyana, and Vallipārṇyataya is a drama in five acts describing the marriage of Vallī and Subrahmanya. Pārvatī-śrotā is a lyric in praise of Pārvatī.

1 These books have been printed in different manuscripts in Travancore, Ettiyapuram and Madras. I am indebted for this information to Mr. A Parthasarathy Iyengar, Vyākhānasa Pandānana, Akalamannadu, Kistna District.
2 CO, I 187. Analyzed by Wilson, Theatre II 412–415. Vaidyanātha, author of Kṛṣṇalīlābhīṣaṇa (CO, I 128, II 24, 195), Vaidyanātha, author of Mithyābhīṣaṇa prahasaṇa (CO, I 455) and Vaidyanātha, author of Saṣṭangavijayanāta (CO, I 690) are different persons and are themselves probably not identical.
4 DC, XXI 848.
5. Ibid., 849.
6 DC, No. 9608.
724 Sundaraviraraghava was the son of Kasthurranganatha and grandson of Viraraghava of Vadhulagotra. He lived at Balakrishnapura (Siruvallur) in the South Arcot District. In Bhojarajanka, he describes the domestic conspiracy at the Court of King Munja against the life of Bhoja. His Ram Bharavaniiya is a drama describing the rape of Rambah by Ravana and the consequent curse by Nalakubara, her lover, that Ravana’s head should split into thousands, if he should outrage any woman. It was intended to be staged at Srirangam at the Catur festival. His play Abhinavararaghava describes the story of Ramayana.

His father wrote Raghuviravijaya, a samavakara in 3 acts describing the marriage of Rama and Sita. At the end the following dates are given for Rama’s birth, marriage, banishment and coronation:

- Birth: 1580
- Marriage: 1585
- Banishment: 1590
- Coronation: 1595

725 Vallisahayakavi of Vadhulagotra was the pupil of Narayana and lived at Virampuram in North Arcot Dt in the middle of the 19th century. Vedapurisadhwani, the author of Margasahayacarita, belonged to the same family. His Yaystitarunanandam is a drama in five acts on the loves of Samudrithi and Yayati who regained his youth by exchanging his old age with his son Puru. His Rocaanandam is probably five acts describes the marriage of Anuruddha, son of Pradymna and Rocana, daughter of Rukmavarm. His Acaryaadigvijaya is a campfire on the life of Sankara.

726 Padmanabha was the son of Kamasastrum of Bharadvaja-gotra, a Telugu brahmin of Kotipalli, Godavari District. On the occasion of the festival of Somesvara at Kotipalli he composed his Tripuravijayavayyoga, celebrating the conquest of Tripura by Siva.
DRSYAKAVYA

He visited Benares and on that occasion wrote his Līlādarpanābhāṣa, a piece of erotic narration. He lived in the 19th century.

727 Narayana Sastrin lived at Nadukāveri in Tanjore District. His brother Śrīnivāsa was a great authority in the Dīnsmānas and edited the Journal called Brahmavādyā. Nārāyana was a born poet. He bore the title of Bhatta Śrī and Bālasarasvatī. He was in impressive lecturer and gave the benefit of his lectures on the Gītā to many in assembly in Madras. He passed away in the year Sādhūrana (1911 A.D.) at the age of 51. His learning was versatile and in the field of poetry his authorship was prolific and he can well rival in volume and quality any other writer of the world. He wrote 92 dramas with themes embracing almost all Indian mythology as well as imagination. Of these ten are in print. His Mythilīyam in 10 acts relates the story of Rāmāyana, Sarvasṭhamayam in four acts treats of the marriage of Yayāti and Sarmisthā, and Kalividhūnam in 10 acts describes the story of Nala. Two other plays are Jaitrajayam in 7 acts and Sūramayūram in 7 acts.

He wrote Sundararnayāja, a long poem in 24 cantos, Guriivali-rampū, Cintāmaṇi an Ākhāyikā in 3 parts and Ākārāvartīdī, a prose narrative in 2 parts on the life of Sankara. In rhetoric, he wrote Nātakadīpikā in 12 parts, Vimarṣa in 6 parts and Kīvamānamsā in 2 Adhyāyas.

The following are his other dramas:

- Bādhilīyam (10), śāmśhāvāvijyām (4), mābhāsantām (5), mānbhāvabhāvā (7), svadīsaṁhitājñāviv (7), śrīpāyāsēṣ (5), śrīvāseṣ (9), mābhāvabhāvā (7), dhītiniś (7), bhīnara (5), bhīnara (10) nivūrāvijyām (12) sarvasṭhamayam (1), mahābhāvā (9), bhīnagāthā (5), bālačandra (9), (10), goṇdukāvī (7), sarvasā (7), mābhāvabhāvā, mahābhāvabhāvā (7), ramaśā (7), samāra (5), goṇdukāvī (7), sarvasā (6), pāśarpārā (5), saṅgatadāyam (7), tānavā (3), tārā (3), rājātēní (6), kālavātī (5), hārākārāvā (7), mukunārā (10), kālavā (7), kūntakāśivatā (10), goṇdukāvī (7), mānbhāvabhāvā (10), dhītiniś (7), mahābhāvabhāvā (8).

1 Ibid III 3177
2 Printed Madras and Chidambaram
3 The manuscripts of his works are said to be with his son at Alampallam village near Kollengode. My attempt to get at them have been of no avail and my better to the Curator, Oriental Manuscript Library giving the information seems to have been of no effect too in getting them preserved. Some of these plays are with Nangavarm Rajappa Iyer of Telchinpoly.
728 Ramacandra was son of Laksmana and Subbamā of Korāda family and Kaundinyagotra. He was Pandit in Noble College, Masulipatam. He lived at Idipalle near Masulipatam late in 19th century. Among his works are Kumarodayacampa, Devivljaya, a long poem and a bhāna Śrṅgārasūdhārṇava.

729 Parthasarathi (Rompivarla, Bhattar) is the son Koḍandaramācārya. For proficiency in grammar he bore the title Valyākarana-Pancānana. He was patronised by the Zamindar of Nuzvid Venkatadri Apparao who like Bhoja was himself a poet and patron of poets in the 19th century. Besides Ārīśṭava and Svāpaprajyga, a didactic poem, he wrote Madananandabhana:

730 Eecambadi Srinivasacārya was the son of Vedāntacārya of Kaundinyagotra of Tiruvahindrapuram in South Arcot District. He lived in 1848-1914 A.D. His exposition of Kaṭhāśa's works, particularly of Śākunṭalā, was unique. He was professor of Sanskrit in the Government College, Kumbakonam. Himself a poet, he had a high standard of poetic excellence. He wrote a bhāga Śrṅgāraṭaraṅgī and a play Usūparṇīvaya and a poem Hamsavīśa in 6 cantos which is allegorical. Among his prose pieces, are Śrī Keśalatīśyā (partly published on Sābhdaya) and Śārngakopākhyāna.

1. Printed, Masulipatam
2. Printed Nuzvid. See Chapter on Allapura poet on this Zamindar and Index
3. Printed, Madras.
4. The manuscripts are with Mr. T. E. Sundararaghavachar, M. A. L. T. Thiruvenkateswar and Mr. T. E. Sagararaghavachar, Advocate, Cuddalore
His proficiency in music was manifested in the poem of songs, Amptamathana on the style of Gitagovinda and on the same he has left an incomplete poem He wrote commentaries on Nāgānanda and Mṛchakatikā.

Among poets of Tiruvahindrapuram there were others equally great. Aṣṭāvadhānam Anantācarya, whose extempore composition of Samasyas and enigmas was a wonder In some of his verses he artistically wove the names of rāgas, e.g.

चिक्रान्ती तु वराणी वदन तव साति चंद्रामरणम्।

Desikabhakta Kavi Venkatācārya talked in verses to his last breath and some of 'hem are now remembered locally

731 Sonthi Bhadrdrī Ramaśastrān (1856-1915) was a Velanāṇī Vairāk Brahmin of Pithapur in Godāvari District He was the son of Gangāramayya of Gautamagotra A great Sanskrit scholar and poet, he adorned the Courts of the Zamindars of Urām and Lakkavaram Besides Śri Rāmavijayakāvy, and Sambarāśurāvijayacampū, he wrote a play Muktavali.

732 PadmanabhaŚcarya was an advocate at Coimbatore and passed away about fifteen years ago He wrote the plays Dhruvatapas and Govardhanavilāsa They are divided into scenes and do not follow the rule about Ankas (acts).

733 Sankara Lala was the son of Mahesvara of Bhāradvaja-gotra. His mother was Monghubai He belonged to the family of Prashmora Nagar Brahmins of Kathiwar He was born in 1844. He was proficient in Avaḍhāna He was made Principal of Sanskrit College at Morvi at the age of 21 He then wrote Rāvajirājakīrīvīlaśa, a poem on the royal family of Morvi State He wrote the Kāṭhas, Anasūyābhuyadaya, Bhagavāṭbhāgyodāya, Candraprabhacariita, Mahēśapraṇāprīyā, a long poem Bālacariita and minor poems Pāncalīcariita, Arundhativijaya, Prasannalopāmuḍra, Kesavapāleşalahari, Bhogavāṭ bhāgyodaya, Kailāsayaśrī, Bṛhartibhayabhanjana, Meghnprārthaś and several śoṭras and prāstus Among his dramas are Sāvīṭricariita,

1 For instance

2 I am indebted for this information to Mr. Chetur T. R Sundararaghavachar, M A., L T

3 Printed at Coimbatore with English translation.
Dhruva, Bhadrāyurivajaya, Gopālacintāmaṇi, Kṛṣṇacandra-bhuyāyā, Vāmanavijaya and Parvaṭaparṇayā. He was made Mahāmaha-pādhyāya in 1914 and passed away in 1916. In his memory, his admirers have founded Sankarāśrama, where sanyāsins are invited to deliver discourses on religion.

734 Narayana Sastrī of Radhamangalam was the son of Vaidyanātha. He was Professor in the Sanskrit College, Trivadi near Tanjore and died in 1932. He says he wrote more than 108 works, of which 24 were dramas. Among them are Mahāesvarollasa, Udāra-rāghava and Mukundamanoratha, the last of which is on the sports of Kṛṣṇa. The rest are not known.

735. Srinivasacarya son of Kṛṣṇamācārya, was born in 1863 near Tiruvadi, Tanjore District. He was Sanskrit Pandit in the Board School of Rājamadam. He wrote two plays, Dhruva and Kṣrābdhisayanam which were staged in the school there. He passed away in 1932.

736. Srisaila Tatacarya son of Venkatavarada, of Śathama-rṣanagoṇṭra lived at Conjeevaram in 1862-1925. Besides a small play Yugalānguliya, he wrote Vedāntadesikacintā on the model of Sankalpaśūryodaya on the merits of Viśisṭadvaita philosophy.

737. Peri Kasinatha Sastry (1857-1918) was the son of Venkata Sastry of Gautama-gonṭa. Ānanda Gaṇapati (1851-1897) Maharajah of Vizianagaram was his paron. He was a professor of Grammar and Rhetoric in the Maharajah’s Sanskrit College, Vizianagaram. Besides minor poems, Gangāstava, Godāvaristava and

1. Many of these works have been published and further particulars can be had from the poet’s grandson Bhāti Shukdeo Khalsankar (S. K. Bhatt) Kathiyav.
2. Printed in Sanskrita Kamadhanu. Some verses on a maiden’s ball play are

अंसकल्यतीके ज्ञानमयाः कुलसमिका कालीकोणाः
ङ्गाररितिमोहद्विगुणाधिपितयासीविजयांक्रिरणम्
परमश्चरुपशिवानिपतनसातसस्मीर्द्धनिर्देशनम्
तत्राक्षरोद्भवसरस्य सरस्वतीशस्य सन्ततिः
कृपाकृतिकमतुलिनकुमाट्ठुरे तन्मुखविनिपितासृष्टिः
कस्तोत्तुष्टकुमाराधिराजः कहते कन्दुभिन्तसममितेदप्तपत्

3. The manuscripts are with his son R. E. Krishna-madhavar, Rajamadam.
Durgāsourdāryasāṭakā he wrote the plays Pāncālikārakṣanam and Yāminipurpaṭalakā.

To the same place Vizianagaram belonged Jayann Venkanna (1864-1924) He was a vakil but devoted his time to Sanskrit learning. Besides poems of melodious verse Abhinava-Rāmāyana a summary of Rāmāyaṇa in 700 slokas (printed in Telugu script), Mukundanandalahari (in imitation of Śivānandalahari of Sankarācārya) and Laksminapaṭisaṭakā, he wrote Prahlādacampū on the story of Nīlasmhāvatāra.

738 Mulasankara Maneklal Yagnik of Gautamagotra was born on 31st January 1886 at Nadiad in the Vadnagatra Nagar Brahmin community from which came some of the celebrities of the Gujarati literature and the ablest Dewans of Native States of Gujarat and Kathiawar. He studied in the Baroda College and graduated in the year 1907. After some service in the Indian Specie Bank, he became Principal of Rājakiya Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya of Baroda. He was initiated into the cult of Śrīvidyā by His Holiness Abhinava Saccidananda Bhāratī, Śankarācārya of Sivaganga Pith in 1916. His proficiency in music is apparent from the Geya Padas of his Sanskrit dramas. His Vijayalahari is a minor poem. In the field of historical research, he prepared genealogical tables of Solar and Lunar dynasties with a map of Jambudvīpa and wrote a lucid prose summary of Viṣṇupurāṇa. His dramas are three, all with a historical grounding referable to standard works on medieval Indian history. Chatrapati-Saṁrajya in 10 acts describes the reign of Śivējā, Prajapaviyāja in 9 acts depicts the life of Śrī Mahārāṇa Pratāpā Sinha of Mewar, and Saṁyojitaśvāyavara exhibits the amorous intrigues of Pṛthvirāja Chauhan, the last Kṣaṭriya Emperor of India. For melody of diction, for grace of expression, for choice of scenes, Mulasankara's poetry is much appreciated. The introduction of songs that can be set to lyre and sung on the stage makes the plays very realistic.

739 Pancanana Tarkavāgīsa (Mahāmahopādhyāya) of Bhalpura (24 Parganas) was born in Bengali year 1273 and was son of Nandālāta Vidyāraṭha of Gautamagotra. He is one of the greatest living erudite scholars of Bengal and he lives in Benares City. Besides a poem Pārtivasvamedha published in the Viṣṇyodaya journal (now defunct) he wrote the play Amaramangalā on the life of Rāṇa Amaramsimha, son of Rāṇa Pratāpa, in Saka 1835. Among his illustrious ancestors was Alla Bhatta of Kānyakubja.

1. All his works have been printed in Baroda.
Cantrakanta Tarkalankara (Mahamahopadhyaya) was son of Radhakantha and was professor of Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta in 1883–1887. Besides Sañci-pañcayya and Candravamsa, poems in limitation of Kumārasambhava and Raghuvarma and Alankārasūtra on rhetoric he wrote the play Kaumudīsudhākara.  

Haridasa, Siddhānta Vāgīsa was the son of Vidhumukhi and Gangādhara Vidyālankāra of Kāsyapagota. He was born on 7th Karuc 1798 Saka (1876 AD) at Unashia near Kotwalipara, Fandpur District, East Bengal, a place described traditionally as “Second Kasi where Brahmns worship a hundred thousand idols of Śiva.” Gangādhara’s father, Kāśicandra Vācaspāti was an eminent scholar and was ninth in descent from Yādavānanda Nayācārya. Among his ancestors was the famous Maḍhusūdana Sarasvati.  

Haridasa was renowned from boyhood for his piety and before he was 18, he had acquired high proficiency in Sanskrit literature. At 14, he composed a play Kamsavadha and a campū Kamsavadha, at 16, the poem Śankarasambhava in 5 cantos, at 18, the play Jānakivikrama, and at 20.a poem Viyogavālhabha. He was a pupil of Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara. Later, he wrote the plays Virājasarojini, and Vangiyaprapāta, a poem Rukmipūrharāṇa and a romance Saralā. He also composed commentaries with historical introductions on Naśadha, Māgha, Kaśicandra, and Sāhityadarpam and on the poems and plays of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti.  

He was professor of Sanskrit in the Tol of Zamindar of Nakipur. His present undertaking, an edition of Mahābhārata with a Bengali translation, has been highly appreciated and Adiparvan and part of Vanaparvan have been published. It is hoped that the learned scholar will live long to complete the edition.

1. This information was kindly forwarded to me by Satish Kumara, Managing Director, Barealley Corporation Ltd.  
3. The earlier history of the family has been furnished to me by Jogesoandra Bhattacarya, manager, Karmasachis to whom I am indebted for varied information on modern Bengali authors.  
4. See para 70a supra.  
5. Most of these have either been printed at Calcutta or are in course of publication.
Deviprasada Sukla, Kavicakravarti, of Benares is a scholar of renown. He wrote a poem Laksminarayana and a play Nalacarita. 

Kalipada Tarkacarya is the editor of Samskritasahitya Parishat Patrika, Calcutta. Besides commentaries on many poems and plays he wrote the plays Syamantakoddhara and Naladamayantiya and an account of Kavya literature called Kavyacinti.

K S Ramaswami Sastri is the son of K Sundaram Iyer and Campaka Laksmi. He lives at Kumbakonam. Ramaswami recently retired as District Judge. His appreciation of Sanskrit poetry is at once critical and aesthetic. His Rativijaya is a small play in five acts, suggested by Kalidasa’s story of Rati in Kumàrasambhava and aims “at presenting the rebirth of love under a new inspiration and with true loyalty to Dharma and to God and at giving a new interpretation to an ancient and beautiful story and its underlying motif i.e. the Lord’s sentiment in the Gita.

V Krishnan Tampi, B.A, Principal, Sanskrit College, Trivandrum, has written some short plays for amateur dramatic entertainment with scenic directions, Lalti, Pratiknyi, Vanajyotsna and Dharmasyasuksmagath.

Makalinga Sastri (M.A., B.L) is an advocate of the High Court of Madras. He is the son of Yagnaswamin, great-grandson of Tyagaraja (better known as Raja Sastrigal), and 12th in descent from Appaya Diksha. He was born in July 1897. Love of Sanskrit has rightly been his heritage and young as he is, his writings are many and of merit. There are his minor poems such as Vanala, Nadipura, Vyajoktanvvali, Arthantaranyasapancasat, Bharaivipsa, Bhrararsanda, Durjanahadayya, Laghupandavacarita, Laghurama, Dravandaryasubhsitasaapalavati. Besides short stories like Kalipradurbhava, he has an abridgment in prose of Bhása’s dramas, Bhásakaññasa, which has been widely appreciated by the Universities. There are his plays Udgatindasana, and Pratirajasuya. The latter dramatic...

1 Published in Suprabhata
2 Published in Jt, Sam Sah Pt
3 Printed, Trivandrum
4 Raja Sastrigal was a famous authority on Dharma Sastras and in the field of philosophy was an unrivalled professor
5 Some are printed in Udyanapatrika, Trivadi. Other minor poems have been collected under the title Kunkajmala. The manuscripts are with the author.
ses the anecdotes of Vanaparvan of Mahābhārata. In Kaundinya-prahasana the hero is a complacent glutton and his in-evitable raids on the kitchen become impossible to thwart. It is said that appetite is "presented here as the root cause of fiction between the two classes of men—the owner and the trespassers" and appetite stands for all the incomitable animal cravings in man.

747 R Shama Sastrin, B A., Ph D., has translated the play of German poet Lesing, Amelia Galāṭṭi in 11 scenes*

SECTION 5

Allegorical plays

748 Personification of manmade beings and personal qualities or senses, shorty called, allegory, is as old as the vedic literature. The comparative superiority of the various organs and senses was often illustrated by dialogues and action. Such, for instance, are the controversies between vāk (speech) and manas (mind) and the prāṇa (life) and the five śāṇīyas (senses).

The following story is in Brhadāraṇyakopanishad, Adhyaya, VI.

1. Printed, Madras.
2. Printed Jl. of Myō, Sankirt College, VII. 116.
In the fables like Pancatantra, animals are humanised and their dialogues impart ethical precepts. In Asvaghosa's Saññiputra-prakarana, Buddha, Kṛiti, Dhyāni are personified and at the end of their dialogues, Buddha appears. This is adopted by Kavikarpapūra in his Caitanyacandrodaya, in which Caitanya takes the place of Buddha. Later literature has abundantly made use of this dramatic artifice to represent with vividness, tenets of particular schools of philosophy and other questions of religious controversy.

Kramamitra was an ascetic of the Hamsa order. He was a follower of Śṅkara and missionary for the propagation of Advaita doctrines. It is said that among his several disciples there was one who was averse to the study of philosophy. To put him in the way, the ascetic composed the play Prabodhacandrodaya on the plan of Paranjanopākhyāna of Śrī Brāgavaṇa. With the apparent exterior of erotic ideas, it dramatises the supreme truth of Advaita Vedānta and ridicules the tenets of other schools of philosophy. The characters are personifications of abstractions. "The Evil king Error appears on the scene, as ruler of Benares surrounded by his faithful adherents, the Faults and Vices, while Religion and the noble king Reason, accom-
pamined by all virtues have been banished There is however a prophesy that Reason will some day be reverted into Revelation, the fruit of the union will be True knowledge, which will destroy the reign of Error. The struggle for this union and consummation, followed by the final triumph of the good party, forms the plot of the piece."

751 The prologue to the play mentions the victories of king Kṛṣṇavarman, and his general Gopāla over the armies of Karnadeva, as the occasion of immediate rejoicing and the enactment of the drama, recently composed, as an item in the programme of festivities Kīrti-

1 Ed Bombay Tran into Germ by Goldstuecker, Koningsburg (gives and of 19th century), by Herzel, Zurich, into English by Taylor, Bombay. On this drama, see Schäfler, Bibl 12, Macdonell SL 366-7, Weber, IL 207, S Levy, TI, 229-55. H Broekhans, Int to Edn (Leopold), M Williams, IV, 608, J Tel Ao III 408-22, Keath, SP 251. (This contains a very full and critical account of the play and its time). S. R. II, 67. For quotations in the anthologies, see Peterson, Subh. On the Bibliography of Kṛṣṇamāra, see JAOS, XXV 189.

VANKATÉŚH VAMAN SOVANYA discovers a long metre at the end of Act IV, a passage forming a magnificent hymn of Ādiśeṣvara at Benares.

अपरं प्र (चन्द्र) नक्षित्रार्थ निसिन्धितपाण्डुराक्षसज्ञानमोहितोत्पन्नोत्पन्न निदाक्षरपरमप्राणिविभेदिनाएव कार्यकोशिनायतुष्टसमाधिमा महाशाखारं प्रस्तावित सत्यप्राणिनिर्मिति आर्यस्मिनिश्चलनायतनाद्वारास्त्रियां विद्वेदार्थौ श्रीमानंस्मिथमाधिमा "।

विकृतश्रवणसौरसबिनमुक्तस्वाभावकोमालाक्षमालाक्षालाक्षालिङ्गश्चित सत्यप्राणिनिर्मिति आर्यस्मिनिश्चलनायतनाद्वारास्त्रियां विद्वेदार्थौ श्रीमानंस्मिथमाधिमा "।

According to the Mahabha inscription, the king Kṛṣṇavarman here referred to was a Chandella king who with his general Gopāla defeated Karpas, king of Cēti. There is, however, some difference between the accounts given in the inscription and the play Kṛṣṇavarman is mentioned as the friend of Gopāla in the drama, whereas in the inscription, the latter is said to have been the general of Kṛṣṇavarman.

3. Karnaśēva, son of Gangadeva, was the king of Cēti (1060-70 A D) who joined Bhouma, king of Gujarāt in crushing Bhoja, the king of Mālsa, about 1060 A D. Smith, BEN, 85, 861, Bendall, History of Nepal (JASB, 1909), 13, S Levi Sā Nepal, II, 229 notes. R. D. B Słow, Pāla of Bengal, (JASB, Memoirs, 1918), M. Duff (Chronology) gives the date about 1060 A.D.
varman ruled between 1049 and 1100 and his victory over the Kṣapa-deva was about 1065 A.D. ¹

The genealogies² of the Kamakoti Pītha record that Mankha and Kṛṣṇamiśra were contemporaries of Candrasekhara Sarasvati the 47th occupier of that seat (1097–1165 A.D.)

752 There are commentaries on the play by Rudrādeva,³ Gaṇesa,⁴ Subrahmanyaśudhi,⁵ Rāmadāsa,⁶ Sadāṃnamunī,⁷ Ghanasyāma,⁸ Maheśvara Nyāyālākarā,⁹ R V Dikshit,¹⁰ Ādhyanātha,¹¹ and Govindāmiśta¹²

753 Venkatanātha’s Sankalpaśuryodaya is an answer to Kṛṣṇamiśra and inculcates Visistadvaita philosophy.²³ Venkatanātha is Vedantadesa

[GOPALACARYA was the son of Rangacārya of Vaḍhūlāgoṭra and lived at Mannārgudi and Pudukkota in 1881–1907 Rangacārya’s father

¹ Hulsew (EII, I 220) shows that the play was composed between 1060 and 1116 A.D. and refers to coincidence between the passage relating to Kṛṣṇaravanan and a passage in Mahobha inscription. See Grierson, JBAS, (1908), 1186

² See also N K Venkatesa, Sankaracārya and his Kamakoti Peetha (Kumbakonam), 28

³ Cal Bod 281 Ed Bombay with Candruṅ<brn />
⁴ OC, III, 76
⁵ DC, XXI, 5429 Tanj VIII 6436 He was son of Venkataša and Venka Līmbā of Ponduri family
⁶ Trav 77 He was son of Vīṇāyaṅa. Ed, Madras, Leipzig and Poona. A manuscript is dated 1546 A.D.
⁷ OC, II 78, 211 His original name was Gacṣadhara. The Ms. is dated Śāka 1436 (1571 A.D.)
⁸ Tanj VIII 8482
⁹ Ed Calcuttā, Leipzig
¹⁰ Ed Poona
¹¹ Ed Shibpur
¹² OC III 8819 Printed ISS, Trivandrum. He was apparently an ascetic and disciple of Prakṣaṭārtha.

¹³. See p. 120 supra. There are commentaries on it by Abhīla, by Kauśika Śrīkanna Tārāya (Ed Conocowaram), by Nārāyaṇa, and by Rāmānuja (OC, II, 163, 209)
was Gopālācārya, the well known scholar of eminence of Mannargudi under whom Mahāmahopādhyāya Raju Sastriyal studied. While yet very young, Gopālācārya was master of all the śaṭras and for his special proficiency in poetry and poetics he was honoured by then Maharaja of Pudukottah. In 700 verses in Arya metre called Arya Saptasati apparently named after Govardhana's work he wrote a biography of Vedāntadesāki, replete with devotion and poetic beauty. Parts of the book were published in Pudukotta Sanskrit journal and will, I am told, be completely edited by his younger brother R. Srinivasachariar, State Vakil of Pudukotta, who has himself composed a short poem on the Lord. His elder brother is R. Krishnamachariar, the present Assistant Administrator of Pudukottai.

On Vedāntadesāki, there are also the poems Desikatotrataratna-manjūśa and Śrisūktaratnakara and Cettur Śrīnivasācārya's Abdamālīka.

754 The attempt of Kṛṣṇamisra to establish the truth of particular tenets of religion by allegorical representation has been fruitful in the production of similar plays covering also the range of theology and ceremonial.

755 Gokulānātha was a poet of the court of Fatteh Sāha of Śrīnagara, and contemporary of king Rāghavasimha of Mṭhila who ruled in 1615 A.D. His Amritodayā treats the story of the Jīvātman from creation to annihilation. His Maḍālāsā is a play on the marriage of Maḍālāsā. His Rasamahārṇava is a treatise on rhetoric and Śivaśataka a lyric in praise of Śiva.

756. Yaśapālā was the son of Dhanadādeva and Rukmiṇi of the Modha family and himself minister of king Ajayadeva. His Mohaparajaya is an allegorical play in 5 acts celebrating the support given by king Kūmaparapala to the Jain religion. The play was first enacted at Tharapadra, probably the capital of Marwar. Yaśapālā was one of the eminent men who heard the first reading of Mūrtrāṇa's Amānasvāmucariṭa at the temple of Śaṅkunā ṇu at Patan in 1252 (1306 A.D.)

1. Ed., Bombay. See B. E. De, SP, 281. See ānas "śupra
2. CO, ii. 97. There are Madālāsaptariṇayā (anonymou) and Madālāsā by Kāmabhata, UC, i. 436.
3. BM, Kavyamala, Bombay.
4. Ed. COS, Baroda.
Samaraja Dikshita, son of Narahari Bindu Purandara, lived at Mathura in the latter half of the 17th century. Anandaraya Chief of Bundelkhand was his patron. His Ripurasundaristotra is in praise of Parvaṭi and Kāvyenduprakāśa is a work on poetics. Besides a farce Dhūrtanartaka he wrote Sridāmacarita, a play in five acts in 1681 A.D. describing the elevation of Sridaman or Sudāman, companion son of Kṛṣṇa, to sudden affluence. "The opening of the piece is in the style of our ancient moralities, and in the first Act Poverty and Folly are said to assail Sridaman, who is abnoxious to Laxmi for his attachment to Saraswati, or, in other words, who prefers learning to house and lands, for Fortune, it is said, will not even glance upon the pious and wise but flies from them in proportion as they are devoted to philosophy and virtue. On the other hand, Krishna or Vishnu employs the same agents to recover those whom fortune has corrupted. Folly, entering into their hearts, prepares the way for Poverty, and when reduced to distress, their minds are weaned from worldly affections and they are fitted to heaven. These allegorical personages effect their purpose with Sudāman, by demanding the rites of hospitality, and being accordingly admitted into his dwelling."

His son Kāmarāja wrote the poem Śṛngārakalika, his grandson and great-grandson, Vrajāraja and Jivaraja composed commentaries on Rasamanjarī and Rasārangaṇī.

In Dharmavijaya, Bhuvika Śukla demonstrates, in five acts, the advantages of a life regulated by spiritual ordinances and lived in 16th century A.D. He also wrote Rasavilasa.

Bhumunatha called Nallā Dikṣita was son of Bālacandra of Kausikagotra. He was pupil of Rāmalīhadra Dikṣita and wrote Dharmavijayacampū on the life of king Shahaji of Tanjore (1684-1710).
A.D.² Besides the play Subhadraparinaya³ and Śrīnārasarvabāhūya⁴ he wrote the allegorical plays Ciṣṭavṛtiṇikalyāṇa⁵ and Jīvanmuktiṣṭikalyāṇa.⁶

760 Jagannatha Sighrakavi was a poet of Kathiawar and lived in the 17th century during the days of Nānā Fatnāvīs. His Sau-bhāgyamahoddayanātaka represents all alankāras as courtiers in the Durbar of Maharajah Vakhatsinji of Bhownagar recounting their functions.⁷

761 Anandarayamakhin describes the marriage of Jīvānman or the individual soul and Vidyā or spiritual wisdom. The real author of this play Vidyarāparinaya was Vedakavi and by him it was attributed to his patron Anandaraao Peshwa, minister of Sārabhoji I and Tukkoj, kings of Janjore in the 18th century. Anandarāya is referred to by Vancisvāra in his Mahāsātākā.⁸ Vedakavi also wrote Jīvananandānātaka, a play of similar import.

762 Jatadeva of Visvamitrāgra performed Soma sacrifice and became an ascetic. He lived in Malabar about 1800 A.D. Ṣrī Pīrṇapuruśārthacādrodaya,⁹ represents the union of king Dāsāsva or Ṇāman possessing ten horses (representing ten senses of man) and Anandapakvavallī. The various systems of thought are introduced as demons and are vanquished, and Suśradhā, and Subhākti bring about the union.

763 Maltari Aradhya was the son of Sarabhaśādhyā, or Chaganta family probably of the Kāntha District. His Śivalingastātaka in five acts is intended to establish the supremacy of Vira-Saiva religion. He composed it for the delectation of Basavesvāra of Kandukūrī family, probably a local chief of Kalyāṇapura of the 18th century A.D.¹⁰

---

1. Tany, VII. 8260.
2. Probably GO, I. 736.
4. GO, I. 166.
5. GO, I. 207.
6. Mod. Rev. XVI.
7. Trans. 79. See para 165 supra.
8. See para 165 supra. A similar satirical poem is Kāhīnātaka, censuring one Kāhīnī, a courtier of King Ekoji of Tanjore. (Tany, VII. 8666).
9. DC, XXII. 3417.
10. DC, XXII. 3417.
764 Nrsimha's Anumitiparṇṣaya explains the Nyāya doctrine of inference. Anumiti, the daughter of Parāmara, marries Nyāyarasika Nrsimha was son of Venkatakrṣya of Bharadvājgrotra and lived in Triplicane in the beginning of the 18th century A.D.²

Ghatta Sesacarya, son of Rāmanuja of Vādhūlagotra, belonged to Kavītarkika family and lived about the beginning of the 19th century A.D. at Manchalagadda, Madras Presidency.³ His Prapannasapindikarāṇanāsa established that for Prapannas there cannot be Sapindikarāṇa.

Kesnananda Vācaspati has lessons on grammar in the form of a dramatic entertainment in his Nāṭyaparṇisuta or Antar-Vyākaraṇa-Nāṭyaparīṣṭa.⁴ Ramescandra’s Saralacitṣukhaśarā is a similar work.⁵ Narasimha’s Sivanārāyaṇamahodaya is a philosophical play in honor of a prince of Keonjhor.⁶

765 Madabhusi Venkatacarya was son of Anantācārya of Nādirunavakāśyapagotra. His play Suḍḍhasaṭṭya illuminates Viśiṣṭa-śvāta doctrines.⁷ He lived in Samarīkota about 1860 A.D.

766. Rani Mahagni Cinna Narasimha Kavi, popularly known as Rani Cayanulu was born in 1862 in the village of Venugumahal of Godavary District. After spending some time with Ananda Gajapaty Raj, Maharaja of Vizianagaram, he became an ascetic. He was a mathematical prodigy and died very recently at Bezwada. His drama Cīśūryaloka is allegorical.⁸ and his two works Kālamānopapaṭṭa and Tīṭhūmanjari indicate his astronomical scholarship.

767 Hanhara's Bharṭṛharinirveda: Ḡhaṇasyāma’s Pracandarāhūdaya, Nārāyanasaṃśātan’s Brahmavidyā have been noticed. Besides these

---

1 DC, XXI 3869
2 Ibid. 8424
3 Printed Calcutta
4 Printed, J Sam Sah XVIII.
5 CC, III 184
6 The manuscript is with P. V Subramanya Sastrī, Sanskrit Pandit, Bazole, Godavari District.
7 Mr. P L Narasimham, Advocate, Visagapatam, tells me that this play is different from the one of the same name (printed, Vizianagaram) by Mudumbal Narasimhariya and that he had seen another old play of the same name elsewhere.
8 See para 263 supra Ed Bombay Analysed by Gopinatha in his edn. of Satakas, Bombay. Translated into English by L H. Gray, JAOS, XXV. 1. It is doubtful whether he is identical with Harbhata, the author of Prabhavatipariṣṣayamātaka (in Maṭra VII, No 2895, Levi II 77, 88, CC I 354, 762) Sobyatei (বৈঢ).
plays there are the following allegorical plays — Jñānasūryodaya of Vādīcanṭa,1 Saṣṭasangavijaya of Vairāyanātha,2 Sammatanātaka of Jayaṇṭabhata,3 Mukṭiparnāyaya of Sundaradeva,4 Bhakṣyabhaava of Jivaṭeva,5 Vivekacandraoda of Śiva,6 Vivekavijaya of Rāmānuja,7 Śāntiṣaras of Vaṅkunṭhapūri,8 Vedāntanālāsā of Varadācārya,9 Mithyājnānakhandana of Ravidāsa,10 Śivabhaktānanda,11 Gairvanavijaya of Bālakavi,12 Śvaṅbhūyaabhīṣā of Anantarama,13 Śivanmukṭikālayāna of Mallā Somayājin14 and probably Śuklesvara’s Pramānādarā 15

768 Ramadeva or Vāmadeva is known better by the pet name Ciranţiva. He was son of Raghavendra Bhattacārya, who was a renowned Śatāvadhāni16 and grandson of Kāśinātha, the great palmist.
of Bengal Rādhāpur was his place. He was patronised by Yasavant-
simha who was the Naib Diwan of Decca about 1731 A.D. He wrote
Vṛṭṭaratanāvah a work on prosody with illustrations in his praise, and
the poems Śragāraṭatini, Kalpalata and Sivastotra and Madhava-
campu and Kāvyavilāsa on poetics.

His Vidvanmodaranguni is a unique composition it is a
humorous quasi-dramatic work, when he brings together the follow-
ers of various religions and irreligious creeds and in the course of their
dialogues, pools together the essence of various philosophical
doctrines.

769 [Satavadhant Vemuri Sri Ramasastrin was born in 1870
in Juvgunta Agraharam in Kandukar Taluk of Nellore District He is
a ‘Velanati’ vaidiki of Haritagoṭra. In his early days he studied Veda,
Śruti, and Jyotṣa at the feet of his father, and afterwards studied
Saṅhīya and Vyākaraṇa. Saṭāvadhānam was his favourite hobby and
from the age of 24 he travelled from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas
exhibiting his scholarship at different chief centres. In Poona, he was
highly appreciated by Dr Bhandarkar under whose auspices he per-
formed wonderful feats of memory, and in Baroda he was highly
rewarded by the Gaekwar for a similar performance. In 1903 he went
to Kashmir and dedicated to him a Sanskrit work called “Graveyaka
Bandha” and in 1911 was presented at the Delhi Durbar for his work
called “Dhelli Prabha” or “Durbar Khaneda.” Through his chief
pursuit is Sanskrit, he is now able to speak in 14 languages fluently,
and can write poetry in Telugu, Sanskrit and Hindu. His Sanskrit
works are “Avadhāna Vidhānam,” a work describing the process of
Avadhāna, Gurukalpam and Nūṭanodyānam. He is still living at
Bezwada.
Vinjamuri Viraraghavacarya, (1855-1920) was a Vaishnavite of Kausikagotra, and was his coworker. He belonged to Donta-vari in Tanuku Taluk of West Godavary District. He lived at Bezwada and was for many years the Sanskrit Pandit in High School there. He was a versatile Sanskrit scholar and poet and wrote the following works in Sanskrit: Ramanujaslokatrayi, Mansasanadesa, Hanumatsandesa, Panaka-Narasimhastotra, Raghuviragadyavakyaya, Catustioiki-vyakhyaya.

Abhijava Panditaraya Madabhavi Venkatacarya (?-1897) of blessed memory was the forerunner of the performance of Avadhanas of the modern day. Though he was a genius in Sanskrit, no Sanskrit work is now available.

Divakarla Tirupati Sastria and Chellapilla Venkata Sastria are famous as Tirupati Venkata kavis throughout the Andhradesa, as performers of Sataavadhanam. Their Sanskrit work is Kalisahasram.

Devulapalli Subbaraya Sastria (1853-?) and Thammanna Sastry (1862-?) were famous satavadhahams and were known as Devulapalli brother poets. They were poets of the court of the Maharajah of Pithapuram and both were versatile scholars in Sanskrit. Among them, Subbaraya Sastria wrote a work called Rauvamsamukavatavali.

Section 6

Chayanataka

Chayanatka, literally shadow-play was considered by Wilson to denote the shade or outline of a drama, "intended to introduce a spectacle of the drama and processions." As a dramatic genre it is not recognised by Sanskrit writers on dramaturgy. But Nilakantha, commenting on Rupopajivanam in Mahabhara (XII, cxxv, 5) wrote:

Rupopajivanam jalamandapika among the southerners where, having set up a thin cloth, the action of kings, ministers etc., is shown by leather figures. This is the picture-show known in South India from time immemorial. The pictures made of leather or


87
ard-board are manipulated by persons behind the screen, so as to move and shake the images falling on the screen as in magic lantern shows, and the dialogue is repeated by the persons from behind the screen quite dramatically. It approaches a Talkie of modern days.

Vātsyāyana mentions Ākhyānaka-pata, "which is evidently a roll of canvas containing the representation of a short story in several scenes like the Pamapata which was spread by a spy of Cāṇakya before the people in Candanadāsa's house and was exhibited by them with songs.

तत्तिः जनपद पत्ताणिः पदतिः गीताणि गाहिः |—Mudrāralaśa, Act I

771 Subhata is highly praised by Somadeva and Namisādhū. His Dūtāngada was enacted in the reign of King Tribhuvanapāladeva of Anhilvid about 1242 A D during a festival held in commemoration of the restoration of a Siva's temple at Somanāth by King Kumārapāla deva (1147–1172 A D). It describes the embassy of Angada to the Court of Rāvana and on failure of the negotiations, the beginning of the war.

There are at least two recensions of Dūtāngada, the shorter that has been printed in Bombay and the larger that is preserved in the India Office Library.

772 Vyasa Ramadeva wrote three such plays Rāmābhya
daya, Pāndavabhuyadaya and Subhadrāparnayā about 1402-1415 A D.

1. Ed Kāvyaśāla, Bombay Analyzed by Wilson, Theatre (II 390) Translated into English by L. Gray, JAOS, XXXII 53 (where there is full discussion of Ākhyā
nātaka), See also Bendall, JRAS, (1899), 229, M. Duff, Chronology, 189, Schruler. Bühl 55 There is a similar drama by Bhūbhāsta, (CO, I & ) Here is a fine verse

भो भो राजन राज्या करति बहुतदना स्मर: ।
प्राचेऽके फ़िल कार्तिस्यम्प्रवाचायमनादिकृत: ।
एक नर्तनवाणितानकबन देवीदुधातज्ञे ।
एक वक्तुप्रतिपासह हति वस्तुषु कोनोयोधन: ॥

2. Psichall says there are as many Dūtāngadas as there are manuscripts. For a summary of them, See CO, I 267, II, 55, III 55.

3. IO, VII No 4199 On the Eggeling says not only is the dialogue itself considerable extended in this version by the insertion of many additional stanzas, but narrative verses are thrown in, calculated to make the work a curious hybrid between a dramatic piece (with stage directions) and a narrative poem.

4. CO, XXI 5485, CO, I, 726, II 129, III 161, Levi. App 77, IO, VII 4187 where manuscript was copied in 1471 (?) Bendall, JRAS, (1898) 381; Cat, 106-6. Analyzed by Levi, TI, 542 and Eggeling (Cat, No, 4197).
under the patronage of Kalacuri kings of Raypur. Vitthala’s Chāyānātaka is based on the history of the Adilshahi dynasty of Bijapur (1489-1660 A.D.). Sāvitrīcancā of Śankaralāla is called a Chāyānātaka. Handīta deals with the story of Kṛṣṇa’s mission to Duryodhanā before the war.

773 Traivikramam is a short dialogue between Sūtrakṣaṇa and Naśī describing the Vāmana incarnation, as depicted in a painting which they were apparently looking at. In the technique of dramatic construction it is unique and but for the mention of the words Sūtra-kṣaṇa, nāndī and ‘enter’ it can only be called a dialogue. The third picture is described; this indicates that the actors were seeing a series of pictures probably of the several incarnations and Sūtra-kṣaṇa was describing the purānic story connected with each, one after another. This is the third in the series and the last words show that the speakers pass on to the next picture. The plot is shortly this.

“Vāmana appears before Bali, son of Hiranyakasipu at the close of the Asvamedha sacrifice performed gloriously by Bali. Bali as customary towards the end of any sacrifice was ready to grant any gifts and Vamana along with Brihaspati, the minister of the Devas, in a mortal coil, appeared before Bali and asked for a piece of land that can be measured by three strides. Bali was ready to grant the request. Samhlāda, his chief minister, pointed out that Vāmana was only Viṣṇu in disguise who killed his father Hiranyakasipu, the conqueror of the three worlds. Bali could not recede from his promise, such a distinguished guest ought to be satisfied. Lakṣmī, the goddess of wealth, moves away from the donee to the donor, and he grants Vamana’s request by pouring water into his hands. Suddenly Vāmana grows into a Viśvarūpā expanding to the corners of the universe. Rākṣhasas blinded by the Viṣṇumāyā fought among themselves talking their brethren for Viṣṇu. Thus most of them perished and Bali was set as the emperor of Pātala.”

Traivikrama is neither a poem where the poet narrates the story, nor a play where the narrator is absent and a mere conversation of characters is presented to the audience with action as in a play.

1. See B&C 251 CO, I 199. Printed, Bombay
2. Indica, SPAW, (1916), 699.
3. CO, I, 737.
M R Kavi says "If it is not the drama of Bhasa it may be ascribed to any of the Pallava kings preferably to Mahendravikrama or Narasimhavishnu" and adds Traivikrama is mentioned for its unique characteristics by the commentator on Sakuntala. "The commentary is called Charchana, a large fragment of which was brought from Malabar and preserved in G O Mss Library, Madras. Besides Traivikrama the commentator refers to dramatic irregularities of all the thirteen dramas of Bhasa and Vinavasavadatta and Chandalaramayana. The last mentioned work alone is not yet available to us. The commentator of Charchana may be older than 300 years as the style shows and probably a native of Malabar.

774 In Telugu Literature, in a poem known as Kridabhirama, translated from a Vidhi in Sanskrit, reference is made to this kind of composition. The two characters, Titthibha and Govinda pass through the streets of Warangal in its palmy days under Prataparudra II and describe the various street scenes in a graphic and interesting manner. The painted canvas represents Palnadu heroes (65 in number) who with a naughty boy of the profession acting under the influence of songs sung by a professional lady strongly exhibits the ecstasy and blind zeal displayed by the feudal lords in their internecine quarrel brought about by the passions of the heroine, Aruvellinayanar."

775 Early writers have distinguished story-telling as by caittika, granthika, saubhika which may respectively mean narration of a story with the help of a painted scene or by song and action or by dress and deportment. The following passage of Abhinavagupta (Natyaśāstra, Gaekwad Edition page 174) supports it:

विनंदितकालविलासकल्पना भवेन्द्रनाथमण्डलीपन्चाकृत्तिकारकृत्यमविशेषतः श्रमिते
कार्यक्रियमितस्मातकारकृत्यमविशेषतः श्रमिते

Bhojadeva in his Śṛngāraprakāsa distinguishes this kind of composition as Akhyānaka and defines it thus:

आस्त्यानकालान्तरतः विद्विधिनाथं पठंगु गायनं
शब्दिक एक कथयति गोविन्दवशविहि सदस्ति

Traivikrama may be called Ākhyānaka.

To appreciate its peculiar characteristics, the piece is printed here:
द्रष्याकव्या

श्री

तैमिक मयूर

(नान्यते तत्र ज्ञातिः दुर्गाराष तस्मिन)

दृश्यः-अयः, तत्स्ये हड्डि चिंतपटे—

देवेन्द्रमृत्तिकश्चिदिकिरोखत्सा

पादश्च यस्य गाम्भीर्यमान्विता

वेदकपितिबुद्धतत्समस्यहुय

सूर्यसिद्धकिंकरुत्य वहनामस्य।

नटी—पन्नो साजवदो बद्रवार्षपस्य अभ्यः, तद्वे तद्वे (तम्मो भगवते बद्रवामनाय।

आर्ये, तत्तत्।)

दृश्यः-आयेः, भृगुता दैलेन्द्र बोधे दैर्घ्यम क्षत्राक्षे धनश्चलतात्

शुक्लाचालतुक्तस्य-वयाः।

शुक्लानिनावतोन्नितो चरवीय पट्टास्थितवर्षादमामिस्व।

वनमुक्कलपतिकार्द्याय प्रवहनमो मूला वायुमये सामोद्राय यहस्मादिः।

पशुस्तुपस्तो

साधनासहायिनः।

नटी—तद्वे तद्वे (तत्ततत्)

दृश्यः-ततस्तैद् दस्ये विहारितमनस्ता बनिनायामिन्त्र युगिण्य चरितिः।

नटी—तद्वे तद्वे (तत्ततत्)

दृश्यः-तत आहारपाचित पयम पुरोपकराराय नात्रु विकमानिन्द्रानि सुयम्।

नटी—तद्वे तद्वे (तत्ततत्)

दृश्यः-तद ईश्वरसदगुप्तिन तेनाप्यविचारायावेन बोधे ददानीपुष्कर बलिनाः।

नटी—तद्वे तद्वे (तत्ततत्)

दृश्यः-ततो कस्मैविविविविविन्धुमित्रिवेदियो वंहानात्मानालेखेन वारिष्ठ न बाताज्जनितः।

अयत विभर्मानसम्बन्धेय दुर्गासात्राः दुधोकल्ताः।

बहुत नाय सकं कन्तं बिजेदेन आत्रों यद्य स्थाप ज्ञ प्रदेयस।

अथ च—

मिलता दृश्य तव अपान दुर्गाहर्षी बहु-लघू नासुकृतीन्तियो! दुरा या।।

साभाराज्ञ्ञातिं दुर्गासात्राः आप्ताविष्ठानिजीतस्य स्तविरिष्यत्।

श्रद्धूक्तः शंकुनि।

नटी—तद्वे तद्वे (तत्ततत्)
दृष्टि—तत्

लोक्य यदि स्वादिष्टोग्यथायी शास्त्रीसिच्छकोइददशस्थापणि

गुड़ेश्वरो यदि याचते मा दायकामि सलावतसाम्योस्ताहत्

अपि चैतद्वृत्त बलिना—

देशीति यो बदति त प्रविध्यक्ष्मीनीति यो बदति त पुनर्चुर्याति

तत्साहायमि पृथिवीं मनुष्यवस्त्र शरीरि मा मन्तु त प्रविध्यक्ष्मी

मलेश्वरच्छ किसानित सहायो बलिना।

नरी—तदयो तदयो (तत्सतत्)

दृष्टि—तत् क्षयुर्म्यकयाज्ञित्वतििमित्वमायाम न्यायमाण्यलाभात्माक्षषीस्ममस्थ।

सम्बन्धमेवामशाखाशुरगणहितकरायायं शुरुगणहितकरायायं करायायं जान्वरस्य शृङ्गारायाय

हत हतो सर्वान्याथेष्ट तोय श्रुसुगणेयक्त बलिना।

नरी—तदयो तदयो (तत्सतत्)

दृष्टि—तत् शुरुगणहितकरे अनुगणनिनकरे अयक्तमल्लदल्लस्ते तत्सतृत करते

प्रभूमाति तोये विक्रयचुरित्वदेविरुष्यस्तुलं तैलोयाप्रसाय वायुमुखितो भगवान्

दिव्याभिरुपि।

नरी—तदयो तदयो (तत्सतत्)

दृष्टि—तदयो विगुणचतुर्विस्तारिशेषकरवायस्यतिरित्याणः नसरमणमहामुक्तिक्याय

साधुतितात देवक्षिणमस्तु।

नरी—तदयो तदयो (तत्सतत्)

दृष्टि—तत्सत्तेष्टेषीतव त विगुण कर्ष्युर्म्यन्यन्य महाल नद्य देशं, हुष्य देशं, आहि देशखल्लुमाय, अर्थुद्धार बायव, अर्थतपतिरसावित, परिता दुःखा, आन्ता मेढ़ा, शान्तामिन नम्, स्वाहितां: परिता, सुयिता सागरा, श्रीनाम वातग्रिमस्वयो अूक्ष्येकरा।

किं दुःखित—

प्रायसिद्धमैयंतित किं दुःखा न विषयः

मन्तुरखु हरिन्द्रो हति हता हता हता सम्।

हति विगुणधिरम्मार्थमययतास्ते

शुचपाठविणेन सर्वेऽग्निका प्रेमम्।

नरी—तदयो तदयो (तत्सतत्)

दृष्टि—तत्

नारायणण स्यथे शुरुगणण देवक्षिणम्मयापालनकारणाय।

देशय वैमधुनाय अजगद्यति विगुणसाधित्करायं मयीष्युस्याय।
हस्युक्तः अपिततानि सर्वेभूतानि ।
नटी—तदा तदा (ततस्ततः)
सूचै—विष्णुविजय विजयमिश्रयुक्तः लीला लोकाभिसंपत्तिः: मेरी शहरनु परवेशः
=ज्ञानवादः ।

दर्पणः पादधेय मनुचिरपञ्चो थालेव गगन
सहायः पादध्योगाः इव गिरेस्वर्यो निपतितः ।
निष्ठर्या यस्य भूमिः संगिरिन्दपुरा चचेत्रचचिरिताः
परस्यः सलस्यः ज्ञातः इव बलिस्वर्याः चचिरितः ॥

अष्टि च—

खर्ग धुरेन्द्र इव दक्षभक्षोऽगोः
पातालात्सल ज्ञात हरिणा स देवः ।

सन्यासाद्वर्तः परम्या रमोत विमक्तः
कि वा करोति शहवा न समाध्योऽयम् ॥

नटी—रमणिः शु दक्षायोऽच, अंग विचपरं बणित्यु अध्योऽ। (रमणेयः ख्यात
कथयोः: अन्य चचिरपरं वर्णयत्वार्थः)

भर्तेऽर्थ हरिपदकथा सेयमतं प्रयाता
भक्तिपुरोषवः च मन च श्रीशस्यन्यायशतः
नरसहेऽव दुर्तिमसिद्ध्रयताः चलताः नः
सक्षो राजाप्रवृत बन्धवाः सति गीताज्ञाने: ॥

(श्रीक्रमं समाप्तवः)
"In Java the Rama cycle may be treated in the dramatic categories of the wayang purwa, a shadow play produced by puppets of buffalo leather, the wayang topeng, and the wayang wong, produced by masked and unmasked men respectively, and the wayang beber, in which pictures are unrolled and explained by the dalang (juynboll, Internationales Archiv fur Ethnographie, xiii, 4-5) In many respects the latter, as the manager of the puppets and the speaker of the dialogue, in which he modulates his voice according to the various characters of the drama (Serrurer, 95-96, 106-112, Haene, 7-9,) corresponds very probably to the Sanskrit sutradhara, although his name seems to signify merely, stroller, strolling player; and it has been suggested that he was primarily a priest who rendered worship to the ghosts represented by the shadows cast by the puppets on the curtain in the wayang (Haene, 23-24, 39-57) At all events, we are justified in seeing in the Javanese wayang purwa or shadow play, the analogue of the Sanskrit chayanataka and both are without doubt the congenors of the Chinese shadow play, the Turkish garagos ans the marionettes which, originating in India, have spread throughout Asia and Europe to be enacted at the present day (see, for example, Pischel, Heimat des Puppenspiels, Rehm, Buch der Marionetten, Jacob, Erwähnungen des Schatten-theaters in der Welt-Literatur and Geschichte des Schatten-theaters, together with the literature cited in these works"

Section 7

Miscellaneous Plays

777 On Weddings Draupadiparinayaa of (i) Peri Kāśinātha of Vijayanagarama and (ii) Kṛṣṇa, son of Nrīsimhā, Pāṇciliparinayaa of Addankī Bālasūrī, Rukmiṇiparinayaa (i) of Ātreyā Varnd.. and (ii) of Kaviṭārkīcasūrī, Godāparinayaa (i) of Śrīśaila Śrīnivāsū and (ii) of

1 He died in about 1929. His son Tātaryudu is vice principal, Sanskrit College, Vizianagaram.
2 DC, XXI 846
3 TC, III 8129
4 There is Pṛthvirāya's poem Rukmiṇīkṛṣṇaśavallī, PR, V 185
5 Tānti VIII 8502 Printed Bombay. He lived at Venkatagiri in 19th century.
6 DC, XXI 8410, 8499, DC, II 103 He lived at Guptakutūi (Kuttakadī) in 8 Arroś Dist. and was of Śrīvatsagaśtra. He was the nephew of Kṛṣṇa abovementioned.
7 DC, XXI 8899.
Kesāvanātha, Subhadrāparṇaṇaya (i) of Nallākavi, (n) of Ragu-
ṇāthācārya, Vallīparṇaṇaya (i) of Bhāskara, son of Śivasūrya of Sṛvatsa-
gotra, and (ii) of Virarāghava, Nilāparṇaṇaya of Venkatesvara, son of Ḍharmarāja, Marakatavallīparṇaṇaya of Śrīvāsa, son of Devarāja, Rukminiḥaraṇa of Se-
acintāmaṇī, Lakṣmikālaṇī (i) of Sadāśiva Dīkṣita and (n) of Mānāvika-
rama.

Madālasāparṇaṇaya, Pārvatīsvayamvara, Sīṭāvivāha by Sesādri of Bhāradvājagotra, Bhamīparṇaṇaya (i) by Sathagopācārya and (n) by Venkatācārya, Bhāṇumatiṇīparṇaṇaya by Nyāsima, Saugandhikāparṇaṇaya, Indirāparṇaṇaya by Virarāghava, son of Śrīsaila, Indumatiṇīparṇaṇaya, Jānakiṇīparṇaṇaya (i) by Nārāyanapabhatta and (n) by Sītārāma, Kalyāṇiṇīparṇaṇaya, Kāmakṣiparṇaṇaya, Kanakavallīparṇaṇaya, Uṣāparṇaṇaya by Śrīvāsa, Lakṣmīsvayamvara by Śrīvāsa, son of

1 CO, I 159
2 TO, I 1240 He was son of Bālacandra of Kausikagotra. He wrote Śṛngāra-
sarvasvabhāṇa. He says he lived at Kandaramamkya where Uddānda also lived in 16th century.
3 CO, I 729
4. DC, XXI 8589 See para 187 supra.
5. CO, III 118 HR. III. ix, II. ix Written in the time of king Sivaji of Tanjore. See para 163 supra.
6. Tanj VIII. 8416. In CO, I, 302, there is one by Dgabhavaṭ.
7. Ladh 8450
8. CO, I 527.
9. Trav 78
10. Trav. 191
11. CO, I 426
12. CO, I 886
13. Tanj VIII. 8524 He lived at Conjeeveram and wrote also Rāmavilāsakāvyas.
14. See CO, I 413
15. CO, II 95
16. CO, I 416
17. Levi, App. 73
18. CO, III 88 He is author of Nanjarajayasobhāṇa, In the prologue Kasipati probably the author of Mukundānanandabhāṇa, is praised.
19. CO, I 737
20. HR. III. 1749, ix
21. CO, I 69
22. CO, I 206
23. CO, I 208.
24. CO, I 86.
25. CO, I 94.
26. CO, I 78
27. CO, I 71 There is Uṣāharaṇa of Harṣanātha, Schuyler, Biol 41
Rāmānuja,¹ Vakulamāliniparīṣṭaya by Viśravaḥ Śrīnivāsa,² Vijayendra-panīṣṭaya by Subrahmaṇyā,³ Pāncālīparṇayā by Balasūri of Srīrangam,⁴ Mīnākhyāparīṣṭaya by Aṃśāśrīstrī⁵ and Lalavatipannayā by Lakṣmīpatī⁶

778 On Kṛṣṇa Kṛtārthamādhava by Rāmāmānīka Kavirāja,⁷ Kṛṣnāla by Vāmoyānātha Tatāta,⁸ Kṛṣnakutūhala,⁹ Bālikāvanctaka,¹⁰ Rāmā-Rādha,¹¹ Kamsāntaka by Harīyavan,¹² Kṛṣnabhakticandrikā by Ananta-deva,¹³ Vaidarbhiyāsudeva by Vaiṣṇavarāja¹⁴

Rāmacandra and Abhinavagupta quote from Hejjalā's Rādhāvipralambha, e.g.

Cayani Candrasekhara was the son of Vājapeyi Gopinātha-rāja-guru, religious teacher of the King Viḍakesarī Rāmacandra of Bundekand of the 17th century A.D.¹⁵ His Maṭhurānuddha is a drama in eight acts with no prakṛt in it, on the secret lives of Uṣā towards Anuruddha who was kidnapped by her maiden Cīṭralākṣā on her behalf

779 On Rāma Raghuviracarita by Cakravarṇa Veḍāntasūri,¹⁶ Siṭārāghava of Rāmapāṇivāda,¹⁷ Kusalavājaya by Venkatakeśa,¹⁸

¹ OC, I 540, III 114.  
² TC, I 1047 See para 242 for the author  
³ OC, II 185  
⁴ TC, III 3123 He says he wrote at the instance of king Rājaśekhara  
⁵ Mys 279.  
⁶ Mys 282  
⁷ OC, III 25  
⁸ OC, I 128, Utkar, 999  
⁹ OC, I 119  
¹⁰ Mys Mentioned in ND.  
¹¹ Mentioned in BP  
¹² Trav 688  
¹³ Trav 180  
¹⁴ Trav 181  
¹⁵ OC, I 436 Analyzed by Wilson, Theatre, II. 396.  
¹⁶ TC, II, 299 He lived in Villīmābakaṁ, near Chingleput His descendant Gojala, son of Venugopala, wrote Pṛājāpārāghava (OC, III, 8066.)  
¹⁷ OC, XXI 8558 See para 177 supra  
¹⁸ Trav. 76.
Rāmāyananātaka by Somesvaradeva,1 Muḍiṭārāghava by Salakrṣṇa,2 Śītācārṇa by Śītācārṇa,3 Rāmārājyābhiṣeka of Vīrārāghava,4 Kṛṣṇārāvaṇa, Janaśīkṛghava, Rāmābhīnanda, Vāhavadha, Chalitarāma, Nirdoṣadasaśārtha, Mārcavanciṭaka, Māyāpupākā,5 Abhirāmarāghava by Anapoṭanāyaka, Amogharāghava,6 Abhinavarāghava of K-īra-swāmin7 Prapanna-Vibhiṣāna of Lakṣmāmana Sūri,8 Abhirāmamani of Sundaramislā,9 Harāvasāna by Kanhyalal Pancatīrtha,10 Raghuvaīracariṇa of Sukumāra,11 Anjayenavijaya of Bhāṣyakara,12 Janakajānanadana of Nṛsimha,12 Praudhabhirāma of Venkatanātha16

Mahadeva was son of Kṛṣnasūri of Kaundinyagotra and lived at Palmaner in the Madras presidency Nilakantha was his contemporary and so he belongs to the first half of the 17th century His Adbhutadarpana narrates the progress of Rāma’s war onwards from Hanumān’s return from Ceylon.28 Ramakṛṣṇa was the son of Tirumala of Vaṭṣagotra and pupil of Ramendraśarasvatī Probably owing to the surname Bhavabhūti he had, he thought of writing a play Utāraracarīṇa to imitate Utārarāmacarīṇa It is said that he lived in the 18th century He describes his family in the Colophon thus18

1 Mahadeva Sastrī, author of Uanāṣīraghava (play) (OC, I 68) and Mahadeva Kavīdīgayya Sarasvatī, author of Dānakalikumāṇi Bhāṅkā (OC, I 244) are different.
Atiratra-Yajvan was a younger brother of Nilakantha and lived in the middle of the 17th century. He was himself well-versed in the tantras and kratus, besides being born a poet and commentator, he was a specialist in the Śalva-Siddhānta His Kuṇḍa-kumudvatiyam, a drama in five acts, describes the loves of Kusa, the eldest son of Rāma, and Kumudvati, the princess of the Nāga race. He is also known to have written a poem called the Prāti-Raghuvarṇa, obviously on the history of the Solar race, and Tripuravijayacampū.

780 On Bharata

Asvamedhanātaka by Sumaṣṭāṁitramalladeva, king of Bhālgoan, Pāndavavijaya by Jayarāmamahādeva, [Draupadīswayamvara, Pāndāvānanda and Vilakaṣa-Durū ṇaḥana], Bhimaparpākrama by son of Saśānanda Abhimanda, Abhumanyuṭātaka by Śāigrāma, Ghoṣayātra of Śītalacandra.

781 Puranic

Yayāticarita of Mayyan Rāmārya of Trivandram, Bhaktivijaya of Śrī Dhūrjaṭprasada Kāvyatṛpta, Subhadraśrūjuna by Kesavaśaṅkara, Subhadradhananjaya of Gururāma, Subhadraḥarana of Maḍhavabhaita, Candrakā- Janamejaya by Paḍma-nābha, Manmathabhyudaya by Venkatesa, Prabhāvaṭipradyumna.

1 Tanj. VIII 8378 See para 154 supra
2 CO, III 8.
3 Called also Saabhāparvanātaka HPR, (1904) Pāndavānanda quoted by Dhanika la different.
4 Mentioned in ND and AB
5. TO, IV. 4440. See para 59 supra On the battle between Bhima and Jarāsandha Abhinavagupta mentions the play.
6. Printed, Calcutta. Here is a fine Nandī

7. Printed, Calcutta
8. Mys 1831
9. Printed, Calcutta
10. Trav 188
11. JSEP, Calcutta, XI, on Prahlāda's story.
12. CO, I, 729
13. CO, I 729
14. TG, IV. 5670
15. TG, III. 9968 He was contemporary of a pupil of Nilakantha (see para 130 supra).
by Rāmakṛṣṇa,² Hariscandra,² Uṣāniruddha by a king of Kāśi,⁶ Revatiśālīka by Puruṣottama,⁴ Madanabhuyadaya by Venkatesa,³ Natesavrāsa by king Śivājī of Tanjore,⁶ Gangaṇāṭara,³ Mangalanaṭaka by Jīvānanda Jyotirvid,⁶ Anarghatara by Sudarsana,⁹ Hariscandra,³ Prabhākara Śrinivas,³² Manmadha by Venkataraṇgha,³¹ Anandacandrada by Rangila,²³

782 Miscellaneaous Natakas Kalyāṇapuranjana by Tirumalākārya,¹° Jagadānanda by Harādeva, Samayasāra by Banarsidas Sekhara-nābha,⁴¹ Chandravilāsa (i) by Gangaḥara,²⁷ (ii) by Rudrasarma Tripāthin,²⁸ Lingādurgabhedana by Paramānanda or Dēdambhatta,²⁷ Kusumāvacaya by Madhusūdanarasavati, Kamala Kanthirava by Nārāyaṇādhi, son of Lakṣmīdhara,²⁴ Candrarekhāvidyāadhara,²⁵ Nilāncandra by Vīra-rāghavacārya of Purī,²⁹ Prabhāvata by Raghunātha,²⁵ Lakṣmīdeva-nārāyaṇī by Śrīdhara,²⁵ Gopīcanḍana,²⁵ Kalpanākalpaka by Śeṣāgiri,²⁴ Sukābhumatana by Śrīnivāsa,²² Śrīnivāsadayāvīlāsa,²² Sāṅkitasamulāsa by Muddu Venkārya,²² Siddhāntabheri by Sudarsanārya,²⁵ Muktācarita by Kṛṣṇakavi²⁰

1. OC, II. 79
2. Quoted in SP
3. BR, 11
4. Tanj VIII 3504,
5. TO, III, 3293
6. It describes the story of the deity at Cidambaram
7. CO, III. 80.
8. Printed, Benares It is in 9 Acts on the greatness of Devi,
10. Mys. 287.
12. Utcar, 998 Composed at Baroda in 1849
13. Mys 275 He was of Śathamarṣanagota of Polepalli family and in the court of Polabhināla of Gadval in Nizam’s dominions in 17th century.
15. OC, II, 86
16. PR, III. 309, 884
17. Lev, App 80, CO, L 544
18. Tanj VIII 8857. He lived in Brahmāśāstram near Ongtīstaram.
19. Tanj, VIII. 8994
20. Printed Ounjeevaran. It mentions King Mukturādeva of Orissa in the Prologue
21. Mys. 278
22. Trav 73
23. CO, I 183
25. Mys. 282
783 Prakarana Sāktivāsakumāra's Anangasena-Harinandini; Amāśya Saukuka's Cīrotpālavalambitaka, Lārngača's, Puṣpadūntaka, Prayogābhhyadaya, and Padmavatiparnana.¹ Candrakānta's Kaumudi-suḍhākara⁵, Ganañadgajatīn's Mādhavivasantiya⁶

Deviparnaya and Nalavikrama,⁴ Udayanacinta and Vīḍhvilasita,⁵ [Vikrāpta Śūdraka, Mayūramārjūlikā, Vedikā, Maṭayabasīta, Bhīma-kulīya, Ratvilāsa, Lakṣmisvayamvarā, Subhadrāharāya, Rāsakānka, Mudrāsveda, Śaṅkisamvāda, and Saṭalarnāharāya],⁶ [Kāmadattā, Ramānanda, Mahesvarānanda, Kandarpanbhava and Viśānanda],⁷ Vakrāṇudgajatīyaka.⁸

In Padmaprabhjataka, Śūdraka quotes from a drama Kumudvati

कुमुदति प्रकरणे शूर्यकस्तला राजदारिका धात्री रहस्यपालसत्—
उन्मसे वैव ताबदु सन्विस्मयरो नौदुता शेमराजि
नायक्षवासिनै तं लो रोमनव गुर्वदीपिह दुर्बिकारे।
स्युत्रासस्निस्स्थिति निश्चितादिताभितान्वयनथायपति
ले भैलके सासनसकदन कहुँकामप्रतिनिधि।

Krṣṇadasa's Kalāvaṭi-Kamarūpam describes the marriage of Kalāvaṭi and Kāmarūpa, son of King Kāmaketu of Kāśi, after rescuing her from the hands of a Rākṣasa who carried her away.⁹ Kavīvallabha's Abhirāmacitralekham is a long drama in 10 acts describing the marriage of Abhirāma and Ciṭrakekha, daughter of Bhujangarāja. It is said to have been enacted at Srīrangam at Cañtra festival.¹⁰

784 Natika Anangavaṭi, Indulēkha, Bhattachāri Bhavanhacūda's Kauśalikī,¹¹ Inḍuṭamaṭi and Ciṭralekha,¹² Padmāvatī,¹³ Vāsaṇāṭikā of

---

¹ Mentioned in ND or AS
² Printed, Calcutta
³ Trav 180 See para 247 supra.
⁴ Mentioned in ND
⁵ Mentioned in BP
⁶ Mentioned in SP
⁷ Mentioned in ES
⁸ CC, I 54
⁹ DC, XXXI 8391 Manuscript breaks off in fifth Act. The author lived in Malabar in the end of 18th century A.D.
¹⁰ TC, III. 8984 A Kavīvallabha is mentioned as having composed Adityabhattaṇī (a Dharmasāstra). See TC, III. 8983.
¹¹ Mentioned in ND
¹² Mentioned in SP
¹³ Mentioned in ES
Rāmacandra,¹ Candraprabhā,² Kuvalayavatī of Kṛṣṇakarnakekhara,³ Rāmānaha of Dharmagupta,⁴ andradaka (i) of Nārāyaṇa and (ii) of Visvanāthakavirāja,⁵ Śrīgaravātipikā of Visvanāthabhābha.⁶

785 Vyāyoga Nṛśimhavijaya,⁷ Vyāyavikrama by Aṛyasūrya of Kaundinyaagotra,⁸ Bhimaparākrama,⁹ or Jarāsandhavyāyoga, Viṇatānanda or Pracandagaruda of Govinda, son of Śevasesvara,¹⁰ Praścandabhārava of Sadāśiva,¹¹ Jāmadagnyavijaya,¹² Vikrāntarāgghaviya by Śrīkṣṇa and Viraraghaviya by Prabhāni Venkatabhūpāti.¹³

786 Prahasana,¹⁴ Candānuranjana of Ghanasyāma,¹⁷ Kuhanabhārava of Ayyalanātha of Bommaganu family of the Circars,¹⁷ Mundita,¹⁷ Ānandakosa,¹⁷ Brhat-ubhadraka,¹⁷ Ďhūrtacarita,¹⁷ Ďhūrtavidambana by Mahēsvara,¹⁷ Ďhūrtanartana by Śāmarāja,¹⁷ Hāsyaratnakara.¹⁷

¹ 10, 2348 composed in 16–17th century A.D. There is a poem Vāsanīkāpamūrya of Narasimha (CC, I, 568).
² CO, I 181
³ CO, III 95
⁴ CC, I 268 Written in 1310 A.D
⁵ CO, I 179
⁶ Quoted in his SD
⁷ IO, VII 4196
⁸ DC, XXI 8410 TC, I R No 821
⁹ TC, II 1761
¹⁰ TC, IV 4440 There is Bhimavikrama of Mokṣādhyāya, Cat of Dr. Museum, 278.
¹¹ Tanj. VIII 8641 CC, I, 978, II 77 He lived at Benares and was a native of Nandipura a village on the Godavan. He also wrote Gopālaliṅgamāvabhāga (Tanj. VIII 8577) Govinda Kavibhaṇḍa author of Samrādhvamādghava (CC, III, 86) is different.
¹² Tanj VIII 8639
¹³ Printed, Bombay, Calcutta and Mysore. Analysed by Wilson, Theatre, II. 274 There is commentary by Rāmakṣya, OSC, 226.
¹⁴ Mys. 286.
¹⁵ O Capeller, Zwee Prahasanas, Gurupujamaumundi, Leipzig.
¹⁶ Tanj VIII 8620 On the author, see para 168 supra
¹⁷ TC, III 8251.
¹⁸ CO, I 8
¹⁹ Mentioned in RS.
²⁰ Mentioned in RS
²¹ Mentioned in SD, 586
²² CO, I 272
²⁴ Mentioned in DR, Int. p 80.
Nātavāla of Yadunandana, son of Vāsudeva Cayanī,1 Sundrakṛtū-
hala of Kṛṣṇādatta,2 Palāndumandana,3 Pāsandavidambana,4 Pavodhu-
maṭhana,5 Vinodaranga,6 Miṭhyācāra of Vandyanaṭha, Kāleyakautū-
hala by Bhāradvaja,7 Venkatesaprabhasana by Venkatesvara,8 Kāli-
kantakutuka by Rāmakṛṣṇa,9 Subhāgānanda by Vāsudevanarendra
ahas Śrīvatsānka,10 Kautakasūrvava by Gopinātha,11 Hāvyārana by
Jagadiśa,12 Kālikeli,13 Kandarpakeli,14 Hṛdayavinoda of Kavi Pāndita,15
Bhānuprabandha of Venkatesa,16 Devadurgapī of Kammody,17

Sandalkapatriparamaka,18 Somavalliyogānanda by Arunagirinātha,19
Mattāvilāsa by Mahendravikrama Vārman,20 Kukṣimbhanabhakṣava by
Prabhān Venkata Bhupati, Kukumbhari by Venkatacārya and Kukan-
bharkśava by Tirumalānātha,21 Lokaranjana by Śrīvatsācārya.22

Sankhādhara flourished in the Court of king Govindacandra
of Kanouj23 in the 12th century A D His Latakatnelaka describes
the marriages of Dāntura and Madanamanjari and is called also
Dānturāparṇayaya.24

1  Printed, Bombay
2  OC, I 707
3  CC, I 380
4  CC, I 886.
5  Mentioned in RS
6  CC, I 677
7  Ed. Poma, CC, I 396
8  CC, I 602. He is called Kālidāsa.
9  BB, (1897) 1
10  CO, I 737, Tanj VIII 866. He was another name Govindādityasena and
appears to have been a chief in Kashmir.
11  CC, I, 131, III 28 Analysed by Wilson, Theatre, II 410 and by Cappeller 
in Gauḍapāla, Leipzig, 59-63
12  Ed. by Cappeller, Jena, Ed Oxford, Ed Calcutta with Bengali translation, 
Analysed by Wilson, Theatre, II 403-9, IO, VII 419 8 with an English translation.
13  Mentioned in RS
14  Mentioned in SD 584 5
15  CC, II, 287
16  CC, I 405.
17  Printed, Calentia.
18  Mys, Sup 18.
19  Tanj VIII 4627, Mys, 28 See para 135 supra
20  See para 48 supra, Keith, SD, 189, Mys Sup 13 T N Ramachandran 
The Royal Artot, Mahendravarman, JOR, VII 219, 303
21  Mys 275
22  Mys, 263, 182
23  See I, XIX 249 for grants dated Sam 1161 and 1188.
24  Printed, Bombay.
Harijivanamisra was the son of Latamisra, and was patronised by a King named Ramasimha. He lived in the 17th century AD. A manuscript of his Vijayaparajitamataka is dated Sam 1730. He wrote also prahasanas, Prasangika, Sahridayanandana, Vibudhamohana and Adbhutaranga.

Kavitarkika was the son of Vaninatha. He was Court Chaplain of King Manikyadeva of Bhulaya, one of the 12 independent chiefs who ruled in Bengal at the time of Moghul invasion in 16th century AD. His Kautukaratnakara is a pleasant prahasa ridiculing an imbecile king who relies on some knaves to recover his abducted queen.

787 Bhana by Sundaratatacarya, Anangalatikā, Anangasarvasva of LaksmiNarasimha, Pancabāṇavijaya of Rangacārya, Pancabāṇavilāsa, Pancāyudhaprapanca of Trivikrama, Madanagopālavilāsa of Rāma, Rasikāmpta of Sankaranārayana, Rasollāsa of Śrīnivāsavedāntācārya, Śrīngarasrīngataka of Ranganātha.

Rasikaranjana of Śrīnivāsa, son of Nāšimha of Pratīvādibhayankara family, Mukundānanda of Kāśipaṭi, son of Ramāpati of Kaundinya-gotra, a nameless bhāna, Sarasakavikutānanda of Rāmacandra of...
Veñala family,⁴ Manmathamodana by Kadayokudi Subrahmanyasästri,⁷ Vasantabhüṣaṇa by Varadārya of Bähradvājagotra ⁸

Sāradāśāla⁴ (i) of Sankara ⁶ and (u) of Sesagin,⁶ Śrṅgarāmanjari (i) anonymous⁷ and (u) of Avadhāna Sarasvatī of Kānut,⁶ Madanabhūṣaṇa of Appākavi,⁹ Śrṅgāraśātabaka of Nṛśumha of Haritagotra,¹⁰ Basaraṇṭākara of Jayanta,¹¹ Śrṅgārañjana of Varada of Kousikagotra,¹² Śrṅgāratarangini of Rāmabhadra,¹³ Śrṅgāracandrikā of Śrīnivāsa of Śrīvaṭṣagotra,¹⁶ Śrṅgārasundara of Īśvaraśarma of Bimbali,¹⁶ Śrṅgārarangini of Venkatācārya of Surapuram,¹⁸ Śrṅgāravāpīka of Viṣvanātha,¹⁷ Anangamangala by Sundara,¹⁸ Śrṅgarādiṇḍa by Venkatādhvarīn²⁰ Hariṇāla by Hardāsa²⁰

Anangajivana,²¹ Anangavijaya (u) of Śivarāmakṛṣṇa of Gauṭamagotra,²² (b) of Jagannātha²³ Kandarpavijaya of Ghanaguru, of Kausikagotra,²₄ Candrarekhāvāsakā of Viṣvanātha,²⁷ Anangamangala by Sundara,²⁸ Śrṅgarādiṇḍa by Venkatādhvarīn²⁰ Hariṇāla by Hardāsa²⁰

---

1. TC, II 1480, Enacted at Bhaḍrachelam in Godavari District
2. Saṁ VII
3. TO, I 1019 See Levi, Aqq. 80 He was disciple of Varaḍadesika who was himself disciple of Śrūṭapraṅkaśikācārya
4. CC, I 543. Analysed by Wilson, Theatre, II 384
5. CC, I 542, Mys 264 Analysis by Wilson, Theatre, II 384
6. Mys 254 He was teacher of Maharaja Kṛṣṇaraja Odayar of Mysore It is full of kabaḷānḍara
7. TC, V 6306 The author wrote a poem Rāmaśabdāravintya
8. Tanj, VIII 8599
9. Tanj VIII 8593 See para 162 supra JOR, III. 71
10. Tanj, VIII 8607
11. TO, V 6909 He lived at Śrīperumbudur near Chinglepat
12. CC, I 661
13. CC, I 660
14. CC, II 157, TO, III 2999
15. Trav 79
16. CC, I 660
17. Analyzed in IO, VII, 4195, CC, I, 661, II. 158. He was son of Mahādeva
18. CC, I 12
19. CC, I 661
20. CC, II 183
21. DO, XXI 8842, Tanj VIII 8566. He was the paternal uncle of Venkata śvavari, the author of Viśvaśuyāgarāṇa
22. DO, XXI 8847 Enacted at Vamalur and composed at the instance of King Naraśamahīpāla, son of Cīkaṇḍevaraya and his son Kṛṣṇayuvāraṇa of that place.
23. Tanj VIII 8575 probably of Viṣvanagar See para 124 supra.
24. DO, XXI 8831 Enacted at Srīrangam, See para 163 supra.
25. DO, XXI. 8401 Enacted at Kolarāḷajadhami.
26. DO, XXI 8465 Composed at the instance of King Bājarājavarman of Cochin
Kāmakalāvilasa by Pradhami Venkatabhūpata, Ṭaruṇabhūṣana by Śahakopa, Madanagopa by Svaśambhūnātha, Madanasāmrāyaja by Bhujanga, Rasodara by Surapuram Aṇṇayārya, Śīrānganāthabhaṭhāna by Śrīnivāsa, Śrīgāravilāsa by Sāmhasīva, Sārasvatollāsa by Venkatarāma, Kaṭavakalācāndra and Śrīgāravilāsata by Nārāyana.¹

Anangamangala by Sundara Kavi;² Anangasarvasva by Lakṣmīnṛṣimha;³ Gopālabhūṣava by Govinda;⁴ Kāmavilāsa by Venkappa;⁵ Kusumabāṅavilāsa;⁶ Rasavilāsa by Čokkanātha;⁷ Rasikajanaśravollāsa by Venkata;⁸ Rasikajanaśravollāsa,⁹ Śrīgaramanjari and Śrīgārārāja by Gopālaroya.¹⁰

Śīrānganāthabhaṭhāna of Śrīnivāsācārya, son of Varadācārya of Kausikagotra,¹¹ Śrīgārārājpaka by Vinjumūṅ Raghavācārya,¹² Śrīgārāpapāvana of Vaidyanātha son of Kṛṣnakavi of Srivatsagotra,¹³ Śrīgārārasodaya of Rāmakavi, son of Rāmakṛṣṇa of Kāśyapagotra,¹⁴ Śrīgārāṭilaka of Avināśiswāmī, son of Kāma of Ātyrayagotra,¹⁵ Śrīgārārasarasvaśa (a) of Śwāmi Śastrī, son of Anantanārāyana of Hāṛītagotra,¹⁶ (b) of Kauśika Nallabudha,¹⁷ (c) of Vedāntācārya of Bhāradvājagotra,¹⁸ Harvilāsa by Haridāsa.¹⁹

1 Mys 285-287, 687-7, Sup 12
2 CC, I, 12
3 CC, I, 12
4 CC, I 163. Ho also wrote Vināṭanānḍavāyyāyoga (CC, I 578)
5 CC, I 98
6 CC, I, 118
7 CC, II, 116
8 CC, I 136
9 Mys 281.
10 CC, II 158, 160
11 DO, XXI 8888. He lived at Sripambadur, Chingleput Dī
12 DO, XXI 8634. He lived at Coimbatore
13 DO, XXI 8585 He lived at Tiruvallur, Tanjore Dī. He mentioned various works of his in the prologue mostly stotras in praise of Śiva and Pārvatī.
14 Ed Bombay, DO, XXI, 8889 He lived at Lītumangunta in Guntur Dī
15 DO, XXI, 8410 Enacted at Vāradāṭilakaputta near Sṛngapattam during 'the days of Śāmēṣa, King of Mysore in the later part of the 19th century. He was of Vandavāśi family.'
16 DO, XXI, 8542 He lived at Trochinopoly. He was the author of a commentary on the Madhūrākṣasas, DO, XXI, 8469
17 Tanj. VIII, 8609. He was son of Balacatdrā and Kusumā of Rāmabhādra Dīlāṭa. See IA, XXXIII.
18 Tanj. VIII 8611 He lived under Rāmabhādra Naik of Mādura of the 16th century A D. Enacted at Tirupati.
19 DO, XXI, 8568. He lived at Prandha-Devārayapuram.
Šringārararasabhṛṅgāra by Indraganti Kondasūri, son of Nārāyana,1 Madanālīḍaṃdarpāṇa by Pādmanābha, son of Laksmanā and Venkamāmba.

Kālikēhyatā on the festival of Bhadrakālī at Kotulinga or Cranganoor and Madanamahotsava,2 a satire on contemporary society of Snkantha alias Nanjunda, of Ātreyagotra

Vallavipallavollāsā by Manjulācārya alias Kṛṣṇamūrti Kumāra, of Vasiṣṭhagotra of the Circars, Vasantaḥbhūṣāna by Nṛṣimhasūri, of Vangipuram, Śṛngāracandrika by Sṛńvāṣa, son of Varada of Śrīvaṭsagotra, Anangatilaka by his son Ranganatha, Śṛngāraśanijvana by Sathaṃ Kavi of Bhāradvājagotra, Maḍanālīḍaṃdarpāṇa of Pādmanābha,3 Śṛngāralīłatilaka of Bhāskara.

Pancabāṇavajya by Rangaraya,4 son of Bhāvanācārya of Vāḍhūlagotra, Madanavijaya by Śrīcārya, son of Vikkirāla family of Kālahasti,5 Maḍanābhyudaya of Kṛṣṇamūrti,6 Manmaṣabhṛudaya of Venkatesa.

---

1 To, III. 3175 Enacted at Srisailam in the Circars at the festival of Mallikārjuna He says he also wrote Maḥāsamanasimahṣava, probably a poem.
2 To, III. 3177 Enacted at Benares at Castra festival He was a Telugu Brahmin of Kotipalli, Godavari district. He also wrote the Tripuravijayaḥyoga (Ibid III. 3870) where see for fuller information.
3 DC, XXI. 8988
4 DO, XXI. 8442 He mentioned Clīdambara Kavi as one of his Gurus He lived at Bālavāṃghrapura (Srimulgur).
5 To, III. 3926 There is another anonymous bhāṣpa of this name (Ibid III. 3878).
6 To, III. 3749 He was a native of Paṇḍukasapura (Ponvalanda Kālėttur, Chingleput Dt.) Enacted at festival at Conjeveram.
7 To, III. 2939 He was the daughter's son of Viraṅghava, probably of Conjeveram.
8 To, III. 3173 Enacted at Srisailam.
9 Ibid, III. 304 The author's father migrated to Guttāla on the Godavari from Conjeveram Enacted at the festival of Saṃjñānagopāla at Ellore and was patronised by King Venkatesanarasaṃba, probably of Nusvīd.
10 To, III. 3177 He also wrote Tripuravijayaḥyoga.
11 Printed JSSP, XVII June He was a poet of Kerala patronised by a Sīr Vīrānandaeva.
12 To, II. 2068 Printed, Madras and Calcutta He wrote also Rāmāyaṇacampu and Ranganāyakasūndaryastotp. Enacted at Srisailam.
13 Printed Madras He was Sanskrit Pandit, C. S. Mission College, Vellore.
14 To, II. 2078, III. 3878. He is the author of Yāskollāṣa. See para 319 supra. He was also called Abhinava-Kailāḍā but he was of Vāsāthagotra.
15 To, III. 8268.
Vilāsabhūṣaṇa by Venkata Kṛṣṇa of Bāradvājagoṇa,¹ Caturī candrikā by Venkatārya, son of Saranyapāda,⁴ Śṛngārakoṣa⁵ by Girvāṇendra⁴ and Kandarpadarpaṇa (i) by his son Śrīkṛṣṇa,⁸ and (ii) by Śrīkṛṣṇa, Sṛngāramanjarī by Visvanātha,⁷ Madanavilāsa by Nāganātha,⁸ Kāmnikāmukollāsa⁹

788 Sarada is mentioned by Saluva Narasimha as the authoress of eighteen plays and several poems in Sanskrit and Prakrit

गायकमये काल्याणाद्रिकादि ||
साक माहितकाल्याण साहित्यार्द्धशाळक ||

Rāmābhyaudāya I

789 In Virabhadraṇyaya, Ekambara Diksita gives a pedigree of Kempe Gauda Chiefs of Yelamanka, Mysore (1418-1728 A.D.) and he flourished in the Court of the last of the line, Mummadi Kempe Ganda (1705-1728 A.D.)

790 Like Vatsarāja, Pradhani Venkatabhupati of Mysore wrote plays of different species, Rukmīṇisvayamvara (anka) Kuṇḍmabhārbhaṅgava (prahasanā), Kāmakalāvilāsa (bhāpa) Urvasī-sārvabhūma (jānapa), Vibudhadānava (samavākāra), Vīrāghavavijāya (vīyoga), Siṭakalyāṇa (vīthi), and on poetics Alankāramanidarpaṇa ¹¹

बीणीश्चे सहस्त्र वरतकपरिष्ठैर्व विष्णुवाा
युज्ञे द्वाराजाद्रिकाद्रिकादिह्रिशिक्षात् ।
विश्वाराम कुःमंत्रवरतरमचर्चानिर्निष्ठैस्य च तेजः
पापांश्च शास्त्रेना शरयित हस समुदायदेवे समुन्द ||

1 TC, II, 2223 Probably of the Circle Enacted at the festival of Bhadra-chellam.
2 TC, II 2342 Probably a resident of Tirupati, Chittoor District staged at the festival at Tirupati
3 Tanj VIII 4649, TC, I. 989 He resided at Conjeeveram.
4 Tanj VIII 5855
5 Tanj. VIII 8575
6 Mys. Sup. 13.
7 TC, II. 2618 He was a poet in the Court of Vemayamantrī
8 TC, II. 2669.
9 TC, II. 2619.
11 Mys 274-297, 396 There is Uddhurtavrkoḍara (prakṣaṅga) by Bhāgavata Kṛṣṇa also of Mysore, (Mys. 274).
सेमालब्रह्मतमस्तु वस्तु कुशलस्तोमाय वामालक्षमा- ्
क्षमा। बालुभागलिं वैरेलुकलाचतुष्णीगाधारिकतम। ।
सत्यार्थशुरुबद्धज्ञातकल्मश्रेणीश्चिनधुबिषण- ्
कृपूर्तकन्यकार्मकुणक्षितश्रामक्रियाकोषाज्ञानम्। ॥

लक्ष्मीरेण्याजलच्छेन मुख्या दन्ता चंद्रच्छेन नां ।
सेवोज्ज्ञवैकृत्यमेधयोगवृषि'कृत्वात्तत्वम्। ।
पाणिस्किर्मिविद्यामीविचारिततितव दातु विशो- ्
रालन्याश्चेत्रसंशोधज्ञानम् कश्वती कामरूप, कल्यातम्। ॥

शम्सा०त्रथम विशारमविन सम्मानिविताया रह। ्
सम्मोपायोपान्निनूसारितस्वपननिनानुचैवाचार्थिता। ।
चूःचन्द्रसुलक्षिता मणिमथि दीपिताय हस्तात् यते ।
देवा। प्रेमभाग(र)तपाशबलिता पुष्पा स्थितं पातु ।: ॥

एक तदु धितान समस्तजगतामेणिरुक्ताक्षित ।
कारणयात्तं वहुदिनस्तु व ठहारिधिकासपदम्। ।
खबरेविन पितामहोपि पितुमाननरे च श्रीमता ।
श्रेणाजातिव्यक्तिप्रतिकायते नरे: सहायो गिरिर।॥

विषेषेऽऽव: ई द्वायाविधिमिति पुष्करग्रन्थं पीतं ।
यस्मादनुवा हस्तं विस्थानी सकल दश्तं व्योक्ति देवे:।
कार्यस। कापि विषेषं क च (नू) कम्मवृम्। कार्यनन्त: क ऋठाः: ।
काप्योवें: कापि सतत्व। क च चण मणिमणा कापि नतादिविचकथम्।॥

श्रीमद्भाग समायानितं कमलं तदलंध्वेन व ये- ्
रक्षीत्रिवर्दरूपवालहा तद्विनुरुप सुखा।।
साहवे लतिता वपु: शुभतं भागाभा तदना ।
सुयात्ता शुअगान्ध्रेविवस्ती ती दयती सपदे।॥
CHAPTER XXIII

Sahitya Sastra

791 Sahityasastra in its broadest meaning embraces the science of all poetic art, be it poetry for the eye (ārṣya) or poetry for the ear (sravya), that is, all that a critic (sahṛdaya) would expect in ideal poetic compositions. The words Alankāra and Rasa used by Bharata had come to be collated and annotated by his followers and early writers like Bhāmaha and Dandin, and the result was the advent of an elaborate literature of rhetorical lore, which by the correlation of matter came to embrace many subsidiary thoughts relating to poetry, faultless and meritorious.

Strictly speaking, the word Alankārasastra, though even now understandable in this expanded sphere, was replaced by the word Sahityasastra as early as the 8th to 9th century A D Rājasekhara in his Kāvyamīmāṃsa has:

काव्योपक्रम में लिखित सभ्यता विषय इति कौटिल्य | पन्नस्वय साहित्याविषय इति ग्रामावरीय | सा हि ज्ञातन्त्राय विषयानि निःविन्द | शब्दार्थयोगियात्रु सहभावन साहित्याविषय ||

There have been more than 30 treatises, named with the word Sahitya, and it may be roughly said that latterly the word Alankāra has been used in names of treatises more for a limited sphere of treatment of alankāra (figures of speech) and rasa (sentiment). The word sahitya is “derived from सहित-सम्बन्धाको by the rule समस्यो सहिततत्त्वो meaning coherence, or (?) from सहित-सह हिदेश meaning the quality of that which is attended with good.”

Vīsvanātha’s Sāhityadārpana may be taken as the type of treatises comprehending all spheres of the poetic science, viz

(i) Kāvyalaksana—theory and definition of poetry with reference to its soul (ājman) or essence, rasa, alankāra, rīti, dhvani, vakrokti, &c.

1. On the history of Alankāra literature, see S K De, Sanskrit Poetics, Orientalka, II 207. (The outlines of Rasa theory, from Bharata to Jagannātha), Yamancharyu, Int to Kavyaprakasa, Durgaprasad, Int to Sahityadārpana, P V Kane, IA, XLI 124, Jacobi, ZDMG, LVI, 892, Winternitz, IIL III 4, Medapalli Venkataaramanacarya, Alankaracaritra (in Telugu), and Int to Nātyadārpana and Bhava prakāśana in GOS, BaroJa, V V Sovani, Pre Dhvani Schools of Alankara.
(ii) **Sabdavyapara**—denotation of words abhidhā, lakṣaṇa and vyanjanā, a philosophy of language or Hermeneutics.

(iii) **Nayaka and Nayāli**—hero and heroine and their relations and moods and classes

(iv) **Rasa**—sentiments including their antecedent and resultant emotions

(These two heads cover Kāmaśāstra or erotics)

(v) **Guna and Dosa**—merits and faults of poetry, classes of poetry, dṛṣṭya and sravya, padya and gadya and their varieties

(vi) **Natyasastra**—dramaturgy, all about the drama in its several varieties except the music and the dancing

(vii) **Alankara** proper—figures of speech

These are treatises dealing with all those topics or some or one of them only and all these go under the title Alankrasāstra or Sāhitya-sāstra

To state briefly, therefore, Sāhitya or Alankarasāstra means the Science of poetry. It embraces its sphere, theory of poetry, the origin, form and variety of poet’s work, its faults and merits, and a description of several embellishments which distinguish poetic from unpoeitic compositions. In its widest sense it covers the field of music, dancing and erotics.

792. The earliest literature of the Hindus is poetic and is the natural effusion of man’s instinct. But poetics as a science must be of later origin, for without a volume of poetry (lakṣaṇa) there cannot be a science (lakṣaṇa) dealing with the regulation of its composition. Tradition says that Goddess of Learning, Sarasvati, created Kavyapuruṣa as the Personification of Poetry, and the Creator sent him down to the human world for the propagation of poetics. In 18 chapters, he taught the subject to his seventeen pupils. The several topics were embodied by these disciples in separate treatises, Kavirāhasya by Sahasrākṣa, Auktika by Uktigarbha, Rītinirmaya by Suvarṇāśāsana, Anuprāṣa by Prācetāyana, Yamaka and Cītā by Cītāśāpo, Sabdasiesa by Seśa, Vāṣṭava by Pulaśṭya, Upamā by Aupakṣāya, Aṃśaya by Parāsara, Arthasāsana by Utathya, Ubhayālankārika by Kubera, Vainoḍika by Kāmadeva, Rūpaka by Bharata, Rasadhikāra by Nandā.

---

1. Balaknsib Bhattacharya's *A brief survey of hityasastra* JDJL, Calcutta University, 1933, p. 97 et seq.)
It has been thought fashionable to treat these accounts as fictitious, but when we see that much of the earliest literature has been lost and replaced by later compendia, which, on account of the ease of study, have tended to throw the older treatises into oblivion, it is possible that these traditional accounts are not after all a fraud. Opinions of many of these early writers are noticed in later works and Vātsyāyana in his Kāmasūtras cites some of them for their views.

793 The Samhītas of the Vedas contain much that is poetic and use figures of speech like simile, nature, hyperbole. The essence of all poetic art is thus summed up

"एकशब्दं सम्प्रग्रहे द्वारसु लोके कामशूक भवति""

The supreme Spirit is described as Pleasure, Ananda, and (the embodiment of) Rasa, essence of sweetness. But a regular theory of poetics is not traceable in the Vedic literature.

---

1 See chapter on Kamasutra post.
2 (i) अन्वातीव पुस्प पुति प्रतीची गतांशिव सनये धनानाम् || जातेन पशु घञ्जती द्रुसासा उपासेव निरिताती अति || (Bk, I 124-7)
(ii) धूष्कववेव वस्त्रयो व्योतिरित्वा सारास्येव मंहीमा गमीरः ||
(iii) बास्तकेव रज्जो नाथ्येन स्तोतिमां वसिष्या अन्वेदने व. ||
(iv) तस्मानेचिम निर्वत योध्वानां द्वारायं विचित्रस्यस्यसानिदेशदद्धान्न्त ||
(v) श्राब्दर्षणं सर्वजा सशा योगम सामान नुत परिष्ठितात ||
(vi) तत्वाश्च विषयं सात्विक कंडालित अनभावन्यो अभिश्ाक्षर्थिति || (Bk, VII. 88-8)
(vii) चत्वारि नृष्ण्यो अस्स पादा. कृ श्रीं सत्यस्ततसस अति अति ||
(viii) विषा बन्धु युगों रोश्याति महादेवो मलानविनेभ || (Bk, IV 56-9)
(i) रूप स्मेत्तिविन || (Bk, X 88-6)
(ii) अप्नासनुपप्पन्न वाच्चुः || (Bk X 71-5)
(iii) दुःस्मता वाचः || (Bk, I 98-2)
(iv) ध्रौत रसाः || रसो वै स || भान्द्य पर्वश्च्यो ऋषिः ||
794 Among Puranas Agnipurana has some chapters on poetics. It mentions gesticulations, figures of speech and faults and merits of poetry and describes the figures of speech Yamaka, Citra, Upama, Rupaka, Sahokti, Artantharanyasa, Uprekha, Atisaya, Vibhavana, Vrodha and Hetu. The enumeration is sufficiently scanty that it is quite in keeping with the antiquity of the Puranas. The name of Bharata is cited, but it is not conclusive to determine the relative priority of the extant Natyasastra and these chapters of Agnipurana, because the origin of the name of Bharata and his work is lost in remote antiquity.

795 Yaska speaks of Upama thus:

अथात् उपमा \| यदैव तत्सद्गतिमिति परेऽतदानां कमेव ज्ञायत्वा वा युक्तेन प्रस्वातत्येण \| खण्डीयः \| व्रज्यात् \| उपमस्येन \| अथात् यन्ति यथायः समक्षः \|

796. Panini has

उपभित व्याकरणबद्धत्वमाध्यक्षोऽऽ==II 1.58
उपमानानि सामायत्वविचेन \|--IV 1.55
अत एव चोपमा दूर्यकादिवर्न \|--I IV 1

797 Bharata’s Natyasastra is, as we have it, the earliest work on poetics. Bharata lays down that Rasa is the essence of poetry, though his conception of poetry is dramatic. He enumerates 36 Lakshayas or embellishments, 4 poetic types and 10 poetic merits and faults. But the Lakshayas were either included by later writers, under the heads of Gunas or Alankaras, or classed as Nativirakaras. Guṇa and Alankāra are according to Bharata subsidiary to Rasa.

Bharata thus describes the genesis of Rasa:

अन्तः—यदव्यायायार्थसंविदते विनवादवादवादवादिते देशानपीतक्षेत्याशतां साधं सामायमण्य- योगोनातिशिष्यवेग रससंवादवादसमं पदी व खथिता रससमायमण्यविव्याहारावदिवर्त उपयोगी ... बल्लाषत्वादि

1. Chapter 336-347 S K De (SP. 108-4) says that those chapters are later interpolations copied from Dandin and Bhāmaha. It is too much to say that after the days of Dandin and Bhāmaha, when the Puranas were widely known, any such interpolations could have been contemplated at all. S K De himself admits that the tradition of opinion embodied in the Agnipurāṇa was developed by Bhoja and Bhoja was not an author who could not discover a fraud or would show regard to such a late interpolation.

Mahāvira in the commentary on Kavyaprakāśa says:

अनिपुष्पितिवर्णवर्गा दर्शनाय ग्रंथसाधनायकरण अनिष्कारायथमेतरत्नं कारिकामिः

सत्यप्रणवित

So says Baladeva in his Sahityakaumudi (P.B. 1888, 12.)
The original rasa-sūtra of Bharata has been interpreted in four ways, by Lollata according to Mimāṃsa doctrines, by Sankuka according to Nyāya doctrines, by Bhatta Nāyaka according to Śāṅkhyā doctrines and by Abhinavagupta according to Ālāṅkāra doctrines. Mammata thus sums up the different views (Ullasa IV).

I. The original rasa-sūtra of Bharata has been interpreted in four ways, by Lollata according to Mimāṃsa doctrines, by Sankuka according to Nyāya doctrines, by Bhatta Nāyaka according to Śāṅkhyā doctrines and by Abhinavagupta according to Ālāṅkāra doctrines. Mammata thus sums up the different views (Ullasa IV).

II. The original rasa-sūtra of Bharata has been interpreted in four ways, by Lollata according to Mimāṃsa doctrines, by Sankuka according to Nyāya doctrines, by Bhatta Nāyaka according to Śāṅkhyā doctrines and by Abhinavagupta according to Ālāṅkāra doctrines. Mammata thus sums up the different views (Ullasa IV).

III. The original rasa-sūtra of Bharata has been interpreted in four ways, by Lollata according to Mimāṃsa doctrines, by Sankuka according to Nyāya doctrines, by Bhatta Nāyaka according to Śāṅkhyā doctrines and by Abhinavagupta according to Ālāṅkāra doctrines. Mammata thus sums up the different views (Ullasa IV).

IV. The original rasa-sūtra of Bharata has been interpreted in four ways, by Lollata according to Mimāṃsa doctrines, by Sankuka according to Nyāya doctrines, by Bhatta Nāyaka according to Śāṅkhyā doctrines and by Abhinavagupta according to Ālāṅkāra doctrines. Mammata thus sums up the different views (Ullasa IV).

(Vamanacarya’s Edn pp 161-1).
By the beginning of the Christian era, the study of poetics had well progressed and we hear of various writers of whom we have references in citations. For instance, there are Kāśyapa, Kapila, Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa, Mañjula, Rāhula, Sākalarāja, Mātrgupta, Priyājīti, Sumanas, Nandiswāmi, and Prabhmanandin. These writers must have so far speculated on poetics, as to recognise modifications in the views propounded in Natyasastra. The result of this advance in poetic criticism was the immediate advent of distinct schools of thought of Bhāmaha and Dandin and the possibility of newer schools in the coming centuries.

Bhāmaha is called the founder of Alankāra school. According to him Vakrokti is all in poetry.

By Vakrokti Bhāmaha meant all poetic expression other than natural, that is, all adorned expression as opposed to naked Vakrokti, said Bhāmaha, was the means by which the meaning was rendered assimilable or delectable; in short Vakrokti flashes Rasa. Rasa is therefore subordinate to Alankāra and Alankāra is founded on Vakrokti. The idea of Vakrokti was carried to an extreme by Kuntalika and his Vakroktījūtaḥ enunciates the theory that Vakrokti is the life of poetry and that comprehends in it other characteristics of poetry, Alankāra and Ṛṣi. But before him Udibhata had kept himself within reasonable limits and accepted Bhāmaha’s general theory, except in some subordinate details of definitions and classifications, and on Bhāmaha’s work he wrote a commentary. To this school also belongs Mukula and Pratihārendūrā who commented on Udibhata’s work.

Alongside of this theory of Alankāra, there was the growing thought that Rīti or style, as a consideration in composition, was not negligible. Bhāmaha mentioned Vañdarbhi and Gaudīya styles as made melodious and flowing words, but said they wanted imaginative charm. Dandin expanded the scope of Rīti and said that Vañdarbhi for instance is not made by a mere jumble of letters or words but must contain

1. See for more details Chapter on Natyaśāstra post

2. दक्षिण: काव्यकीलितम्

3. श्रेष्ठान्त सहितत वक्ताविक्यापार्यालिनि
   कविये व्यवस्थिते काव्ये तद्विद्याहारायणिः
pleasurable ideas. He elaborated the characteristics of two styles, Vaiśāraṇī and Gauḍīya, and while the former was tender and charming the latter was harsh and boisterous, each being suited to the expression of particular sentiments. What Bhaṭṭa called Alankāra, Dandin called Guna. Dandin says that Gūṇas pertain to the soul of poetry and that Alankāras are "those attributes which produce charm in poetry" and all Alankāras endow the sense with Rasa. While Bhaṭṭa subordinated Rasa to Alankāra, Dandin subordinated these to Rīti. And they spoke of Rasa, Bhāva etc., as Rasavā, Preyas, Uṛjasvān,

801 But it was VAMANA who expressly declared that style is the soul of poetry and Rīti is the composition of words of superior excellence. Vāmana however saw that mere style unaccompanied by other embellishments would not make good poetry. He included Alankāra and Rasa among the necessary qualities (Guna) of poetry and those qualities he classed as formal and essential, for he called Rasa as an essential feature of Kānṭi-guṇa. He differed from Dandin in saying that Gūṇas are those attributes which produce charm in poetry, while Alankāras enhance the charm.

802 During the period of the progress of the Alankāra and rīti theories, Bhaṭṭa’s theory of Rasa had not lost its charm. Udbhata still admired it and he wrote a commentary on Nāṭyasāstra. But he was influenced by the views of Bhaṭṭa, for he assigned the same place to rasa as Bhaṭṭa did though he appreciated that Bhāvas were needed to realise rasa more critically. He mentioned a fourth Rasalankāra, Samāhita. He recognised Sāṅgaraṣa as suitable for the drama as for the poem. Rudrāṅga championed rasa, as of universal merit, that is, not merely in dramas but in poems too; a poem devoid of rasa is no more than an insipid sāṣṭra. He mentioned nine rasas and one more preyas.

Rudrabhatta expressed a similar view in his Śrīnārāṭilaka. 

---

1 Kāvyālankārasangraha I, 81—84
2 अर्थशास्त्रिकारारंगतात्परकावयित्वमात्र ॥ इति कौमारारसांस्कृतम् ग्रन्थम् दश ॥ गुणास्मृता ॥
   —Kavyādatta, I, 4
3 काव्यशोभकारानुपरन्नुपर
4 Kāvyālankāra, XII 2, 4
5 Kāvyālankāra, XII 2, 4
6 I, 56
803  From the earliest times, speculation was rise among rhetoricians on the grammatical rectitude and the exegetical interpretations of expressions in poetics. For instance, Upamā or comparison is of various kinds, comprehending in it various Alankāras, which have been given distinct names by later writers. Even in Upamā proper, there are several classes, according to the particle of similitude is expressed or implied. Grammar was described as father of poetry by Bhāmaha thought it necessary to devote a whole chapter on grammatical forms adaptable in poetry. Vāmana did the same. The theory of speech and meaning has always been a point of difference among the several schools of philosophy in India, that is, to state shortly, whether the real meaning of a word is want is expressed or what is comprehended by way of suggestion and inference, that is, in Sādhārana they differed. This difference has led rhetoricians to distinguish between the merits of abhidā and lakṣāṇā, expression and implication on the lines of propounded by grammatical philosophers. The result of the expansion of these disquisitions was a close alliance in the study of poetics and grammar and in the next stage of progress, a third function of words, namely vyājanā, was conceived on the analogy of the theory of Sphota.

804  The theory of Sphota, briefly stated, is that sphota or dhvam is the characteristic capacity of words to signify their import. It is attributed to the grammaman Sphotāyana, a predecessor of Pāṇini and it attained its perfection in Bharṭarhi's Vākavapadiya. Anandavardhana adopted this theory and applied it to poetics. He rejected the earlier theories of rasa, alankāra and rita, so far as each claimed to be the soul of poetry and propounded that vyājanā or dhvam is the soul of poetry. This Rasaśāstra theory of Anandavardhana "differs from the original theory of Rasa as formulated in the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata in two points. According to the former the Rasas are enjoyed by the audience only, being suggested by the words, but according to the latter the factors vibhāva, etc. whether expressed or suggested by the words create the pleasure in the minds of the audience (विभावायद्वाक्यविशालिनिनिशाचि). Moreover, the chief function of poetry according to Anandavardhana is to suggest the sense of Rasas, Alankāras and plots for Vāstu as applied to both the poems and dramas. Bharata holds that the best form of poetry is that where the representations of Vībhavas, etc. before the audience create the aesthetic pleasure in their minds."

It cannot be said that vyājanā was a discovery of Anandavardhana. Bhāmaha and Qandin saw that a suggested sense was always there in
Samāsokti, Apraṣṭutaprasamsā, Vyājaśuti etc Bharata and Udbhata included dhvam in Paryāyokta. So did Rudra. Vāmana included it in Vakrokti, which he defined as ‘suggestion founded on similarity’. But with these writers, the suggested sense (vyānjita) was ancillary to the expressed (vācyā).

805 According to Anandaavardhana Dhvam is supreme in characterising good poetry. Dhvam literally means suggestion. The poet expresses an idea in a sentence and to the readers’ mind flashes an idea not actually expressed by the words, but implied or suggested by them. Dhvam is the result of the function vyānjana, as opposed to abhidhā or lakṣaṇā. Dhvam is the soul, Gunas like mādhurya, ojas &c are the properties of the soul of poetry, as bravery is the property of the human mind, and Alankāras are ornaments which enhance the charm of poetry, as ornaments of gold set off a person’s beauty. Poetry is classed under three heads, Dhvam, where the suggested sense is prominent, Guṇi-bhūtavavyangya, where it is not prominent, and Citra where it is not manifest.

806 The Dhvam theory was not applauded by all. There were still the admirers of Rasa. Pratiharenduranāja wrote Laghuvarṇṭī on Udbhata. He said that Dhvam was implied in Alankāras like slesa, rasavat and paryāyokta, and reiterated that rasa was the soul of poetry. He differed from Bhāmaha in refusing to include Rasas among Alankāras.

(1) एवेतदार्थाकत्व वर्षयोक्तादिसवतक्तम: ||
(2) रसायनिशिटत कौष्ठी जीववेदुपत्य यत: ||
कष्टाते हर्षादीनां काय्यानवत्त व्यवस्थितम: ॥

वषु रसादीना पूर्णवाळकारस्वल तदेवविधेयद्विवृक्षया ॥

807 Bhattanāyaka was a devout follower of Bharata. Starting from Bharata’s explanation of bhāva, vibhāva &c he said that besides abhidhā, which is the only operating function in Vedas and Śāstras, there are two other functions bhāvakta and bhojakaṇṭha in all kāvyas, dṛṣṭya or sravya, from which emanates the aesthetic pleasure in the minds of audience.

Bhoja thought it was good poetry, if it was free from blemishes and if it had the merit of guṇa, alankāra and rasa.

808 Dhananjaya and Dhanika did not recognise dhvam at all. Dhanika answered criticisms of Bhattanāyaka’s views and held that Tātparyasakti, desire for expression and understanding “not only
makes the hearer understand the meaning of the sentence but also actuates him to act according to the sense of the sentence, not only to make the reader or the spectator understand the vibhāva, etc., from the poetry, but also to act accordingly. This activity is nothing but the enjoyment of the aesthetic pleasure thus the poetry becomes Bhāvaka of the Rasāvāda through the lātṛparākṣa, and therefore, no dhvani or vyayanāvypta as the chief function of the poetry is necessary. The connection between the Kāvya and Rasa according to Dhanika is Bhāvyabhāvakabhāva and not Vajanyavajyakabhāva as formulated by the Dhvani school. This kind of connection according to him is different from the Janyajanakabhāva as held by the Naiyikas (Asatkāryavādins) because rasas already exist in an appreciative mind in the form of permanent moods (Bhājavatā) " Dhananjaya did not adopt sānta as a rasa.

809 The theory of Dhvani however soon gained prominence and obtained recognition. Adhinavagupta’s erudition gave fresh vigour to it and his Locana stands as it were an original treatise on Dhvani. But the theory was again assailed with vehemence. Kunjaka in his Vakroktijīvita said dhvani was included in Vakrokti Mahabhājita did not brook the insolence against logicians and in a mood of revenge set up his theory Anumāna or Kavyanumīti. In his Vyaktiviveka, he attempted to demolish the various theories of poets and said that anumāna or inference was all-pervasive and in it was embraced dhvani or whatever was attributed to it.

810 Vidyadhara was a follower of Anandavarsadhana. He refuted the views of Bhāmaha and others who denied dhvani, Dhvanyabhāvavādins. He refers to Bhāmaha and Rudrata and Mahimē as Anantarbhāvavādins viz. dhvani is comprehended in guṇa and alankāra and is not different from anumāna, and to Bhatta Lollata as Dirghavāyāpāravādin, viz., the expressive power of words reaches very far like that of arrows.

811 By the time of Mammata, Dhvani attained a firm stand, but the earlier theories of alankāra, rasa and rītī were still in the field for Bhoja and his erudite circle gave them prominence. Mammata therefore thought it prudent to define poetry in more comprehensive terms, keeping Dhvani as the foremost quality and appending to it the essentials of alankāra and rasa, with a better recognition. "Mammata was influenced by Vāmana (III 1-1-3) although Mammata considered gunas as primary attributes of rasas and only secondarily of letters. To a
less extent he was influenced by the alankāra school, as he allows a Kāvyya to be devoid of alankaras in a few cases. However, Bhamaha's Vakrokti does appear in Kavyaprakāsa under the name of Praudhokti. Bemg as it were a compromise of the existing theories, without giving up the accepted superiority of Dhvani, all the same, Mammata's views have been considered the perfectest theory of poetry and during these long centuries they have not lost their appreciation. In the mode of exposition and in the classification of the subject, his work has been the standard and many rhetoricians of repute thought it a merit in them to compose commentaries on Mammata's Kāvyaprakāsa, though they expressed their views in independent treatises on poetics. Except in the way of further illustrations, newer definitions and keener classifications the science of poetry as described by Mammata has remained unaffected.

812 The views of different rhetoricians have thus been summed up by Ruyyaka in his Alankārasarvasva.
813 Samudrakandha in his commentary on Alankarasrasvasva has another classification of these poetical theories, (TSS, p 4) into five schools

Vāmanācārya (Int Kāvyaprakāśa, p 24) thus summarises the views briefly

युनाकारुक्तो यवन्यां कायथमिति वामनभत्वम्।
अदोपवालिष्किविषिष्कुवाद तौ कायथमिति समस्तभस्तम्।
एवमेव वनाकरस्तम्।
निद्रोष्य युनाकारस्तवत् वाक्य कायथमिति मोजस्तम्।
युनाकारार्थोत्सोपेत् साधुवार्थस्वदसी। कायथमिति वामस्थस्तम्।
निद्रोष्य युनाकारक्रमीकारीतितियतीतितितत् वाक्य कायथमिति पूर्ववर्षमयस्तम्।
सादिमदायकं कायथमिति चौदेवकितिस्तम्।
एवमेव विश्वनाथदिमश्यम्।
इत्यादिपि पदाल्पकी कायथमिति द्रवितमस्तम्।
सप्तियमद्यमतिपदविकश्यम् कायथमिति जगजानस्तम्।
ब्याधातस्तव वाक्य कायथमिति महिमस्तम्।
रत्नाकारस्तूते द्वायाविशेषावाचव वा कायथमिति केशवभस्यस्तम्।
The following extracts from P V Kane's 'Outlines of History of Alankara Literature' (IA, XLI 124, 204) will be of interest

"The most ancient basis of classification appears to have been very simple. Figures of speech were divided into two classes those that depend for their charm on words alone and those in which the beauty is seen in the sense alone. This division of the figures of speech is the only one that is found in ancient writings on Alankāra. Bharata does not speak of it in his Natya-Sastra. Dandm tacitly recognizes it, as much as he treats of Arthalankaras in the second Panchcheda and of Sabdalankaras in the third. Both Bhamaha and Udbhata do not explicitly divide Alankaras into two varieties, but they seem to have had the twofold division in mind, for Bhamaha first speaks of Anuprasa and Yamaka and then of figures that are regarded by all as Alankaras of Artha. Udbhata similarly speaks of Punaruktavada-bhasa and Anuprasa first and then of Arthalankaras. Vamana speaks of Sabdalankaras in the fourth Adhikarana (1st Adhyaya) of his work and of Arthalankaras in the second and third Adhyayas of the same Adhikarana. Rudrata, Mammata, Ruyyaka and most subsequent writers recognize this twofold division of figures of speech.

Some writers, however, propose a division which is a little more elaborate. Alankaras, according to them, are either of Sabda, or of Artha, or of both. Bhoja in his Sarasvatinabhahabarana enumerates twenty-four Alankaras of each. It is worthy of note that he regards Upama, Rupaka, etc., as Alankaras of both Sabda and Artha (and not of artha alone, as said by almost all other writers).

The number of Sabdalankaras has never been very large. Most writers, such as Dandin, Bhamaha, Udbhata, speak of two or three. The largest number is that mentioned by Bhoja, viz., 24. The ancient works of Alankara paid a good deal of attention to Sabdalankaras, but as critical insight grew, the Alankaras of words dwindled into insignificance.

Unlike Sabdalankaras, the number of Arthalankaras has generally been large and has been subject to great fluctuations. We may safely affirm that as a general rule, the more ancient a writer is, the fewer is the number of figures treated of by him. Bharata speaks of only four Alankaras. Dandin, Bhatti, Bhamaha, Udbhata and Vamana treat of from thirty to forty figures. Mammata speaks of more than sixty, while Ruyyaka adds a few more. The Chandraloka (13th century) speaks of a hundred figures of speech, to which the Kuvalayananda adds about a
score more. This is the highest number known to us. Jagannatha prefers a smaller number of figures, although he is later than the author of Kuvalayananda. If for some slight difference a different figure of speech were to be defined there would be no end of figures, as remarked by Dandin.

In the ancient writers there is no basis of division. Dandin, Bhamaha, Vamana and Udbhata give no classification of the figures of sense. They generally first speak of Upama and some other Alamkaras based upon it and the rest are treated at random; e.g., Dandin puts Vibhavana between Vyatireka and Samasokti. It is Rudrata who first gives a fourfold division of Arthalamkaras. Mammata seems to have had in view no scientific basis of division. The Alamkara-Sarvasva gives first of all, the figures based upon Aupamya (resemblance); then those based upon Virodha (contradiction); then those based upon Srinkhala (chain), such as Karanamala, Maladipaka, Ekavali; then the figures based upon Tarka-Nyaya, Kavya-Nyaya and Loka-Nyaya; then the figures based upon the apprehension of a hidden sense; and lastly based upon the combination of figures such as Samkara and Sansrishti. The Ekavali, the Prapaparudriya and the Sahityadarpuna generally follow the classification. Jagannatha also speaks of figures based upon Aupamya, Virodha and Srinkhala. From Kavyalinga downwards he does not mention any express basis of classification but appears to have followed in the main the Alamkara-Sarvasva.”
CHAPTER XXIV

Alankara

814 Alankara-Sutras Every science, Sastra, in India has its sūtra, vṛtti and Bhāya. So has Alankārasūtra Sauddhodani is mentioned by Kesava as an author of Alankārasūtras, and it was on the Kārikas of Sauddhodani that Kesava commented in his Alankārāsekhara. Mammata’s Kavyaparakāśi have been considered, mostly in Bengal, as embracing the original Bharata’s Alankārasūtras, on which Mammata wrote a vṛtti called Kavyaparakāsa. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana took these Kārikas as Bharataṣūtras and wrote his commentary on them Sāhityakaumudi in the 18th century. Bharata, it is said to the contrary, wrote sūtras relating to rasa etc., in nātya and not sūtras for Alankāra, but these sūtras are but rarely preserved in the extant Nātyasaṅgrāha. Pāṇini mentions Natasūtras of Śilātin.

Alankārasūtras of unknown authorship have been commented upon by Sophaka in his Alankāraraṭnakāra. Sophakāra was son of

1. Abhayabhimāruskarā ora svagānta nāḍāritadini. Kāvyakāśikā sādārasyādyam. (IV m. 10)

Several other authors call these Kārikas sūtras

1. Udāharaṇepu ṛtastvāṭūtrautamāṇi māṇḍavagāmāḥ-Mahēśvara
2. Sūtras Prāscīrāparṇa pūraṇapraśānātoḥ Mahāsena.
3. Sūtrakāratāsūrasāhaṅgasaḥ—Valīyānātha
5. Sūtra Chālpānāparataḥ bāgyam—Nagolībhatta
6. Sūtras Sārthakāsarṇaṅgitalāṅgīni mitavipūrṇaṁ ṛṣṭi maṇḍavagām. (IV m. 11)

7. Māyā, bhāya.
Trayisvarasura and lived about the 12th century AD. He is quoted by Jagannatha. These sutras have been extracted and illustrated by Yasaskara in his Devistotra, a poem of devotion. Yasaskara was a poet of Kāśmirī. On account of ill-health, he spent much of his time at the sanatorium on the hill Pradyuman and there on the spot held sacred on account of the final ascent of King Pravara to Heaven in bodily form, he composed his Devistotra.

There are again Kavyālankārasūtras on which Vāmana wrote his own Vṛṣṭi and Ruyakā. Alankārasūtra on which Maskha wrote vṛṣṭi. Alankārasarvasva. Jayaratha mentions an Alankāravārtika in his commentary on Alankārasarvasva (p 71).

Bhamaha was the son of Raknī Gomin. Maskari was probably his son. From the word Gomin and from the salutation to Sarva Sarvagna at the commencement of his work it has been said he was a Buddhist. Cauḍa in his grammar mentions Gomin as a termination of respect. The epithets Sarva and Sarvagna have been used for various divine incarnations without limitation. Bhamaha's reverence to the Hindu pantheon and his elegant references to heroes of Rūmāyana, Mahābhārata, and Purānas indicate more properly his Vedānta persuasion. This surmise is supported by Bhamaha's scathing criticism of Buddhist theory of Anyāpoha.

1 PR, I 12
2 This health resort is mentioned in Raj III 045
3 PR, I 77 (where the sutras are all extracted)
4 He says so in his commentary on Caṇḍama Dharmasūtra.
5 बैशाक्षाचन्द्रादिशितम्
6 प्राप्तस्य सावः संभवः
7 II 38, III II 32, 36, IV 21, 23, V 44
8 III 7, V 36, 39, 41, 42, 43
9 III 5, 42 V 59.
10 VI 16, 17
On the relative priority of Bhāmama and Dandin, there has been divergence of opinion. But the assertiveness of Dandin's expression of dissent in relation to views of Bhāmama on particular topics indicates his posteriority. It is possible that Bhāmama was an elder contemporary of Dandin and Bhāmama was an author whose opinions were then fresh in the minds of the readers which Dandin thought ought to be controverted before they gained a place of honor.

From illustrations of Alankāras and from their number and significance it is conjectured that Bhatti came after Bhāmama.

If Dandin flourished about the beginning of the 7th century, Bhāmama can be safely placed in the 6th century A.D.

Bhāmama composed his Kāvyālankāra after an investigation of the thoughts of good poets for the instruction of the virtuous and the making of faultless poetry facilitates the pursuit of the Puru-

\[1\] For details of arguments about the priority of Bhāmama to Dandin, see Trivedi's introduction to Prataparudrayasaobhusana, M Rangasharma's Introduction to Kavyadarśa, Anantaoharya in Brahmadeo (1911), B Namasmbhchara, Ind Ant, XLI 29 and Medepalli Venkataramacharya's History of Alankārasastra (in Telugu). Truvagāvaspati, in his commentary on Kavyadarśa (I 29, II 286 7, IV 4) distinctly says that Dandin criticises Bhāmama. See S K De's SP, I 45 62. For a contrary opinion, see P V Kano, JRAS, (1908) 545, IA, XLI 12-98, Patilak, JB RAS, XXIII 19, IA, XLII 222, M T Narsambha Ayangar, JRAS, (1910) 583, Barnett, JRAS (1910) 841, D T Tattacarya, Int to Edn. While Bhāmama mentions that Upamā should not be divided into several categories as Nindopama, Prasamsopama, etc., and that all such varietas should come under śāmānyaguna, these scholars see in it a criticism of Dandin's long list of varieties of Upamā.

2 See A Rangasami Sarasvati, JMy, III 682

3 For the list of Alankāras illustrated in Canto X, see JRAS, (1929), 830 et seq.

On this question there is a difference of opinion. See para 42 supra.

4 Ganapathi Sastri, in his introduction to Svapnotavada (TSS, No 15 p XXIV), places Bhāmama far earlier than Kālidāsa and in the 1st century B.C. See III, 84 and I, 49, where references to Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṃśa, XVI 7, 8 and Megha, I, are indicated. S K De, (SP, I 49) places him in 73 8 century A.D.

5 Printed by K P Trivedi, as appendix to Prataparudrayasaobhusana (BSS), Ed by P V Nageshastri with translation, Tanjore, Ed D T Tattacarya with Viṣṭil, Trivedi, Tanjore
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sarthas and leads on to pleasure and celebrity. His instruction for choice of words and their disposition is an enchanting instance of his esthetics.

His humility is in keeping with his dignity and he leaves his homage to the Goddess of Poetry unmindful of his deserts.

In six chapters, he deals with six topics, Kavyasarita, Alankara, Dosha, Nyaya and Sabdasuddhi. His veneration for Pāṇini is supreme and his description of the Ocean of Vyakarana reminds us of the garlands of metaphors which is Vālmīki's peculiar glory.

By his assertive expression and courageous criticism he displays the ardour of his study and the range of his learning. He disapproves.
as unnatural and improbable of the use of inanimate objects as messengers of love and the story of the capture of Vāsaraṇa by the lure of a false elephant. He condemns the Sphota theorists with disdain

The illustrations are all Bhāmaha's except where he quotes expressly from other authors. He says

Bhāmaha is called the founder of Alankāra school. According to him Vakrokti is the character of poetry

This verse of Bhāmaha has been quoted by later writers, and Bhāmaha also states it in other words

And Abhinavagupta thus explains it

It cannot therefore be said that Bhāmaha was an opponent of the existence of Dīvani, though indeed Mallinātha called him Dīvanya-bhāva-vādīn

Ānandavardhana appreciates Bhāmaha's views:

Ruyyaka thus sums up Bhāmaha's views:

Among the authors and works mentioned by Bhāmaha are Nyāsa-
kāra, Medhāvīn, Sakhavardhana, Ratañharaṇa, Rāmasarman’s Acyutottara, Asmakavamsa and Rājāmiṭra

It is a matter of controversy whether the Nyāsakāra was Jānendrabuddhi. Namisādhu mentions Medhāvīn as a writer on Alankāra and adds

śāstraḥ swhāmopādānaḥ svarṣaḥ varāntar iti mahāvāyisālayisvarātisvarakṣuma yātka śāstraḥ varāntar hīntaṅkhyāyakamānaye vijñeyojaśadhāyamītī satyopamaadāyā, tadātmaścātma.

Medhāvīn is probably identical with Medhīvi Rādha, whom Rājasēkhara instances as a poet born blind and one of the three Kāñḍasas (Kāñḍaṣṭraya) mentioned by Rājasēkhara. The Lexicon Tārikandaśa gives it as a synonym of Kāndasā.

Rāmasarman’s poetry is thus described

नानाध्यात्मालग्नसीर्समकाल्यपदेशिनी।

त्रेशिन्क्रा सा चुडिता राममोचिद्वा। II 19

Sakhavardhana’s verse is fine

निमेघुरासादिव तस्य दीना चरा धनुष्कंदलमध्यसाज।

जान्दवस्माना इव वारियारा विनाध्यासाज परिषेष्ठिनोबार। II 47

and the same verse is quoted anonymously by Namisādhu and Māmata

On the style of Asmakavamsa there is this comment

नन्द चास्मकवशादि वास्मर्मिति कथयते। I 33

From Rājāmiṭra, there is an instance taken to illustrate the figure samāṁśita

1 1 पूर्ण उपमादोपास्तमेवाविनंदनता। I. 40

2 His verse

निमेघुरासादिव तस्य दीना चरा धनुष्कंदलमध्यसाज।

जान्दवस्माना इव वारियारा विनाध्यासाज परिषेष्ठिनोबार। II 47

is quoted to illustrate the fault Aṣambhava.

3 His verse

सपूतवासा मर्महत्याकारोऽयोज्यमार्ग बिपुरायः कः।

शवत्तैवावनुवाचियसा समुपयमानविनोितिवे च। II 57

is instanced for उपमाने अविधपदवम्।

4 On this see K. B. Pathak’s Bhamaha’s attacks on Jānendrabuddhi (JBRAS, XXII 18), P. V. Kane, Bhamaha, Bhāsa and Magha (Ibid 91) and K. P. Trivedi, (IA, XLIII, 204, 207)
Bhamaha refers to Nanda and Cānakya thus,
वाणस्ये नन्दत्वायांस्यस्यस्माधुर्याय नाथ ||—III 13

Bhamaha has been honoured in the history of poetics as an Ācārya of antiquity and renown. Vidyānātha wrote

वृद्धि-निष्ठाय नामादिस्य सादर विहितावधि ||

Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Vāmana and Mammata and others quote his views and verses with distinction.

Udbhata’s gloss, Bhāmahavivarana, is now lost.¹

In the prefatory eulogies to his commentary on Kavyaprakāsa Bhatta Gopāla wrote

उद्भटनाथिन नामसंग नायक्येपदावधि ||
इति नाम इव श्रीनाथपायस्यपरमपि सामह ||

Is it possible that Bhātānāyaka also composed a commentary on Bhamaha’s Kavyalankāra, as Udbhata did?

It is suspected that Bhamaha wrote a later work on rhetoric with greater completeness, for we have in Rasikarasāyanam,² which goes under his name, an elaborate treatment in seven parakarana of all topics embraced in poetics. The exposition of the Nātyālankaras of Bharata is particularly good. But a distinction must be made between the Kārikas and the Vyākhyās. If these Kārikas could have been the

¹ In his commentary on Udbhata’s Kavyalankāsamgraha Pratihārenātraṇa says,

विभेदकालिनकान्ते तथा महाविखरवरणे महोदयेन युक्तदेशवत्त एष व्याख्यात ... ... .

Abhinavagupta in his Locana (p 10) says

मामुदोत ‘शब्ददेशवत्तोपिनिकायार्’ इलामिचारस्य शब्दादु सेव व्याख्यात अन्तर्भूतो बमारे ||

Hemacandra in his Kavyalankārasaṅgahāra (p 110) says

तस्मातानहत्त्रिकामाण्डे शुक्लकालास्य शति महाविखरवरणे गद्दीर्वात्स्यवादान्तः तत्तिर्भवः ||

and Bṇuyaka in Alankārasārasamaya (p. 183) says

अथे व शब्दादिवाकारातः (1)वैति तथा हेतुरु प्रवक्ष्यते मामाही || वाचायमानाक्षुवः चा विशिष्टिति चोज्जनकान्ते ||

² MPG 308
work of Bhāmaha Vṛtti must have been anonymously written later than the 12th century A.D., for it mentions Kīvyaprakāśa and Bhāvaprakāśa and quotes Mālatīmādhava.

In spite of the attempts of scholars to get a complete manuscript of Bhāmaha's work, it is still suspected that these editions are not yet the last word. For instance in Loc. ma, Abhinavagupta writes

प्रागो यहांगत कृयामवादिकिदित्वं यथा |
अष्ट या मम गोविन्द जाता चर्म यहांगते |
कालेन प्रेमसन्तितसंवाचाननात जन ||—III. 5

But in the extent editions, we see only one verse delineating the Love for Devas

प्रेमो यहांगत कृयामवादिकिदित्वं यथा |
अष्ट या मम गोविन्द जाता चर्म यहांगते |
कालेन प्रेमसन्तितसंवाचाननात जन पुन ||

There is an indication that Bhāmaha wrote also a work on metrics. Rāghavabhatta in his commentary on Sukanṭalī quotes:

तद्वक सामहेन—

देवता वाणका श्रद्धा ये च सर्वदीवस्वका |
ते सर्व नैव निवा मुलिपितो गणतांगि वा ||

क्षरो गो चतुर कल्पित विषयो इत्यथा च सुख से |
भीति जो बिच्छाय मयमरणकरी त्वरि द्विती खेदितु के ||

बश्योमात विशेष अर्थ्यात्म स गण्त सुख थथ युर्द |
दो घु. सौभ्य सुन्द न मुखमयमरणक्षबुल्क पवर्गे ||

यो कश्य रथ दाह व्यसनस्थ वर्णो दससुख यथ वेद |
सत्सीम्य हि तेद विलयमारि च द्व ज्ञातस्यति कराति ||

सुधाकर अन्य दाह सुखसाधनपुर्वेणविन्यासया (?)
पथार्ग गयावेके वचसि च साह साहतादी स्मोदयु ||

And if these two authors are identical, this work on metrics appears to be an extensive treatise on the topic.

Here are some fine specimens of Bhāmaha's poetry

तात्त्विकारागलय स्तुरद्रवनविति |
हङ्गोविरासनिनय तपेव बदन तं || III 46

वशस्मिति मणिम "पुनितिस्वय शाहिलसिं " |
इन्हेल समीरवनि वांचेस्वलक्ते यथा || V 64.
Dandin a Kavyadarsa, in four parts, is a standard treatise on poetics and belongs to the school, for which rith or style is the mark of poetry. It deals with only two styles Gaudi (learned) and Vaidarbbi (simple) but allows intermediate types. The first part treats of the nature of poetry and classification of poems, the second and third parts with figures of speech and poetical devices and the fourth part with the faults of poetry. It refers to Setubandha and quite often differs from opinions must probably of Bhāmaha. Very soon it attained great eminence and as early as the eighth century AD it was copied in the Kannarese work on Alankāra, Kavirājamargavijaya of Amoghavarṣa or Nyapātunga.

There are commentaries on Kavyadarsa by Vādighanghāladeva.

1. Ed by Premacandra Tarkavagisa, (Jib Ind) Ed by Bohlen (Leipsig) with German translation by Jhananda (Calcutta) Tr in English (Poona) On Agashe’s doubt on the identity of the authors of Kavyādāra and Daśakumāracerīja, see IA, XLIV 67, S K De, Bharava and Dandin, (IbQ, I)

2. The four vibhagas (parts) are called marga arthāłamkāra, sabdāłamkāra and doṣa

3. Kavyādāra, I 34, also to a work called Kalāpanosheja

4. On the relative priority of Bhāmaha and Dandin see para 816 supra S K De, A note on Avantisundardīrīka in relation to Bhāmaha and Dandin, IBQ, III 395

5. Ed with notes and translation by V Krishnamachiar and V Hanumantha chariar, Madras TQ, III 3939, SKO, 01, 970

There is a copper plate grant of Ganges King Mārasimha dated 963 A D to a Jain Scholar Munjūra who had the title “Vadighanghālabhatta” (See Mys Arch Rep. 1931)

The contents of this plate and 6 other plates are described by R Narasimhacarya in his paper “The Western Gangas of Talkad,” published in the J Mythic Society,

Bangalore Ganga genealogy from Kong światmaratio Masāsimhaḍe (Satyavakya) is given there. See EI, IV 141, Mys Arch Rep 1919, Ep Car X, Kolar 90. In commenting upon Kavyāḍāra, II 979, he says

रात्रि (२) वर्णश्री होति रात्रिहृदि नाम

and that verse is from Keralavāmsakārā In mentioning previous rhetoricians I 2 he names Brhadāśāstra, Nandīśwami etc. He refers to Kusumamānjarī an Ākhyāyikā Rāggāyana and Agāshe read Rājayārvana and he referring to Rājendravarma varman alas Nārsimhamārvana II of Kācnī whose titles Kālakāra Dandin is said to have alluded to in Kavyāḍāra (III 80) Mahāvānava (Ibid IV 25) is said to be a from referring to the royal token of Calukya Pulakesin II S K De, (SP, II 72) says "But the passage under discussion looks like a reference to a legendary rather than a contemporary prince and as Pischek suggested the entire verse 278 may have been taken directly from a work relating to history." 1

1 Ed Madras by M Rangacharya with an introduction DC, XXII 8635. Tarunavācaspati and Vādīghānghāa say in their commentary on I 29, II 235 and IV 4 that Dandin there refers Bhāmaha Tarunavācaspati quotes Rhoja and the Jain poet Hastimalla and is quoted in an anonymous Subhatsāgarāha, probably of the 16th century. Poet Hastimalla referred to by him is probably the Jain dramatist (See S K De, SP, II 72) The name is given as Dharmanavācaspati in Opp 2581

2 Ed BSS, Bombay
3 Printed, Calcutta
4 Printed, Calcutta.

5 Ed Madras DC, XXII 8638. It is called Hrdyaṅgama In the commentary on I 2 it is stated that before Dandin, Kāśyapa and Vararuci had written works on Alankāra and Kālidāsa had produced his poem. The second anonymous commentary is extant only to the 1st Paraccheda and seems to be an ancient work. This quotes the first verse of Prapīṇāyaṅgandharāyaṇa. For the third, see Matra, 297, CSCO, VII 21

6 PR, VI 20 (Bod 208) He was son of Visvādhara and wrote a commentary on Sarasvatikāṇṭhābhāṣya He cites Kāśyapārāja

7 CO, I 102 Nṛṣimha was the son of Godābhara and grandson of Kṛṣṇapārma

8 Hararaprasad Sastri's report (1896 00) and Haraprasad Sastri's Notices, second series, IV He was a Jain and was also known as Vāgīśimha

9 Hall's Index, 83

10 ICC, No 1497

11 CO, II 20. He is referred to by Visvādhara in Alankāra-kōṣṭhā (69) He is different from Kolacala Mallanātha

12 CO, I 103, Opp. 4119
817 **Dharmakirti** is an old writer on Alankāra. He was a Buddhist philosopher. He commented on Dignāga’s Pramāṇa samacāya and wrote several other works on Buddhist philosophy. His Buddhanirvāṇapastota is a short poem of devotion. Quotations in the anthologies show his exquisite poetry.

818 **Buddhhasangati**, though not now extant, is probably alluded to by Subandhu in his Vāsavadatta. It is quoted by Ānanda vardhana and Ksemendra.

According to Ṭarṇāṭha, Dharmakirti lived in the time of the Tibetan King Stron-sun-gampo, who was born in 617 A.D. and reigned 620–695 A.D. and if Dignāga flourished in the 5th or 6th century A.D. it may be safe, apart from difference of opinion, to say

---

1. *Antirecht*, *JS*, XVI 204, *ZDMG*, XXVII 41, OG, I 268. He is quoted in the Savadarsānasangrāha (1 5). See also *BR*, (1897) xx.
2. For a full list of his works, see Thomas, *Kav* 46-9.
4. *Hall’s Hdbn* 285 and pref. 10. On this Śiva rāma says: अलक्षीरो नाम धर्मविविधकारी अन्नविवेय. See also R V Krishnamachar Int to Vasa xxii, K T Telang, *JBRAS*, XVIII 146, K B Pathak, *JBRAS*, XVII 38, L H Gray, Int to Vasa 150. See also *Tebotan* 45. The Tibetan Tanjur does not mention this work.
6. See for instance in *SDA*, II 141.

कम्युद्रज पवलस विकिरति गगनाग्नेपवन् ||

7. *History of Buddhism*.
8. Dignāga’s date is fixed at 6th or 6th century (see para 17 note supra) and Dharmakirti must be at least half a century later.

There is a tradition that at the instance of Bāṇa, Bhatto Nārāyaṇa secretly studied under a Buddhist monk and after learning the secrets of their teaching vanished Dharmakirti, then they became friends and jointly composed the grammatical works Rūpāvatāra (id Madras). This would make Bāṇa, Bhatto Nārāyaṇa and Dharmakirti contemporaries.

9. Burnell’s Preface to Śāmaviḍhama Brāhmaṇa, K B Pathak, *JBRAS*, XVIII 69, says that Iising calls himself a contemporary of Dharmakirti (Max Müller, *India*, 210 and 9A, XIX, 819). The authors’ Translation of Iising’s, *A* record of the Buddhist religion, 1v et seq and the accuracy of the translation is disputed (see *JBRAS* XVIII 149). See also *IA*, IV 141 and IX 149, 818, K T Telang (*JBRAS*; XVII 149) calls attention to this fact that Śibaramati who was a contemporary of Dharmakirti (Max Müller, *India*, 306) died some considerable time before 637 A.D. (IA, VI.9)
that Dharmakirti flourished in the last quarter of the 6th and the early part of 7th century A.D.

819 **Vamana** was a poet of the Court of King Jayapida of Kāśmir (779-819 A.D.)\(^1\) and having migrated later to the Court of the Rāṣṭrakūta King Jagatūnga known as Govinda III (794-813 A.D.) he became also a member of his Council.\(^2\) From the invocatory verses in his works, it is inferred that in religion he favoured Buddhism and Nāmaism. Abhinavagupta refers to Vāmana's views as having been alluded to by Anandavardhana and thus suggests that Vāmana was the earlier.\(^3\) Vāmana makes quotations\(^4\) from Kādambarī, Uṣṭarāmacarita, and Śīvapālavadha and these references make it probable that he flourished about the end of the 8th century and the beginning of the 9th century A.D.\(^5\) His Kāvyālankārasūtras with his own glosses\(^6\) are divided into 5 chapters and embrace the whole sphere of poetics. His theory is that style (रीति) is the soul of poetry,\(^7\) and though traces of this theory are discernible in earlier literature, it was Vāmana who clearly pronounced it and created a school of poetics. The popularity of the work has brought it the name of Kāvprīyā.

There are commentaries on the Kāvyālankārasūtras by Gopendra

---

1. बमुद्र, कववस्तस वामनाराधारितिषिप || Rat IV 497

2. "While commenting on the phrase Rājārtha in the 9th Kādika of his Longā musasana Vāmana mentions Jagatūnga sahā. Vāmana also mentions the name of the village Śrībhāvana as a village and this village is given in BI, XI 162 (Vani Dundon and Redhanpur plates) of that King as a place where he spent the rainy season with his army." For the grants of Govindarāja III, see BI, VIII App 10-12, EII, V 192

3. Dhvanyāloka, p 87 वामनाराधारितिषिप ||

4. He also quotes from Subandhu, Amaraśīkha, Kṛitārjunīya and Mṛcheha katikā and refers to Kamanṭakinit, Nāmamāla and Harirabodha, also to poets Viṣākhita (author of Kalāśāstra), Śudraka and Kaivalyā, probably the one mentioned as ancestor of Rājaśkhara (?)

5. Vāmana the author of the grammatical work Kādika is referred to by Huen Tsang the Chinese Traveller and could not therefore be identical. See also PR, I 28 30. See articles in COJ, and II

6. Edited by Cappeller (Jean), also Bombay (Kāvyamāla) and Sircangam. Ed by N N Kulkarni, Ed. by in JSSP, Calcutta Tr into English by Ganganath Jha

7. See para 801 supra. See article by K. Gopalakrishnasastri in Andhra Sah Par Patrika, XXI 189 and by G Ganapatisarma, in Ibid, XX. 817
Tippa Bhūpāla and by Mahesvara and by Sahadeva. Sahadeva, the earliest commentator on the work says that the study of Vāmana's work had fallen into disuse and Bhatta Mukula procured a manuscript and revived the interest in it.

Besides this work on rhetoric the following works were also Vāmana's compositions, Lingānusasana, Viḍyadharakāvya and part of Kāśikāvṛtti.

820 Udbhata was a poet of the court of King Jayāpīda of Kāśmir (779-813 A.D.) and was the President of the royal Council on a salary of a lakh of dinaras a day. In that council was Manoraṭhī, Sankhadaṭṭha, Cakala, Sandhumān, Vāmana etc.

So says Kalhana (Raṭ IV 495, 497)

विद्वान् दामारक्षेण मल्ल तत्ततास ||
मनोस्वरहुवर्ततस्तस्य वृन्दावनसमपति: ||
मनोरधयक्ष्वशश्वशकासङ्गोस्माशाय ||
बमङ्गः कवियस्तस्य वामानाधाय मन्त्रय ||

1 He is otherwise known as Trīpurāvara Bhupāla, apparently a South Indian Prince. He cites Viḍyādhara, Viḍyānātha, Maliniṭha and Dharmā and also a work called Kavajāṅkula. He lived probably in the 16th century A.D. The commentary is called Kāmaḍhenu. Ed Benarier and Strengam.
2. IOC, 566 0 Bod 3076 See for further information under Śrīvaśṭalāṅkhaṇa and Subodhanamīśa, commentators on Mammata gost.
3 Sahadeva was a despoile of Śrāvaṇa and belonged to the family of Tomaras. He learnt the work from Bhatta Mukula.
4 On Vāmana generally see V V Scovani, Bhandarakar Com Vol 888, G A. Jacob, JRAS, (1896), 368, Ehrler, Ehl, 55, P V Kane, IA, XII 204, Vāmana cīrya, Introduction to Kāvyapakasa, Pischall, Introduction to Śrūḍgāralakasa, Capeller, Introduction to Ehl (His date as later than 1000 A.D is untenable) S K De, SP, 81-4.
5 वेधिता सर्वेशास्यं समोद्वृद्धकामित्र ||
सन्ध्वा कुलविद्वादश्रे भास्मार्गविद्वद्वङ्ग ||
काशिकावभाषाय नेत्रेद्विमानामोदितस ||
6. Ed with the author's own commentary by O. D Dalal, (GOS) with introduction.
7 This is referred to by Varāhamāṇa in his Gaḍārasthamahodādhi.
8 The joint author was Jayādīya. See Belwalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar and articles in JSSP, Calcutta by Malati Sen.
In Sadgurusantanaparmala it is stated that Abhinavasankara, 38th Atarya of Kānakotipitha was contemporary of Udbhata

According to Kalhana, Jayāpida roamed about other kingdoms with a feigned name Kallata and while witnessing Bharatanātva in the temple of Kārtikeya at Paundravardhana (in Gauda Country ruled by king Jayanta) he was so taken up by the graces of the art, that he took with him one of the dancing women, Kamalā and made her his queen. It was probably at the request of the king that Udbhata began his writings.

Ānandavardhana mentions him with great reverence. His Kavyalankarasangraha, a treatise in six chapters, deals with 41 figures of speech.

There are two commentaries on it, one Vivṛti (now anonymous), probably the same as Udbhataviveka of Rājānaka Tilaka, the other by Praśhārendrāja.

Udbhata's gloss Bhāmahavivarana is referred to by Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and Hemacandra.

821 Udbhata's poem Kumārasambhava is extant only in the illustrations quoted in his Kavyalankarasangraha. The few verses so preserved indicate a grace of expression and a mode of narration, which far transcends the theme of Kāhḍasa in its poetic propriety. These are some verses:

1 Ray IV 412-434
2 Bom Edn., pages 96, 108
3 Ed GOS, Baroda. Rājānaka Tilaka is mentioned by Jayaratha in his commentary on Alankārasarvasva, as the author of Udbhataviveka (Bom Edn., 118), Tilaka was the father of Ruyyaka (Rucaka) and lived about the end of the 11th century for whom see post. In the introduction to this edition by K. S. Ramaswamasestri Suromani discusses all that relates to this commentary.
4 Ed by Banhatti, Bombay.
ALANKĀRA

केठिलोकालिमलाखाना कलो कोलाहले कविता। कुरती काननाहुंद श्रीदुर्गपरवर्धमाय।
कहिदुर्गकमला कमलानाथदुर्गपरवर्धमाय। शत्रुद्रकामभोर कुसदकामभोरसारसा।
पाठीने पाठीने गदाधुर्यायागल मानसारू। अनुदेशुरारामाधुर्यागल हसुदकामायान।
जित्युपुत्रकिंतुजलकिंतुजलश्रेणिकिंतुसमाजिता। केसोबस्तात नारीसुदुर्गवस्तीसुदुर्गपरवर्धमाय।
काला काला इवस्मितति मरातीव सरासि च। चेतुस्यापियहुर्यान। निन्माय इव निन्मग।
योज्यामुनेकुन्तकुमेन ताराकुमारानुरूपसरासा। कम्मेश्वरपारमाश्रयायानामसत्त्वत्त।
उस्ताक्षिपतितबिष्णुतवादशालिनी। राजसेवाविनयंत सर्देश सर्देश।
आसारामाराशिष्ये नमोग्रामसरासा। मसायने सम वयादेशाराज्य बलाकरे।
जनाराम शस्त्रकाल कद्दुदुर्गकालिव। प्रेमविश्वाहिनीता च निश्चितहृदसम्पद।
क्षण कामवस्तीकिले पूर्वस्तात्सपुष्यैः। विषमनामृताश्राणी चलिका चन्द्रत यथा।
तत्तथ इव शारति सम चक्रावती स्तनारित। प्रबोधावशर राली किश्कलाजीनमृतादुय।
बहादुर्खिन्न सम बसाय कुसदकामनाय। आम वा सुखुस्ली तिरुदेवढे पाठि कवितन। अमालस्थोपप्रभा पतितात्मरुष्टिव।

* * *

इति काले कलोहापिकाकादमकुलसुबे। तिद्याबीस्ताद्वे पद्माचापन गूँथी।
तानि शक्तियावदनि नीलेनवद्देशाद्वे। सर्वकालात्सागृहीति गृहरी माति मनो दशे।

* * *

सदर्शनवर्णनेपापी वैयक्तसर्वितात्साना। सुपुष्प कामने सामनामकायिनित्वादित्वाद।
बश्याक्षेपे कन्दप्र पुष्पा माथि तिरोहिते। समन्तातुलवैनाया किं सा शोकास्त्रा सवेदे।

* * *

स गौरीसिक्षुर गत्या दशको तप कंदापू। राखुप्रतिमायेदेशदोषैर्यंतिरूतस्तव्य॥
पद च निधितिनिन्दाय दिता भन्ड च निधितिनाय। स्पर्शसेवन सतत सुखनाम अकुश्कनीय॥
श्रीपुरणाभावातासाकेदिपै तपसि निधितिनाय। समुद्रहर्तानी नापूर्व गत्याभ्यस्तपतिवाद।
या शैशिरी श्रीतपसा मानस्थेन विचृतता। तपसा तातु दुष्योषण दृश्यार्थरातिमाय॥
अनकेशाकामिरसामाज्ञानप्रथमाय। अनलकक्तामालामोक्षाय च चित्रतदीय॥
दुन्दुःसुनन्त पाणिद्याकृतिमीय॥ तर्कव नामाता शैनजातापार्थरातिमाय॥
तपस्तोजस्फुरित्या निजलाक्षणपदाः। तपसाय: कालात्मक कीमारायेहैन कथण्ते।
अविनाशच भवानानी ू रस्मिन्यता। पतेन्द्रे श्रीरीवयान्त्रा पश्चे विद्यासिनि।
मुखाद्वेशभावायाय। कर्तेव: स्याच्छदपास।
सन्ये च निपतन्त्या कटाय मिद्य पृत्द॥ प्राचाइने ू गत्त्वृति समर्थाचापपरत्॥

* * *

कित्वाब बहुनोत्तेश नूञ मतारस्मायः। उद्भवमानायाभ महानं। किमाते॥
822 Lollata’s commentary on Bhārata is mentioned by Abhinavagupta and other later writers. He seems to have definitely championed the theory of rasa, and this Sankuka who came after him attacked. He was probably a Kāśmirian and lived about the beginning of the 9th century AD, because according to Abhinavagupta he controverted the views of Udbhata. On the question of denotation of words, he held that abhideśā is comprehensive enough to include any implication or suggestion, so he is called by Mamnata and Hemacandra as Dirghavāpyāparavādin. There is Rājasekharā’s quotation in Kāvyamīmāṃsā (p 45)

"अतूर नाम निस्सैमा अर्थसार्यम् किंतु रावणते एव निबन्धो युक्त न नीरसभ्निम्नतां आयराजिति यदाहः"

‘सखन्युपाचर्यसम्भवसंमायामद्यादिविवर्णिः’
सरसमपि नातिभवेः शहतरसानवित रचयेदुः
यस्तु सरिबद्विसागरपुरुषराजादिखलणां यल
कविविक्षयातिविविक्तो वित्तवित्या नो मत स इह’"

This second verse is quoted along with another by Hemacandra in his Kāvyānusāsana (p 35) as Lollata’s

यदाह लोक्तः

‘यस्तु सरिबद्विसागरपुरुषराजादिखलणां यल
कविविक्षयातिविविक्तो वित्तवित्या नो मत स इहे’
समकालीनमतातिररचनादिसिद्धोतिसवरोदिन्यः
अभिमानात्मेश्वरंद्रवणादिसिद्धावहो वा’"

This suggests that Lollata was son of Aparājita 2

---

1 Vallabhadeva has a verse of Bhatta Aparājita (Subh 1034) which looks satirical

2 Vallabhadeva has a verse of Bhatta Aparājita (Subh 1034) which looks satirical

इसके एक बहुत बड़े चिन्तक के साथ है, जिसमें राजसेन्हारा का एक समय में वह एक नामक लोकीक था।

वल्लभादेव ने सभ्यता अपराजिता को बताया है कि उसके प्रकाश में भारतीय रस्सी का उपयोग किया गया था।

2 Vallabhadeva has a verse of Bhatta Aparājita (Subh 1034) which looks satirical
823 Sankuka\(^1\) is by tradition known to have criticised the views of Lollata on rasa, and he was probably a younger contemporary of Lollata, for his poem Bhavanabhuyudaya\(^2\) was composed during the reign of Ajitapida, King of Kāśi (814-851 A.D.). Sankuka's commentary on Nātvasāstra is quoted by Abhinavagupta and later writers. He lived earlier than Anandavardhana.

824 Ghantaka came after Sankuka. His verses are quoted in the anthologies,\(^4\) but Abhinavagupta's quotation of his opinion on nātaka

\[ \text{संकुकाः पञ्चमतिदिलितिहाय अष्टध्वत याचे} \]
\[ \text{तथा च देवी कन्या च नस्याता अस्याता मंदेन चन्द्रवी} \]
\[ \text{कन्या तु अन्न पुरस्नातितेंद्रन द्विषिति} \]
\[ \text{वष्टकादवस्तवह नायको व्यतिरितलितान्तपत्रम} \]
\[ \text{नातकादवपुष्पजिवित न तु नस्यातलमपी} \]
\[ \text{तद्वेदग्रहणे बोध्य सेवा हिति} \]

suggests that he wrote a treatise on dramaturgy

---

1. In the Sarangadharapaddhati and Sukhumnuktavali, the verse

   इसारसस्मवारो विचारो दूरे मनोज्ञसुकुम
   गाढ़ प्रेम नव बयारतिरितिता श्राणा कुल निराखम
   ब्रह्म वेदेंद्रिति मन्यायुद्धरत्व काल शतात्तेम
   नै सत्यतुतरं कथा ते निरहस्तिदेय रस्म गंध

   This is quoted in Subhā as Mayura's son Bhatta Šankuka's. If Šankuka was the son of Mayura (see para 279 subra) he must have lived in the 7th century A.D. and must be a different from Šankuka of Vikrama's Court.

2. Thus says Rājaśarangini (IV 703-4)

   अध मन्योपत्तंकोपदशुरूस्वरूपान्व रगः || श्रद्धाधावा बलासिदितताला मुखविताले ते
   कविकुमारस्वतितलोकशुक्कुटसिव || युवदिवयकरोकाल्यण मुनि युद्ययमालिकाः

   On Šankuka, see S K De, SP, 38, Peterson's Subhā 127, Quackenbos, Sanskrit Poems of Mayura, 50-52, G A Jacob, Notes on Alankara Literature, JRAE, (1887), 281, 287. For the misreading by Peterson (PR, II 59), see IA, XII 159. For quotations in anthologies, see Quackenbos, l c 50 in and Peterson l c. This is a poet Šankha or Šankhaka quoted in Subhā 8514.

   "In 1877 one of the Buddhist Pundits obtained clue to the existence of a copy but did not succeed in persuading the ignorant owner to produce it."

3. S P Pandit's Pref to Gaudavāno, lxxxvii

4. शतमोहः वैक भगवतिक्रुल कक्षमलवल
   मन्यो लेप शचमलत्य इसि पञ्च विलिता
   द्वाराः जेतु यथा विश्वयमेदास्य विलय
   स कर्म कारार्थ केति दिधु द्वितिपार्श्वस्तति

   See on Ghantaka, R. Ramamurti in JOR, II
Anandavardhana, was the son of Nona. He was a poet of the Court of Avanțvarman of Kāśmir (557-584 A.D.) Raṭnākara, Muktākara and Śivaswāmin were his friends. He was the father of the school of Dvānti in the science of poetics. His Dvāntkāloka elaborates the doctrine of dhātu or suggestion, as the soul of poetry, and on that basis he discusses its relation to the other poetic embellishments. His language is lucid and so such as must clothe the expression of one who was inaugurating a new thought. His ideas have always been respected and have found a deserving notice at the hands of every later author. The commentary on it, Locana of Abhinavagupta, has given it a worthy elucidation and a wide renown.

His Devisataka is a melodious lyric in praise of Pārvatī. Among his other works are Arjunacaritamahākāvya and two Prakrit poems, Vīsamabānali and Harṇivāja.

According to Gururāṇamalikā, Saṭṭānandaśarasvati, 8th Acārya of Kamakoupītha was a contemporary of Anandavardhana.

1. Ānandaśaṭṭha, the teacher's teacher of Paḍamasundara who wrote the Rāya mallabhīyuḍaya Mahākāvya in Sam 1015 (1631 A.D.) (PR, III 267, IV, List of authors) is a different person. See para 281 supra.

2. Egy V 34

3. Called also Sahāyāloka. Ed Kāvyamāla Bombay Abhinavagupta appears to think (p. 54) that Anandavardhana was the author only of the vītis and the Kāṅkosa are anonymous. Uṣṭhunagodya in his commentary on the Locana (TO, III 8876) calls Anandavardhana's work Kāvyāloka. Among the authors and works quoted are Kālidāsa, Pundarika, Bāṇa, Bhaṭṭojhata, Bhāmaha, Sarasvāma and Śatavāhana, Amaraṅka, Dharmaṅkṛ, a poem named Madhumāṇhānavajaya Raṇjavali, Tāpasa vatsarāja, Rāmabhīyuḍaya.

4. So says Raṣṭabhara

5. In DC, XIX 7678 and SKO, 68 there is a different work of the same name.

6. There is a commentary by Kaseṭṭha, son of Cauḍāditya and grandson of Vallasbhaḍera, composed in Kali 4076 or 973 A.D. in the reign of king Bhṛṣmakapuṭha. This Vallasbhaḍera is probably the famous commentator and the same as the poet quoted in the Subṣaṭṭiṃvāli. See Peterson's Subb 112-114 Kayyata, son of Jayyata, the author of Bhṛṣyapradipa is a different person. See para 20 supra.

7. It was an anthology. See Sten Konow's Int to Karpuramanga (JOS No IV) p 183 Peterson (PR, II 18) conjectures it is a work like Kuttimatam.
826 Mukula was son of Bhattakallata who was a poet of the Court of King Avantivarman of Kashmir (855-884) Mukula's son Harata wrote a gloss on Jayadevachandas, and that is mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Natyasastra. Mukula's Abhidhartimati deals with the literal denotation of words.

INDURAJA, also known as Prajhabarinduraja was his pupil. He was born in Konkan and subsequently migrated to Kashmir. His only known work is Kavyalankarasarakalagutta, the commentary on Udabhata's Kavyalankara.

827 Bhattanayaka's Hrdayadarpaka is reputed to be another commentary on Bharata Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha quote a verse under his name, which Mahima cites as from Hrdayadarpaka. It is in prose and verse and is traced only in a fragment the availability of which now is doubted. Bhattanayaka thought that rasa is the essence of good poetry and differed from Dhvamavardhana. He was therefore the object of attack by Abhinavagupta. Ruyyaka sums up Bhattanayaka's views. He was probably a poet of the Court of King Avantivarman (855-884 A.D.) and King Sankaravarman of Kashmir. He seems to have written a commentary on Bhāmahālankāra. His transcendental view of ītya is rightly quoted by Abhinavagupta.

1 Ray v 66
2 See Bharata (1926) S. K. De, SP, II 76.
3 Ed Bombay. If refer to Kumana, Sabarasamin and Bharṭṛhari.
4 On Induraja, see P. R. IV Index of authors, BER, 66, Peterson's, Paper on Audityavacara, 20 and introduction to Subh 11, and Vamanacarya's introduction to Kavyaprakasa, 22 Jacob JRAS, (1897), 205.
5 He called himself Kṛṣṇa Siddhāraja.
6 Ed Bombay. Among old authors mentioned in it are Amaruka, Kātyāyan, Curnkāra (Patanjali), Dandin, Vaman, Bhāmahā.
7 See BER, 64-67.
8 See T R Chintaman, Fragments of Bhattanayaka, JBR, (1997), 257.
9 The manuscript was possessed by the late father of M. Ramakrishna Kavl and was by him entrusted to Cheru Narasimha Sastr of Pidur village, 8 miles from Manikole Railway Station in Nellore District. This may set at rest the doubt and suggestion of S. K. De, SP, 39-43 that Hrdayadarpaka is not a commentary on Natyasastra, but an independent treatise on Alankara.
10 Ray, V 159. Peterson's, Subh 50.
11 GA Jacob, JRAS (1897), 295. Bhattagopala's commentary on Kavyaprakasa has
He distinguished Kāvya for Sāstra and Ākhyāna by the poet’s expression of Bhāvaktavavyāpāra generated by guna and alankāra. Mahimabhatta embarked on the same object of refuting Dhvani theory, though he did it without seeing this Hṛdayaḍārpāṇa and he was probably his younger contemporary.

828 Rajasekhara’s Kavyaminamsa is a unique work of literary criticism and tradition. It is supposed to be a fragment of a bigger treatise Kavirahasya (or Kavimaraśa), not now traceable, though

V Raghavan explains that this does not mean any commentary on Bhāmaha.

“Nāyaka accepted, as Abhinava says (p 13), that Rasa is the Atman of poetry. But in distinguishing poetry from ordinary, Sātraic, or Purāṇic utterances, he formulated the doctrine of Abhidharmāny or Vyāpakāntāny. This means an emphasis on the form of poetry as its differentia. Bhāmaha gave Vakrokti as the differentia of poetry. The Abhidhā of a poet is his characteristic expression as a whole, his Vakrokti. Abhinava equates Nāyaka’s Vyāpāra, (p 6) expression having it and Bhāmaha’s Vakrokti in his commentary on the section on Laksanas.

Abhinava says in his Locana that the Bhāyakatvavyāpāra, which is one of the three Arūdas of Kāvya Śabdās as distinguished from other Śabdās, is the embellishment utterance having Guna and Alankāra pp 68-70.

“Saakornabhāpi samyavatamānyabhāparasamamānicharīvividhavasthīteshāt
dhītām”

Thus it is most likely that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, in defining poetry and its difference from other utterances, and in expanding his idea of Abhidhāpradhānāya or Vyāpāra prādhānāya, drew upon, adopted, exploited and reinterpreted Bhāmaha’s idea of poetry as being characterised by Vakrokti. This is perhaps the upadāna which Bhaṭṭa Gopāla says, Nāyaka gave to Bhāmaha.

1. So he says अट्टहदर्पणा समवी.
Bhatāsṛi Nārāyanaśastrī mentions it and gives an extract about Bhāsa's works. Kāvyamīṁamsa has been extensively used by Kesemendra, Bhoja and Hemacandra and has been held in very great reverence.

A B Keith has an excellent summary of this work. He conceives of the Kavyapurasa, the spirit of poetry, son of Sarasvatī, and the Sahityavindya, science of poetics, who becomes his bride, the term Sahitya being derived, we may believe, from the old doctrine of the union of word and sound and sense to make a poem, as laid down by Bhamaha, Magha, and others. He distinguishes carefully science, Castra, and poetry, and analyses the division of the former and discusses at length the relation of genius, poetic imagination, culture, and practice in making a poet and classifies poets on this score. A further classification is based on the fact that a poet may produce a Castra, or a poem, or combine both in varying proportions, and of poets in the narrower sense he makes eight illogical groups. His own conception of poetry appears traditional, he defines it as a sentence possessing qualities and figures, and he accepts Vamanā's doctrine of styles which are the extreme of Sahityavidya's wanderings in diverse lands. The sources of poetry are touched on, and the subject-matter as concerned with men, divine beings, or denizens of hell is investigated. Very interesting is the discussion of borrowing from earlier works, it is recognized as justified by freshness of idea and expression, and elaborate illustration is given of thirty-two different ways of evading improper plagiarism. Important also is the consideration of poetical conventions, and we are given a geography of India and many remarks on the seasons with their appropriate winds, birds, flowers, and action. Rājasekhara also gives curious details of the likings of different parts of India for certain languages and their mode of mispronouncing Sāṃskṛta. The Magadhas and others east of Benares are blunt in Prakrit, good at Sanskrit, but the Gaudas are thoroughly bad in Prakrit; the Lātas dislike Sanskrit but use the Prakrit beautifully, the Dravidas and Travanass mix Apabhraṁcana with Sanskrit, the Dravidas recite musically, Kāśmirin pronunciation is as bad as their poetry is good, Karnatakaus end up sentences with a twang, northerners are nasal, the people of Pancala sweet and honey-like. Women poets are recognized, and sex barriers despised, while of the ten grades of poets the rank of Kavirāja, held by Rajasekhara, comes seventh even above the Mahākavi himself. Great stress is laid on the assem-

1. See para 688 supra
2. See S. K. De, SP, 195.
blues at which poets were judged and where the prize given by the king included crowning with a fillet and riding in a special chariot. The poet's paraphernalia is given, chalk, a board, palm leaves, buren bark, pen and ink. More important is the insistence on the equal rights of all four forms of speech, Sanskrit, Prakrit, elegant, sweet and smooth, Aapabhranca also elegant, as loved in Marwar, Takka, and Bhadana, and Bhutaabhas current in Avanti, Pandiyatra, and Dacapura, while the people of the Madhyadeca, used all equally well. The people of that land show also their admixture by their colours, brown like the easterners, dark like the southerners, while like the westerners, while the northerners are fair. When we add that he quotes extensively including the Mahabaratstra, gives many fine verses and anecdotes and is usually lively if pedantic, the merits of his work can be appreciated."

829 Rudrata known as Sptananda was the son of Bhatta Vamuka, a follower of Samasakha. His Kavyalanka is quoted by Rajasekhara, by Bhoja and by Pratiharendura in his commentary Udbhatalanka which was written in Sam 1122 (1066 A D) Rudrata must have therefore flourished in the latter half of the 9th century.

Of Rudrata's works, there are two, Sngaratilaka and Kavyalanka, besides Tripuravada of which there is a mention.

830 Sngaratilaka, in three parts, delineates rasas as developed in poems as opposed to plays. It is written in very fine verse and has been quoted profusely by later writers with admiration. There

1 SL, 365 Ed with introduction, (GOB) Paroda and Ed by Narayanasastri Kushe, with his own commentary and Ed with the commentary of Pandit Madhusudanamurti

2 Nyayavacaspiti Rudrapati, son of Vidayavilasa was the author of Bhavavilasa and panegyric of King Bhavasumha of Jaipur, son of Wanasumha, contemporary of Akbar of the 17th century (Kavyamala, Part II)

3 This information is given in the Mahacakradanda See the diagram at the end of the book in the Kavyamala Series

4 Buhler originally thought (BEK page 67, JBRAS XXI 67) that Rudrata belonged to the second half of the 11th century but later on saw (IA, XII, 30) that he could not be placed later than the 10th century A D Jacob (VOJ, II 151) suggests that Rudrata was a Kashmiran contemporary of King Sankaravarma, son of Avantivarman and that the example of Vakikut given by him (II 15) was prompted by Raushaka whose work Vakikutpancadaka contains similar railleries between Siva and Parvati.

5 Ed. Bombay, and by Pishall, KVI On the identity of authors of Sngaratilaka and Kavyalanka, there has been much difference of opinion. But the quotations here following make the identity clear. In Bhavapariksa (Oh, IV) Samadisanaya
is a commentary on it called Rasaṭarangini by Gopala Bhatta, son of Harivamśabhatta.¹

831 His Kavyālāṅkāra is written in Āryā metre and is in 16 chapters. Rudrata recognises the fame of the poet and the good of others as the only object of poetry. He deals with the figures of speech depending on sound and sense. He includes Vākrokti among the former and makes a broad classification of the latter into vāstava, apanā, atsaya and sloṣa.

There are three commentaries on Kavyālāṅkāra by Vallabhadeva, Namisādhu,² and Āśādhara.³

832 Namisādhu² was a Svetāmbara Jain Bhikṣu and disciple of Śāhībhadrā. He wrote his commentary in the year Sam 1125 (A.D. 659). The work is lost, ⁴

The work is lost. ⁵

The work is lost. ⁶

The work is lost.
833 Dhananjaya was the son of Visnu. He was a poet of the King Munja (Vākpatirāja II) of Paramāra dynasty of Malva who ruled in 974-995 A D. Among Dhananjaya's friends were Padmagupta, Halādyudha and Dhanapāla. His Dasarupa is a succinct treatise on dramatic writing. It is mainly based on the rules laid down by Bharata, which "being diffuse is bewildering to those of slow wit" and except to a little extent in the classification of heroines, and treatment as Śrṅgara, he rarely differs from Bharata's Nāṭyasastra. The excellence of Dhananjaya's presentation has gained for it a popularity which has tended to replace in a great measure the usefulness of Nāṭyasastra and it is referred to by later writers on rhetoric mostly with approbation.

There are commentaries on Ṛasarūpa by Dhanika, and by Bahurūpamāra, by Nṛsīmbhabhatta, by Devapātu, by Kṣopīdharamisra, and by Kūravāna.

1 Ed Bombay He quotes from Aujunacanta of Anandivardhana, Tilakamanjri of Dhanapāla and from a work on prosody by Jayadeva
2 Peterson (PR I 17) thinks middle of 11th century probable
3 About this dynasty, see paras 515 supra
4 Ed by F. Hall, Calcutta with preface, by K P Parab, Bombay, by Vidyasagar, Calcutta Tr into English by O C, C, Haas (Col Univ Series) with notes and introduction See also S K De, SP, I 128-135, Barnett, JRAS, (1919) 190
5 Ed along with Dasarupa (I c)
6 TC, IV 5434, V 6180
7 TC, III 3847 There are commentaries on Kāvyapraṇā on Sarasvati kanthābharaṇa and Śabarabhaṣya by Narasimha, but it is not known if all these Narasumbhas are identical. From the fact that manuscripts of commentary on Kāvyapraṇā are found in Telugu commentary only, it may be said he was a different author but the manuscripts of the other three commentaries are found in Malabar and were discovered in the house of Pyyur Patten, father of Vāṣuḍeva, in whose family there was a scholar named Narasimha. About Pyyur Patten see para 170 supra
8 TC, II 1097 He is quoted by Ranganātha in his commentary on Vikramorvaṣṭi and must therefore be earlier than 1656 A D
9 Hall's Edition, 4 notes
10 GO, II 53 His Dasāruṣakāraḍhaṇi (CO, II 1007) is in 110 verses on the characteristics of plays. He also wrote a commentary on Bhāmataqūpatu and Viśva, guṇḍarṣa and Kuvalāyanaṇḍa. (See HB, I xi) He was patronised by the Zamīndar of Karvet Nagar, Chittoor Dist, in Madras.
834 Dhanika was probably Dhananjaya's brother unless as some say Dhanika and Dhananjaya are one. In one of the manuscripts of his Avaloka he is described as an officer (Mahāśādhyapāla) of king Utpalarāja, that is Munja. He was probably the father of Vasanṭācārya who was a donee under a grant of land by king Vākpati (Munja) in 974 A.D. He also wrote poetry and gives his own illustrations on Dhananjaya's definitions. In his Avaloka (IV 46) he quotes verse from another work of his, Kāvyanirnaya.

835 Bahurupamisra is described as Mahāmahopādhyāya in the colophon to his work. Of the latest writers, he quotes are Bhoja and Murārī and from the circumstance that he does not refer to Mammata or any later rhetoricians he may be assigned to the beginning of the 12th century A.D. His commentary on the text and gloss of Dhananjaya and Dhanaka, and thereby treats both as Dasarupa. His commentary is called Rūpadipikā. It is probably the best commentary available and its value is enhanced by illustrations taken from author of whom many are now unknown.

836 Abhinavagupta alias Nrisimhagupta was the son of Nrisimhagupta (known as Chukhala or Mukhala) and Vimala, and grandson of Varāhagupta. His father's maternal grandfather was Vāsarāga.

---

1 In some works Dasarupa is referred to as the work of Dhanika (see Sāhityādarpana, 313 and 316) and this had led to the confusion that the author of the Dasarupa and the commentary are one. See Levi, WI, 17, Jacobi, GA, (1918) 808. The commentary has several indications of difference in authorship. See for instance II 84, III 40 and IV, 63.

2 See Wilson's, Theatre, I xx-xxi, Hall, Int to Edn 3 notes.


4 Among works quoted or referred to are, Udāttārāghava, Chalitārāma, Panḍavānana, Rāmābhyaṣya, Tārangaṇṭṭa and Pūṣpadūṣṭaka.

5 Among rare authors and works quoted by him are.

6 'Gupta' denotes a sect of Kashmir brahmams. Abhinava is the proper name. So writes Kṣemarāja in his Nṛrtyodhya. See Dungārasāda's Int to Sāhityādarpana (Bombay).
Manorathagupta was his brother. His teachers were Utpalaraja Bhattenduraja, Lakmanagupta, Siddhieela and Bhatta Tauta. Ksemendra was his pupil. He was a staunch votary of Sveta. He is held in great reverence by later writers and he is styled Acaryapadi. His Brhat-Prativabhighna-vimarsani gives his parentage and the date of its composition as the year 90 Laukika or 1013 A.D. He was a poet, logician and philosopher.

Abhinava’s paternal uncle Vamanagupta was also a writer on poetics. He is quoted thus in Abhinavabhara (p 297).

In Madhava’s Sankaravijaya (XV 158) it is said that Abhinavagupta was vanquished by Sankara. The 48th Acarya in Kamakoti-pitha, Advaitanandabodhendra is said to have vanquished by Abhinavagupta and Sriranga. So says Punyaslokamanjari and Gurutrinimalakii.

His Locana is a commentary on Dhvanyaloka of Anandavardhana.
and is a mine of rhetorical learning, Bhairavastotra is a collection of verses in praise of Kalabhairava and Mahopadesavimsa is a series of sententious moral maxims. Among his other works are also Krama, Ghalakarparavritti, Nityalocana and Abhinavabhara, the last two being commentaries on Bharata's Nityasatra.

837 Utpaladeva was the teacher of Abhnu's teacher Laksmipagupta. He was the son of Udayakara and lived about 930 A.D. He is quoted by Ksemendra. He was the author of Isvarapratyabhijnasutra, on which Abhnu wrote a gloss (vritti) in 1015 A.D. Utpala's guru was Somananda, founder of Pratyabhijnas cult. Utpala's views on music are quoted by in Abhinavabhara. For instance

\[ \text{tasyādityānāmano manmek prasādānirupit uktha |} \]
\[ \text{śrītēṣṭāyārikaparāt prasādātmāyogyam |} \]
\[ \text{śatakā yadvayaṇyakṣatavajjokalayet |} \]

and in Basavaraja's Śivatattvaśāstra, there is this reference

\[ \text{utpalaḥ parimāṇa kārti śāṅkhavasya cha |} \]

838 Bhatta Tauta's work Kavyakautuka is lost. His definition of Kavi and Kavya is mentioned by Rama and quoted by Mañkalacandra. For a list of his works, see SKC, 365.

\[ \text{tattvākā ānuyogāvāya—} \]
\[ \text{śṛṇa navanamabhāśāni pratibha mātā |} \]
\[ \text{tadāprāṇajīvindriyamānāpada kahī |} \]
\[ \text{tattvākā śruṭā kāvyāvāya |} \]

It appears that Rājacādāmaṇi Dīkṣita had a copy of this book and he follows Tauta's definition in his Kavyadarpana.

Tauta's estimation of a kavi (poet) is superb and is quoted by Hemacandra.

---

2. For a list of his works, see SKC, 365.
4. See chapters on Music and Dancing, post.
5. TO, III 3843 For a summary of quotations, see Thomas, Kav. 99, also Aufricht, ZDMG, XXVII. 12, OC, I, 64, SKC, 806.
6. For a discussion of fragments of Tauta, see V. Raghavan's article on Writers quoted in Abhinavabhara, JOR, Madras.
8. Srirangam [Edn, I, 7.]
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तथा चाहु महतोत —

“नावित्ति कविविष्टता कविविष्ट किल्ले दर्शनात् ||
हिंसामत्सवधर्माश्चतस्य च दर्शनम् ||
स तत्वविद्यानादेव शालेश्वु पठित कविः ||
दर्शनानुविषयस्वरूपो लोके कविभाषित ||
tथाः हि दर्शने तथे धीमतुपादाकहेद्युः ||
नोदिता विभिन्नो यावज्जाता न वणना || — Kavyāmūḍasana, p 316

Abhinavagupta wrote a gloss on it Vivaraṇa and mentions it in his Locana,⁸ and quotes his views in Abhnavabhārati. Tatuṇa refuted the theories of Lollata and Sankuka on rasa.

839 Bhattenduraṇa was the son of Śṛiḥūṣṭirāja and grandson of Saucuka of Kāśyapagoṭra. His verses furnished easy illustrations for Abhinavagupta, who calls his teacher Vidvat-kavi-sahādaya-cakravartī. He is quoted by Kṣemendra in Aucityavīcāracarca and Suvatātālaka.

840. Ksira or Ksiraswamin was a pupil of Bhattenduraṇa. His drama Abhinavarāghava is quoted in Nāṭyadārpana by Rāmacandra, a pupil of Hemaçandra, where Sthāpaka says—

आये विश्रव स्वूत्वः —

अस्वेष राचवभविर्नकाभाष्यम्
काव्य अवन्धनमायितं स्वितम् ||
स्त्रेसुराज्यस्त्रवभाजिणतया
क्षरस्य नाटकविन्यासवाजनारम् ||

and Rāmacandra in introducing the above quotation says—

यथा क्षीरलाभिकृताभिनिविन्दनवराष्टे —

841. Bhojadeva of Dīrā⁹ has a distinguished place in poetics, and with his name are associated Sarasvaṭīkanthābharaṇa and Śṛngāra-prakāśa. In Sarasvaṭīkanthābharaṇa, in five long chapters, Bhoja discusses the merits and faults of poetry, the figures of speech, and the sentiments. The general precepts are profusely illustrated from the

¹ Bom. Bhī p 178 महतोत्ते काव्यविषयकृते अस्वेषाद्वितीयं विश्रवविवेचनं ||
² See S. K De, Agnaptuṇana and Bhōja [JRAS (1928), 587]
³ Ed Benares. For a detailed description of the work, see Aui Bod. Cat. No 489 and R. Mitra’s Cat No. 8149, DC, xxii, 8708.
works of standard authors and in this respect, the treatise forms a landmark in the history of Sanskrit literature.

There are commentaries on it by Raṭnesvaramiṣṭa composed at the instance of Rāmasimbādeva, by Bhāṭṭa Narasimha, by Lākṣmīnāṭhabhāṭṭa and by Jagaddhara.

842 Bhoja's Srngaraprakāsa is the most extensive work on Alankāra and has largely been used by Hemacandra and Śaraṇatanaya. It has 36 Prakāsas or Chapters. The first eight deal with grammatical technicalities and the theory of Vṛtti, the ninth and the tenth with faults and merits of expression and thought, and the eleventh with Mahākavya and the twelfth with drama, and the next twenty-four chapters are devoted to Rasas, of which the main is held to be Śṛngāra.

In the last verses of these two treatises Bhoja invokes eternity for his work thus.

1 Among rare works and authors quoted are, Kādambarikathāśāra, Bhāravi, Kumāraśīva. Gāḍhāsaṃptaśāti, Candīśataka, Caturapancāśika, Dākapuruṣeswarī, Bhallatāśālaka, Bhāsa Mahāśāstra, Mālayarudra, Ramāraka, Bhāma, Mūdārākṣa, Lākṣmīdīvara, Vīkatāntamābhī, Viṣṇu, Rājaśekhara, Hayagrīvaśastra. For a fuller reference, see Jaoobi, Notes on Alankāra Literature, [JRAS (1897), 281.]

2 Ed. Benares DC. XXII 8505
3 TC III 3513.
4 CASB 215.
5 Ed by Kedarnath Sarma, Bombay.
6 TG IV 4881. Ed. partly by Sri Yadugiriswami of Melkote.
7 Among works and poets quoted see the following that are rare.

Among works and authors quoted are, Kādambarikathāśāra, Bhāravi, Kumāraśīva, Gāḍhāsaṃptaśāti, Candīśataka, Caturapancāśika, Dākapuruṣeswarī, Bhallatāśālaka, Bhāsa Mahāśāstra, Mālayarudra, Ramāraka, Bhāma, Mūdārākṣa, Lākṣmīdīvara, Vīkatāntamābhī, Viṣṇu, Rājaśekhara, Hayagrīvaśastra. For a fuller reference, see Jaoobi, Notes on Alankāra Literature, [JRAS (1897), 281.]
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Among works and authors quoted are, Kādambarikathāśāra, Bhāravi, Kumāraśīva, Gāḍhāsaṃptaśāti, Candīśataka, Caturapancāśika, Dākapuruṣeswarī, Bhallatāśālaka, Bhāsa Mahāśāstra, Mālayarudra, Ramāraka, Bhāma, Mūdārākṣa, Lākṣmīdīvara, Vīkatāntamābhī, Viṣṇu, Rājaśekhara, Hayagrīvaśastra. For a fuller reference, see Jaoobi, Notes on Alankāra Literature, [JRAS (1897), 281.]
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Among works and authors quoted are, Kādambarikathāśāra, Bhāravi, Kumāraśīva, Gāḍhāsaṃptaśāti, Candīśataka, Caturapancāśika, Dākapuruṣeswarī, Bhallatāśālaka, Bhāsa Mahāśāstra, Mālayarudra, Ramāraka, Bhāma, Mūdārākṣa, Lākṣmīdīvara, Vīkatāntamābhī, Viṣṇu, Rājaśekhara, Hayagrīvaśastra. For a fuller reference, see Jaoobi, Notes on Alankāra Literature, [JRAS (1897), 281.]

Among works and authors quoted see the following that are rare.

Among works and authors quoted see the following that are rare.
843 Ajitasena was a Jain ascetic. He was minister of the Ganga King Rācamalla of the 10th century A.D. He was the teacher of the Kanarese poet Nāgavarma, head of a Mutt at Bankipore. His Śrīngāramanjarī is a small work in 128 verses meant for elementary instruction, but Alankāracūḍāmaṇi is more elaborate.

844 Kṣemendra’s Aucityavicāracarca has been noticed. It propounds the theory that aucitya is the mark of poetry.

In his Kavikanthādharmāna (p 126) Kṣemendra quotes a verse of Bāna, from a source unknown:

कद्वन्तो महदयकाः बलासुंदरीक्षर बन्धनशहस्रव \\ समस्तम् सारुचन्ति पदे पदे हरति सतो माणिकुरा इव ||

and from Lalitamahākāvyā of his pupil Udayasimha.

845 Kuntaka or Kuntala came between Rājasekhara and Mahimabhatta and was very probably a younger contemporary of Abhinavagupta. He must have lived between 10-11th century A.D. Bhāmaha had declared that vakrokti embellishes poetry. Dandin classified poetry as svabhāvokti and vakrokti.

निष्ठित्वा समारूपितवक्रोक्तितिरिति वाक्मयां ||

Kuntaka laid down in his Vakroktijīvita that vakrokti is the life of poetry and combatted the theory of dhvani by saying that dhvani should be included in upacāravakraṭa, vakrokti based on resemblance or attribution.

846. Mahimabhatta or Mahumā was the son of Śrīdhairyā. Mahumā courted renown and the means he chose was to make a destructive critique on the most famous work of his day. Ānandavaridhana’s Dhvanyāloka was the target and with a sagacity of thought, scarcely rivalled by any other rhetorician, Mahumā brought into his work a width of learning and a logic of argument which can only be appre-
ALANKĀRA

753

ciated by a study of it. The latest writer Mahimā quotes is Abhimava-
gupta and the earliest writer who reviews the work of Mahimā is
Mammata. Mahimā must therefore be placed between Abhimavagupta
(about 1000 A.D.) and Mammata (middle of 1050 A.D.), that is about
the beginning of the 11th century A.D.*

Mahimā was a dialectician par excellence. To him all the world
was anumāna or inference. He would reduce any idea into a syllogism.
In short, no knowledge there is that is not in scientific essence ground-
ed on inference. Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka had already taken up his cudgels
against the theory of Dhvam, but Mahimā had not seen his work
Darpāṇa, Hṛdayadarpana, because his aim was to achieve celebrity
without delay and without being charged for not being original.

847 His Vyakṣivyāva, (called by him Kāvyālankāra⁴ of that
name), literally an inquiry into Vyakti (or succession), is in three
chapters. In the first, the definition of Dhvam as given by Ānanda-
vardhana is attacked word by word and letter by letter and is merely
a destructive criticism. In the second he takes up other sundry
theories such as of Vakrokti of Kuntaka and refutes his doctrine of
that the merit of poetry is felicitous expression.

Mahimā’s reasoning is thus epitomised: Vyakti is Dhvani. It is
the manifestation of that which is desired to be manifested and it
manifests itself along with its subject, that is, that which manifests it.
For instance, a vessel contained in a dark room becomes visible along
with the light that makes it visible.⁵ Mahimā’s object, viz., to gain
celebrity, has been really attained. He cared not whether it was
approbation or reprobation, for in any case his aim was not to sink
into oblivion in the literary world.

1. अद्यकान्तभिः प्रकाशोऽवलोकितं |
व्यक्तिविवेक कुप्त: प्रणस्य महिसा परा वाचय ||

2. See P. V. Kane, (Id., 41, 304).
3. सहसा यथोपत्तिः साधुप्रतात्तपतर्या मद विन् || See para 309 supra.
4. व्यक्तिविवेकायः काव्याखानं ||
5. Ed TSS, Trivandrum.
6. See Mahādovassast’s preface to Edn. 1, c 2.
7. अन्येश्वादिन्द्रपंथविषयं वृहामाण दून स्वतेलिङ्गेत्तरं विदिषाशेषवेद्यः \ ||
हत्याकारणगंगेण्या नवार्थवत्तवत्स्तिपरिश्रृंभितोविहाय वा ||

The commentary that is printed in the Trivandrum edition is nameless. Jayarātha
in his commentary on Alankārasarasvatsā says that Ruyyaka had written a Vyakṭiv-
vikāvica. From the fact that the commentator mentions his other works Nātaka-
848. Mammatā was the son of Jayyata\(^1\) of the Rājānaka family. He was a native of Kāsmir but had his education at Benares. Tradition says that he was the brother of Kayyata, the grammarian and Uvvata, the Vedic glossator.\(^2\) He came after Bhoja and probably had himself seen the last years of that king's reign, and hence distinctly mentions his greatness and liberality in his Kāvyaprakāśa.\(^3\) The earliest commentary on this work, yet known, was written by Mānikiyacandra in 1159 A D\(^4\) and we may safely assign Mammatā to the middle of the 11th century A D.\(^5\)

Mammatā was a staunch devotee of Siva. He was a great grammarian and followed the views of the grammarian school.\(^6\) His Kāvyaprakāśa (in 10 Ulasas) is often called Akara. It covers the whole ground of rhetoric, treats as usual of the merits and faults of poetry, the operation of words and their sources, and the figures of speech. According to him, real poetry is that which is free from faults and mimāmsa, Saḥityamimāmsa and Harṣacaritvārtika and Bhāṭṭi, it is likely that this commentary is the work of author of Alankārasarvasva, (Mankhuka?). See Int to Alankārarasvrita, TSS.

1 Jayyata was probably the joint author with Vāmana of the Kārikāvyārtā.
2 This account is given in Bhāmasēna's commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa. But Vāmanācārya (Int to Kāvyaprakāśa, Bombay) says that Uvvata calls himself in his Bhāṣya the son of Vajrata and that his Bhāṣya was composed when Bhoja was the reigning king. He therefore thinks that this tradition cannot be true. See on this JRAS (1903), 65, 66.
3 The references are given by Vāmanācārya (c and p 5-6).
4 Ibid (c and p 26-27) where the extract from the commentary is given.
5 Peterson (Subb 85) notes that Mammatā cannot be placed earlier than the commentary on it by one Jayanta written in 1800-1294 A D and that the earliest writer that is known to refer to Mammatā is Ruyyaka, who wrote his Sanketa on Kāvyaprakāśa (PR, II p 18). Duff (Chronology, p 188) refers to the commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa by Narahari dated 1242 A D (See Vāmanācārya 7 and pp. 28-29). Ganespatīśāstra (TSS, No 5, Int., p 8-9) makes him contemporary of Bhoja. Vāmanācārya (b) assigns Mammatā to the end of the 11th century. M. T. Narasiṃha Ayyangar (JRB 1908, 65) discusses these dates and arranges the chronology thus. Abhinavagupta, the last decade of the 10th century, Mahimabhatta early part of the 11th century, and Mammatā, middle of the 11th century. Bühler (BK, 68) thought that Mammatā was later than Jayaratha, the commentator of Ruyyaka, whom he assigned to the end of the 12th century, but G. A. Jacob (JRAS 1897, 289) says that Jayaratha refers to Mammatā by name and that Bühler's view is impossible. Bühler later on agreed (I A Jan 1884) with Peterson (JERAS, 1883-84 Extra No.) in placing him in the beginning of the 12th century. See P. V. Kane (IA, XXII 204).
6 The commentators, Nārāyana and Suṣhāṣṭagaṇa say so (See Vāmanācārya, Int. I c, p 9).

A collection of Mammatā's grammatical views is found in Vāmanācārya's introduction (I.c. pp 10-12.)
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adorned with ments. It has two parts, Śūtras or Kārikas and Vṛtti or the gloss. Bhimasena expressly says that Mammata was the author of the Kārikas, but on this question there is a difference of opinion. Vidyābhyāsa in his Śrītyakaumudi calls the Kārikas Bharatasūtras and has written his own gloss on it. Whatever it is, Kāvyaprakāsa has in fact eclipsed all earlier works by its popularity. Lucid and erudite, it enchants the reader and infuses into his mind a thought of its sublime merit. Mammata begins by the invocation of Sarasvatī.

नियतितनियत्वसद्धितं वादकमयोमतन्यथपरत्नाम्।

वक्रस्तिरा निषिदितायादिती भारती कविजयति॥

It is now almost accepted that Kāvyaprakāsa was the work of two authors Mammata and Allata. Mammata's work ends with the Pankarālankāra and the rest was made up by Allata. The other work known

1 तद्वद्वाम पञ्चव्याख्यानवस्तृत पुनः कापि।

2 Ed by Vāmanacārya Jhalakikara with a long introduction and commentary, Bombay and again revised with additional extracts from several commentaries and Ed with Tr and notes by H. D Sharma. For other editors with notes, see Cal of Or Book Agency, Poona, p. 57, Tr into English by Ganganath Jha, by H. D Velankare and by P. P. Joshi.

3 On this question, see I 1, XLII 23, ZDMG LXVI 477, LXVII 35. The commentary Vivaraṇāyaṇa says that the current tradition in Bengal is that Kārikas are the work of Bharata, but in the Rasagangādhara Mammata is referred to as the author. See Vamanacārya's Int. I c. 13-16, where he shows that Mammata refers to Bharata as an author, p. 101.

4. Ed Kavyamāla (Bombay), See on this PR, II 20 and para 814 supra.

5. Ananda in his commentary on Kāvyaprakāsa says

कालवक्तामयान्वयिण्यं परिक्रमाबधि।

सलुषु पूर्वतत्सौ विषयायाद्वरिणा॥

Jayantha in his commentary calls Mammata the author of the work (See PR, II 20). It may be interesting to note (PR, II, 14) that in the colophon to that Chap I of the Kāvyaprakāsa-Saṅketa, it is said that the whole work is described as of Mammata, Allata and Rucaka. It is, it seems, that the whole work is described as of Mammata, Allata and Rucaka. So says Sarasvamuccaya also. But were Mammata and Rucaka contemporaries? Peterson (PR, I 21 and II 1888-84, p. 13) takes Alaka to be the real name of the joint author. Some Mss give the name Bhattrājānaka. The Jammu Manuscripts (SKO, xxv) contain the word Allata. Alaka who is mentioned in Rajakanta's Sarasvamuccaya as a commentator on Ruyasa's Alankārasūtras, who was also the son of Jayantha, the author of a commentary on Rajakanta's Harivijaya, says that, to all intents and purposes, the commentator on Harivijaya is a different person (See SKO, op. cit. p. xxvi) Peterson identifies them (PR, II 17). See also Suhler (14, XV p. 258) Vamanacārya (I, c p. 9) confounds one with the other and calls Allata author of the commentary on Harivijaya.
to be Mammata's is Sabdavyāparacarca on the derivation and function of words like Mukula's Abhidhāvīśikā.

The extent to which Kāvyaprakāsa was revered is seen from the numerous commentaries that have been composed on it in all these successive centuries. Every later writer of repute considered it an edification of his own learning to expound or discuss Mammata's views so much that it was said by Mahēśvara that in spite of glosses written "from house to house," Kāvyaprakāsa was still unfathomable and and Bhāskara and Kamalākara said so too, though they saw ' thousands of commentaries" written on it.

So far as is available the commentaries will now be noticed

849 Manikyacandra was the pupil of Nemicandra and Sāgarendu of the Rājagaccha of which Pradyumna was the founder. He wrote his Pārvanāṭhasanāta in ten cantos in Sam 1276 (1220 A.D.) at Devakūpaka (Divbandar) at the instance of Dehada, son of Vardhamana, a councilor of kings Kumārapuṭa and Ajayapuṭa. His Nalāyana or Kuberapurāṇa is a long poem in 100 cantos and relates the story of Nala, whom he takes to be a prior incarnation of Kubera. His merit in rhetoric is displayed in his commentary, Sankāṭa on Kāvyaprakāsa, composed in 1160 A.D.

850 Sarasvatitirtha was born at Tribhuvanagirin (near Kalpi in Cuddapah District) He was the son of Mallinātha (nor the famous commentator of Śrīvatsagotra). His original name was Narahari but

---

1 Peterson, Suba, p 86 The book is in manuscript in Dacca Coll. Library.
2 Kāvyaprakāsa कता युः युः टीका, तथा पेश तबैव दृष्टम्
3. टीकाकार Kāvyaprakāsa काम सन्तु परवस्ता
   कायकारे टिपण्यसहस्र सन्तु यथा
4 Manikyacandra mentioned in Merūṭunga's Prapanḍhaolīśamaśī as contemporary of king Jayasimha is a different person
5 Peterson (PR, IV cxvii) identifies him with Sāgarendu who wrote the first copy of Amāmaswāmiśī in Sam. 1252 (1196 A.D.)
6 PR IV xcv Pradyumna was a great scholar in Nyāya and triumphed over Digambaras. He is reported to be the author of 84 works and was honoured by kings of Sapādalakha, Tribhuvanagirin etc PR, IV lxxix.
7 PR III 160, 820
8 PR, III App 35
9 Ed. Mysore. See S K De, SP, I. 169, OC, I 101, II. 20, PR, III, 191 JOC, II 1104
after he became a sanyāsa he called himself Sarasvatī Tīrtha. He wrote his commentary at Kāśi in 1242 A. D.

851 Jayantabhatta (1277-1297 A. D.) was the son of Bhāradvāja, a priest at the Court of King Śārangađeva, Vaghela king of Gujarāt. He wrote his commentary Jayaṇa in 1264 A. D.

852 Srivatsalanchana or Srivatsa was also a native of Bengal. He cites Vidyāśāktha and is mentioned by Kamalākāra. His commentary Sarabodhmi follows in substance Cakravarti’s work. He must also be placed therefore in the 16th century. He refers to the commentaries by Vidyāśāktha and Jayarāma.

853 Somesvara was the son of Devana of Bhāradvājagotra. He belonged probably to the 14th century A. D.

854 Visvanātha was the author of Sāhitya-gaṇapatha and lived in 14th century A. D. He refers to the other commentaries by Candidāsa and Śrīdharā.

855 Candidāsa was probably the granduncle of Visvanātha. He mentions a work of his called Dhvanisuddhāntagrantha and cites commentaries of Śrīdharā and Vācaspatīmisra who was different from the author of Bhāmaṭī.

856 Cakravartin or more fully Paramāṇarāja Cakravartin was a native of Bengal and a great logician. He refers to Visvanātha as well as king Praṭāpa Rudra and is cited by Kamalākāra and lived probably in the 15th century A. D. He wrote the commentary Sāhitya-gaṇipākā.

---

1. As for his other works, see Vamanacārīya, l. c., pp. 28–30 and PR, I, 25, among which commentaries are Mahāduṣṭa and Kumārasambhava. On this author, see para 31 supra.

2. CO, I, 101, II, 19, BR, (1888-4) ap, 326. See Vamanacārīya, l. c., 80, PR, II, 16, 20, BR, (1888-4) 17–18. Jayanta, author of Kādambarākṣekha, was an earlier author.

3. CO, I, 102, II, 20, 198, DO, XXII 8638, SKC, 60 He wrote also Kāvyamūrtā (CO, I, 778, II, 19), Kāvyāmrīta (CO, I, 109) and Rāmodayanājaka (CO, I, 786). See S. K. De, SP, 177–8, There is a Kāvyāmrīta poem by Kalāśa (CO, II, 20)

4. See Vamanacārīya, l. c. 80, CO, I, 103, II, 20, III, 22, PR, V. 59–60 The denotation of this author with Somesvara, author of Kṛtkīrtṣa (PR, V. IXXIV; CO, I, 102, 737) is incorrect as the latter was the son of Kumāra

5. CBSC, 299.

6. IOC, 491.
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857 Mahesvara Nyāyālankāra, or Subuddhimaṇḍra wrote his commentary Ādārśa at the end of the 16th century A.D.¹

858 Ananda Rajanaka was a native of Kāsmīr and a staunch devotee of Śiva. He interpreted Kāvyaprakāśa as having an inner meaning referring to Śiva in his commentary Nidārṣaṇa which he wrote in 1612 A.D.² He refers to the commentaries of Ĉakravartīn and Subuddhī Misra³

859 Kamalakara was son of Rāmakṛṣṇa, a Mahratta brahmin of Benares. His name is particularly known to us as the author of Vivādatandava and Nṝṇavasindhu which he wrote in 1612 A.D.³ He refers to the commentaries of Ravibhatta, Padmanābha and Ṣeṇavātīha. He wrote a big poem Rāmakauṭuka and a commentary on Gitagovinda⁴

860 Narasimba Thakura appears to have been of the same family as Govindathakura. He refers to Kamalakara's views as that of moderns and must have been either a contemporary of Kamalakara or followed him immediately. He was a great logician. He refers to the commentaries by Yāsodhara, Mātpāḍa and Rucikara,⁶

861 Vaidyanatha was the son of Rāmakṛṣṇa of Tatsat family. He wrote his commentary Udaharanacandrika on the illustrations only in 1684 A.D. and a commentary on Kāvyapradīpa called Pralīha⁶

862 Bhimasena was the son of Śivāṇanda of the Śāndilya family of Kānyakūṭa. He was a great grammarian. He wrote his commentary Śudhāsagaras in 1723 A.D. He says Māmata, Kayata and Auvata were brothers. He refers to two other works of his, Alankārasāroḍhāra and Kuvalayānandakhandana. It was his object to support the views of Māmata and to answer the faults attributed

---

1 Ed Calcutta. OC, I 193, Tant, IX 400) See Vamanācārya l c pp 96-7, PR, II 19 and III 4p 394
2. OC, I 193, II 20 Is he the same as Rājananda (DC, XXII 392)? Buhler's statement that Nidārṣaṇa was otherwise called Sarannamocaya (IA, 1884) is wrong. See SKE, xxvi, I 21, 74 and II 15-16 He wrote also Mādhavānandakāśīnarmac and a commentary on Naṣaṇīha. See PR, I 114; III 4p 395, IV, x, BK R, x. Weber, 194, II 149
3. Ed, Benares. For a list of his works see, Vamanācārya l c, 87-88 and OC, I, 80 where his works are given. See PR, l v xxviii Hall (Int to Vas 54) gives his name also as Mahesvara which according to PR, I 19 is doubtful. On his pedigree, see V P Mandalik's int to Vyavahāramayanukha, Ixxv, BK R, (1893-4), 50.
4 OC, I 80 3010
5. Ed Bombay. OC, I 101, II 19, Adyar, II 84
6 Ed Bombay, PR, II 22, 108 He is different from the author of the commentary on Kuvalayānandā
to it by Govinda in his Kavyaprakṣīpa. He refers to other commentaries by Acyutabhatta, his son Ratnapāṇibhatta, and his son Ravibhātta, by Murāri Misra and Paṇḍhadhara (Jayadeva)².

Nāgopbhātta was a Mahratta Brahmin of the Kaḷaṅga family of Benares. He was the son of Śivalbhātta and Śatī and grandson of the famous Bhatojō Ṇilāṣa. He was attached to the Court of Rāmasimha, the ruler of Śrīgaṇavārapura, of the 18th century A.D. He wrote commentaries on Kavyaprakṣīpa, Rasagangādhāra, Rasamāṇjara, Kuvalayaṇanda, Gītā-Govinda, Sudhalahāri and Rāmaṇya.

863 Rajanaka Ratnakantha was son of Śankarakantha of Dhanmūyaṇaṇagotra of Kāmīr "the land that is purified by the dust of the lotus-feet of Śāradā". Besides being an excellent scribe of Śāradā script, for in his hand are several manuscripts preserved at Śrīnagar,³ he was a poet and rhetorician. His eulogy of Śūrya is contained in Ratnakata or Citrabhāṇusatikā composed in 1680-1 A.D. He wrote commentaries on Ratanaka's Haravrjaya in 1681-2 A.D., on Vāsudeva's Udhuśabhravijaya in 1671-2 A.D.,⁴ on Jagaddhāra's Śatīkumāraṇaḥ in 1680-1 A.D. and on Yaśaskara's Devīstotra. On Kavyaprakṣa, he wrote the commentary Sārasamuccaya, containing a resume of Jāyanī and other earlier expositions.⁵ His descendants still live at Śrīnagar as a respectable family of Karkuns.

---

1. Ed. Benares, CC, I 102, II, 20 On Bhtmasena’s commentary, see PR, I 96, 94; IV lxxxvi
2. Ed Poona. For a list of his other works on grammar, see Vamanācaryā,
1 o 43-44
3. See Stein’s Intr to Rat, vil
4. Printed, Kāvyamāla, Bombay
5. Ibid. In the colophon his other works are mentioned.
6. PR, II 10 In Stein Kashmir’s catalogue, xxv, there is mention of a manuscript in which colophon to Ulīka I reads thus इति श्रीमद्राजाखनाकाकादिकन्यातं दिपदिपिते lotikāsya

Ananda’s gloss Kavyāgarāṇa was also called Śīlkanṭhavibodhaṇa. "By Śīlkanṭha is meant the god Śiva. Ananda calls his commentary the 'perception of Śiva' since it is his endeavour to interpret Mambata’s text as having besides its ordinary meaning a mystical sense relating to the worship of the god. Thus he says with reference to Mambata’s Mangala: राजाकाळक्रिकरखो सर्वाणि अर्यन्तरस काव्ययुग्मः गतितत्तत्त सकाशिकामिर्दभिरथापिका इति अस्विन कालं तरसति Ananda who composed his commentary in A.D. 1666, is still well-remembered in the tradition of the Kashmirian Pandits as the contemporary and friend of Rajanaka Ratnakantha." Seema Kash. Cat, Int xxvii
863-A Other Commentaries—Besides those referred to elsewhere, there are also commentaries by Gopinātha, Candīdāsa, Janārdana Vṛṣasa (SKC, 61), Devanātha Tarkapancānana (TC, II, 2214), Jagannātha Pandītaraṇa, Nārāyaṇa, Baladeva, Bhāṣucandra, Bhāskaramitra (Tany X 298, TC, III 3976), Rattesvara, Ravi, son of Ratanapāṇi (Mys 298), Rāmakṛṣṇa, Ramanātha Vidyāvaraṇa, Lābhita Gopālabhātta (Tany, IX, 4003, DC, XXII 8629), and by Śrī Vidyācakravarṇa (DC, XXII 8626, Tany, IX 4011), Venkatalaclasūri, Vaiḍīyaśāṇa (Mys, 298), Śivarāma, Śrīdara Śāṅkhīvatākībha, Śivanāyaṇa and Jayarāma Pancānana (Mys 298), and by Vedāntācārya, son of Sārvāṇādhvarṇa of Bhāradvajagotra (TC, III 3578), Yagnesvara, son of Kṛṣṇadeva (DC, XXII 8623), Jayadraṭṭha, brother of Jayarāṇa, Sāhityacakravarṇa (Tany, IX, 400, Rucūnātha (Adyav, II 34), Harisankara (Ed Calcutta), and Sivadatta (Ed Bombay), and by Bhāṣucandra, Gaḍāḍhara cakravarṇa, Gokulanātha, Gopinātha, Guṇaratnagopāla, Kalāṇhara, Kalyāṇa Upadhyāya, Kṛṣṇa

1 See CC, I 101-2, II 19-20, III 22 and 114, 108, 190, PR, II 18, 16, 17, 31, III 394
2 He wrote commentaries on Rāghuśāstra and Vṛṣastatākara
3 His commentary Kāvyakatuṇḍi answers the criticism of Vīvānātha. He also wrote Rasākapaṇḍita on poetics (CO, I, 497). His son Rāmananda wrote Rasākara gīti (TC, III, 3171)
4 About the 10th century A.D.
5 Rātanapāṇi wrote a commentary probably called Kā yārāpañcita on Kāvyaprakāśa which Ravi expanded Ratnapāṇi or his father Acyuta was minister of Śivādikā, king of Mithila (See JSB, (1226), (1243), (2699), 96, grant dated Saka 1291 (1899 A.D.) See Mummkan Chakravartty, History of Mithila (JSB, 1226).
6 Ed. TSS, Trivandrum, earlier than 12th century A.D. He also wrote a commentary on Rāmāyaṇa
7 His Bhata is printed in TSS, Trivandrum. He calls the Bhatacārya Bhatacārya’s See PR, IV, XXI.
8 The commentary was composed at Patna in 1649 A.D. He was a pupil of Bhāsejva Thakkura.
9 PR, II, 18.
10 CC, I 101. He wrote a commentary on Daśakamānasāraṇa
11 Hitra, 1227; CSC, VII, 13
12 Ganganātha Jha’s Translation of Kāvyaprakāśa, Int. IX He wrote the play Ṣāhityandarpāna and the same
13 CC, I 101. He also wrote a commentary on Sāhityandarpāna, about the end of 17th century A.D
14 CC, III, 19.
15 CBOS, 501. It is a synopsis of the Kārikās
16 Ganganātha Jha, I. c.
Alankāra

864 Raghava's gloss called Avacūri is incomplete and extends only to the middle of the 7th Ullāsa.

Mahesacandra was professor in the Calcutta Sanskrit College in 1882.

Narasimha's gloss Rjuvāṭi is a commentary on the Karikās only.

Kavyāṃṛtatārangini is an adverse criticism on Mammata's work of unknown authorship.

---

1 CC, I 101
2 HPR, III. No 58
3 CC, I, 101 He was the son of Rāmanātha and a logician. For his works, see CC, I 101.
4 CC, I 101 He lived at Nādoa in 17th century A.D.
5 CC, I 101.
6 CC, II, 19.
7 CC, I 101 He was son of Rangamātha who wrote commentary on Vīkramor-vati in 1686 A.D.
8 EB, CC, I 103 See under Ruyyaka, para 270 post.
9 CC, I 102
10 CC, II 30.
11 Mentioned in his commentary on Sarasvaṭi Kāntābharaṇa.
12 DC, XXII 3622.
13 CC, I 102.
14 CC, I 103, II 20.
15 CC, I 103 He lived about 1625 A.D.
16 Weber, I, No 61; CC, I 102 He lived in the beginning of the 17th century.

For his other works, see CC, I 649.

17 He is cited by Śrīvaṭsaśalānohaṇa. Was he identical with the commentator on Bhāṭṭikārya?
18 'CC, I 103.
19 CC, I 103. The manuscript was transcribed in 1686 A.D.
20 DC, XXII 3643.
22 Vamanākārya, I. c. 86.
23 'Printed, Calcutta.
24 TC, III 4118. He belonged to the Āṅgira country.
25 Mātra, 774.
865 Govinda was the son of Kesava and Sonodevi of the Ravikara race. Rucikara alias Sri Harsha was his younger brother. His fifth ancestor Narasimha lived in the 18th century and he was himself prior to Kamalakara who wrote Nirnadyasmdhu in 1612 A.D. He may be assigned to the middle of the 16th century. His Kavyapraddipa, though usually considered as a commentary on Kavyaprakaśa is in fact a distinct commentary on the Kārikas of the Kavyaprakaśa. His reference to Mammata’s lines are much in the way of possible criticism, though likewise explanatory. At the end of his work, he says that in the composition of his work, his brother Rucikara or Sri Harsa was a collaborator.*

866 Hemacandra lived in 1088-1174 A.D and for some time in the Court of King Jayasimha of Anhilwld. His Kavyānūsāsana in eight chapters with his own commentary is very valuable in literary history.*

Jayamangala also flourished in the Court of king Jayasimha and wrote Kavitaliṣa, and Nagavarma wrote Kavyālokanaṃ.

867 Vagbhata Among the contemporaries of King Hemacandra was Vagbhata I, the son of Soma Vagbhata (Bahada) was the minister in the Court of the Calukya king Jayasimha Siddharaja of Anhilwld (1094-1143 A.D), for such is the description given by Prabhācandra in his Prabhāvakaçarita. The work on poetics known after his name Vagbhatañkara describes in easy verse and in five chapters the forms and functions of poetry and refers to that king and his capital. It is likely Vagbhata wrote also the poem Nemimrvana. There are commentaries on Vagbhatañkara by Ādinātha or Juna-

---

1 Ed Bombay
2 PR, I 97-28 also refers to another commentary on the Kārikas called Kavya-
3 Leśā at Ody porous. This may show that the Kārikas are considered as of distinct
4 authorship
5 See para 70 supra.
6 CO, I 88
7 His Prakri name was Bāhada. Vagbhata, the writer of medicine was the son
8 of Simhagupta and was a different author.
9 Haricand (Kālidāsa) wrongly says this Jayasimha was King of Kaśmir. According to Lassen (Ibdit, III 669) Jayasimha ruled 1099-1154 A.D,
10 This work gives the dates for Vagbhata, 1128 and 1157 A.D
11 Ed. Bombay and Calcutta. But Weber’s Manuscript (1713) has a sixth chapter
12 on Yamaka.
13 Winterme (IL, II. 3886, III 642) thinks so The work is printed in Bombay.
Adinātha was a priest of Kharataragacchā in about 1403 or 1419 AD

868 Devesvara or Devendra was the son of Vāgbhata, who was a Mahāmātya to the King of Malava. In one of his verses he praises Hammīramahimahendra, who, if he was the Chauhan king, ruled about 1283 AD. His Kāvikalpalatā follows the Amarasimha’s Kavyakalpalatā and a verse from it is quoted in Sānghadhārapaddhatī. It was probably composed about the year 1300 AD. He also mentions a work Candrakalāpa on poetics.

There are commentaries on Kavyakalpalatā by Vacārama Sārvabhūma, by Rāmagopāla Kaviratna, by Saracandrasāstrī, by Śūrya Kavi, and one anonymous

869 Vāgbhata (II) was the son of Nemikumāra, and Vasun-

4. PR, IV. oxavī, CC, II. 182. He was a pupil of Śakaloandra, who was pupil of Jinaśandra. He wrote also a commentary on Raghuvamśa.
5. CC, I. 559, PR, (1888 s), 156, 279. The manuscript was copied in 1480 AD.
6. CC, I. 559, 704. He was pupil of Jinaśakāraksara who was pupil of Jinaśrībha-

sūrya of Kharataragacchā. Composed between 1350-1400 AD. See COJ, II 312.

8. CC, I. 559. It was composed in Samvat 1639 in Marwad during the reign of Gajasimha.
10. It is not likely that this Vāgbhata was identical with the two rhetoricians of that name. On Devesvara, see Sb. Do SP, 212, JRAS, (1929) 578.

11. अन्तङ्कारयक्षलपमपमातिस तद्वृद्धज्यायम् न प्रकृतप्राकृतयायम् न प्रकृतप्राकृतयायम्

The reading however is different in other editions.
12. Ed Calcutta. He was son of Bajārāma. His other work Anandārāṇgiṇī describes a tour from Canduramagore to Benares (Mitra 805).
14. Ed Calcutta (Bibl Ind) and in Pratīna Kramanandūn, Benares, Nos 1-81.
15. CC, I. 87, III. 19, S K De, PS, II. 214.
16. OŠC, VII. 8.
17. Eegling wrongly identifies this Vāgbhata with Vāgbhata I IOJC, III. 390.
18. Peterson (UB, III app 124) notes one Nemikumāra who lived in Samvat 1395 (1239 AD) was probably Vāgbhata father.
ALANKĀRA

The commentator is Alankara, who lived at Rādhāpura. He refers to Vāgbhata (I) and of the two kings he mentions, Mūlarāja and Vibhākara Mūlarāja was the founder of the Calukya dynasty of Anhilwad and may have lived about the end of the 13th century A.D. His Kāvyānusasana with a vṛtti on it is a work full of quotations of fine poetical illustrations and must have suggested itself to him after the work of Hemacandra of the same name. He alludes to his Chandonusāsana, a work on metrics and Rābhadēvacarita, a big poem, but they are not now available.

870 Ruṣyaka⁴ was the son of Tiṣṭaka. He lived in Kāśmir and was the teacher of Mankha, the author of Śrīkanthacarīta, who was attached to the Court of King Jayasmha (1129 to 1150 A.D.) His Alankārasarvasva is reputed to be work of Ruṣyaka⁵ But from the recent edition of the work published at Trivandrum, with the commentary of Samudrabandha⁶ it appears that Alankārasarvasva is only the name of the gloss, while the sūtras alone were the work of Ruṣyaka⁷.

1. दुःसिद्धान्तवावस्थारिदिष्टार्थार्थश्रवण, वयुः मातुरेऽञ्ज मस्ताधःक्षणः विनिष्ठ द्वापारः मन्याति॥

2. See Hamoband, Kālidasa
3. Ed Bombay
4. Rayānaka Ruṣyaka is identical with Rā ṛṣuaka and Rucaka (Anfrrecht, Oxf Cat 210, BER, 69) In Buhler's List 1375 6 No 247 and PR, II 14, 17 the manuscripts make Rucaka the author of Alankārasarvasva and Kavyaprakāśaṃkṣetra Vidyācakravartti calls him Rucaka Jayacartha, refers to Kavyaprakāśaṃkṣetra as Ruṣyaka's work. In a manuscript (Buhler's List, 1375 6 No 265) of the Sabrājyā-틸a, there is an explicit statement of the identity (See Pleischel Gott gel Anr Nr. 19 p 767) See G. A. Jacob, JBAI, (1897) 286 Peterson's Subh and PR, II 14, 106 and Introduction to Vyaktripāṭha (TSS,) p 8
5. Pleischel (op. cit.) notes the name of his father as a commentator on Udēbhata. Jayacartha calls it Udēbhataśriyata (See Bombay Edn p 205)
6. PR, II 17 18
7. Ed Bombay Ruṣyaka's views as expressed in the Alankārasarvasva are criticised by Mammata See Vāmanācarya's Int to Kavyaprakāśa, p 23
8. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No XL

इति समुद्राबन्धः द्वितीयकार विदिषाकारस्तवः स्वाखरिदिष्टार्थः श्रवणः।

9. Samudrabandha also calls it Mankhuka's work This commentator was a poet of the Court of King Sangrāmaśīhara or Rayverma Bhupa of Koplem (Quilon) in Travancore who was born in 1265 A.D. He was probably the father of Simharāja, the father of Prakṛtaśāpāvajā (See Int to Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Nos 8 and 40)

10. In the opening stanza, Mankha says that he was beginning a gloss on Gurvar-lankāmasūtras i.e., the alankāra aphorisms of his teacher It must however be noted that at p. 16 and 17 in quoting from Śrīkanthacarīta, it is said that Mankhiye Śrīkanthacarīta and at p 17 madiya The latter is the reading in Bombay, Edn. p. 19.
ALANKĀRA

871 ALANKARASARVASVA, meaning by it the gloss above, is in the nature of the Bhāṣya. It attempts to classify Alankāras, accompanied by criticisms refined in language and temper.

Ruyyaka seems to have been the author of several other works. His SAHRDĀVALĀ Ḫ is "a short prose-poetic discourse on the qualities of a fashionable gentleman, a charming formulary in four chapters and deals with attributes of beauty, adornments, youth and devises for preserving and enhancing beauty." His Alankāravimarsana is a commentary on the Jabalā's Somapālavilāsa, and a commentary on Mahimabhātā's Vyākhyāveka has been identified to be (Ruyyaka's?) work. This latter commentary refers to his four other works Nātakamāṃśa, Sāhityamāṃśa, Harśacarītarītiś and Bṛha Śrīkanthasṭava was probably also his work.

872 Jayaratha wrote his commentary Alankāravimarsana. He was the son of Śrīngāra, the minister of King Rājarāja who ruled at Satīsaras. He quotes from Prthvīrajavijaya, a poem describing the

1 There is an Alankārasarvasva of unknown authorship in praise of King Gopāla-deva, DC, XXII 3609
2. For a summary of earlier views, see para 812 supra
3. Ed by Pischell, Kiel Ed Bombay, with the commentary of Jayaratha
4. Raṭnakantha's Sārasmuccaya yields this reference. See Peterson, Subh p 100; PR, II 17
5. In the introduction to Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (No 5) Ruyyaka is taken to be the author of the Alankārasarvasva and from this basis the commentary on the Vyākhyāveka is traced to be Ruyyaka's work, because in his Alankārasarvasva the works Śāhityamāṃśa and Harśacarītarītiś are mentioned in both as the author's other works. If as now opened in Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No 40, Alankārasarvasva is the work of Mankha, it would follow that all these four works and the commentary on Vyākhyāveka must also be Mankha's works.
6. Pischell rightly says that this was a hymn to Śiva. But Aufrecht takes it "to be a chapter in praise of the country so called standing at the head of a poem called the Harshacarīṭa also by Ruyyaka." See Peterson Subh l c 106. This mistake seems to have been due apparently to Aufrecht's referring to a passage quoted from Harṣacarīṭa, in Alankārasarvasva (Bombay Edition p 47), Harṣacarīṭa, Śrīkanthākhyājanapādavārpaṇa. See also JRAS, (1897) 225
7. Śrīngāra is quoted in Kaviśravacanasmuccaya and Saṅuktikarpamṛta, V 95, 114. CQ, I 66. M Duff calls the author of the commentary Jayāratha, brother of Jayāratha, author of Taṃtratokavikāva (PR, II 181.
8. Ed Bombay He quotes from a romance Anangalekhā, (see para 145 supra), and

9 Buhler's ER, 62. See also O. A, Jacob (JRAS, (1897) 292 3)
victory of the Chauhan King Prthviraja, who died in 1193 A.D. and must have flourished probably in the 13th century. He wrote a poem Haracantacintamani.

There are also commentaries by Sri Vidyacakravartin and by Alaka quoted by Rathnakantha.

873 Malayajapandita or Sarvesvara was the son of Trivikrama and pupil of Vamars. He was proficient in Bharataśāstra. Vamars is referred to in Belgaum inscriptions as having lived at Vanabasi in 1168 A.D. His Sāhityasūra is a short treatise on dramaturgy.

874 Rajaraja ruled at Calicut about the beginning of the 12th century A.D. He, or a poet of his court, wrote Rājarājīyam, a name adopted in the absence of the real one. It is a treatise on poetics, music and dancing, but only that portion dealing with the drama is now available. In his days, the works of Manoraṭha and Bhattanāyaka were probably read and there is therefore a hope that their existence may be still be traced.

875 Asadhara was the son of Sallakaṭa and Rāṭhi of the family of Vyaghrala. He was a Jaina teacher. His wife was Sarasvaṭi and his son Chabada, a favourite of King Arjuna-varman of Malva who ruled in the 1st quarter of the 13th century A.D. He lived till Sam 1296 (1240 A.D.). He wrote about fifteen works, of which he gives a list. His Ārhasūtra was written in 1236 A.D.

876 Dharmadasa was a Buddhist ascetic. His Vidagdhamukhamandana in 4 parts describes poetic riddles and involved composition. Jinaprabha, pupil of Jayasimha, commented on it and he

1 DC, XXII 8609 In this commentary he refers to a drama Hariscandracarita not known elsewhere
2 The manuscript is with M. Ramakrishna Kavi, Madras.
3 If he is the great Cola king Rājarāja I he ruled about 999 A.D. See EI V 49 Trav. Arch. Series, II 1
4 This verse is finite.

उत्सनेषार्थसति महिमास्तिग्यातुतप्रिद्वपिताधिकरसिः भिमताविद्वृता ||
आन्दन्तवनपशिनबिदित्रिकिंचित्व्यलौरितस्य समया....राजराज ||
5 Asadhara, son of Rāmāji, commentator on Kuvalayānanda is a different person.
6 He gives this account at the end of his Dharmāmrtha.
7 PF, II 86, BR (1888-94), 103-4
8 OC, I 64
9 Ed Calcutta, Bombay and elsewhere. See supra.
lived about 1298 and 1309 A.D. Dharmadāsa may therefore be assigned to about the end of the 12th century or the beginning of the 13th century A.D. There are other commentaries on it by Aṭmārāma or Svapnārāma,* by Jārācandra Kāyaśṭha, by Narharibhatta, by Trilocana, by Dhūgādāsa,* son of Vāsudeva

AMRIJANANDAYOGIN’S Alankārasangraha in 10 chapters is an extensive work written at the instance of king ‘Manva, son of Bhatibhumipafi who probably lived about 1250 A.D.*

877 Saradatanaya was the son of Bhatta Gopāla of Kāṣyapa-gotra. "His great grandfather lived in a village called Mātrarāja in Merūtara-Janapada. He performed thirty Vedic sacrifices to please the god Visnu, and wrote a commentary entitled the Vedabhusana on the Vedas. His son Kṛṣṇa, the grandfather of Sāradātanaya, was also equally well-versed in the Vedas and in the Sāstras. He worshipped Mahādeva in Benares and obtained a son by name Bhattagopāla the father of Sāradātanaya through the god’s favour. Bhattagopāla was likewise well-versed in eighteen sciences (Vidyās), he propitiated Sāradā the goddess of learning and obtained through her favour a son whom he named after the goddess as Sāradātanaya." He studied theatrics under Divākara,* who was proficient in the art and kept up a theatre (nātvasālī) "He was a follower of the Praṭyabhijnā School of Philosophy which had its origin in Kashmir and was elaborated by

---

1 Weber, 1793, PR, IV. xxxvii, Klāte’s Onomasticon His Guru Jinasimha founded Laghu Kharat marginalized in 1276 A.D.
2 CC, I. 579
3 CC, II 574, II 285, III 129. For other works, see CC, I. 239
4 CC, I. 578
5 CC, II 285, SKO, 274.
6 CC, II 285, III 121, PR, IV 30
7 The rare works he quotes from are the plays Mārisvandana, Vāluṇḍha, Ujakṣaraṇghava, Nalavijaya, Diviparanaya. The first five chapters were edited at Calcutta with English translation DC, XXII, 8604, and CC, I. 29, contain only 5 chapters. The copy in the Gattai Library of Rajamundry and TC, III, 2280 contain all the nine chapters
8 Probably he is the same as Divākara, quoted by Purpasarasvati in his commentary on Meghasandeha. The teaching is this described:

श्रीमतस्वप्नाराम सिस्तरिलं भिष्मार्गीयां न श्रुतं अवस्थितेऽपि नारदश्री च श्रुतंहै नारद्वास्यायां।
श्रिप्रत्यक्षां श्रद्धं च नारदश्री च मातन्यथाप्य तत्तत्त्वस्तक्तगुणसन्यासस्यायां|

॥
the great Abhinavagupta. While describing the origin of music on page 181, our author deals with the 36 Taṭṭvas in accordance with the tenets of the Pratyabhijñā system, and defines the functions of Pramāṭṭma, Jiva and Prakṛti in the beginning of Creation. Following the principles of the same philosophy, he has introduced in his work a very interesting simile for the enjoyment of dramatic Rasas by the audience, and refers to a few early works of Śivāgīti in this connection. This enjoyment, he said, is similar to Jiva’s enjoyment of worldly pleasures. In the course of his arguments he also defines certain Taṭṭvas of the Pratyabhijñā philosophy such as Rāga, Vidyā and Kalā. He has summarised chapters of Bhoja’s Śṛngārāprakāśa. He is quoted by many writers of the 13th century and must have flourished in the 12-13th century A.D.

Sāradāṭhanaya wrote a commentary on Kavyaprakāśa and a work on music Saradiya.

In his Bhavaprakasanam, a treatise of extra ordinary merit in 10 adhikāras, Sāradāṭhanaya summarises the views of earlier writers like Saḍāsvīra, Drauḥmī, Vāsuki, Vyāsa, Nārada, Śrī Harsa etc. In general, he follows the plan of Bharata’s Nātyāsāstra and notices the deviations of later authors from Bharata’s views. He reiterates Abhinavagupta’s theory that rasa is the soul of poetry, but differs from him on occasions. “For instance, he differs from Abhinava on the point that Rasas must always be Vyangya in the best poetry and not Vacya. Here Saradatanaya following the Dasarupaka opens a new path by suggesting that Rasas are the soul of poetry whether they are expressed or suggested by the poems. In the same way he does not want to

1 Int to Edn GOS, Baroda, pp 10 11 by Yadugiri Yatrīraswamī
2 सङ्ग शाफार छाले भ्रमणे हुए दण्ठितम् || (०५ p. 194)
3 भ्रमणे पूर्विन्तेयो विषयाबाकासारिणा ि ||
4 Among rare authors and works he quotes are plays

अष्टबन्धमिसर, अमृतमन्धम, एन्सुल्फ़े, उदातकर्षम, कविेपी, कुमठेलर, कलाराजमिसर, गवातकिक, गवालार्जसम, गांभीर्यम, तेरगदह, गियपरंपर, तारभोगरम, केतिङ्गतक, विनिहार, कुड़माल, दैवीपरिश्रम, दैवीप्रवेश, नवविकम्ब, द्वितीयविक, पञ्चवतीपरिश्रिया, मद्देस्व, महानार्तक, भार्तश्रिहित, मरीचविवेक, मरणान्तम, धीयाक, तनादवर, भृगुरिलक, सैरशिक, सवितरम, भार्तिवच, रामारान्द, महानार्तक, तीमिक।
give altogether a separate existence to the suggestive capacity (Vyanjana) of the words from their Tatparya Vrttu, and brings the Dhvani also under the Tatparya-saktu. He holds that if at all there must be some difference between these two-Dhvani and Tatparya—it is just like that of the Brahmana and the Brahmacann, or in other words, that Dhvani occupies a less important position under the wider scope of Tatparya. There are two other important points where Saradatanaya differs from Abhinava. There is difference of opinion as to the exact mode in which the enjoyment of Rasa is brought about, amongst the authors Lollata, Sankuka, Bhattanayaka and Abhinavanupta. Most of the later writers followed Abhinava on this point but Saradatanaya, strange as it may seem, follows the original view of Bhattanayaka as developed and modified by Dhanika in his Dasarupakavaloaka. He approves of the theory as formulated by them that the connection between the poetry and the Rasa, is Bhavya-Bhavaka-Bhava and not Vyangya-Vyanjaka-Bhava. The Vrttas such as the Abhidha, Laksana, and Tatparya help the audience to understand the Kavyartha or the Rasa, and the audience through the Bhavana Vrttu get the Bhoga of the Rasa, which is similar to Brahmananda. In the same way, Poetry and Rasa are also connected with each other as cause and effect. Because, when poetry is presented before the audience, the necessary Vibhava, etc create the sense of enjoyment in the mind of the audience. The second point where Saradatanaya criticises the views of other writers on Dramaturgy, especially Abhinava, is about the nature of Santa Rasa. Udbhata was the first writer to include Santa as one of the Rasas; it was approved by Anandavardhana, and Abhinava gave it a place of unique importance amongst the different Rasas. Rudrata or Rudrabhatta not only accepted Santa as an important Rasa but included Preyas also as a Rasa, and boldly declared that the Vyabhicari and the Sattvika Bhavas such as Nirveda, Harsa etc, also when properly developed contribute to the pleasure in the same way as Srngara or Karuna, and therefore, they should also deserve to be admitted as additional Rasas Saradatanaya, who follows Dhananjaya in this respect, condemns the views of all these thinkers and opines that Santa Rasa cannot be enacted on the stage, for no Vibhava, Anubhava and Sattvika can be produced by the Sama, the Sthayibhava of the Santa. But unlike Dhananjaya our author thinks that it is the chief among the Rasas and it can be realized in the form of poetry except in the Dramas. Thus the scope of this work is to collect as far as possible all theories existing before and after the time of Bharata.
and to examine and state them in a final form with certain modifications. Being a firm believer in the theory of Rasa as promulgated by Bharata, Saradatanaya has mainly developed the Sṛṅgara Rasa on the lines suggested by Bhoja in his Sṛṅgarapakṣa.

Kāvyakamadhanu is on the same lines as Bhāvapralāsa and treats of rasa, bhāva and sabdavyāpāra elaborately.

878 **Sobhakara** was the son of Trayīśvaramisra His Alankāra-ratnākara 4 is in the form of a commentary on aphorisms that had been extracted by Yasakāra of which his Čevistotra is meant as an illustration. He probably lived about the 13th century A.D. 5

879 **Singabhupala** was the son of Ananta or Anapoṭa 2 and Annamāmbā and was the seventh in descent from Vetala Naidu 4 (Bet Reddi), the original founder of Kingdom the Rajas of Venkatagiri. Vasantaṛāya was his brother Singabhupāla had six sons and ruled over a vast extent of territory between Vindhya and Śrīsaila (in the Kurnool District) about the year 1400 A.D from his capital Rājścala (Racakonda) 8 He was a great literate and patron of letters. He bore the title of Sarvajna. In his court shone Vaiśvesvara and Appayācārya. The latter wrote a commentary on Amarakosa.

It was in his Court that Nārāyaṇācārya alias Kumāra Vedānta Deśika, the son of the famous Vedāṇṭadeśika, vāṇquished Śākalyamallia, the opponent of the Vaiṣṇava religion in disputation and then it was

1. BHR Ap XXVIII
2. For these sutras, see PR, I 13, 77–81 OC I, 32, II 6
3. Anapoṭa wrote a drama Abhirāma-Rāghava, quoted in Rāsarpaśvaṇḍhākara. There is a drama of that name written by Manika in Nepal in 1390 A.D (Levi, 268)
4. The Biographical Sketches of the Rajas of Venkatagiri published by the Venkatagiri State Singabhupal 1 is given as the tenth in descent. In our manuscript the name is given as Śvabhupal. Venkatagiri is a flourishing Zamindari in the Nellore District.
5. Singabhupala, the present author, was the son of Anapoṭa who was the son of Singabhupāla 1 I It was the latter who bore the title Sarvajna and Śrīnāṭha was the post of his Court. Śrīnāṭha refers to him by the title Sarvajna. In the Telugu script Vamsacārīstram (in Telugu) the author of Rāsarpaśvaṇḍhākara is given as Singabhupal 1 That seems to be incorrect. There are inscriptions there given of Anapoṭa dated Saka 1503 and of the wife of Mādhava, the last of Singabhupala II dated Saka 1531. Another inscription dated Saka 1591, also printed there, was composed by Nāgānāṭha son of Pasupati. Nāgānāṭha wrote a bhaṣa Medanavilāsa mentioning Anapoṭa and was a pupil of Vaiśvesvara, author of Camaṭkāraśabdakīrti, in which Vaiśvesvara eulogised Singabhupala. It will be seen presently that Vaiśvesvara was the real author of Rāsarpaśvaṇḍhākara.

(See Veturi Prabhakaramastri's Sṛṅgara Śrīnāṭham, 196 et seq.)
that a commentary on Vedāntadesika's Subhāsītanī, called Raṣṇapetikā, was composed and presented to the king.

His Nāṭakapanbhāṣā appears to be a work on dramaturgy. His Rasarnavasudhākara presents in three chapters a vivid and elaborate treatment of the canons of dramaturgy inclusive of the governing Rasas and is probably the most comprehensive work on the subject so far available. Its importance is enhanced in literary history by the several works and authors quoted in it, and so far it forms a landmark for historical research.

Viṣvanātha, the author of Camatkaracandrika, was a poet of his Court and in this work which is a treatise on rhetoric the illustrations are in praise of Singabhūpāla. Here and in Rasārṇavasudhākara (page 151), his work Kandarpasambhava is quoted. In many places in Camatkaracandrika the reader is referred for details to Rasārṇavasudhākara. From these references it is inferred that the real author of Rasārṇavasudhākara was Viṣvanātha.

880 Visvanātha was the son of Candrasekhara a Mahāpātra brāhmin of Kalinga. They were Sāndhivigrāhika, that is a high official in the royal Court. Candidāśa, the commentator on Kāvyaprakāśa, was his grand uncle. He quotes Gīṭagovinda and Nasmātha and mentions Alladdīn. Jayānta wrote his Prakāṣādipikā in 1324 A.D. and Alladdīn, the famous Khilji marauder, was assassinated in 1315 A.D.

1. CC, I 284 791
2. Ed T S S No 50 and Ed Venkatagiri
3. Among the works and authors quoted are
   Amārārāṣṭrapāla, Amogārāṣṭrapāla, Anantadityaprasasūnam, Katiyakprasūnam, Kṛṣṇakṛṣṇa, Paṇḍitāyanirmudra, Rāmavatara, साधुसंघविजय, वैराङ्गनविजय,
4. We have several instances in Rāmābhuyodaya of Śālva Nāmasimhaṇa and in Mahātakasudhanidhi of Immac Diwarṣaya, where the real author was Arunagirinītha.
   See Votaur Prabhakara Sistrī's Singarasrīnātham, 208-4
5. सम्भव सरसदरुण विमान प्राणपिरण
   अलावशोमतपून न सम्भव च विमान
6. His works Puṣpamālap and Bhāṣārṇava and verses his are quoted in Sāhitya-ḍarpāṇa.
7. S.K De, SP, I 239 gives the date 1800-1850 A.D. See also Kano, (Int to Edn VI; Cakravarti, JASB, lxxii, 146 and II (n. 8) 167 n.; Keith, JRAS (1911), 848
   Visvanathas, authors of (i) Śītārāvēpikānāstikā (ii) of Sangīta Raghunandana (iii) of Vṛjīkasūtra (iv) of poem Jagatprakāśa and Śītārāvaliṣṭātā (v) of poem Amṛṭala-hari (vii) of Śivaṣati, of Śīvāmṛṭalahari (x) of Bhāgavataśāmsangamba (xi) of poem Śambhūvilāsa, [mentioned in CC, I 593-6, II. 128] are different.
Visvanātha mentions [Saugandhikāharana of his namesake of the Court of King Prataparudrendra who ceased to reign in 1323 A.D. It is said in Sāhityadarpaṇa that Nārāyaṇa, grand-father of Visvanātha, vanquished a poet Dharmadatta in the Court of King Narasimha of Kālinga. Visvanātha himself composed a poem Narasimhavijayam, apparently in praise of a king of that name of Kalinga. These two Narasimhas must be different. There are four Kings (Narasimhas) of the East Ganga dynasty of Kalinga, of whom Narasimha II ruled between 1268-1302 A.D.,9 Narasimha III ruled between 1326-1330 A.D. and Narasimha IV began to rule in 1376 A.D. A manuscript of Sāhityadarpaṇa is dated Samvat 1440, (1384 A.D).8 Sāhityadarpaṇa could not therefore have been composed after 1376 A.D., if we allow an interval for a manuscript to pass from Kalinga to Kāśmir. We may infer safely that Visvanātha was in the Court of King Narasimha III (1268-1350 A.D.) and that of his son Bhānudeva (1350-1376), and Nārāyaṇa, his ancestor in the Court of King Narasimha II (1268-1302 A.D.)

881 SĀHITYADARPAṆA4 is an exhaustive treatise on the plan of Kāvyaparākṣa, on which also Visvanātha wrote a commentary. In ten chapters, it traverses the whole field of poetics and his treatment is lucid and impressive.

There are commentaries on it by Maṭhurānātha Sukla, by Ananṭādīsa, by Gopinātha,10 and by Rāmacarana Tarkavāgīṭa.

1 Dharmadatta is cited in Prabhākara’s Rasapaṇḍita (composed 1586 A.D.) in which Sāhityadarpaṇa is also quoted.
2 El. V, app. 58, VIII app. 17. See JASB (1903), 29.
3 See 64. It is therefore seen that Weber (SL, 231, 244-n), Eggeling (IOOC, III 887) and Hartcand (Kāhīdāsa, 115) were wrong in their assumption of 16th century A.D.
4 Among rare works mentioned in it are

क्षत्रमेलकर, इयात्विनिस्म, अवसाद, अस्तातपयु, कसमंड, रामायनत्वम, बाड़-गर्तिय, जानकीराजश, रामायणम, वायातितिनिस्म, राजवायणम, पुष्पमुयितिक, हीरणमयिक, कुमाथेश्वरविनिस्म, समुद्रमयिक, अस्तातपयु, कल्लितिरिप, समसरस, वेदान्तमानक, नर्मदा, बिलासवती, श्रीरामलिङ्क, देशाशाहदेव, लेनका-हितन, सायाकापालिक, क्रृष्णासालय, ककनवाहीमान, ब्रह्ममती, कणावरकस, बिलासमान, वायातिनिस्म, ज्योति, देशराजचरितम, ब्रह्मचरयमा.

5 El Calcutta, Bombay, Calcutta etc. Translated into English by Ballantine and P D Mitra Bub Ind Calcutta. See S K De, SP.
6 CO, I, 715. He wrote a voluminous writer, see CO, I, 472. He wrote his Jyotisādhaka in 1283 A.D. He also was a commentary on Kuvalayānandam.
7 CO, II, 171 He was son of Visvanātha. A manuscript is dated 1686 A.D.
8 CO, I, 169.
9 El Calcutta and Bombay. DO, XXII, 8710. He wrote his book in East Bengal in a Bāha 1629 (1701) A.D.
Alankāravādārtha discusses the views of Sāhityadarpana 1

Among his other works, from which he quotes are the poems Rāghavavilāsam, Kuvalayavacantam (in Prakrit) Nārasimhaviyayam, and the plays Candrakālā and Prabhāvatīpanāyam. His Prasasti-ratnāvāli is a Karambhaka in 16 languages, containing panegyrics.

882 Visvanatha, son of Tilmanda and grandson of Ananta of Dharasura city on the Godāvari, wrote Sāhitya-sudhāsāndhu in 3 tarangas and a play Mṛgānkalikhā. 8

883 Rasaviveka called Kavyādarsha is an excellent treatise in three chapters on rasa probably of the 14th century A.D. 4 The author’s name is not known, but he was the brother of Saunyabhāsinakavī and pupil of Pāṇini. The illustrations are from ancient works, of which the latest are K-emendra's Silasataka till now unknown and Bihāra's Vikramāṇkadevacarita (I, 14).

884 Bhanudatta, known also as Bhānakaramiśra 9 was the son of Gaṇapatha or Gaṇavara of Vidhāna (Vidarbha?) His Gita-Gaurīsam is a lyric modelled on Jayadeva's Gita-Govinda and the commentary on his Rasamanjari by Govinda is dated 1428 A.D. Bhanudatta's father wrote Rasaratnadipikā from which quotations are found in Rasatarangini, and his great-grandfather Sankaramisra who was the author of Upakāra and a commentary on Śrī Harva's Khandanakhādyā lived about the year Saka 1327 (1405 A.D.) 8. From these references it

---

1 HP8, I, 12, CC, III, 7
2 SKO, xxix, where the manuscript is dated 1603 A.D. He cites Candrāda commentator on Mammata.
3 See para 710 supra
4 TC, I 804 Thus he begins discussion
5 An author Kaśmīrābhijati is quoted. Can he be Hariṣa mentioned as a dramatic writer by Abhinavagupta?
6 "अलक्ष्यार्जुनात्त्व... अनुपादेयते च काव्यम् तदुपयोगदेहातो शक्तिपृथ्यास- स्वप्नां कृतिन्द्रुपीशीलवात्त्वकम् वैण्यत्वम् यात्"
7 There is a poet Bhānakara who was patronised by a king Virabhāmin, who according to Haradatta Sarasvati (IEO, X, 478) was contemporary of Sher Shah (1540-1554 A.D.). For a discussion, see Chapter on Erotics post under Virabhāmin's Kandarpasūtanī. See COJ, I 197, II 251. In Sahyānakhara, Govindāy quote distinctly from Bhānakara and Bhanupandita (BR, 1897, 91, 1xii).
8 CO, I 405, 798, 100, VII, 1443-5
9 Ananta Bhātta (17th century) commentator explains the verse तत्कि राजपरे निजाध्यक्षीपकायकायलक्षित: | as निजाध्यक्षों देवगिरिराजः |
is inferred that Bhānudatta lived between 1350 to 1450 AD. His Rasamanjari deals with the phases of love as embodied in poetry and illustrates the conditions of lovers of different ages and experiences. In delineation of character, in appreciation of psychology in and choice of illustration, it is unsurpassed in excellence. The reader feels himself in a land of enchantment and it is in short a book of pleasure.

His Rasatarangini is a similar work in eight chapters on rasas and refers to Rasamanjari for elaboration. Among his other works are Alankāratilaka, Śṛngāradipīkā and probably the poem Kumāra-Bhāgavīyam.

"In the sixth chapter of the Rasatarangini, Bhanudatta excuses himself from giving details about certain points because he says they are given in the Rasamanjari. From this it is clear that the author of both was the same, but there is some question as to his native country. In Professor Aufrecht's copy of the Rasamanjari it is spoken of as 'Vidarbhabhuh' or the land of the Vidarbhās, and the manuscript before me agrees with his. But Dr Burnell in his catalogue of the

Ahmed Nizam Shah obtained possession of Deogir (Doultabad) between 1497-1507 A.D. and founded Nizam Shahi dynasty in Deccan which continued in possession till 1697 A.D. (Beligge, Ferishta, II 200).

E N Bhattacharya (Jl of Dep of Letters, Calcutta, Vol IX, 163) refers to a tradition that Bhānn's father wrote Rasaratnālipikā and his grandfather Sankham wrote a commentary on Śṛī Harśa's Khandanakhaṭīya (Pandit, XIII, 172), CC, I 125, II 149, III 130.

In Kumārabhaṅgalīya (SOC, VII 1540) mention is made of one Snrēvārō, son of Raṇasvāra, who was an ancestor of Bhānudatta, separated by 6 generations from himself and who wrote Śrīmakhābhayavārtīka.

1. S K De (SP, I 243) says he cannot be earlier than the middle of the 14th but later than the 13th century. See his paper on the date of Bhānudatta (Ivo of Or. Confes, Allahabad, 1926).

2 Ed Madras, Bombay, Benares and Calcutta

3 For instance

रसात वारिद्वायरिमिरिविचितो वासो धने काने
श्रीकन्दनश्रीरसरससिद्धो देवस्माराधिति।

नीता जागरणलक्य रजनी श्रीवा उठा दशिनात
तस्मि न तपस्यायस स कथ नामवि नन्दनाधितो: ||


5. OC, I 89, II 66, III 7, Tang IX, 4107, P R, VI, App 29

6 OC, I 661

7. CASP, 47, with comm. of Gopālananda, Bharatamallika and Nayanitarīma.
Tanjore manuscripts calls him Mithila Bhanuddatta, i.e., Bhanuddatta, the native of Mithila, and the copy of the Rasamania purchased by me in 1879 and another procured since the close of the year have Videhabhuh instead of Vidarbhabhuh, i.e., the land of the Videhas of which Mithila was the capital that Vidarbhabhuh is a mislection is shown by the fact that the author represents the river of the gods or the Ganges as flowing through his country, while the country of the Vidarbhas, which corresponds to the modern Berars, is situated to the South of the Narmada.

886 There are commentaries on Rasamania by Mahadeva, by Rangaswryan, by Anantapandita, by Nageshwaratte, by Bopadeva alas Gopala, by Seacintaman, by Gopaldabhatta, by Anantasarman, by Vrajara, by Visvesvarya and one anonymous.

There are commentaries on Rasatarangini by Gangarāma Jati, by

1 TO, I 985,
2 DC, XXII 505 He was also called Gurljālasṛyam He was son of Dharmācārya of ChilaSMart family of Gurjula, Guntur District, Madras
3 Ed Benares DC, XXII 5085 He was son of Tryambaka and patronised by King Citrabhānu of Benares Citrabhānu was son of Virasumha and was called Straikshna For particulars, see IOC, III. 956 His native place was Purvaparamba on the Godāvari. He wrote his commentary in 1686 A.D. at Benares
4 CC, I 495, II 116, 120, III 106, Ulswar, 1079 On Nāgoji; see para supra.
5 CC, II, 116, 19, II 36 When the date of composition is given as Saka 1494 but SKC, 273 gives the date as Saka 1484 Bopadeva alas Gopala Ācārya was son of Nṛśma of Kaundinyagotra of Jabolagrama of Mahārāstra
6 CC, I 495, II, 116, 220, III, 106 where his other works are given. Seaca- cintaman was son of Śeacantimha of the 17th century. For Śosa family of Benaras, see para 652 supra.
7 ibid He was son of Hariyamabhata Dravida. He commented on Śrangārājīka and Kāvyaprabha. For his other works, see CC, I, 102.
8 CC, I 495, II 116. He also wrote Āryāsaptai, in 1645 A.D.
9 ONWP, II, 120 He was son of Kāmarāja and Jivardasi was his son and wrote a commentary on Rasatarangini. See para 903 post.
10 CC I, 495, II 116, III 106 For Viśvesvāra, son of Lakṣmidhata, see para 312 supra.
11 IOC, 542.
12 IOG, III 384, DC, XXII 5080, TO, II 1088. He was son of Nārāyaṇa and wrote Rasamama (Ed Benaras). His commentary is dated 1732 A.D.
Jivarāja,\textsuperscript{1} by Mahādeva,\textsuperscript{2} by Gaṇēśa,\textsuperscript{3} by Ayodhyaprāśāda,\textsuperscript{4} by Bhagavad-bhatta,\textsuperscript{5} by Divākara,\textsuperscript{6} by Nemisaha,\textsuperscript{7} by Venidatta.\textsuperscript{8}

Jivarāja flouts Gangārāma’s commentary Nāukā and praises his own Seṭu thus

\begin{align*}
\text{तेजु परिलक्ष्य विस्मृतकृदयो नौकाविद्वि क्रियाविलयसाधने} & \\
\text{तां तर्कसम्पन्न तत्त्व च च ज्ञात्य द्रव्यदक्षता इति} & \\
\text{तेजु परिलक्ष्य विस्मृतकृदयो नौकाविद्वि क्रियाविलयसाधने} & \\
\text{तां तर्कसम्पन्न तत्त्व च च ज्ञात्य द्रव्यदक्षता इति} & \\
\end{align*}

887 Jayadeva's Candralokā is almost a student's handbook in poetics. In ten Mayūkhas or chapters it describes the qualities of good poetry and illustrates the figures of speech. In the introductory verses, Jayadeva calls himself Piṣyāvasa and in the concluding verses, gives the names of his parents as Māhādeva and Sūmitrā These references are conclusive on the identity of the authors of the Candralokā and Prasannarāghava.\textsuperscript{10} Besides Kuvalayānanda, there are commentaries on Candralokā, by Venkatasūr,\textsuperscript{11} by Payagunda Vaḍyanātha,\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{CC}, 494, II 229, III, 106 He was son of Vrajarāja and great grandson of Sāmarāja Dīṣṭa who lived in the latter half of 17th century. Of Vrajarāja, see para 903 post
\item \textit{CC}, I 494
\item \textit{Ibid}
\item \textit{Ibid} He also wrote a commentary on Viṣṇuṭatnākara
\item \textit{Ibid},
\item \textit{CC}, II 118.
\item \textit{CC} I, 494, III 106. He was son of Bhimśāna described as Mahāraṇghi-
\item \textit{Ibid}, \textit{Ulwar}, 1071 He was author of Alankāraceradṛḍaya His commentary is dated 1668 A D
\item Printed Venkateswar Press, Bombay and everywhere. There is another Candralokā, \textit{Ulwar}, 1658
\item The identification of this author with the author of Gitagovinda, made in the Introduction to this Edition is wrong, likewise is the statement of Dayānanda that this Jayadeva was the same as the brother of Bopaṭeva, whose parents were Bhopaṭeva and Rājā (see his Saṭyārghaprabhā, 335).
\item Called Būḍharanjan. It embraces only the chapters on Arthālankāra. The author was patronised by Rāmakhupāla. Ed. Madras \textit{TO}, III 1626, \textit{DO}, XXII.
\item Called Rāma \textit{DO}, XXII, 8651. He is different from Vaḍyanātha Ṭaṭsaṭ, the commentator on Kāvyaprakāśa.
\end{enumerate}
by Visvesvara alias Gagābhata, Pradyotanabhattacārya, Virūpākṣa, Vājacandra, Sūrya Balrama Caube, and one anonymous.

888 Sukhalalamisra was son of Bāburāja and grandson of Hṛdayarāma. He was pupil of Gangesamisra. His sixth ancestor Ṛmadhara came to Kāśi from his native village Charonda and having studied there became minister of Vairamaputra. Sukhalāla's Alankaramanjari purports to follow Jayadova's Kārikas. His Śṛngāramālā was written in Sam 1801 (1745 A.D). The first verse imbeds the names of planets thus —

अष्टिनिरस्मविचन्द्र पावकमीम भुजसिद्धि ||
हृत्विध्रुवधियम काविवध मन्त्रमभन्तु पदप्रक्षु देवया ||

Gangesa's son Ihariprasāda wrote Kāvyārthagumpha and Kavyaloka in Sam 1775 and 1784.

Among Reddi Kings of Addanki, Prola Vema was a great patron of letters. Lolla Mahādeva Kavi adorned his Court. His grandson Kumāragiri or Vasantarāja wrote a work on dramaturgy Vasantarājīya. From this work Kūtayaśema who had married Komāragiri's sister Mallāmbikā, has quotations and so too do Mallāmba, Kumāraswāmin and Nādindla Gopāmantr.

1 धर्मशुद्धवासा पुष्पचित्रनाथनविताः ||
विश्रविश्वाच्छ शतसोहन ददाति दश पदि सर्वनित्यद्व ||

Commentary on Viśramorvadyāyam

1. Called Rākāgama or Sudhā. He was also known as Visvesvara alias Gagābhata, son of Dinakara and nephew of Kamalākara of the 17th century. DC, XXII, 8658, PR, II 500.

2. Called Saradārama. DC, XXI, 8655. This name was apparently suggested from the last verse of the Candrāloka. The author was the son of Balabhadra, and wrote at the instance of Princo Virabhadrā son of King Rāmacandra and grandson of Vīrasimha of Vandalia family (Vaghola?). Virabhadrā's commentary on Kāvyasāstra is dated 1577 A.D.

3. Called Saradāsvarati (HR, III, vii).

4. OC, I, 182.

5. Called Dipikā. Ibid.


7. Utpār, 1083, SKO, 74.

8. OC, I 102, II 20, PR, III 856, S K De, SP, II 828.


10. See para 820 supra.
Commentary on Pratāparudrīyam

Commentary on Māgha, II 8

Vemabhupala succeeded Komāragiri on the throne of Kondavidu in about 1403 A.D. as the nearest agnate in succession.

1 On Vemabhupala and his family, see Veturi Prabhakarastri's Singārana gadham, 45, also E I III 288, III 60

The genealogy is as follows —

Komati Prolaya (1820 A.D.)
(with capital Addanki)

Mānas

Prolaya Vema (1880 A.D.)

Peja Komati Vema (called Pallava, Trinetra &c., patron of Telugu poet Yerrapragada and Sanskrit poet Mahādeva the 7th ancestor of Lolla Lakṣmidhara, who lived about 1580 A.D.)

Rāma Vemana

Anapoja (till 1866 A.D.) (removed capital to Kondavidu, Bālarasavaṭi was a poet of his Court)

Anavemedaddi (till 1881 A.D.) called Dharma Vemana. Trilōsana was a poet of his Court.

Komāragiri (till 1409 A.D.)
He is generally known as Pedakomati Vemareddi. He was the grandson of Māca, the elder brother of Prolayavemana. A poet and scholar himself, he was a great patron of letters. He bore the title Vīranārāyana. He gave away a portion of his kingdom to his brother's son Māca and installed him at Kondapalli. He claimed the territory of Rajahmundry which had been given away by his predecessor Komāragiri to his wife's brother Kātyayavema and had to wage war against the grandson of the latter and his adherents. His wife Sūramāmbī was known for her charity and some tanks and canals are associated with her name. He passed away about the year 1420 A.D. In his Court the great poets Srinātha and Vāmanabhatta Bāna flourished.

Srinātha called him Sarvajnacakravartin* and Vāmanabhatta narrated his life in his romance Vīranārayanacantam. Besides his commentaries on Amaruka* and Saptakatisāra, he wrote Sahityacintāmanī on poetry and Sangitacintāmanī on music. The first is a learned treatise in 13 Parichhedas on the plan of Kāvya-prakāśa and criticises Mahimābhata's theory of inference. Among the poets he quotes is one Kuśumāyudha. The illustrations are sometimes in praise of himself and this leads to a doubt if the work was only a dedication by a poet of his Court, presumably Srinātha. Among the works quoted in these works, are his own Kuśya (or Bhāna) Vīranārayanacantam* and Kādambarinātaka* of Narasimha, a nephew of Komāragiri alias Vasantarāja was found of feast and pleasure and he was free to enjoy them, while his wife's brother Kātyayavema a warrior and scholar administered the kingdom with ability. Lakuma, a celebrated actress, was in his Court. He wrote a work on Nātya called Vasantarājya and this is referred to by Kātyayavema in his commentary on Bakunāta. At his instance Kātyayavema wrote commentaries on the plays of Kālāśā.

1. सूर्यामर्दितिर्याणं हुमेंदपरिपत्थिः विविषिकासिद्धिः ||
   सूर्यामणिर्याणं पेदकोमटिसमपुविनपिन्यतिः ||

2. Ed. Madras.
3. The manuscript in Oriental Mss. Library
4. **acija, XXII 8706.
5. Trav Sov This is a Sangitacintāmanī and Sangitāmrta by Kamalocana (CC, I 79), and another anonymous in Trav XVI 7236
6. It is not known what this work was For instance

7. For instance

---

2 Komāragiri alias Vasantarāja was found of feast and pleasure and he was free to enjoy them, while his wife's brother Kātyayavema a warrior and scholar administered the kingdom with ability. Lakuma, a celebrated actress, was in his Court. He wrote a work on Nātya called Vasantarājya and this is referred to by Kātyayavema in his commentary on Bakunāta. At his instance Kātyayavema wrote commentaries on the plays of Kālāśā.

1. सूर्यामर्दितिर्याणं हुमेंदपरिपत्थिः विविषिकासिद्धिः ||
   सूर्यामणिर्याणं पेदकोमटिसमपुविनपिन्यतिः ||

2. Ed. Madras.
3. The manuscript in Oriental Mss. Library
4. **acija, XXII 8706.
5. Trav Sov This is a Sangitacintāmanī and Sangitāmrta by Kamalocana (CC, I 79), and another anonymous in Trav XVI 7236
6. It is not known what this work was For instance

7. For instance

---

1. सूर्यामर्दितिर्याणं हुमेंदपरिपत्थिः विविषिकासिद्धिः ||
   अधिक विवीकक्षियो चनानां युक्तापि प्रवृत्त गृहर्गयः ||
2. कुषण कुष्णको तन्मण्डलेण्कुषण कुषण इत्यद्य स्वयं कुषण हृदयः ||
   नितितिर्विनी न्यसया नितितिक्षणं द्वेषी बिद्वेषेन वेद चान्तरयः ||
Agastya In learning and patronage, Vemabhūpāla and his family were vying with the contemporary kings of Racakonda, of whom Sarvaknasīnga and his grandson of that name attained fame.

890 Paundarika Ramesvara's Rasasmdhu treats of rasas and bhāvas in 14 raṭuas (chapters). Among the works he mentions the latest is Viśvanātha's Sāhityadārpana and he must therefore have lived in the first half the 15th century.

891 Anurathamandana or Ratnamandanaguru was the pupil of the Jain priest Ratnasekhara, son of Iapagaccha who died in 1861 A.D. His Jalpakalpalatā in 3 parts is an instructor in poetic composition and Mugdhamedhākara mainly deals with figures of speech.

892 Punjaraja was the son of Jivana and Maku of Śrīmāla family. Jivana and his brother Megha were ministers of Khalacī Sahi Garjasa of Māva who ruled about 1475 A.D. Of his two sons, Punja, who became king, abdicated in favour of his brother Munja. Punjaraja's Dhvanpradīpa is a treatise on Dhwani and Śisuprabodhālankāra is an introductory work on figures of speech.

893 Haridasa was son of Puruṣotāma of Karana family. His Prastāvaratānakāra deals with enigmatic composition and was composed in 1557 A.D.

894 Vitthalesvara or Vitthaladikṣata called also Agnīkumāra was the son of Vallabhācārya the reformer and was born in 1515 A.D. His brother was Gopinātha. He wrote Ritivṛttīlakṣana on literary style and Śrīngārayasamandāna on the sentiment of love.

895 Kesavabhatta was the son of Harvamśabhātta and disciple of Vitthalesvara, the son of Vallabhācārya. His Rasikasājanīvani in three chapters deals with heroines and their relation to the amorous sentiment.

---

1 See para 120 supra
2 CO, III, 106, BORI, Poona, Ms No 595, P. K. Gode, COJ, II 50
3 BR, (1888-94) 156-7, PR, IV cm, IA, XI 255
4 Weber, 1722, II 278 80
5 PR, VI XV, 81
6 See BR, (1892-3) 12
7 PR, VII xliii, 168 9, PR, V 169
8 CO, I 360, II, 212, III 77
9 CO, I 661, II, 158, III, 187 For other works, see CO, I 572 III 121.
10 CO, I 127, 497
Appayyadiksita has a venerable place in poetics. He composed Kuvalayananda, a treatise original in itself, but designed as a commentary on Jayadeva’s Candrāloka. In Āsādhara’s commentary on Kuvalayananda, we have the story of its composition.

It is said that Appayya who wished to compose a work on Alankāras was sent by his father to go to the king Venkatadri. The king induced him to compose the work and settled on him an annual allowance in consideration of his scholarship. Appayyadiksita returned with the boon and wrote the kārkās on the subject under the name of Candrāloka and wrote also a commentary called Kuvalayananda.

The name of the king is given at the end of the work:

आदु कुवलयानन्दमस्त्रोतद्वद्भिषित ||
नियोगतंद्रपतेरिन्द्राधिक्षानिषेषे ||

“Appayyadiksita composed the Kuvalayananda by the command of Venkatapati who was the mine of disinterested mercy.”

“From the statement of Appayyadiksita in the beginning of the work, it appears, however, that he did not compose the whole original work, but adopted the work of Jayadeva (5th chapter) and added definitions of new alankaras and their illustrations. This perhaps roused the indignation of Jayadeva, the author of Candrāloka and was referred to by him in his drama of the Prasannaraghava as an unworthy plagiarism. In the introduction, it is said that the manager had a brother named Gunarama, that he objected to being called ‘prince of players’ owing to the fact that his elder brother was living, that the title should be conferred on the latter, that he wrote a drama called Haracaparopana which was acted at the court of a king called Ratjanaka and obtained a great fame as an actor. A contemptible player stealthily assumed the title of Gunarama and misappropriated...”

1 For his life and works see paras 142–3 supra. In a discussion in JOR, P P S Sastry fixes his date as 1520–1599 A.D. विके मूलक प्राप्त विषय विजये सुरूसायते।
2 For commentaries on it, see i.e. and also by Kuravi Rama (HR. I xi).
the fame to himself. Having heard this, the real Gunarama went to the south and secured the alliance of a singer named Sukantha and began to fight against his enemy at the courts of the kings of southern India. While we can clearly see in the above statements, an allusion to the story of Ravana carrying Sita, the wife of Rama, and the latter allying himself with the monkey leader, Sugriva and fighting with Ravana to recover his wife, we cannot help thinking of the probability of a reference to Appayadiksita’s modification of the Candraloka and commenting upon the work Jayadeva might have considered this to be a plagiarism and resorted perhaps to the courts of king of Southern India where Appayadiksita was living to expose the plagiarism before the king and the people assembled.”

897 His Citramīmāṃsā, also a treatise on alankāra is supposed to have been left unfinished, and Vaidyanātha in his commentary on Kuvalāyananda thus supports the general tradition “Citramīmāṃsā is not seen anywhere beyond the Utpreksālankāra” Jagannātha made a ruthless criticism of this work in Citramīmāṃsākhandana, and this was in its turn answered by Nilakantha and Candamāruṭācārya.

898 Gangananda was a protégé of Mahārāja Karn of Bakaneer (1506–1527 AD) and belonged to Mithila (Tirabhukta). His Kāvyadākini is divided into 5 drīṣṭis and deals with poetrical blemishes (dosa) “In the last chapter there appears also a discussion whether a dosa is regarded as a guna when it does not involve any defect at all or when it is neutral, so that it cannot be treated as a guna or a dosa”

Gangananda also wrote Karnaḥṣaṇa, a treatise on rasa, a poem Bhṛngadūṭa and a play Mandāramanjarī.

---

1 HR, II 68.
2 Ed. Bombay, along with Citramīmāṃsā. For instance on the verse.
3 Ed. Bombay, along with Citramīmāṃsā. For instance on the verse.
5 Ed. Kāvyadākini, Bombay.
6 CC, III, 20.
7 Mentioned in Kāvyadākini, p 44.
899 Jagannatha\(^1\) His charming lyrics have already been
described His Rasagangadhara\(^2\) testifies to his high culture in the
appreciation of poetry It stops with Uttarālankāra, probably in imita-
tion of Appayādikṣa’s Citramīmāṃsā, whose views he criticises in his
Citramīmāṃsākhandana\(^3\) In his disquisitions he is self-conscious and
the language of his rhetorical works, particularly of Rasagangadhara is
not lucid and a knowledge of dialectics will facilitate its appreciation.
He declares that his illustrative verses are his own\(^4\).

900 Kṛnasudhi was the son of Śivarāma and descendant of
Jagannātha Panditārāja of Upadraṭṭī family He lived in Uttar-
mallur on the banks of the Seyyar near Kānci He wrote Kāvyakalā-
nīṃṭhi,\(^5\) a very comprehensive work on poetics, with illustrations in
praise of his patron King Rāmavarman of Kollam

In Alankāramāṃsā, Śaṅkalūri Kṛṣṇasūrī, son of Gopalaśārya of
Tanuku, Krishna Dist, criticises the views expressed in Rasagangā-
dhara He also wrote Sāhiṭyakalpalāṭīkā\(^6\).

Bhallata was a poet of the Court of King Prataparudradeva, He
was called Vīra Bhallata and was a proficient in Nāṭyaśāstra, He wrote
Nāṭyaśekhara, so says Çīngarasekharā, author of Abhinayabhūṣāṇa.\(^6\)

901. Kṛnasarmāṇ was a pupil of Vāsuṭēva Yogīsvāra of
Guṇapura, His Mandāramanandacampū though so named is in fact a
treatise on poetics and prosody of an encyclopaedic variety. He
copied his definitions from Appaya Dikṣa and might have probably
lived in the 17th century A D.\(^8\) His Rasaprakāṣa is a commentary on
Mammāta’s Kāvyaprakāṣa.\(^9\)

---

1 See para 811 supra
2 Ed. Bombay, with a commentary on Nagesabhaṭṭa, Views here expressed are
criticised by Kṛṣṇasudhī in his Alankāramāṃsā (TC, III 8852) There is also an
anonymous commentary, CO, t. 4948.
3 Ed Kāvyamāla, Bombay.
4. His stray verses have been collected and printed under the name Panditārāja
   ātalakam in Agra Press, Vizagapatnam.
5. TC, IV 4909.
6 TC, III, 8852, 8788 His son Jayajaya Rāmānuṇuṭārya is a scholar and poet.
7. Andhrapatra, Annual number, 1917-8, 325
9. See para 869- A supra
902 Prabhakara was the son of Mādhavabhātta and grandson of Rāmaṇa of Vīsūmītragrama. His Rasapradīpa, in which Alankārāhāsyā is quoted was composed in 1583 AD. In three chapters it deals with the essentials of poetry, rasa and dhvani. He wrote an epitome of Devimāhātmyam in 1629 A.D. called Laghusaptasatikāstava, Ekāvaliprakāsa and commentaries on Kumārasambhava and on Vāsava-

Rāmaṇa rādahattā has three sons, Nārāyaṇa, Śrīdhara and Mādhava Nārāyaṇa was born in 1513 A.D. and was a favourite of Iodarmal, the finance minister of Emperor Akbar. He wrote the commentary on Vṛttaratnākara. Prabhākara’s son Kiṣṇa wrote Vāgīsvarīsaṃstava.

903 Samaraja Dikṣita son of Narahari of Bīndu Purandara family composed his play Śrīdāmacarita in 1681 A.D. He also wrote poems Tripurasundarīmānasapājanaśotra, Aksaragumpha and Āryā-

Samaraja’s son Kamaraja, (or Kāmarūpa Sastrī) wrote the poem Śrungarakalika and on poetics Kavyenaṇuprakāśa or Rasaniṇaya.

Kamaraja’s son Vrajaraja alias Haradātta wrote a commentary on Rasamanjari, and poems Śrungarasaṭaka, sadṛtavartana and Āryā-

Vrajaraja’s son Jivaraja was in accordance to Hall (Blé, 181) Prabhākara was born in 1584 A.D. For Prabhākara’s works, see CC, I 858. For the story of this family, see the poem Śankarabhatta’s Gadhipamāvatana Haraprasad Sastrī, I, 1917) S K De, SP, I 808, Printed Mirzapur. In Kāntāthī’s Bhāttavāsamkīyām Rāmaṇa is thus described:

1 According to Hall (Blé, 181) Prabhākara was born in 1584 A.D. For Prabhākara’s works, see CC, I 858. For the story of this family, see the poem Śankarabhatta’s Gadhipamāvatana Haraprasad Sastrī, I, 1917) S K De, SP, I 808, Printed Mirzapur. In Kāntāthī’s Bhāttavāsamkīyām Rāmaṇa is thus described:

2 Ed Sar. Bhav Sotres, Benares by Narayana Sastrī Khiste, with a long introduction

3 S K De, SP, II 820.

4 CC, I 708

5 Printed Bombay Ulwar, 1086

6 There is a poet Kāmaraja quoted in Sarng, and another who wrote a gloss on Kaṇpuramārjana.

7 Printed, Bombay. BB, (1897 91) No 601

8 Printed, Bombay.
the Court of Madhavasena and he wrote Gopālacampū and a commentary Seitu on Rasāṭarangini

904 Caturbhujā wrote Rasakalpadruma to the delight of Saistakhan, who is described as son of Asalakhan, and grandson of Iṭamaddoula. It is an elaborate work in 1000 verses in 65 prastāvas covering the whole range of poetical and erotic. Saistakhan was himself a great Sanskrit poet and six of his verses are here quoted. The composition was in the year Sam 1745 (1689 A.D.). Here is a fine verse

Among rare authors and works mentioned are Acalarudra, Anuruddha, Avilamba, śvarādāsa, Ugragraha, Kamsamārāyaṇa, Kubjakutīrā, Gaudayadāva, Jagamānaprījā, Dhakkārava, āśāvadhāna, Nāvinakavindra, Nāṭhamīra, Pancānana, Purā्तrāma, Bhāratīkavi, Bhupātīmīśra, Matū, Madhuravallī, Mahāmanuṣya, Mohanasimha, Raghupāta, Rāṇīdeva, Rāmacandra Sarasvatī, Ruci, Lakhya, Vasanta, Vaṅiraśāla, Vaṅvambhara, Vaiṅipati, Sanjayaśāvīrājś, Sarvādāsa, Svasthitāmīśra, Hanbhātta, and Harindrā.

905 Ḍaladēva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was a disciple of Ḍāmodaradāsa and a follower of Caṅdashya and a native of Bengal. He lived during the days of king Jayasimha of Jaipur who ruled in the 18th century. His Sāhityakaumūḍi is a commentary on the Sūtras of Bhaṭa and is accompanied by a gloss of his own. These Sūtras are the Kārikas, embraced in Kavyaprakāśa of Mammata and in the colophon, it is explicitly stated that the name of the work comprising the Kārikas is Kavyalakṣaṇa composed by Bhaṭa, and that his commentary thereon was following several commentaries of old, such as that of Mammata.

1. Uṭṭar, 1070. Here it is said 'Jayasimha says that his grandfather Samaraja obtained the name Kamaraja and was the author of Kavyenduprakāsha, Rasamrīya, and of Nṛśumhaśāya and other natakas. Jayasimha says that his father Vrajara was also called Haradvaita.'

2. Uṭṭar, 1087.


5. There is Kavīlakṣaṇa (DC, XXVI 9908) which describes the attainments and character of a good poet.
This reference to several commentaries on the Kārikas other than Mammata precludes the idea that Mammata himself wrote the Kārikas.

Vidyabhūṣana is an eminent rhetorician. He illustrates his comments with verses of his own composition in praise of Kṣīna of whom Caitanya was an incarnation. He adds a supplementary (last) chapter where he formulates rules on topics not touched upon by Bharata.

An anonymous commentary on Sāhityakaumudi is more explicit. It says that Bharata threw into concise Kārikas the science of poetry as developed in Agnipurāṇa and other works and to explain these is the object of the Sāhityakaumudi.

Among other works of this author are Kāvyakaustubha, Padyāvāli, and a commentary on Uṭkālikāvallari.

Visvesvara was the son of Laksīndhara of Pande family of Almoda. His descendants of the ninth generation are now there. He lived in the beginning of the 18th century. He was a literary genius and began writing when he was ten. Such men are rarely long-lived and he died at 34. In poetics, his writings are various, Alankara-kaustubha, Alankārakārnabharana, Alankārakulapradīpa, Alankārakūṭa, Kāvyalīlā and Kāvyaratna, Rasacandrika, and a commentary on Bhanudatta’s Rasamanjari. In Alankārakaustubha, he mentions his plays Rukminiparnaya and śṛṅgāramanḍarī (in prakrit).
907 Vasudeva Paro of Karana family was a poet and doctor in the Court of Gajapati Jagannātha. Nārāyanadeva of Khumundi State, Orissa. His Kavikālikāmāni is a large treatise in 24 Kiranas and deals particularly on Kavisanwa and Samasyāpūraṇa, and Sangīta also in the last three.

908 Gauranarya was son of Ayaluprabhu, brother of Miṭrāya, minister of King Singaya Mādhava of Recarla family, probably of the 18th century A.D. His Laksapadi and Prabhandaṣṭi is a general treatise on poetics probably in 10 prakāsas.

909 Ramadeva Ciranjiva Battacarya or Ciranjiva was the son of Rāghavendra. His Kavyavidāsa in two parts deals with Rasa and Alankāra. His Śṛgūraṭalini is a collection of erotic verses and Vṛṣṭaraṇāvali is an illustrative work on prosody meant as a panegyric of Yasvanṭasmha who was Naib Dewan of Deccan about 1731 A.D. His Vidvandodiṣṭarangi has been noticed.

910 Tirumala Bukkapatnum Venkatacarya wrote Alankāraśubha. He was son of Anayākārya, a poet of the court of the Zamindar of Surapuram in Nizam’s dominions and lived about 1770 A.D. His brother’s son Srinivāsaṭrīya wrote Rasamanjarī and the celebrated work Jāṭvāmanṭīndra.

911 Acyudaraya Modaka was the pupil of Nārāyanasaṭītan and probably son of Nārāyaṇa. His Sāṭiyasāra in 12 chapters describes the topics as taken from the “ocean of poetics”, so that the chapters are called Dhanvantaṇiratna, Airavataraṇa etc. He wrote also a commentary on Bhāminivilāsa and probably also Bhāgirathīcampū composed on 1815.

912 Rajasekhara son of Venkatesa of Kolluru family and of Gocāmagoṭra lived in Peruru (Somatīthapura) on the banks of the

1. TC, IV, 4925
2. DC, XXII 8502, 8604, Tan 1X 4029. He quotes from Alankārasangraha and Kavikālikāmāni, Camaṇḍikā, Sāṭiyacamāṇḍikā, Camaṇḍikā, Sāṭiyacamāṇḍikā, Camaṇḍikā, Sāṭiyacamāṇḍikā.
3. CC I 102, II 20, III 22
4. CC, I 600
5. HR, III No 360
6. See para 708 supra
7. DC, XXII 8600
8. TO, I R No 869
11. CC, I 770. See also S K. De, SP, I 291 

See also S K. De, SP, I 291.
river Kausiki in the Godavari Konasima about 1840 A D  

His Sāhityakalpadruma is a work on poetics in 81 stabakas  
He also wrote Śivasatāka, Śīracampū and Alankaṇamakaranda.

913 Ratnabhusana belonged to a Vaidya family of East Bengal  
In his Kāvyakaumudi composed in 1859 A D, he deals with poetics in general, but in the first three chapters with nouns, genders and verbal suffixes.

914 Bhaskaracarya was a descendent of Varadaguru of Śivatsagotra and lived at Snperumbudur, Chingleput District, probably in the 19th century  
His Sāhityakalpadruma embraces the whole topic of poetics and dancing.

915 Srisaila Nṛśimbhacarya was son of Dāśāmacārya  
On Lakṣānamālākā of unknown authorship he wrote a commentary Alankaṇrendusekhara, dealing lucidly with all topics of poetic.  
He also wrote a commentary on Śāntavilasa, which is a work on music by Subrahmanyasudhi or Harṣabakavindra. He refers to his work Campū-Jānakāpārniyaya and to Gītāmanjari of Harisaba.

916, Venkatanarayana was the son of Lakṣmī and Kamesvara Dīkṣat of Godavarī family  
He says he composed works in eight languages  
His Śṛngārasāra in 6 ullāsas treats of heros and heroines, rasas and rūpākas. He refers the reader to another work of his, Śṛngārasārāvalī, for fuller treatment.

917 Ramasubramanya Sastrin was son of Rāmaśankara and grandson of Asvatthanārāyaṇa and desciple of Śivarāma  
He was an authority on Śaṭtras and lived at Tiruvasanallur, Tanjore Dt.  
He was born in the last thirties and died in 1922 A D  
His works on several Śaṭtras are numerous and his commentaries on the Upaniṣads are very much respected.  
In his Alankaṇaśāstravilāsa he criticises Vidyānātha’s definition of poetry  
His Bhaktyanandaprabhāsa is a treatise on Bhakti or devotion to God.
In Sāhityakantakoddhāra in two chapters Mañjuśūdana, son of Nārāyana of Śrīvat-sagotra, has a running criticism of works of well-known authors such as Śri Harṣa, Bilhana and Bhāravi in regard to the use of certain nouns, verbs and euphonies.

918 Surdarādeva Vaidya, son of Govindādeva, wrote Rāma-sundaramahākavya to illustrate particular poetic conceptions.

Kavikāthapāda is a treatise on a poet’s personal appearance, on the effects of the initial letters of a poem and of the time of composition etc. It is said to be based on Pingala’s work.

919 Mudumbai Narasimha Acaryā flourished in the Courts of Vījanāma Gajapati and Ānanda Gajapati, Māhārājās of Vījanāgarām (Vizagapatam District). Besides the works already mentioned (in para 356 upra) he wrote the poems Daivopālambha, Narasimhāttabā, Jayasimhasvamedhiya, Victoriaprāsastī and Yuddhaprotṣāhana, and in the field of poetics, Kāvyopothāṣa, Kāvyaprayogavādhi, Kāvyasūtaśivrāti and Alankāramālā and the following Sūtras.

920 Other Works Kāvyālankārasūtra by Śākamuni with the commentary of Akhilākāraśāstra, Alahavasāgrārasamānpaṭa by Bukkapatnam Venkatācārya (Mys, 178), Alankāravacara (Tanj IX 3978), Al. nākārānusahāyāna (DC, XXII 3602), Alankārasekhara by Jivāntīka (CC, I 32), Alankāraśāstra, 1a by Kandolajāra (Mys, 296, 3119, 3771).

1 TC III 3109, 3714.
2 CC, I 725. See for his other works para 767 upra.
3 DC, XXII 8611, TC, III 8771.
4 In the Introduction to Rāmacandakāṭhāmṛta, an extensive poem on Rāmaśṛṣṭa (printed, Vījanāgarām), M Venkataramanacharya gives a long history of the poet’s family and of the royal patrons of the ruling house of Vījanāgarām.
ALANKĀRA

Adyaś, II 33), Alanākramamālā by Damodara-bhutta (CC, I 32, 250), Alanākara-kaumudi by Valla-Abhutta (Ed. Grantharatnamala, Bombay, II 1189), Alanārasāra by Nṛsimha (Mṛs 297), Alanāramanārya by Nṛnala (?) (CC, I 32), Alanākara-kaustubha (i) by Venkalācārya (Adyaś, II 33, DC, XXII 8595, Mṛs 295) and (ii) by Srīvikāśa (CC, I 103), [Alanārasūtra by Candralānta Tarkālanākara (Printed, Calcutta, 19th century A.D.), Alanākara-candrīka, Alanākara-kānka, Alanākara-kaumudi (DC, XXII 8595 Mṛs 295), Alanāramayuktā, Alanāranukramānukā, Alanākaparaka-kanara (SR, I No 52), Alanākapra-kaiki (DC, XXII 8599, Mṛs 295), Alanākrai, Alanākarācintāmaṇī (n) by Santarāja, Alanāratulaka (i) by Srīkāramaśra (CC, I 32), and (ii) by Bānādatta (Ten IX, 4107, Mṛs 295), Alanārasarvasva by Devas-Αnanda-Kr soundarāja (TC, VI 7186)

Alanākara-prakaraṇa (CC, III 7), Alanākara-vatāsa by Sudhindrayogin (DC, XXII 8713), Alanākara-vatśaya (Ibid 8714), Alanākara-ramanja (i) by Tīrmapallabhāṭṭa and (ii) by Sukhāla (PR, IV 25, CC, II 6), [Alanākaparasṛṭṭi by Visvanātha, Alanākara-ramanja by Devasankara, Alanārara-cakara by Sōbhdhāraṇa, Alanārara-rasāsa by Prabhākara, Alakāra-pāṭṭi (PR, IV 25), Alanākasamudgaka by Sivānanda], Śāṅkara-viśvavāmśā.  

921. [Kāvyakalāpa, Kavikalpa-ālika and Kāvyadīpi-kā (DC, XXII 8615), Kavyakaumudi, Kāvyakausūṭha and Kāvyalakṣaṇa (DC, XXII 8630), Kāvyalakṣaṇa-pīcāra (DC, XXII, 8716, Tavan 76), Kāvyamāntrāranāmi, Kāvyapariccheda, Kāvyaratna, Kāvyopadesa], Śāṅkara-viśvāhā (Tav, 70), Kavilantaphalāsā (Adyaś, II 33), Kavikalpa-āli by Deveshara (Printed, Calcutta, Ten IX 3985, DC, XXII 8612, SR, II 80), Kavikauṭhulaha (i) by Viṣṇudasa and (ii) by

---

1 Cited in Śīravāsa's commentary on Viṣṇudasa's commentary on Vāravaiśāta
2 CC, I 81-2
3 CC II 6
4 Quoted by Appayāpiṇīṭa in Viṣṇupālīka
5 CC, I, 101 3
6 He was probably the author of Manoḍaṭa, IO, 1184. See para 928 supra.
Kānticandrāṃkhopādhyāya (Ed Calcutta, 19th century), Kavyatativiṣcārya by Haladhara (I/PR [1803-1900], p 16), Kāvyaśabdākṣara (i) by Rāmacandra Nyāyavāgīsa and (ii) by Kāvicaṇḍa, son of Kāvikaṃśapūra², Kāvyavṛttiratnāvalī by Nārāyaṇa (Tany, IX 4012), Kaviśaṇvini (TC, VI 7172)

Kāvyollāka by Nilakanṭha² (TC, III 3348), Kavyaśātrasangrahātraya by Śrīnivāsa (Tany IX 4014, Ady 298), Kāvikarpatikā by Śankhādhara (CC, I 86), Kavyālakṣanasangraha by Śrīnivāsa (Ady, II 34),¹ Vyanjanaśabdartha by Vāgīsa (Pd Bombay), Kāvyaśabdartha by Nārāyaṇa Bhattachārya of the Cīrcaś (14th century), Kavyarāppi by Sāmasandarbha (I/Ed Calcutta)

922 Rasālīndu, Rasagrandha, Rasāntāsindhu and Rasāsamuccaya (CC, I 494), Rasāriccava (Tany 72), Rasākaraśāyana (Ady, I 36), Rasahālpadruma by Jāchanathuṃmi, son of Ānandamitra (1600-1700 AD) (Ady, II 37, TC, IV 5619), Rāśārnavālankāra by Prakāśavarā (TC, IV 5366), Rasākaraśāyana (TC, VI 7223), Rasāritrangini by Rāmaśand (TC, III 31), Rasārājāradīpikā by Lallārīya (Tany, IX, 4073), Rasatārnavalī by Viśvavīra (IO, II 359), Rasākārnūṇī (i) by Śrīkālī (CC, I 494, early 17th century) and (ii) by Gūḍārāma (DC, XXI 8877), Rasatārnavalī by Gāṅgārāmagadā (IC, 176, 290), Rasācandra by Gūḍārāma (IO, II 351, 1696 AD), Rasaisndhu by Purandārāmeśvara (CC, III 106), Rasapadmakāra by Gāṅgādhara (CC, II 30), Rasikapraakāśī by Devanātha (CC, I 497), Rasikājivana by Gāṅgādhara (CC, I 497, II 116), Rasikāhāra by Rāmārāhāra by Gāṅgārāma (IO, II 351, 1696 AD), Rasasindhu by Purandārāmeśvara (CC, III 106), Rasatārnavalī by Viśvavīra (IO, II 359), Rasasindhu by Purandārāmeśvara (CC, III 106), Rasācandra by Gūḍārāma (IO, II 351, 1696 AD), Rasasindhu by Purandārāmeśvara (CC, III 106), Rasamūrdhāna by Śivarāma (CC, II 116), Rasakahī (TC, III 3055)

1. I/O, III 844 He quotes from his own poem Raunāvalī, Rāmacandraśāmpu, Śtavāvalī, Sāntivaṃśikā and also verses of his own sons Śrīkavīvallabhā and Śrīkavi bhuṣana,

2. He was the author of the play Kalyānaśaṅgandhika

3. There is a poem Kāvikārpatikā by Vāgīsa (O, I 66, Tany VI 2711)

4. He is different from Raṭnākīśa. S K De’s identification (SP, I. 319) is not correct.

5. He is mentioned by his disciple Vālabbha in his commentary on Māgha and quoted by Mallinātha in his commentary on Bhāravi.
Sṛngārarasamandana by Vīthalesvara and Sṛngārāsārodaya by Sudhākara Pundarikayayan (CC, III 137)

Bhāratībhūṣaṇa by Grīdharadāsa (1875 A.D.), Padmābharaṇa by Padmākara (1875 A.D.), Nāvikānuvarana by Rāmaśaṅkara (DO, XXII, 8678), Uṭpreksamanjarī by Ṣaṭadācārya (ML 297), Kākāpanācārya by Sudarṣanācārya (Ibid), Vṛttalankā by Chāvīlal Sin of Nepal (1901 A.D.), Kākātalavāsīṭha by Sambhuḍāsa (Ibid), Citramanjari by Rāmasaiman (DO, XXII 8678), Utprektanianjari by Kālidāsa (Mys 297), Karaṇakavatara by Pujadharasa (CC, 1875 A.D.), Padmapuraṇa, Sṛngārāvatangmi, Sṛngāraraasa, Sṛngāravidhi, Sṛngāradīvaśaya (DC, XXII 8701), Sṛngārarasārvabhāsa by Devaśāṭṭha (CC, I 258), Sṛngārahāra by Baladeva (BKR, 1880-12, 71),

Dasarūpakapadādhāti of Kuravi Rāma and Dasarūpakāvivaranam (anonymous)

923 Sāhityābhidhi by Venidatta (Tanj IX 4105), Sāhityaviccāra by Kṛṣṇatarkālankāra (CC, I 716), Sāhityaviccāra by Anuṭa (CC, I 13), Sāhityāṭarangāni by Kṛṣṇa (CC, II 171) Sāhityaḥamudi (IO, III 33) and Sāhityavakautūḥaḥ by Yasasvīn (CC, I 715) Sāhitya-ūṣā by Hāpa dattāsamā (CC, I 716), Sāhityakalolabhi by Bhāsyarakāraṇa of Bhūdrupūr (DC, XXII, 8706), Sāhityasāra (i) by Suresvarajati (TC, III 33C8, Trav 72) (ii) by Mānasimha (CC, I 715), and by (iii) Aṣṭyasaṃmamodak (Ed Bombay, Mys 304, composed in Saka 1753-1831 A.D.), Sāhityamimamsā (Tanj IX 4104), [Sāhityasarayati, (Mys 304), Sāhityasūkṣmasaraṇī by Śrīnivāsa, Sāhityacitādānī and Sāhityaḥabodha by Tīgarana Seturāma (TC, I 3593), Sāhityasārgadhara by Sāṃgbhara, Sāhityasangraha (i) by Kāla and (ii) by Śrīmānādy (CC, I 716)

Sāhityaḥacandrikā, Sāhityamuktāmaṇi, and Sāhityaratnamāla (CC, I, 7156), Saroṣakalikā by Kavrajā (CC, I 87), Upanāsudhāṣṭri (CC, I, 68), Ekasyatałakāra-prakāśa (CC, I 74), Kurapaśvāni by Sāṅkhārā (Uṭṭ II 4531), Karpurarasamāṇti by Bālakāri (Rice, 282), Kāvyarthacitādānī (TC, I 792), Nālakāvāṭāra (CBod 142), Bāvāsvikera (TC, VI 7151),

[Śṛngāracandrodaya, Sṛngā rakausūṭbha, Sṛngāramamanjari (SR, II 23), Sṛngārupāvama, Sṛngārāṣṭarangmi, Sṛngāraraasa, Sṛngāravidhi, Sṛngāradīvaśaya (DC, XXII 8701), Sṛngārarasārvabhāsa by Devaśatā (CC, I 258), Sṛngārahāra by Baladeva (BKR, 1880-12, 71),

1 TO II 1097
2 DC, XXII 8674 It is conjectured to be the nāṭaka chapter of bigger treatise.
3 Cited in Praśṭavacāntāmaṇi, Weber, I. 299.
4 CC, I 860-1
ALANKĀRA

Śṛngārasarasā by Bhūvāmisra (CC, I 681, II 158, 230), Śṛngārasāra by Venkatanārāyaṇa Ṛiṇḍita (DC, XXII 8899) Śṛngāralālā by Sukhadevamisra (PR, IV app 29), Śṛngārsārodadhi by Sudākara Pūndarikayavan (CC, III 131), Śṛngāramātpādabhi by Samaññādīkṣita (DC, XXII 8702),

Kāvyopadesa,1 Ṛavīkara,2 Kāśīmatālakara,3 Kāśāsya,4 Rasasudākara,5 Rājakundatapa,6 Rasikasāravāla,7 Rasīkalā6 Angādhāralakṣana (Tāv 75), Sūtvikangikabhūvarasāviveka (Ibid 172), Tīyapuraśārthasaṃgrah19

924 HALAVUDHA's Kavarahasya is really a guide to poets. It is called Kavīguhika or Āpasatīdābhāsākṛavya by the commentator Ravidharoia10

कविगुहिक अपासतीधाबसाक्रव्यम् नामक कविगुहिक यांकी

यस्य देवोपन्न धातो कविगुहिक यथा यत् \( \| \)

अधिकारश्वद्वितीयम् वदिप समायम् धार्मिकविवेकम् \( \| \)

तथा हरिदुर्गन दृत्त कविगुहिकरपम् \( \| \)

अविनाशित सत्तान्तु सत्तारम्यश्चनद्वितैः \( \| \)

तदद्यम् लघुविन नित्यवर्णपेशेः \( \| \)

* * * *

�पासतीधाबसाक्रव्य काव्येः तीक्षकारतम् बलवूर्धशानि

रचिततम् कविरुपमन्न नामान्न समाधानितम् \( \| \)

"According to a Gujarat copy of the work its hero was one of the Kṛṣṇas of the Rashtrakūta line, possibly the first of that name (A.D 760-80)."21

1 Cited by Ilamādīn on Raghu (CC, I 109)
2 " by Mālimāṭha in commentary on Mōghaduṭa
3 " " by Mālimāṭha in commentary on Mōghaduṭa
4 " " by Mālimāṭha in commentary on Māgha, XV. 89.
5 " " by Mālimāṭha in commentary on Raghu, VI 12.
6 " " by Mālimāṭha in commentary on Kum, VI 40
7 " " by Nārāyaṇa in commentary on Gītāgovinda, V. 2
8 " " by Vāncīcārya in commentary on Karpuramanjari (TO, III 8055)
9 It is about 600 years old and quotes several medieval poets of 900-1300 A.D
10 See Int to Kavyamjñāma (GOS), 1984 Edn, ix x Ed with commentary, Bombay
11 Bhandārkar inclines to identify the author of the Kavirahasya with the Halā-
yuṭha who wrote the Abhidḥānakarṇamālā, but Weber places the latter about the end of the eleventh century. PR, 1888-9, p 9.
925 A mode of composition, which may be styled Yasobhusana, was directly designed by Vidyānātha, in which was attained a double purpose of a treatise on poetics and a eulogy of the poet's patron or deity of devotion. Udbhata inaugurated it in a way, when he imbedded the story of Pārvatī's wedding in illustration of his tenets of Alankāra. But it was Vidyānātha that developed the idea and called his work Pratāparudrapā-Vasodhūsana.

926 Vidyānātha was a poet of the Court of King Pratāparudradeva of Lateśānagara of the Kākaṭiya dynasty (Warrangal), who ruled between 1268 and (1319?) 1328 A.D. The term Vidyānātha appears now to be a mere appellation granted or assumed for proficiency in arts and behind that appellation is the name of Agastya.

Pratāparudra also called Vīrarudra or Rudra was the son of Mahadeva and Mummidiamba. He had a boar as a sign in his flag and he bore the title of Chalamāgandha. He was a patron of letters and it is said there were 200 poets in his Court. Among them was Mallikārajunabhatta who wrote Nirosthyā Rāmāyaṇa. Sewell (I. c.) gives dates 1295 to 1323 A.D. Seshagiri Sastrī (SR, II 82) gives dates 1268 to 1319 A.D. For inscriptions referring to him and Kākaṭiyas, see BI, III 84, 94, V 148, VII 198 92, VIII 166 7, IA, XI, 9 20, XXI 197. Sewell's List of Anubhūtās, II 114, 172 K P Trivedi gives the following genealogy as made up from these inscriptions and from Pratāparudrajyam,—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rutama (Tribhuvanamalla)</th>
<th>Prul (Jagatikesarn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruḍra (1182 A.D.)</td>
<td>Mahādeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganapati (1291, 1290 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganapamba (1250 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudramba (known as Ruḍra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mummadamba (Mahadeva)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratāparudra (A.D. 1296, 1299, 1315, 1316, 1317)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the later history of the dynasty, see Sewell (I. c. 82) W W Hunter, Imp. Gaz. XIII 591 and new edn., XXIV 866. For a general account of Kākaṭiyas by Seshadri and Ramana, see Andhra Patrakāra Annual No. (1921 22) 168 8 and JI of Andhra History Society.

This is inferred from the following verse in the Pratāparudrajyam (Bombay Edn. p. 91).

[Note: The text includes a table and a list of dates and references for historical and genealogical information.]
who is known as the author of several works and as having been
honoured by the Kings of Vijayanagar.

927 His **Prataparudrayasobhasananam** shortly called **Prataparudriyam** is an elaborate treatment on poetics with illustrations in praise of his patron. His mode of panegyric imbedded in a work of instruction is a new device of Vidyanātha’s creation. In dealing with the canons of dramaturgy he has ingeniously interposed a model play known as **Pratiparudrikaśānam**, which performs at once the functions of apt illustration of the technique of the Sanskrit play and of giving a description of the goodmesses and exploits of Pratiparudradeva. The object of the work is avowedly to show how the importance of composition depends on the apt characterization of the merits of the hero. Accordingly the first Prakarana classifies heroes and heroines and describes their qualities. The second Prakarana propounds the nature of poetry and the several species of poetic composition. The third Prakarana contains the model drama, describing the coronation of Pratiparudra and his glorious rule and conquests. The fourth Prakarana deals with Rasa, the next two with the faults and merits of composition and the last three with figures of speech.

This treatise has been very popular among later writers and is specially in Southern India never missed as a text book in rhetorical study. It is profusely quoted by Mallinātha and it was apparently that appreciation by Mallinātha that made his son Kumāraswāmin write a commentary on it. Appaya Dikṣita criticised some of these views in his Citrmīmāṃsā, but those criticisms were answered by Visvesvara in his **Alankāraśrāvīlaśīha**.

There are two commentaries on it now extant, **Ratnasāga** and **Ratnaśāna.** **Ratnasāga** is the work of Śrīmalīcārya of Suḍavāla (Cilakamarṣi) family. He was the son of Rāmānujacārya and lived at Rāmatīrtha near Kotipallu in Godavari District in the 18th century AD. He mentions another work of his Hemanṭakalābhānavi and he

---

1 Ed. **BSS**, by K. P. Trivodi and at Madras
2 The first two prakarāṇams have been published in **BSS**, (1 c) The rest is in **Ms TC, II 8680**
3 The following verse is quoted at page 531:

> **कृपायः पूजितव्यं श्रुति**
> **व मदवेदे हेमनःतिलकान्ति**
> **आहितवे मीरोण्या साहु**
> **स्निष्ठोपरासिद्धबलवः**
> **कथमपी पूर्णिश्विगते श्रु**
> **.. इति सुवाचनाप**
wrote a commentary on the Kuvalayānanda also Ratnapāna of Kumāraswāmi, son of Mallinātha, is replete with illustrative quotations.

928 Vidyadhara wrote Ekavali* on the lines of the Kāvyaprakāsa, with Kānkiṇas followed by an explanation in eight parts called Unmevas Vidyadhara mentions Haribhara and the prince Arjuna, from whom he got amazing wealth, who must have been the King of Malwa of that name who ruled early in 13th century AD Haribhara, a Jaina poet named Madanakirṣṇa, and Somesvara the author of the Kirtiśaṃuddī and Vastupāla were contemporaries and Vastupāla died in 1242 AD. The illustrative verses are in praise of Narasimha, a King of Utkala and Kalinga, which means the modern Orissa and the province bordering on it to the south called Kalinga.

1 TO, II 3995 Is all unmo Unāmasheśvara? (Vṛt, 297)
2 Printed Madras On Mallinātha, see para 31 supra In a commentary on the Campūrāmāyaṇa called Padiyojana (OC XXI 8212) by Venkataśrayana, Kumāraswāmin is described as the son of Peddibhatta, brother of Mallinātha Venkatanārāyana was a descendant of the family and gives the genealogy thus

Mallinātha (honored by Vīrāṇa)

Kaparāṇī, author of Śaṅkakārikas)

Mallinātha Peddibhatta (Arthopādhya commentary on Naśidha)

Kumāraswāmin

For further information see K. P. Trivedi, (I) xxiv While Kumāraswāmin says in his preface to Ratnapāna that he was son of Mallātha, his word must be preferred to that of Venkatanārāyana, a descendant of several generations from Kumāraswāmi

3 Ed. by K. V. Trivedi, BSS, Bombay with a valuable introduction

4 Beginning

शास्त्राचार कन्यकाफळचतीपनवनलविषिष्टा नेत्रस्त्यांलिङ्गात्मकदशिणातिपैति-वनस्थि ||
धेखसेतुविवृत्तिष्क सम्भ पादार्थनिन्द्यम रष्टान्त पापः सुकालस्वदिकोरहितादिप्रसिद्धित्व ||

Vāisthī Ekaśā more वारुणिकारिक अभिकल्पी ||
सतायामरोदिता श्वानबद्धसुद कुसुंगलावमेव नहं ||

Colophon इति अर्थाचार महास्पदशदर्श कल्याणवादस्व इति एकालीनास्मात्स्वानरे-भान्न स्वस्त्याधिकारित्तम नामाद्योगोस्येह ||

Sri Vidyā Vidyadhara, author of Kelabhasya (OC, I 125) is a different author. There are poets Vidyadhara, son of Lulla and Vidyadhara, son of Sūkhatasukhavarman quoted in Subhāṣītavah.
929 Vidyadhara calls Narasimha Hammira-mada-mardana, i.e., to have humbled the pride of Hammira. "Of Hammira, three are known. The first belonged to the Narasimha branch of the Chohan family and appears not to have been a person of note. He was a dependant of Prithviraja and was killed in 1193 A.D. As the terminus ad quo for Vidyadhara who must have been a protege of Narasimha, as no poet bestows such fulsome praise on a deceased prince, is, as shown above, the early decades of the 13th century, this Hammira cannot have been Narasimha's contemporary. Besides, Orissa was not ruled over by a king of that name from 1024 to 1237 A.D. Another Hammira was the prince who belonged to the Gehlote family and was, as stated in the introduction to the Rasakaprya, an ancestor of Kumbhakarna, king of Medapata or Mewar and reigned from 1301 A.D to 1365 A.D. A third was the king of Sakambhari of the race of Chahuvana mentioned by Sarnagadhara in the beginning of his anthology and represented by him to have been famous for his bravery which equalled that of Arjuna. He is the hero of the Hammira Mahakavya of Nayachandrasuri and is represented to have begun to reign in 1339 of Vikrama Samvat, i.e., 1283 A.D. It was this Hammira who defended the fortress of Rathambhor (Ranastambhapura) with bravery against Allauddin Khilji for more than a year and fell at last when it was taken in the year 1301 A.D. Both these princes bearing the name of Hammira were famous. But as the Chohan prince is represented by Nayachandra as having attempted the conquest of southern countries, he was probably the Hammira alluded to by Vidyadhara.

From the last of the kings of Orissa given by Sir W.W. Hunter and copied by Mr Sewell in his Sketch of the Dynasties of Southern India, it appears that there was a Narasimha who ruled over the country from 1282 A.D. to 1307 A.D. If the Hammira alluded to was the Mewar prince of that name, our Narasimha may have been the one who reigned from 1307 to 1327. There were two more Narasimbhas after 1327, but they reigned for only 2 years and 1 year respectively, and therefore neither can have been the hero panegyrised by Vidyadhara. There was another still, who reigned from 1257 to 1282. But he has been excluded by the whole trend of our argument. Thus then the Ekavah was written about the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century of the Christian era.”

1 On Narasimhabhacaeva, see JASB, LXIV 182, LXV 282. There were according to Sewell (i) Kesari Narasimha, 1282-1307 A.D. (ii) Pratapa Narasimha, 1307-1327 A.D., and Nrsimha II of the inscriptions 1280-1314 A.D.
930 Fkāvali is quoted by Appayya Dikṣita by Jagannātha and Singabhūpāla

'The commentary called Tarala, or central gem, of Fkāvali, or one-stringed necklace, is by Mallinātha, the celebrated commentator on the Kāvyas. In the sixth of the verses given below, which has a double sense, the commentator says that 'this Fkāvali, though a work of merit and an ornament, was because it had not a commentary, (this Tarala), kept or secreted in treasure-houses as a necklace is, because it has not the central gem. Now that Fkāvali necklace has a bright central gem in the shape of an elucidatory commentary (Tarala), may blessed persons wear it round the neck and on the bosom, that is, get the work by heart and commit it to memory! It would thus appear that the Fkāvali was not for some time studied and the work was neglected because it had no commentary, from which it is to be concluded that Mallinatha wrote the Tarala after a certain period had elapsed since the composition of the original'.

Vidyādhara was therefore almost a contemporary of Vidyānātha and not improbably a rival on the field. It looks as if the name Vidyādhara was assumed to vie with the name Vidyānātha. It is noteworthy that while Mallinātha commented on Fkāvali, his son Kumārasvāmin commented on Pratāparudrayaśobhūsaṇa.

931 This mode of composition of rhetorical panegyrics has been fruitful in later imitations. The idea of flattering patrons was by some rhetoricians considered too vulgar and temporal and while adopting this mode of composition they used it in praise of deities of their particular devotion.

932 Dharma or Dharmasudhī or Dharmabhatta was born at Pedapulivatru on the Krṣṇa. He was a Telugu Brahmin of Vellanati sect of Haritagoṭra and son of Parvatānātha and Yellamālīṃhā. He lived at Benares and his descendants are known as Vārānāsī family. In his later days he became an ascetic and took the name of Rāmānanda or Govindānandarasavatī. He was a devotee of Rāma and in his

1 In Rupa's Ujjvalanāmaṇī and Bhaktimārśicaryā (TC, IV 4494) and in Lakṣmīprabhu's Kṛṣṇalankāradhārapaṇa and in the anonymous Bhaktirārasūti (TC, IV 4529) (Mys. 639) the illustrations are in praise of Śrīkrṣṇa, in Bṛhupātikabhadrapālī (Adyav, II 37), the verses adore Rāma.

2 See article by Srimangal Someswarasastri in Andhrapratika, Annual Number (1936–7) and by V Prabhakarasettri, Bharatl (1931), 199 Aufecht (OC, I, 303) mentions another work Panoaṭjantakāvyā.
philosophical writings understands Rama as the Supreme Being. His brother Nara was a vedic scholar and his grandfather of all-round literary merit. He lived in the 16th century A.D. He was particularly great in nyaya, but the attraction of nyaya did not affect his love of poetry and rhetoric. In his Sāhityarātnākara, an extensive treatise on rhetoric, he expressed his devotion by illustrations in praise of Rama. He blamed poets like Vidyānatha and Vidyādhara who for mercenary motives extolled kings in their writings on poetry and himself illustrated his precepts by the story of Rama. He wrote a gloss on Sankarabhāṣya, Rañnaprabhā. His Kṛṣṇātṛti eulogises the river Kṛṣṇā. His Hamsasandesa is a prakrit poem. His vyāyoga, Narakāsura-vadha, describes the heroic story of the slaying of Narakaśura. His Bālabhāgavata is a poem on the early life of Kṛṣṇa. There are commentaries on Sāhityarātnākara, Nauka by Īrāvan, and Nauka by Madhusūdana Sarmā.

933 In Alankāramāthā, Śrī Kṛṣṇa (Parakālasām) has illustrations in praise of God Śrīnivāsa of Tirupati. So is his Locanollāśa.

Sathakopālankāraparicaryā is anonymous and describes various figures of speech with illustrations in praise of Sathakopa known as Nammālwar, the Varāiava Saint. So is Śathavāirvaibhavavadākaram by Maranganti Nārasimhācārya.

934 Sudhindrayogin's Alankāramāṭha is a short work on Arthālankāras with examples in praise of Sudhindrayogin, a Madhwa.

1. See para 211 supra.
2. See paper by E. Veenaragavacharya in JASSP, VI. 291.
3. Printed, Ellore, DC, XXII. 8712.
4. Printed, Benares, Orissa. He was patronised by Balabhadra-deva (Ganga) Chief of Orissa. He also wrote poems Māyāsahāribhāṣa and Harumat-sandesa pāravali. He died just before 1900 in Godavari District.
5. Printed, Madras and Nollore. He lived in Vizagapatam district, probably at Śimhācalam.
asetic, disciple of Vijayindrayati. Sudhindra wrote also the play Subhadrapannayam while his master wrote the play Subhadrādhanaṇjayam. He lived in 17th century in Tanjore and was honored by king Raghunātha Naik.

Visvesvara’s Camakaraçandrika is a similar work in which the illustrations are in praise of Singabhūpāla who ruled at Rājucala about 1330 A.D. Nāganātha was pupil of Visvesvara. He wrote the play Mañanavilāsa in honour of Māca, son of Sarvagna Singa of Recarla family. He was the author of an inscription dated Saka 1291 (1369) during the reign of Anapota.

In his Kavitavatara composed about 1425 A.D. Puruṣottamasudhī has illustrations in praise of Nāgabhūpāla. Nāga was the grandson of Māca, the ruler of Gangāpura of about 1400 A.D.

935 Sahityacudamani is ascribed to Vīrānārayana but was in fact composed by some poet of his Court in 7 chapters and the illustrations are addressed to Vīrānārayana Vīrānārayaṇa or Peda Komati Vema lived in the beginning of the 15th century A.D.

936. Bhairavosahanavarasaratna contains 41 verses depicting the nine Rasas. The hero is a prince named Bhairavaśāha, son of Pratāpa of the Rāstrandra or Rāthr race, whose capital was Mayūradri.

937 Kṛsṇayajvan’s Raghunāthabhūpāliyan as a similar work illustrating the greatness of Raghunātha Naik who ruled at Tanjore at

1 DC XXII 8713 There is Alankāramāṇḍā by Sudhindrayati, (Font, IX 6971)
2 DC XXI 8560 8561 Vilayendra commented on Trimalabhātta’s Alankāramaṇḍā, Tanti, IX 8978
3 TO III 9818 Eggeling, Cat VII 1507-8 He was the disciple of Kāśīvamīśa, the author of Rasamāṇasa. See para 306 supra.
4 TO II 2619 See para 889 supra
5 TO III 3837, Tant IX 3992
6 GC I. 715 See para 492 supra. It is called Sāhiyadintamāṇi in DC, XXII 8708, Mys 304
7 “In the Kirtiānud, a Pratapamalla of the Rashtarkuta race is mentioned as a dependent of the Chaulukyas of Anahilapattana. Rashtarkuta is the sanskrit form of Raṣṭrāṇauha or Bāthor, but whether this Pratapamalla was the same as the father of our hero cannot be determined with certainty. Bhairavasaha is in some of the verses called Bahirammassaha which looks like a thoroughly Mahomedan name. But it is not impossible that a Rajput may have adopted it.”
There is a commentary by Sudhindra on Sāhityaratnakāra and Alankāraraṭnakāra of Yagna-ārya;\(^7\)

Yajñesvara\(^8\) was the son of Kondubhatta and nephew of Lakṣmi-ḥara of Cerukūri family. He wrote Alankārarāghava, Alankārasūryanāya\(^9\) and a commentary on Kāvyaparakāśa\(^5\) and lived about 1600 A.D.

Kāśīlaksmana’s Sāh irajiyam\(^6\) illustrates the merits of King Shahji of Tanjore (1684-1711). So is Gunaratnakāra of Narasimha in praise of King Sārabhoji of Tanjore (1712-1727).\(^7\)

Devaṅkara Purushita’s Alankāramanḍūsa illustrates Alankaras with the glories of Peshwas Madhava Rao I and his uncle Raghunātha Rao (17 -1768 A.D).\(^8\) He was the son of Natanabhai and lived at Jratpattana near Surat.

In Kiṣṇarājajayaḥodinduma, Anantāya, son of Singayāra, illustrates the greatness of Kiṣṇarāja of Mysore (1714-1731) A.D. It is noted in his work on poetic conventions, Kavisamayakallola.\(^9\)

Mangalesa’s Vibhaktivilāsam\(^10\) with a commentary on it Darpaṇa, a small poem in 31 verses eulogising a Vijayaramaṗāla of the ‘usapāti race, Zamindar of Vijayanagaram. The verses illustrate the rules of poetic as well as the grammatical sūtras of Pāṇini.

In his Nanjarajaḥodhusanam\(^11\) in seven Ullāsas Nyyaṁhakavi illustrates the greatness of Nanjarāja, son of Virabhūpa of the family of Kaluve.

Nṛsimha was the son of Divarama and Alur Īrurala-avi\(^12\) He bore the title of Abhināwarasura while his friend

---

1. TC, I 806 Mys Sup. 14. There is a commentary on it by Suṣṭhindrayati pams 148 and 150 supra TC, III 4037.
3. Tanj. IX 8975, Mys. 296, CC, I 38.
4. Tanj. IX 8981, SB, II 65. He composed on his son Kiṣṇarāja’s ṛabandharāya. Tanj. VI 2728-81. See para 5 supra
5. DC, XXII, 8023. Lakṣumlāha commented on Gitaṭokinda and lived about 70 A.D.
6. Tanj. IX 4034, Mys. 804.
8. CC, II 6, BB (1867-91), xxxi (b).
9. There is his Kiṣṇarājacakalaḍa, Mys. 299; DC, XXII 8615.
10. TC, IV 4924. He belonged to Niārmint family of Vizagapatam District.
11. Ed. GOS, Baroda. DC, XXII 8665, Trau. 71; CC, I 275; TC, I 80.
12. He wrote Hāḷāṣyaḥatyam in Telugu prose.
13. SB, I. 5, 82.
Tirumaiakavi was called Abhavabhanu. He also wrote a drama
Candrakalaparnaya. Nanjaraja was minister and commander of the
Mysore forces and was practically the king-maker of Mysore from
1734 to 1770 A.D. 3

939 In Alankarasutrasangati, a pupil of Mankha, the illustrations
are in praise of King Ravivarman, who wrote Pradyumnanabhya udaya.

In Rāmavarmayasobhūsanam 4 Sadāsivamakhin describes the great-
ness of Rāmavarma Kulasekhara Vancipala (Karṭika Tirunal) who
ruled in Travancore in 1758-1798 A.D. 5 The author was the son of
Cokkanātha 6 and Minākṣi of Bhāradvajagotra. In the chapter on
drama a model drama Vāsulaksīmikāyanam is imbedded describing the

---

1 On Nanjarāja, see Sewel's E.E., 296-267, S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar's
Ancient India, 395-308

2 See Trav Arch Series, V 18 Called Bālarāmavamayalobhōsana in
Trav 71

3 He was the nephew of king Mārṇḍandaravarm and author of the dramatic
treatise Bālarāmabhārata. See Trav, Arch Series, IV III, V 18. It was his nephew
and successor Rāmavarm who wrote Ruknāparayam.

4 "We know of three different persons bearing the name of Chokkanathha at the
end of the 17th century, i.e.,

(i) the author of Sevantakaparvayam who was the son of Tippādhvar and
who mentions a certain Basavaleshthendra, in his drama

(ii) the author of the commentary of Yuddhakarvahayam of Vāsudova, which
is in manuscript in the Palace Library and in which is mentioned that he
was the son of Sundarsana-Bhatṭa of the Bhāradvājagotra and a native of
Sattanur, and

(iii) the father-in-law of Rāmābhadrabhishita (1698)

Of these No 1 refers to Nilakantha-Makhin and was the author of कातिमतीपरिणययः
composed at the instance of Bhājirāja and belongs therefore to the beginning of
the 18th century. It may also be noted that there was a Basavappa Nayaka of
Ilkere (1697-1714) and a chief named Basavaramendra (c. 1700 A.D.) either of
whom may have been the patron mentioned by the author (JMy X, p. 257),
but we do not know if he was of the Bhāradvāja gotra to identify him with
Sadāśiva's father.

No 11 is of that gotra and says in his commentary that he completed it in the
cyclical year Vikrama month Natha (Sravana), Revati, Monday as triyā, and
as these details are correct for both the Kollam year 875 and 936 in all particulars
except the weekday it may be presumed that he was Sadāśiva's father. Sadāśiva
must have composed his Yasothushanam in the early part of his patron's reign."

See para 161 supra.
marriage of Rāmavarman with Vasulakṣaṁi, the daughter of the king of Sindhu. Sadāśiva also wrote a drama Lākṣmikālyāṇam

In praise of the same king Sadāśiva wrote thus:

In the Court of the same king Balarāma Varman, Maharaja

1 This is the plot

"The king of distant Sindhu had a daughter named Vasulakṣaṁi and had set heart on marrying her to the king of Travancore Ramavarmā-Kulaśekhara, whose accomplishment were much noised abroad. But the queen who had another bridegro in view in the person of her nephew, the prince of Simbala, started her daughter on voyage ostensibly with the intention of visiting a famous temple while the propo destination was in reality Ceylon Province, however, upset the queen’s calculation and the royal barge was stranded on that part of the Travancore shore which was in jurisdiction of the frontier captain (antaṭarpa) Vasumadraja, the brother of king’s consort, Vasumati. The ship wrecked princess was then sent by this captain to his sister at the capital where her beauty at once captivated the pliable heart of k. Ramavarman, the hero of the drama. The usual love intrigue culminates in clandestine meeting of the lovers in the Palace garden and the jealous senior th attempts to dispose of her rival by marriage to her cousin, the Pandya king But ti scheme is frustrated by the king and his accomplice, the inevitable Vidushaka, who the disguise of the Pandya king and his friend receive the bride. In the meantime, ti Sindhuraja learns of the whereabouts of his missing daughter through Nātisagara ti Travancore minister, and coming to Travancore with a large escort confirms ti betrothal of King Ramavarman with Vasulakṣaṁi which happily coincides with h own inclinations.

2 अरिष खुच्छ मारद्राजकलकलकलकीर्षकर्ष गर्गनर्तनतनस बोक्नाथकर्ष तदुक्त सीनाश्रिकितेकुताम सनासिकबल्न कुति असितो शनकक्तय ना गाटकम्

3 This describes the late King Martandavarman

3 See on this author chapter on Sangita post,
Travancore (1758-1798 A.D.) flourished Kalyana of Kalyana Subrahmanya. He was the son of Subrahmanya and grandson of Gopala. He was a Smarta Brahmin of Pantalam in Central Travancore and was popularly known as Pantalam Subrahmanya Sastri. After education under the Rajas of Pantalam, went over to Trivandrum and composed Alankara kaustubha, on the model of the great Appayya Diksita's, Kuvalayananda and Visvesvara's Alankarasarasvata and deals, like them, with Arthalanarkas alone. He illustrates the figures of speech by verses in praise of the sovereign or his family deity, Sri Padmanabha. In the troublous times that followed the death of the illustrious patron, Kalyana Subrahmanya went over to Cranganore to teach Sanskrit to the young princes there and lived under the patronage of the Cranganore Rajas till peace returned to Travancore with the accession of Ram Lakshmi to the masnad. He was then invited to Trivandrum and passed his remaining years as the court pandit of Travancore. In 1814 he was directed by the Darbar to translate Vyavaharamala, a well-known Sanskrit work on law into Malayalam. He passed away somewhere about 1820.

Kalyana also wrote Padmanabhanjaya. Here is a verse from Alankara kaustubha:

राजाजन्मधुराचरा प्रविठ्ठचोला कनककुक्ती
कामसुदारिज्ञणातिलिति काशीपुणातिलितां ई
कृष्णी श्रीरामासविक्रियमा रत्नाकरोदिखिता
जाला तपारारक्ष्यविद्वं श्रीरामाकृपामि ||

His King Rama Varman was thus praised by the youngest brother of Edvettikalitatt Nambudri in his poem Rukminipana:

राजा किमिन्दरचर्च नायकसमालारी राजा पर विजयते वृक्षि रामचरि
नालोककल्ल्हुद्दीव नदीवन्तुरुक्करेण नवदुर्गाविकृतहृ ||

Among his friends and poets at the same court were Devaraja and Ramapanivada. Their works have been noticed. They were

1 Bala is ordinarily added to the name of every ruler of Travancore and that the two predecessors of the sovereign referred to by the author were known as Bala Mārtanda Varma (Vide Travancore Archaeological Series, Vol. I, pages 27 and 40) and Balarama Varma (Vide the Kakkur grant). See Travancore State Manual, I 417.

2 BR, I 60, 291, DC, XXII 8601, Trav 70. These are other works of this name by Visvesvara (OC, I 81) and by Śrīnāla Venkata (Mys. 298) by Śrīnivāsa and by Kavikarnapura (OC, I 31) and Alankara kaustubha (Roc, 268).

3 He was of Mārār caste and not of Wāroor caste as stated in para 177 supra.
also patronised by King Mārṭānda Varman (1729–1758 A.D.) of Travancore. Besides a treatise on drama, Rāmapāṭhavāda wrote the plays Candrikā, Lilāvati, Lālīṭərāgāhavīya, Sītārāghava and Pāḍukāpaṭṭābhīṣaka.

940 Krsnasudhi was son of Śivarāma and grandson of Upadraṣṭa Nārāyana Śāstrī, probably a descendant of Jagannātha Panditārāja. He lived at Uttaramerur near Conjeevaram. He wrote Kāvyakalānishṭi in Kali 4957 (1855 A.D.) with illustrations in praise of king Rāmavarman of Kollam.

ARUNAGIRI KAVI wrote Godāvaramayasobhāṣaṇam with verses in praise of king Godāvarman of Travancore.

941 Alankāramanjarī of unknown authorship contains illustrations in praise of Rāmacandra, a Zamindar of Kākarlapudi family, Vizagapatam District, of the 18th century A.D.

In RAMACANDRAYASOBHUSANA, Kachapeśvara Dīkṣita eulogises Bommarāja, Zamindar of Karvetnagar, Madras, who lived in the first part of the 19th century A.D. In three chapters he deals with śṛngāra, rasa and bhāva. He was the son of Vāsudeva and lived at Brahmadeśa, a village in the N Arcot District.

In ALANKARAMAKARANDA, Kollur Rājaśekhara treats of poetics (called a Kēvyā) with illustrations in praise of Rāmesvara, ruler of Manna and son of Kāmakṣi and Viśvesa of Anapindi family, Guntur District.

RAMAKRŚNA'S Yaśavantyaśobhāṣaṇa is an eulogy of Yaśvanṭha, a prince of Rājaputāna.

Alankārasarvasva of unknown authorship as available is incomplete and refers to a rhetorical work by the author's teacher in praise of king Gopālađeva.

1 TC, IV, 4309
2 Trav 94.
3 TC, III 2985.
4 DC, XXII, 890. In that court was the poet Kuravi Rāma.
5 TC, III 3130. The author quotes from Caritakāśikaśicarākārā. He is also the author of Saḥāyaṇabalaṇa, see ibid, III 2995.
6 In praise of the Rajas of Uīwaṭ, Māṭīkyaśāntīṭīḷī wrote Vaiṅikṛtesvarakīvya and Gargadīna wrote Vinayashāmbakīrṭiṇa.
7 Uīwaṭ, 964, 970.
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Cavali Ramasastriz's Kuvalayamoda is a similar work with illustrations in favour of the poet's patron Raja Simhâdri Jagapatî Rao of Peddapur, who lived in 1853-1911 A.D.

942 Venkata Sastrin was the son of Ānivilla Yajnanārāyaṇa of Kakaraparti agraḥāram, in West Godavarī District. Proficient in all sāstras he was honoured by valuable gifts by the Jagapatī Mahārāja of Peddāpuram and Nilādri Mahārāja of Dārlapudi. Besides Māhesvaramahākāẏya, Saṭṭaṣṭakam, Bhāskarprasasti and Rukmṇiparṇīyāyam (poems) and Alankārasudhāsindhu and Rasaprāpanca, he wrote Apparayayasascandrodhayam with illustrations in praise of Meka Venkata Narasimha Apparao, Zamindar of Nuzvid, and was presented with the agraḥāram of Vallurimallī in 1745 A.D. There he performed Somayāga and wrote glosses on Śrītaṣṭaṭra. His son Narayana wrote a similar work, Sāhityakalpadrumam and dedicated it to the Zamindar Jagannāṭha Appaṭrao of Nuzvid. Nārāyaṇa's son Venkata, known as Bālakālidāsa dedicated his Citracamāṭkāramājanari to Śrī Vaṭṣavāyī Tīmma Jagapatī Mahārāja of Peddapur and wrote also Śūryastava, full of citra Ānivilla Venkatasastri's pupil, Carla Venkataśāstrin, son of Lakṣmīnāraṇa, wrote a similar work, Venkaṭādriyam, as also Naukā, the commentary as Sāhityaraṭṭanakara.

943. Carla Bhāsyakara Sastrin of Lohityagotra also lives at Kakaraparti Agraḥāram in West Godavari, Madras. He is a unique relic of old-day Sanskrit scholarship and in the mastery of grammar, lexicons and poetics he is probably without an equal. Venkataśāstrin who was the donee of the agraḥāram aforesaid was his maternal ancestor. In grateful recollection of that munificent gift, Bhāsyakāra has now composed a similar work on Alankāra, Mekādiṭa-sabdarthakalpadarur.

His Mekādiṭa-Rāmāyaṇa is a hemistich of 16 letters (sloka) which is interpreted by the separation and combination of the letters, so as to

1. To the same place belonged another Venkata Śaṭṭri, who lived about 60 years ago and wrote a commentary on Lakṣmīmāhasāram, and also another Venkata Śaṭṭri (1860-1918 A.D.) who wrote Śītārāmaśāmpu on Rāmāyaṇa and Buḍhamānasūlīsa on Bhāgavata.

2. See V. Krishnarao's History of Nuzvid (Andhra Patrika, Annual number, 1914, p 209) Namismha Apparao lived about 1700 A.D. He was son of Venkataśāstrī and Venkaṭādri's father built Nuzvid Fort in 1873 A.D. Among the friends of Venkataśaṭṭri was Madabhusi Vadjimatthabhakantihirava Rāmānujaśārya who wrote a poem Śrinivāsaśārya.

3. Printed, Nuzvid.
cover the whole story of Rāmāyana. His Kankañabandha-Rāmāyana, has been noticed² His Vināyakacaritra narrates the story of Syamantopakhyaṇa on the birth of Vināyaka, which is read ceremoniously on Vināyakaśaṭṭhi day.

By an ingenious and intricate splitting up of the letters, consonants and vowels, that are embraced in the term मेकार्पाश (Me-lā-dhi-sā), thousands of meanings are made out, so as to illustrate various topics of poetics as dealt with in Pratāparudra-Yasobhusana and this is Mekādhasaśādārthākalpataru. The commentary rightly describes his versatile learning in these words —

येश्रब्धार्चिचचरतपरिभिषियेत्वा श्रुणाधिकिया
देशासत्ताहदे विविधकवीने येत्वा ध्धनाहुसुका |
येत्वा भावसारदास्समतो येत्वा नाटके रागिना
मेकार्पाशपदे तमरबमृष्य पश्यन्तु नन्दन्तु व |
येत्वा साहिष्ठविचारदास्समतो येत्वा शामिकासुककिया
येत्वा चित्रकागितपाटविभिन्न कार्तिकासुककिया |
वेस्तुरकुरपिच्छास्समतो येत्वा वेपका गायका
मेकार्पाशपदे स्त्राहारविभिष्यातु पश्यन्तु नन्दन्तु व |

अथ् मुहावरणस्कृतविस्तारबिस्तबिवधिमन्तवधितस्यथेतो दशावस्य कथ्यते |
तदन परिगदिता बिशानयन —

चहु गृहित्रिवेदनस्मास्स्फलस्मेटश्रुणाधिकिया |
आगंर काव्यसारितेलेखा लायोश्य सन्धर |
उन्मादी मूर्छन्त वेढ सरण चरं मिर्दु |
अवस्य द्राहवस्य मता कामशालासारं |
केवलक प्रतापज्वरी लतचा दशावस्य नन्द वदर 

तद चहु गृहित्रिवेदन —
आदवराकृपण चहु गृहित्रिवेदनिषीण |

सू | मेकार्पाशमेकार्पाश |

पढ़ | मान-का-आधिना-मे-कार्पाश |

1. See para 97 supra.
Sri Yatirajaswami, more fully known as Sri Yaduguri-Yatiraja-Sampatkumara-Ramanuja, is the present head of the Yatiraja Mutt at Melkote, Mysore. Before he became a Sanyasin his name was Anan|5carya and he was an official of the Mysore Archaeological Department. He is a great rhetorician and his dissertations on Bhamaba etc., are very original. He discovered the first copy of Svapnavasavatafa and to him likewise is due the credit of the printed edition of a few chapters on Šngāraprakāśa prefixed with a learned introduction.

[In KALIDASA ET L'ART POETIQUE DE L'INDE (ALANKARA SASTRA) [pp XIV 360. (Paris 1917)]]. P Hari Chand, Sastri accomplished the colossal task of tracing the verses of Kālidāsa in works attributed to him to quotations in several works on Alankāra and has expressed an opinion on their comparative authenticity thus.

"Six works are by universal consent considered the authentic productions of the great poet: the three dramas Šakuntalā, Vikramorvasī and Malavikagnimitra, the two epics Rāghuvaṃśa and Kumarasambhava, and the lyric Meghadūta. All these are frequently quoted in Alankara works. The Ritusamhara is also commonly attributed to Kālidāsa, but a strong argument adduced by our author against this attribution is the fact that the treatises on Alankara ignore this poem.
Bharata's Natyasastra is probably the earliest extant work in music and dancing. The name of Bharata appears in two forms Vṛddha Bharata or Adubharata and Bharata merely. There are two works Nātyavedāgama and Nātyasāstra. The former is called Dvādasasāhasrī and the latter Satsāhasrī, about half the former in volume. Dvādasasāhasrī is likely the work of Vṛddhabharata and as only sixty-three chapters of it are available now, it is not possible to verify quotations as from Vṛddhabharata from the manuscript.

"Satsāhasrī and Dvādasasāhasrī" says Śāradātanaya "were simultaneous compositions, the former being meant as an epitome of the latter."
Even as it is extant, the Nāṭyasāstra, is a very ancient work. It quotes from Andravyākaraṇa and Yāska and not Pāṇini. It frequently quotes from earlier literature verses and sūtras prefixed thus:

अन्रावस्यायं समत । तत्र हेतु । etc

In language and in its treatment of the subject it has the archaic tenor and it is natural that Bhāratā has come to be mentioned as Bhāratamuni with divine veneration.

The extant work has itself been called sūtra, meaning by it a terse and authoritative composition.

Nānyadeva has कशामानि सूतकत्तानि ग्या—

Abhinavagupta says

पद्यितानि सर्वसमिद्ध विद्यमन् बन्दे केवल तिताबिषेकाय वाय |

According to the chronology of the Purānas, therefore, the antiquity of Bhāratā would be very great. Fearing that the tendency of modern scholarship is towards a distrust in anything traditional, it may be sufficient to state that barring the epics it is the earliest available literature in Sanskrit of the period when the sciences came to be restated in the garb of poetry, explanatory of sūtra literature that preceded it.

1 Ed M R Kavi, GOS, Baroda, with Abhinavabhārati by Sivadatta and in parts by J Grosset, with a preface by P Regnaud, Paris, and by Hall, Calcutta and by Regnaud, Paris "The words printed in the end समात्मा नवनि सर्वसमिद्ध विद्यमन् (See S K, De, SP, 24) which have led to much misapprehension are not found in any of the manuscripts I have examined and on the face of it was written by some scribe who knew no grammar"

On this work generally, see S K De SP 80, 82 44, H H Dhrava, Nāṭyasāstra or Indian Dramatics, As Quir II 849-59, H A Pople, The Music of India, 12, Pischel, Gg A, (1885) 763, P K Bhandarkar, JA, XLII, 157, H P Sastri, JASE, V 352, Sten Konow, Indian Drama, 2, Rapson, Essay of Religion and Ethics, tit-Indian Drama, V 588, T Ganapati Sastri (Int to Pratimanaśaka xl-i) (says Nātya śāstra was posterior to Bhāṣa) These scholars assign this work variably to the period, 2nd century B C, to 2nd century A D. S K De (1 c 26) says that the work assumed its present shape after several modifications by the end of the 3rd century A D and this extraordinary conclusion is reached in spite of the admission that before Abhinavagupta there were several commentators whose works are now known only from quotations. In another place (1 c 32) he places the chapter on music and the rest too in the 4th century A D. (See also IA XII, 165) Pischel's (1 c) argument based on reference in the text to Pahlavas comes to be of no value. On Bhāratā's Rāgādhyaśya see Andhrapārtha, Annual Number, VII. 165.
"The present work consists of 37 according to the northern or later recension but only 36 according to the southern or earlier texts. The difference lies in the numbering of the chapters, as the southern or older texts combined the 37th with the 36th. Abhinava, the commentator, appears to be the author of this numerical extension of the text, though he himself states that the work consists of 36 chapters. He actually comments upon the 37th chapter also. Should one be tempted to call the excess a copyist's error, it would be an error for the commentator begins each chapter with a verse in praise of Siva as incorporated of one of the 86 tatvas of the Sava Siddhanta in some order while the 37th chapter is headed with a verse indicating anuttarah (nothing beyond) a doctrine in Kashmirian Saivism propounded by Utpaladeva, the commentator's paramaguru (teacher's teacher). The reason for this extension of the text is not a mere fanciful device for introducing his Sava tatvas. The subject-matter thus separated from the rest was probably composed by one of the Vartikhakaras, either Rahnlaka, Simi, or Srilharsa. But he himself says in two places that Bharata's work consists of 36 chapters and hence the 37th must be according to him an interpolation by one of the Vartikhakaras.

Bharata divides the work broadly into four sections based on abhnayas or modes of conveyance of the theatrical pleasure to the audience, which pleasure, called rasa, is pure and differs from the pleasure we derive from the actual contact with the objects of the world which is always mingled with pain. These modes or abhnayas are four, viz. Sattvika (conveyed) by the effort of the mind, Angika or the natural movement of the organs when any thought is expressed or conveyed, Vakika, the delivery through expression and Aharya, the dress, deportment, and Mise-en-scene. The sage attaches great importance to the first of these modes and deals with it in chapters 6 and 7. Expression of feeling is conveyed to a stranger only by gestures or through the organs of speech. Hence Angika-abhnaya comes next and is dealt with in chapters 8th to 13th. Then delivery of vacika is taken up which extends over chapters 14 to 20. Then comes aharya, i.e., dress and scenic appliances and mutual conduct or movements on the stage along with the musical auxiliaries behind the stage to intensify the emotional effect produced on the stage. To this four-fold division of the subject are added chapters on the origin and greatness of the theatrics, the forms of the stage and rules for their construction, and the auspicious ceremonial of the foundation and the opening days. The fourth and fifth chapters treat of purvadanga, preliminaries.
before the commencement of the actual drama. These include music and dancing in praise of gods and in averting the evil influence of the demons. The postures recommended in dancing to please the ādhyāyas are numberless and a selected list of 108 of them called Karanas or single postures and 32 selected Angaharas, (combinations of two or more of these Karanas) are fully described in the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter gives details about the preliminaries. Chapters 35 and 36 are supplementary and deal with the qualifications and behaviour of the actors and actresses on the stage and how the theatres descended from Heaven to the earth. Thus excluding the preliminary and supplementary chapters the subject proper is dealt with in 29 sections (6 to 84).

"From time immemorial Bharata's work is considered authoritative on the science of Natya. In spite of the fact that Bharata treated dramaturgy in extensive, he had to summarise the general principles of gita and nṛtya in order to add an element of grace in dhruvagana and purvarangavidhi. Though the two latter subjects are only auxiliaries to Natya, Bharata gave them such a comprehensive shape that the writers on those sister sciences had looked upon him as their authority. Bharata has not dealt with ragas. For, in his exhaustive enumeration of jatis where any of the 63 svaras can be chosen as āmsa svara he has made the field of ragas so wide that it covers almost every raga in the world —

यत्सिद्ध गीते लोके तल्लबे जातिदु स्थितम्।

He left the choice of a particular raga to the sutradhāra himself as befits the occasion. The case is similar in nṛtya also. For he has enumerated the general and natural movements of the hand, eye, etc., but their combinations which produce endless variety in each sort are left to the actors to frame new poses without detriment to rasa and which have possibility of use in actual life. Bharata has condemned

1 M B Kavi says, i.e.,

"In the compartments of the east and west gopuras in the Nataraja temple at Chidambaram in South India Karanas were cut on rocks with appropriate verses from the Nātysastra underneath each of the postures. But unhappily only 98 of the postures were recovered, the remaining fifteen were either damaged or the compartments altered during the repairs. These postures are found in Bharata's order for about 60 numbers and then owing to masons' or supervisors' ignorance or on account of some subsequent alteration in the construction the remaining 48 are not in the order followed by Bharata. Kopperunjngadva (Rajashmbicva, the Great?) who set up an independent kingdom against the Cholas between 1243 and 1278 A D was the patron of the above decorative sculptures."
the use of angikabhinaya for actors of uttama or great sattvic type.
Angika is intended for adhama characters and to some extent it is tolerated in the madhyama also. So the standpoint of Bharata makes him reject much of the technical side of sangita and nrtiya.

"There are two main recensions with greater difference purely on exegetic principles. The older recension, so called because the older commentators have used it, was followed by Udbhata and Lollata. The later recension seems to have been adopted by Sankuka, Kirtidhara and was actually used by Abhinavagupta. Undoubtedly, the merit decides the question in favour of the later version. For Abhinavagupta's sole aim is to make the work of Bharata completely based upon the principle of rasa, while Nandin and Kohala have imported greater conventions from gita and nrtya into natya i.e., in ordinary parlance they have made the science of stage rather unnatural or more conventional. Both of these recensions have on the other hand longer and shorter versions. Udbhata seems to have followed a shorter version, while Lollata appears to have used the longer or the older recension. Similarly Kirtidhara appears to have followed the longest of the later recension, while Ghatanaka seems to have used the shortest. These are only tentative theories based upon certain remarks made in the Abhinavabharaṇi, other commentaries and various works on sangita and nrtya.

Abhinava's text ends with Chapter XXXVII while most of the others end in XXXVI. The apparent reason for extension of the number, seems to be the introduction of the 36 tattvas one for each Chapter by Abhinava and the commentary of the 37th is headed by the verse indicating anuttaram dharma of the Pratyabhijña school.

आकाशश्वार्णं प्रश्ननिवेषे पूर्वसावाचर्चिनां
धारावशस्तुपितुःपिरिरां यशस्थप्रमिति।
ऋष्यायव्रन्यं परिभाषिनं वा नतिष्ठानमचक्षाति
शैलदन्त्र तदहस्यहुनातूर्वात्र शास्त्रं कर्त्ये॥

It may be added that Bharata looks upon the science of Natya as an anga to vedic rites allowing all its aesthetic profundity. His treatment of purvaranga (Chs 4, 5, 29, 31, 32, 34) and of saptagitas (Ch. 31) amply illustrates his conception. Nandin sees an agamic vein in nrtya, gita and natya. Abhinava maintains in a high degree the vedic and aesthetic aspects of natya viewing it from a psychological

Abhinavagupta represents the three mātras or schools of Sādāsiva, Brahma and Bharata and answers an objection that the Bhārata-Nātyasastra was the work of some pupil of Bharata embodying the views of Bharata

...perspective, while others mix them up to produce only the pictorial effect.*

Abhinavagupta represents the three matas or schools of Sadasiva, Brahma and Bharata and answers an objection that the Bharata-Nātyasastra was the work of some pupil of Bharata embodying the views of Bharata.

...vidhi) should be strictly followed. This applies to karanas and angaharas which find prominent place in the various angas of purvaranga."

The pedigree of Cola kings is thus —

Rājendrā I (1018-1045 A.D.), (son) Rājādhirāja I (1018-1054), (brother) Rājendra II (1058-1082), (brother) VitaraRājendra (1062-1070), (son) AdhiraRājendra. He was murdered by Eastern Calukya, Kuloṭṭunga I (1070-1118) or Rājendra Cola (who was the daughter's son of Rājendra I, Vikrama (1116-1186), Kuloṭṭunga II (1183-1143),
BHARATA

947 Bharatatika appears to be the earliest commentary. The author’s name is unknown, but he was a pupil of Śripāda. Abhinavagupta quotes the criticisms of Bharatatika, mostly in the chapters on music, on Bharata’s views and Abhinavagupta attempts a justification and at times his language is scathing.

"अन उपदेशाविद्वेशोऽपमानन्तः साहित्यविद्ये साहित्यविद्ये विवेष-पतिपाद्यन्तु टीकाकारः कृतम्, तत्कालसमयमनोहान इथावर्मणिकात्रम्, भक्तावप-योगादिन्द्र उपेक्षसेवः।” Vol III, p 48

948 Harsa is another glossator. His gloss is in the form of verses and is known by the name of Harsa-vārttika. He is frequently quoted by Abhinavagupta in his commentary and mentioned by Bhājya and Śāradatānaya as an authority. The following quotations from Abhinavabhārata will elucidate some of his views.

वासिक्कृतमयुक्तम्—

"वाम्यालाक्षतिरेष्य वरिष्यादेवाप्यि मानविषये। उभयेऽपि हि गौरवेऽ को भेद्य जनानाधिक।"

"रमा गान् पूर्ण वा अहूः वा तत् एवं नागविवाहावः। तुर्यालाकारस्वेऽं विद्वानालिकम्।"

"पदयो भीत, ‘अत्यद्वा हत्ता नाम (कवि) कलसभिवाहरूः। देव मानविवाहार निर्दित मृणालिन्ते। अवस्यस्य पुरोहितस्तुण’ हस्यदि।"

From these references, and others we can infer that he differed in his interpretation of Bhārata’s work from other commentators in the description of Purvaranga and the species of dramas. Balhurtapanisra calls him Śrīharsadeva and probably therefore considers him the author of the dramas, Raṭnāvali, Nāgānanda and Priyadarśikā.

949 Rahulaka’s (Rāhula or Rāhala) commentary is in verse. He was a very early writer, and he is mentioned in the Tamil epic, Māpimekalar which is now generally assigned to a date not later than 4th century B.C., though it was probably a much earlier composition. Abhinavagupta calls him Sākyacarīya Rāhulaka, implying thereby that he was a Buddhist and does not accept his criticism of Bhārata, for instance on Alankaras of damsels.

Rajārāja II (1140-1164), Rajarājēyā Kārikālia (1172-1179), Kulottunga III (1178-1216) Rajadeva III (1216-1257), Rajendra III (1246-1268) Thū Panōyas overcame the Cola kings.
“तेन मौर्ययमदमाविक्यपवित्रचतुरदीपालुषी गात्रा (शाक्या ?)चार्यरासुरादिचित्तिद्वान विद्यभिषिक्क बनना।”

This is also mentioned by Hemacandra in his Kavyānusāsana (p 316)

सर्नगद्धर वुश्यकारी राधुकारि जयययामादरशनु मनुष्याक्षिबित्तिमेति प्रेमार्थे।
लाभाय यो स्वसापं ग्रेषिवाय कार्तित तस्मां विषाणसहित समस दुःखाय।

Sūngadāhara quotes this verse as Rahulaka’s *

बदकदददलन्तर्वलयमानीमर्दन्द्रमद्याबित्तिमेति प्रेमार्थे।
लाभाय यो जस्तानी ग्रेषिपाय कार्तित तस्मां विषाणसहित समस दुःखाय।

There is a manuscript of a Vārtika, got by M R Kavi from the Central Provinces. The beginning and end are missing, but as it is it extends to 2000 grāntas and the author’s name is not known. It is expected to be published as an appendix to Natyāsāstra Edn of Baroda.

950 Nakha kutta was an ancient author. Bahurūpamāśra writes

तथा नोतकारानी नक्षत्रकारविक्षिप्तमानिको लक्षणविकुटम्;
दिव्यात्मकं कारस्वरूपो नाटकानूपम् || श्रति नवहुः \n
But Śāradātmanaya attributes this to Harṣa

दिव्यात्मकमयानो यज्ञविवेकेकै; तत्वत् तौत्तक सेद्वो नाटकाचति हर्ष्याकै।

Are Harṣa and Nakha kutta identical? *

951 Mātrgupta was a very early writer, probably of about the beginning of the Christian era or even earlier. In Rājaṭarangini (III 129-229) Kalhana gives a long account of the poet Mātrgupta and his relations with king Vīkramādiṭṭha Harṣavardhana of Kāśmir.

Harṣavardhana, alias Vīkramādiṭṭha, had in his court a poet by name Mātrgupta. He was very conservative and consequently was not prepared to push himself up to royal favour of his own accord. The king was not unaware of the high poetic talents and deep culture of his protege, but he intentionally ignored him. In absolute poverty, without proper food, decent clothing, and timely sleep, the poet continued to serve his master with diligence. He knew no comfort.

At last the time came when his stars began to exert their influence, being in the ascendant. On a particular night it happened by chance.

---

1, So does Vallabhādīva, Subh-2900.
that all the guards were asleep, the lamp which was dimly burning in the apartments of the king was put out by a strong wind, the king wanted the lamp to be re-lit, but there was no servant to do it. He shouted at the top of his voice, but there was no response from any of the guards. Matṛgupta who was waiting at the gate entered and did the needful. While he was about to retire, the king wanted to know his exact position in life and asked him how he alone was awake at that dead hour of night. The poet composed the following verse on the spur of the moment:

\[\text{शोभनोद्वितिया माण्डलहिमाण्डलिनाचन्द्रो मक्षत}\\\text{शाश्ताचि स्वर्णिपालस शमत्स प्रभामकस्मक्ष मे।}\\\text{निद्रा काश्ययमणितेत दविता सलव्य दूर गता}\\\text{सत्यप्रस्तापितेत बद्धता न श्योते श्रवरी।}\]

Rājatarangini III—181

On hearing this verse, the king realised the sin he had committed by neglecting his duty in not having recognised the merits of the poor, needy and eminent poet and began to contemplate as to how best he could expiate the sin.

At dawn he rose, having already come to a conclusion with regard to Matṛgupta. The kingdom of Kāśmir was then without a ruler. That kingdom was his vassalage, and the responsibility of finding a suitable ruler to that country devolved upon him. Now he called upon Matṛgupta and handed over to him a note in which there was an order to his ministers at Kāśmir that Matṛgupta should be anointed their king, and bade Matṛgupta deliver it unto the hands of his ministers at Kāśmir and do as they required. The poet was unaware of what the king had written and did as ordered. He marched along to Kāśmir with many auspicious omens at every step. And as soon as he delivered the Royal message, he was anointed king of that country.

We also learn from Kalhana that he was not of the same place to which Harṣavardhana belonged. Probably he was a southerner.

Mentha displayed his Hayagrīvavadha before Matṛgupta and received appreciation.*

---

* See para 87 supra. Hasmacandra calls it a kāvyā, but Vamanadeśīrya (p. 249) says it was a Nātaka on the authority of Candrikā of Vaidyanātha, etc. There is a quotation from it by Mammata (KP, I, 5).
Māṭrignaṭa very probably wrote a commentary on Nātyasāstra. This appears from a reference to Sundaramisra's Nātyapradīpa on Nāndī.

His opinions on Nāṭya, Alankāra and Saṅgītā have been quoted profusely by Abhinavaṃgupta, Kunṭaka, Bahurupamisra, Sāradāṭanaya and in the commentaries by Vāsudeva (on Karpūramanjari), by Ranganāṭha (on Vikramorvasīya), by Sarvānanda (on Nāmalāṅgānasasana) and his verses by Kṣemendra and Vallabhadeva.

952 Kirtidhara is mentioned by Śārṅgaṭa as a commentator on Bharata. There are references to Kirtidhara's views in Abhinavabhāṣāṭi.

(i) "एततवक्तः—‘मांसपक्कल साम विकल वल्लिन तथा। चन्द्रन्तु (२) विकल शुपके पुरथो सार्थक * * * * ||’
हसित कौवितरयाचारी।

(ii) ‘नाथ चतवारि यत्ता कौवितरोप्यवात्त हसित।’

The reading of the last quotation is doubtful. Is it possible that the original work of Nandikesvara was not available to Abhinavaṃgupta? The latter quotes Nandimaṭa largely in Chapter XXVIII, or instance.

चतुः कौवितरयेष नान्दिकेषाज्ञात्माणागमिलेन (५) दर्शित तदस्माति (सदस्माति) नः प्रयं, तत्लयाथू लिस्वते।

---

1. See T. B. Chiranjivi, Fragments of Māṭrignaṭaḥyāya, JOR, II 119.
2. यथोल महादानक—
   पुष्प च जनयकेको मूःयोध्वर्णालिन्यः।
3. अन्नसर्वनिर्देशसंयोगः पुनः कियंते। यत्ता मानुसः—मांसपक्कलं सात्रयोजि—
   चित्तविन्दविशिष्टपरिपूर्वकदीनिः काल्याणी सम्भविति।
4. नाय निरामिश्रसांहस्धाराजसंह कौरिकोवितकालाद्वितीयाणि।
   बामाति नाथ तददित दिविषत हुमाहि—पुण्डरिकेश्वरसिद्धपिन्दं यस्तस्वदोषः ||

Anontyaśnacaracā, 149.
953. Udbhata is mentioned by Śāṅgadeva as a commentator on Nāṭyasastra, next to Lollata and Abhinavagupta. Contrasts the views of Udbhata and Lollata. These commentaries are not available.

954. Sakaligarbha came after Udbhata and before Lollata. Unlike Udbhata who rejected four vr̥tiṣ of Bharata and substituted two of his own, Sakaligarbha added one to Bharata's four. Abhinavagupta thus criticises it.

955. Abhinavagupta's Abhinavabharati is a commentary on Bharata's Nāṭyasastra of Bharata, and an extensive and erudite treatise on dancing and histrionics. The manuscripts now available cover the first thirty-two chapters except the seventh and the eighth. Abhinava recites and criticises the views of Śrīharva (the Vartikakara of Bharataśītra), Rāhulaka, Śankūka, Bhatta Nāyaka, Lollata, Ghantaka etc. He refers to the following rare authors and works in the course of the commentary:—In Chapter I to Bhatta Tota (his preceptor) Kāvyakauṭuka, Svapnavāsavadattā (by Bhāsa), in Ch IV to Cudāmaṇi Dombika (a lyrical play), Rāghavavijaya, Guḷamāla (a lyrical play), Māricavadha (a lyrical poem), Rāṣṭaka (a poet, probably the author of the Mançavāda), Viśākha (a writer on music), Daśṭila (music), Paramesvaracariṇa (Paramesvara), Battayantra and Lollata (commentators on Nāṭyasāstra), Kṛtadvaha (a writer on music), Śanku, in Ch V to Hejjala (author of Rādhāvpralamba), Kāsyapa (a writer on music), in Ch VI to Tāpasavāsāraśā (of Māyurāja), Draupadīsvayamvara (probably a drama), Bhāsa, Rāmāyana-nāṭaka, in Ch IX to Udbhata (as a writer on Nātya), Bhīma (author of Prajñācānaṇka), in Ch XIII to Māyāpuṣpaka (a drama), in Ch XIV to Jayadeva (as a writer on music, also on metric), Bhatta Nāyaka, Pādaśāntaka, in Ch XVIII to Kṛtyāravata, Vāsavādattanātyadhāra by Subandhu, Samudradaṭṭacāstīta, Puṣpadhūṣṭaka, Mudrārākṣasa, Devicandragupta (a drama), in Ch, XIX to Pāṇḍavāṇanda (a drama), Rāmābhuyadayā (a drama), Dandrarudṛaṭṭa, Prajñānuruddha by Bhīma, Udāśṭārāghava (by Mayurāja), Candraka (a playwright), and in Ch XXI to Abhisārikāvancīṭaka (a drama).

Abhinavagupta under the sublime teachings of his master, Bhatta Tota, has fixed the limits of Nātya and rejected such matter as strictly

belongs to the province of music and dancing arts. He criticises his previous commentators in the light of his own theory whenever they had overstepped the boundaries of natya and fallen into the allied grounds. His conception of natya is very liberal and aesthetic, but it rejects all musical dramas for Bharata in his opinion has recognised only ten kinds of dramatic compositions. In accordance with his theory such passages which were said to possess wider significance to include graces and flourishes in gita and nrtya by authors like Matanga and earlier commentators, are explained by Abhinava to apply only to Natya. Thus his text slightly differs from that of the others which he points out or criticises. It is the difference in interpretation that gave rise to various recensions. Variants in the text are also created by various other causes, viz., wrong deciphering, scholars filling up the omissions if letters are lost, scholars correcting the clerical errors, etc. Though every copy of Bharata's text abounds in errors of this description, interpretative differences alone constitute the difference in recension. Besides the two above influences the readers or commentators have added a number of slokas from Kohala and other writers wherever they are explanatory to Bharata's cryptic and terse expression. Such additions are plenty in the Taladhyaya (Ch. 31) and Avanaddha (Ch 34)."

956 About Bhattasumanas, Bhatta Vṛddhi, Bhattayantra and Bhatta Gopāla who are quoted in Abhinavabhārati, nothing more is known except that they were writers on music. Vṛddhi's verses are quoted profusely in Subhāṣītāvali. For instance

अशिष्ठोद्देशत्वात् उद्गाृहित नित्यकविद्यापरम् ।
शान्ति नेत्रलयाप निमालये नुमितिविविविचि ॥—1734

उपरक्षेवसंग्रहमपागतयुग्गुल्लक्षित्वेंचिम् ।
पटिकासंस्कृतिजन्ते कुदेशमव वीच्य शक्त्रु्रः ॥

आभिरववाचारिक अज्ञेर्वेच्रुतक्षुजज्ञतिरतिवसृ ।
मानिवशृवृहयेर्यः कांड़च्छवेश्टि मूलम् ॥

दश्याक्षेपन समरसु चुल्लचलचाच्चर्याकरिणेन ।
वेश्याशेषं काम प्रदीपतो नीश्चान्तेन ॥

अपगतात्सौतिविकारा फलपटुकानातारकाताको ।
कृष्णपत्रोपसरस प्राघिक दुधविनिवेच ॥—1734-8

1. M B Kavi, Int. to A.B.
Bhārata is quoted by Abhinavagupta for his definition of Nṛtta (p 208)

Bhattagopāla wrote Tāladipikā and was different from the author of the same name of a commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa and from the father of Sāradātānanaya of the same name. This is the reference.

Abhinavagupta quotes Bhattayantra for his definition of Nṛtta

Bhattagopāla wrote Tāladipikā and was different from the author of the same name of a commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa and from the father of Sāradātānanaya of the same name. This is the reference.

Bhārata is quoted by Abhinavagupta for his definition of Nṛtta (p 208)

Dattila Among the immediate disciples of Bhārata, of whom hundred are mentioned in the Nātyasāstra, Dattila and Kohala have written separate treatises. Dattila was a devout follower of Bhārata and never differed from him in his expositions, so that, when later writers wanted anything to support Bhārata, they invariably invoked Dattila. Dattila’s work embraced music and dancing, and its merit is seen from the existence of a commentary on it called Prayogastabaka.

Kohala was the immediate disciple of Bhārata and comes next to Bhārata himself in merit of composition. While the Nātyasāstra of Bhārata comprised 11 subjects, Kohala enlarged them into 13. Even according to Nātyasāstra, Kohala was to write a treatise on Prastāratantram. He is frequently cited by later writers, and largely by Abhinavagupta and commentators on Sārngaḍeṣva. But Kohala’s work is lost, but for a fragment that is available, Tāladhyāya. A study of the citations there indicates that Kohala, though he followed Bhārata in the main, improved upon Nātyasāstra in details of classification.

1. The name appears also in the form of Daṭṭhila.
2. Ed. TSS, Trivandrum
3. Sūmharaja quotes from Prayogastabaka in his commentary on Sārngaḍeṣva.
4. A study of the citations there indicates that Kohala, though he followed Bhārata in the main, improved upon Nātyasāstra in details of classification.

5. CC, I 180, IOC, 8025, 8099; DC, XXII 8725 (with Telugu commentary)
6. For quotations from Kohala, see PR, IV 48 and Cat Boz, 199, 201
7. For instance in the case of Cāri (dance). See Kallinātha’s commentary on Sārngaḍeṣva, pages 770-8.
Abhinayasāstram attributed to Kohala may be a part of Kohala's work or any later abridgment of it. Datṭila-Kohalīyam purports to be a narration by Kohala to Datṭila and Kohalarahasya by Kohala to Matanga and these are epitomes of Kohala's work.

Kohala's work appears also to have been a narration by Kohala to Śārdūla, and this is seen from Kalinātha's long quotation.

959 Matanga wrote Brihadodasa. Though apparently meant to deal primarily with Desī music, the extant portion in six chapters embraces Śrūtis and Svaras. He mentions Bhārata but differs from him in several places and particularly in the introduction of 12 Svaras in Mūrchana. Matanga is referred to by later writers as the originator of a new school and Matangamaṇḍa is quoted profusely, for instance, by Abhinavagupta and Śāṅgadhara. Among Prabandhas he is said to have introduced the form Harivilāsa and among dances, a species called Zakkini, and when speaking of the latter Kāli is described as

1 DC, XXII, 872a, 8725 (with Telugu commentary), IOC, 820
2 BTC, 69 I am informed that the book is now missing from the library.
3 TC, I, 1039 This manuscript contains only 18th chapter, but I am told the whole book is available in Vadakkutturumallur in Alavuntunagari, Thenvelly District.
4 In commentary on Śāṅgadēva, pp. 875-89 A similar mention is made by Bṛhadnātha in his Saṅgītasudhā.
5 Ed. TSS, Trivandrum. The manuscript so far available and printed contains chapters on Nāḍīc.eqāṭhi, Śrūtiniyās, Śvamāmala, Mūrchana, Tāṇa, Varṣa, 89 Alankāras, Jāti, Bāgalakṣana, Bhāgalakṣana, Prabandha and ends with the line.

The name Bhāḍāđesi suggests the existence of a smaller work called Laghuḍesi by S. K. De (SP, 246) speaks of a work called Maṭangabharata by Lakṣmāṇa-Bhāskara but does not give any reference. In a manuscript (BTC, No 11526), the manuscript though labelled Maṭangabharatam, is really Lakṣmāṇabharatam by Bhāskara Lakṣmāṇa of which there is a good copy there No 11546 Lakṣmāṇabharatam, consisting of Abhinaya only, was composed by some later writer and had nothing to do with Maṭanga.

6 यथाः महत्स, नवेचि राग, भासविशेषस्वन्भाः, क्षयौ विशेषलक्ष. स्वप्नेऽः मन्तरसन्धादिव, तथा चाह भरत, जातिसम्बन्धानागाणागिति. यत्तिरिविशेषेऽव तत्त्वं आत्मानुविश्वतिविशवररतृति.

(Kalinātha commentary on Saṅgītmāṇākasa, p 860),
7 It is so stated in Yāśakamaṇḍam, Manuscript No 12 of 745 Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.
having requested her Maṭangamum to create the new device. In the Tamil epic Silappadhikaram now generally assigned not later than 4th century B.C., Matanga as a writer on music and dancing is mentioned and the commentary frequently quotes from his work. Considering that Matanga was thus mentioned as a Muni and father of Kali (and so called Matangī) and that his views are quoted with reverence, we may say that his work could not have been composed far later than Bharata’s Nātyaśāstra. Matanga quotes passages from Kohala and Śārdūla.

960 There is a noteworthy tradition that Matanga’s sons were Daṭṭila and Kohala, that they married Sukīṇa and Kṛṣṇā, daughters of Jhulukā and that these damsels transformed themselves into rivers so as to be of incessant service to Yaṭaparāha of Śrīmusnam In the Śhalapurāṇa of Śrīmusnam (in South Arcot District), a shrine where Śrī Viśnu is worshipped in his Varāhavatāra, there is this passage (VIII 17-20)

961 Brahmaprabhāratam represents the work of Brahma of Prīthmaha. The small portion that is now available in six chapters deals with Abhinaya. It embraces Mārga, Nāṭya and makes no reference to Desī at all. There is no mention in it of any earlier work and

1 पूरा देश्र महाकाली लासित श्रवणा स्थ
जनक प्रेष्य परवर्ण मन्त्र श्रीकेशेशसे ||—B T. C No 11536.

2 Chapter V, line 18d.

3 In Kalināṭha’s commentary on Sangitaratnakara (p. 89) there is the following passage यथा शास्त्रे वेदारम्भवेदाग्रीष्टीपालया सवादितवादानीदितवाद तारागाति इत्येन खता सप्ताहनेति न दोषे दृष्टि सद्योगस्य त्रैयो त्रिवितदेशाय! This might mean that Maṭanga was later than Bṛhadā It is presumed that there is some error here in the reading and that the sentence ends aś न दृष्टि and a quotation from Maṭanga has then been missed.

4. The manuscript is with M. Ramasrishna Kavi, Madras.
from the scantiness of the details, the book forms probably the earliest record of the science. In his Kuttinimata Dāmodaragupta describes a character Bhattaputra as proficient in Brahma-Nāṭyaśāstra.

Padmabhū's (Brahma) view is mentioned by Sāradātanaya (Bhav, 47)

962 Sadasivabharatam,\(^1\) ascribed to Sadasiva, deals, so far as it is now available, with Nātya. It may be placed on a line with Brahmbharata for its merit and antiquity.

Sadasiva's views are quoted by Sāradātanaya thus:

\[ \text{loícikś! narmāṇiśuṣṭkāśvā daksānaā |} \]

963 Nandikesvara, or Nandikesvara, was the first to receive initiation into the science of music from Śiva. With his name are associated works on Kāmasāstra\(^2\) and Sangīta, and his views have been referred to by later writers as a school of musical thought alongside of Bharaṭa. While Bharaṭa confined himself to music in relation to drama, Nandikesvara interested himself in the music requisite for ceremonies and festivals.

Bharatarnava,\(^3\) in 4000 verses, purports to be a narration of the principles by Nandīn to Sumanī, an actor of Indra's stage at Indra's recommendation. It is avowedly the work of Nandikesvara. The manuscript in Tanjore Library has 5 to 14 chapters, that on Abhinaya only and is entitled Guhēśabharatalakṣaṇa. The colophon reads thus:

---

1. *Mys. 809, also Ms No 1293 noted at page 808 though catalogue as Adābharaṭa*

2. So says Vājyayana —Māhodāvāravīruh Nandī śatīrśāṇāyānānā śrēṣṭḥāvāmyuṣmāṇo moham |

3. *DO, XXII, 6785, TC, III, No. 2485, II. 1860. The Tālaśhyāyam is with M Ramakrishna Kavi, Madras; On Nandikesvara, see S K De, SP, 24-26 (He is referred to Dāmodaramśa in his Kuttinimata (6th century A D) along with Bharaṭa as an ancient writer).*
It is likely that the part of which this is a chapter is called Nātyārnava.

BHARATARTHACANDRIKA is an epitome of Bharatārnava and is in the form of a dialogue between Nandī and Pārvaṭī and deals so far as it is available with Abhinaya

ABHINAYADARAPANAM in 13 sections deals with gesticulation, and the colophon says it is a part of Nandiksesvarabharaṭaṁ. Its commencement presumes that there was a prior portion of which it is but a continuation. It is also a narration by Nandī to Sumati at Indra's instance, it is probable that it is a chapter in Bharatārnava and Nandibharaṭaṁ is another name for Bharaṭārnava.

But later writers have expressed that Nandikesvara differed widely from Bhaṭa not only in his theories but also in the nomenclature Abhinavagupta for instance quotes a verse as Nandimaṭa in connection with Mṛḍanga. Raghunāṭha is more explicit in that he says he referred to Nandīśvarasāṁhitā and that Aumāpāṭaṁ does differ from Bharaṭa's Nātyasāstra Kallināṭha contrasts the views of Bharaṭa with those of Nandī and Maṭanga.

1 DC, XXII. 8785, Tanj XVI. 7224 The manuscript of Tālalakṣaṇa (Ibid 7812) begins with नदिक्षेत्रवर्य नम
2 DC, XXII. 8787
4 अथोधानी तु हत्तानां कृष्णं गृह्यते मया।
अध्युतस्युताय हस्ता लेखा प्रकृतिता। ||
5 यषोऽन्नीतरमेण—
वोक्षापिकरणपुदा मेदा पञ्चधोदिता।
ताने महसुलानाथोऽसुख्यतुधयम्। || (Chap 34).

"The school of Nandikesvara seems to be older than Bharata's and from the available works bearing on Nandī, one is tempted to say that he has developed conventional side of nātya, sangīta and nṛtya to a remarkable degree. Bharata seems to have rejected much of Nandī's technique and accepted only such forms as are really found in actual life or just to suit the theatrical conventions which he calls nātya śāramī. Kohala and Maṭanga seem to follow Bharata at the same time bringing in extraneous forms that are in vogue on the conventional side, of course basing their authority on Bharata himself as having given sanction by his expression." M R Kavi, Int to AB See V Raghavaṇ, Nātyaḥārmś and Lokaḥārmś, JOR, VII. 355.

Poona Edn. p. 47.
We have now therefore two sets of works, both going under the name of Nandin, the one agreeing with and the other differing from Bharata. Until the Samhita mentioned by Raghunatha is discovered, for which there is yet hope, we cannot say whether Bharatarnavam is really the composition of Nandikesvara.

964. Among Puranas, some have chapters on dancing and music, Vayu (chap. 24-5), Markandeya (chap. 21) and Vishnudharmaṭṭa (chap 16-14).

There are several names of the Hindu Pantheon of gods and demi-gods that are quoted for their views on music and dancing, Madhava (Visnu), Gaṇesa, Sanmukha, Vayu, Durgāsakti by Maṭanga, Visvāvasu, Ājaneya and Vyāsa by Śaraḍātanaya Rāvana Rambhā, Kāmadeva, Ṛaksė Prajāpatī.

Nārada mentions Har, Kamalāsyā, Brahma, Candī, Sanmukha, Bhṛṅgin, Sarasvatī, Kubera, Bali, Visvakarman, Kusaka, Angada, Guna, Samudra and Vikrama.

KAMADEVA

चरणस्कृयान्तु कामेवेन—
उत्तरा वाष्णवेनः *
सरस्वतीकृष्णानांतरसादपरम्परानां
* *
करतालोऽगुरुत पादन्यसौस्यसु विवेत
अमणिरीप लोहिः श्रुत: वृत्त विवेत

—Tālalakṣaṇa (DC, XXII, 8726)

VASUKI

नामाज्ञाये: पाकाय्यम्बज सावन: यथा |
एव्य सावन सावपरि रसान्निंमय्यसस्त |
रः वांशेकिन्येनुको सावन्यो रसस्वाः |

—Śaraḍātanaya (Bhav 37)

[The verse is quoted in Nātiyaśāstra, but omitted in Gos Edn.]

ṚAKSA PRAJĀPATI

इन्द्रजापतिनि—
अंवधानानि गान्यः पथोक्तं कर्तारपदाँध्यः |
अंवधानातिरिक्त विनिबिन्नो नीपपर्वते |

—Simhabhāpāla’s commentary on Sangītaratnākara.
Phenikka

कीर्तिन्यागाने नेदुङ्कर्चिैि नाणे कीर्तिन्।
खेलण्डावेष सुव्रत्ति उल्लोपदेशक यज्ञाद्।।

—Kuttamimata, 82.

Drauhini

साततै बुधिरिविद्यित सौरिशिरीरवीै।
(on Prasāntanātaka)— Saradātanaya (Bhāva 239)

965 KAMBALA AND ASVATARA. According to Mārkandeyapurāṇa (Chap 21) Kambala and Asvatara propitiated Sarasvatī and learnt music and sang Śiva’s praise.

नादविधि परं अंबद्वा सरस्वती: प्रसादत ।
कन्बलाभ्याती नागान शम्सौ कुंभकर्ता गताः॥

—Dāmodara’s Sangītadarpana

Swāti played Bhāndavādya in the first drama in Indradhvaja festival enacted by Bhārata, while Nārada did the music. So says Bhārata

सातिमांजलिनः धूषां सह विश्वेशस्यमुखा।
नारदाधाम गन्धर्व गानयोगो तियोतिर।॥
सातिनारदस्युः वेदवदाध्यकरणम्।
उपरितोऽस्ति कोकेऽन प्रयोगाय स्तान्त्विषप्॥

—Nātyasastra L

and Abhinavagupta’s commentary thus summarises Swāti’s discovery of Puṣkara:

साती ऋषिविषेष: येन जात्रचरमयिनपत्तिकिल्लारवैविश्वासितमहयामपुष्करदव- विभिन्तिरहितंतिपिन्तिसवालोढरणोलत्यया यथास दृष्टिनिमोन पुष्कराध्यनिमोन स्तान्त्विषप्।।
as set out by Bhārata in Nātyasastra (XXXIII, 5-12)

Vyasa

अष्टादशेऽकं सरङ: द्वायात्विद्यित कोहतः।
व्यासस्मानयावर महाकुञ्ज्यय स्त्रया॥

(on Uṣṭhitikanā) Saradātanaya (Bhāya. 251)

966. KASYAPA, sage, is quoted by Abhinavagupta (and other writers) as an authority on Sangītā and he gives a long extract, on the tunes appropriate (viniyoga) to each rasa and bhāva. He says

‘तस्म तस्मनंमनाने मायोगक्रस्यपादंदिघ् (क्रस्यपादंधिष)विनियोगजात कथ्यते।’
केवल क्रस्यपादमुः विनियोगो निरूपितं॥
And Hṛdayagama, commentary on Ḍandin’s Kavyādarsa (Madras Edn p 3), mentions Kāṣyapa and Vararuci as ancient writers on Alankāra

Nanyadeva often quotes from Kāṣyapa, as also from a Bhṛṭa-Kāṣyapa

967 Narada\(^2\) is according to Hindu mythology the divine bard and he is represented as playing on the Vīnā. So is Sarasvatī. Nārada was the son of Brahma and was naturally the first to be initiated into the musical art. Besides being cited as an authority in the Ṭantras, Nātyasāstra mentions that Bharata took Nārada and Swātī with him when he got leave of Brahma for his first performance at Dhvajamaḥa\(^8\). Nārada was indebted for his views on music to Nāradopanāṣṭa\(^9\) and the principles therein enunciated were developed by him in his Sīkṣā. Among the works that go under the name of Nārada is Nāradīya-sūtra.

968 Nāradasūtra\(^4\) deals with the music of the Sāma Veda. In the Sīkṣas of Saunaka, Āpisalha, Vyāsa, Vyādi etc., Nārada is referred to as an authority. Bharata follows the views of Nārada on Sāmasvara and elsewhere quotes a verse from it.\(^8\) Abhinavagupta refers to it in several places.\(^6\) The whole of Sīkṣā was reproduced in Nāradīyasūtra.
purānam These references are sufficient to show that Śīkṣā is an ancient work entitled to priority over the extant Nāyāśāstra. As a special feature of Śīkṣā we may mention the recognition of Gandharagrama, a stage that cannot be reached by the human voice, and this therefore was ignored by Bharata and his school. Though the definitions and particulars of Śrutis agree in Bharata and Nārada, they differ in terminology. The opinions of Nārada were gradually departed from, and while Bharata’s differences were only limited, Maṭanga reached a very wide divergence.

Nārādaśīkṣā is in two parts, each consisting of Khandas or chapters. It deals with the music of Sāman, generally and particularly as chanted at sacrifices. It furnishes the link between vedic and post-vedic music and is the earliest extant record of musical divisions and terminology. There is a commentary on it by Subhankara, who was the author of Sangītā-Đāmodara and lived before the 17th century A.D.

969 The other two works attributed to Nārada are Rāganirūpaṇa and Pancamasārasamhita. Daśatī-Nāradasamvadā in three chapters deals with Rāgas, Śrutis and Svaras. Because there is a reference in it to the name of Sārngeva, it must be said that it is a later compilation of Nārada’s views, as expressed in earlier books, and many of the verses in it are quoted under Nārada’s name by writers earlier than Sārngeva.

970 Sangitamakaranda of Nārada is a later work. In two parts Sangītā and Nṛtya, of four chapters each, the views of Nārada Rā

1 Some scholars have expressed the opinion that Śīkṣā is a late work of the 10th or 12th century A.D. In Popple’s Music of India, 1d, it is said “It shows considerable development on the Nātysastra in its rāga system and in a number of matters agrees with the Kudimyamala inscription where that disagrees with the next important treatise, the Sangitaratnakara.” The imaginary development in the rāgas is due to difference in views between Nārāda and Bharata. The Kudimyamala inscription has not yet been rightly interpreted. Aaerecht (CC, I, 287) gives the name as Bhatta Sobhakara.

2. The full manuscript is with H Ramakrishna Kāvi, Madras and an incomplete copy in Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.

3. Ed. by D K Joshi, Poona. It is a metrical description of 140 rāgas. Quotations are given in Sangitaratnakara of Nārāyanadeva e.g., nārādasabhāsāya, bhātāre- kūṭaśāāstāśāṇ, .......

4. CO, I 287

5. The manuscript is in the Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.
are followed here and there is a reference to him in the prefatory benediction. It mentions two divisions of rāgas, principals and their wives, and classifies musical sounds into five kinds according to the source of percussion. It mentions Mahāmāhesvara, that is, Abhinavagupta, in dealing with the faults of the singer and its definition of Gāndhāra is almost repeated by Sānggadeva. It may therefore be assigned to 11th century AD.

971. *Veda's Sangitamakaranda* is a large treatise on music and dancing and in it are mentioned the later forms of modern dancing as influenced by European and Mohamadan art. Veda was a poet of the Court of Shahji, father of famous Shivaji, who was known as Makarandabhūpa and was tutor to the king's son Sambhu, elder brother of Shivaji, early in 17th century AD.

972. *Ānjaneyabhāratam* is a revelation of the science of music by Ānjaneya to Yāṭuka. So says Raghuvaṭha Yāṣṭikamaṭam, as is now available, deals only with music and seems to be only an epitome of it. Later writers speak of Yāṣṭikamaṭam synonymously with Ānjaneyamaṭam. According to Kallinātha, Yāṭika adopts the view of Maṭanga on rasas but with altered terminology. Śāradāṭanaya and Kallinātha quote Ānjaneya's (Mārutil) views

\[
\text{वे मावा रागविवाहि क्रीणामुर्का प्रवा प्रवा } \sim \\
\text{साधारणाते सवालं क्रीणातिलाह मावते. } \sim \\
\text{—Śāradāṭanaya (Bhav 251)}
\]

11. तथा चाह जान्नेते—
\[
\text{वेषा धुतिसरमामामालादिनयो न हि } \sim \\
\text{ज्ञादेशातित्वाया देशीरागास्तु ते स्वः. } \sim \\
\text{—Kallinātha}
\]

2. So does he call himself in the colonnena to his works, particularly a commentary on Nāṭyaśāstra and Ārātāstanaya says that Bhōma and Abhinavagupta were the only two writers who well dealt with Gītādeśa.
3. Tanj. XVI 7268. The manuscript is dated 1650 AD.
4. Mys. 309
5. Ms. 12 of 745 Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras. Some verses attributed to Maṭanga and Kohala are also found in this book.
CHAPTER XXVI.

Sangita

(MUSIC AND DANCING)

973 **Sangita** comprehends Gîta, Nātya aad Nart na. So says Catura-Dāmoḍāra

The divine origin of Sangīta is often referred to with veneration by several authors. In Bharatalakṣāna of unknown authorship, it is said:

The text contains a reference to Kohala in Īlaḷālakṣāṇa saying:

---

1 Tanj, XVI. 7247.
2 Tanj, XVI. 7245
3 DC, XXII. 6726.
In dealing with different kinds of Rāgas, forms and attributes, Rāgasagara records a discourse between Daṇḍa and Nārāda giving Rṣi, Chandas and Dhyāna of each rāga and predicating that Sangitāsāstra conduces to bliss temporal and eternal *

पुतानि सर्वरागाणि भवानि सुनिमि पुरा।
कथ्यन्ते सर्वशास्त्रेण निषिद्धानि सर्वेऽत।
पुत्र विषयात्राय सर्वकाममाहाद्।
अनन्तहरिसृपाक्ष्य रामसारिताय।
तदाला(रूप)पर्वतावेण अनिष्कित्तकर कष्टेऽः
पुत्रपौत्रयं नूर्णा राज्याच्छायक्षम्।
पुत्रमानस सदा विष्णुहर्षे संतित संबेद्।

974 Sarngadeva commences his work thus

श्रमणविज्ञानानादगतिना वित्तं हृद्यजे
सुरीणासुरक्ष कुष्टिपद योश्य लघु राजते।
कर्मदारामविसारणचाकारणान्वितमो
कर्म नादतत्र तयुन्द्रजाती शुद्धे रक्षो।

In his commentary on Sangitaraṇākara Gangārāma thus describes Śrī

जीवाभ्यवहुदरी कुलपतियो नादसूमानशी
या साध्विशस्वरहरणकोत्तरा नाप्याभापकी।
भावान्त्यस्मलनासवाहिमयो सूर्यसुप्राच्छायमां
सा श्रीमधुमेश्विन्तु शून्ययोगीयुरी बिदेहात्मणे।

975 God Śiva in his well-known aspect of Natarāja is pre-eminent the Lord of Dances. Tradition attributes Nātyasāstra in its earliest from to his divine authorship. It was the rattle of the drum (Dhakkā) played at the end of Śiva’s dance that once gave ont 9 plus 5 sounds, which constituted the Māheśvaraśatras forming the basis of Pāṇini’s grammatical aphorisms.

1 DC, XXII 8748
2 Definitions and particulars of varieties of Śiva’s dances are given in T. A. Gopinatha Rao’s Elements of Hindu Iconography.
The Aphorisms* are

| S3+ | VIlII | Śrīvatsasane nāvrajājī, nanāda nāvapārthām. |
| S3+ | VIlII | | utkūdakamathurākāra, ērāntatāmāsē, śiśvājñātām. |

Thus Nandikesvara begins his Kārikas of 27 Ślokas on Māhesvara-sūtras, and expounds their mystical singificance Nāgasa extracts this first verse in his Ṣabdendusekhara as from Nandikesvarakūrti There are some commentaries on the Kārikas, one of which is by Abhimanu.

Thus Śiva is the father of all that relates to nāda or sound, and so of the sciences of grammar and music In Ruḍra-damarūdhabhava sūtra-vivarana,* there is an elaboration of this tradition that those sounds are the origin of music The Nepal Library has another work Bharatanāma-dīpakanāda-sūtra,*

"The dance represents Śiva’s five activities (Panchakrīya), namely, Sṛṣṭi (creation), Sthīt (preservation), Samhara (destruction), Tirobhava (illusion) and Amṛagraha (salvation), symbolised in the iconographic equivalents of the sounding drum, the hand of hope, the hand holding fire, the foot trampling on the demon Muyalāga, and the uplifted left foot Its deepest significance is felt when it is realised that this dance takes place within the heart and the self Everywhere is God and Everywhere is the heart The essential significance of Śiva’s Dance is threefold first, it is the image of Rhythmic Activity as the Source of all movement within the Cosmos which is represented by the Arch (or the prabhāmanda), secondly, the purpose of his dance is to release the countless souls of men from the snare of illusion thirdly, the place of the Dance, Chidambaram, the centre of the Universe, is within the

1 On the linguistic aspect of these aphorisms see Introduction.
1 CO, I 277, BTC, 41, Oudh, XIX 54
1 89, 519.
2 Nepal, 281
Of all the impressions which the pilgrims to the sacred shrines along the Western Ghats carried home with them, the most vivid must have been the gorgeous spectacle of the sun in its descent towards the ocean, illuminating tier after tier of the rocky precipices and the forest-clad ravines with its slanting rays of crimson and burnished gold, until at the time of evening prayer (sandhyā) it touched the far off sea horizon and began the sacred Dance in response to the ceaseless time-beat of the waves—the Dance of the Cosmic Rhythm which all the Rishis and all the Devas knew. In fair weather, it was only a gentle swaying moment like the fluttering of the falling leaves in the forest on a still autumn evening, for Siva then only manifested his benign aspect. But even the setting sun flashed fierce red rays through banks of purple cloud and Siva’s mighty drum began its thudding beat along the shore, while the long snake-like rollers sowed their glittering teeth, the Great God revealed himself in his tremendous world-shaking dance, the Tandavaṃ which summed up the threefold processes of Nature, creation, preservation and destruction, and woe betide the unhappy man who was whirled within the ambit of that awful Dance. The corpses strewn along the shore next day increased the unrelenting toil, which the Lord of Death always demands from his worshippers. Such was the constant mental stimulus which the brahman at his evening meditation on the Western Ghats received from the wonderful nature he saw around him, until the Sacred Dance of the Cedic ritual with which he responded to the prompting of his spiritual self became interwoven with his philosophy and took a permanent place among the temple icons of the Deccan and Southern India, the natural imagery being translated into metaphysical concepts, for the brahman like the Platonic philosopher, used the beauties of earth as steps by which he climbed upwards to the higher planes of thought.”

976. Mrdangaiaksana, an anonymous work in Purānic style, thus gives a legendary origin to the musical drum, muraṇa,

पुरा मुराणेरो नाम देवातामको बली।
इत्युत्सर्गु बलभावेतातु (माव) तेषली तथा॥

सन्त्यागामसु त गणातीरे समोहे ॥
हिसवरणस्वातातारि द्विनाशेन कलिते पंक्ते॥

1. 'A K Coomaraswamy's article in Śāḍhiḥkālōpaha quoted by T A Gopinabha 'Rāo, t. ii, p. 381.
2. E. Harrell's Monograph on The Himalayas in Indian Art
Vedas are eternal and at the beginning of every cycle of creation after a deluge are only revealed. Such is the belief of the Hindu. Vedas are self-contained in any branch of knowledge and to Vedas therefore the Hindu looks to the original source of any science or art.¹

"The first public use of music by every nation has been in religious rites and ceremonies. The ancient Egyptians celebrated their festivals with hymns. The classic Greeks used music in rhapsodising the Iliad. The Chinese, the Tartars and even the Negroes solemnised their worship with songs and dances. The reason is obvious. By music alone such rites and ceremonies and such worship could be amplified and prolonged and by music alone some state of feeling could be raised and sustained in a great crowd of people. Even in Italy, music—when it revived in 33 A.D.—was used only in connection with the

¹ "Music is eternal. In Greece, Pythagoras is said to have brought music under arithmetical rule and found that the seven planets were each related to one another as the seven notes and as such, produced in their movements "the Music of the Spheres" which in India, the Siva's Dance or rather the mystic dance of Nataraja was perhaps intended to symbolise. One thing is certain that in both, Greece and India, music has come down from the beginning of the world and is deemed to be as eternal as God. Indeed, in India music is ever associated with Saraswati." Extract from Hind (19—9—1933) of lecture by M. S. Ramaswamia Aiyar
The Aryans of India did not form an exception to the rule but chanted Vedas—Rik, Yajur and Sama, on all occasions of festivals.

The literature of the Vedas reveals a good knowledge of music and musical instruments. Besides Sāmaveda, of which the mode of expression is musical chant, we have in the rituals of the Yajus and Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras following Vedas mention of occasions in all sacrifices and many household ceremonies (such as Seemanṭonnayanaṃ) when Viṇḍgānam, and particular tunes too, are prescribed. Passages in Yajus indicate the existence of professional singers and it is stated in one place that women are enamoured of musicians—

1. तैविरियश्राणेः, 111–9.

2. यजसत्सहितायाः, 71–5.

3. अगायदेवासस्स देवान्नय गायत उपायतेति तस्मादायतन्त्र ख्रिया. कामयते राज्यका पुनम्म-हितेन भवति ||

979. "The Vedic Index shows a very wide variety of musical instruments in use in Vedic times. Instruments of percussion are represented by the ḍundūbhi, an ordinary drum, the adambha, another kind of drum, Bhumī-ṇḍūbhi, an earthen drum made by digging a hole in the ground and covering it with hide, vanaspati, a wooden drum, aghaṭṭ, a
cymbal used to accompany dancing. Stringed instruments are represented by the *kanda-vina*, a kind of lute, *vana*, a lute of 100 strings, and the *vina*, the present instrument of that name in India. This one instrument alone is sufficient evidence of the development to which the art had attained even in those early days. There are also a number of wind instruments of the flute variety, such as the *tunawa*, a wooden flute, the *nadi*, a reed flute, *bakurt*, whose exact shape is unknown.

980 "The Saman Chant pivoted on two notes called *udatta*—'raised'—the higher one and the *anudatta*—'not raised'—the lower tone. In course of time the interval between these was established as a fourth. Then, later, the notes of this tetrachord received distinct names. The highest was *prathama*—'first'—then *dotiya, tritiya, chaturtha*, down the scale. These names are found first in the *Rikprathisakya*. Later, a note called *svanita* is also mentioned, this seems to be graded *udatta*, thus indicating a note higher than the *prathama*. Later still we find this note definitely established and called *krushta*—'high' (*Taittriya-pratsakhya, 400)*. About the same time two other notes lower than *chaturtha* appear. These are called *manda*—'low', and *atisvara*—'extremity'. This last was an extra note and was usually sung only in the cadence of the Saman chant. So we find the whole series of the seven notes, or *svaras*, as they were called, of the octave."

981 Naradiyāsikṣa thus connects the seven svaras of Sāmagana with the seven svaras of classical music.


* Saman was the really musical portion of the Vedas and was indeed a mere melody for which words were found in the Rik or Yajur. It was mainly vocal and its scale—like its Greek prototype—was conceived downwards as a descending series, namely, GRSN. Indeed this scale was a primal tetrachord of Samagamanam to the notes whereof the following names were respectively appended in those days, viz., *prathama, dwithiya, thrithiya* and *chaturthi*. Later on, a higher note M was added to which name of *krushta* was given and two lower notes D and P called *manda* and *atisvara* completed the scale of Samagamanam. *Rikprathisakya* however makes mention of three voice Registers or *sthayees* as we call them, the *Ramayana* of Jathis and the *Mahabharata* of Gandharagrama.*

* Tetrachord means group of four notes
Sangita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saman</th>
<th>Classical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swara 1</td>
<td>Madhyama (म)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gandhara (ग)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rābha (रि)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sadja (स)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhaivata (ध)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīśāda (लि)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pancama (प)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the first hymn of Sāmasambhitā may be sung thus

जोग  हि  आयाहि ह्येस हरे या आयः  तोया आः  हि ।
सासास । शाकाधारिशामामापाणाम । मामापाणाम ॥

Nāradīyāsikṣa thus describes the svaras

श्रीं जयूरो वद्वति गालो रसाशिं चर्चसम् ।
अजाबके तु गार्नावर कौन्नो वद्वति सयमसम् ॥

पुष्पाकाखरणे काले कोकिलो वाक्ति पर्चसम् ।
अस्वस्तु वैवर्त वाक्ति निषाद वाक्ति क्रूर्णर ॥

Pāniniyāsikṣa thus describes the sources of svaras

उदाचारादाचार लरितम लराजय ।
हस्ती दौर्षै पुष्ट हित कालतो निमया अन्ति ।
उदाचर निपपाताचाराबादाचार सम्बद्धता ।
लरितसमवा ब्रह्म ब्रह्ममयस्मानं ॥

982 "The velocity of slowness of sound" observed Sir W Jones, "must depend, in a certain ratio, upon the ramification and condensation of the air, so that their motion must be quicker in summer than in spring or autumn and much quicker than in winter. Hence the primary Ragas of the Hindus were arranged according to the number of Indian seasons. This restriction of the six Ragas to the six seasons, added on to the fact that the subject-matter of the songs sung therein were nothing else than that of the Vedas, kept the running water of music crystal and pure. It was however, when the Raganis and Puthras were introduced, that foreign elements, for the first time, mixed themselves into the original system and the strict discipline of the Indian music became not a little relaxed, just as the Italian music deteriorated immediately after the introduction of Madrigals into it." Thenceforward the Indian music carried with
and to this ritual must be referred the institution of Devadāsīs, that is, unmarried damsels devoted to the service of God. During these worship the gods are invoked, particularly the guardians of the quarters, the Dikpālas, and during such invocation the times and tunes adopted are those dedicated to or liked by the particular God. Among the instruments used in these festivals are the pipes and drums and all available genius is displayed at the closing ceremonial of the day, when the deity retires to rest. It is in these Tantras that much of the old musical literature is preserved. Among them Yāmalatakaṭantras is valuable for the purpose of literary history. It is as if were an elaborate index of contents of Sanskrit works on all branches of knowledge.

Of the 32 Yāmalatantras, some treat of music and the passages are worth quotation. Among the Sākteyaṭantras, Uddīṣāmaḥoḍayam is valuable and in it we find a succinct description of 16 musical instruments. These Tantras mention the names of various early views of Umāmahesvara, Bharaṭa, Nanḍi, Vāsuki, Nārada, Vyāsa, Durgā, Yāḍīka, Daṇḍika, and this mention conclusively determines the age of these writers as of a very remote antiquity.

Yāmalatakaṭantra says:

- गानेकर्तेः शत्रुश्वसाहसपक्षस्मिन् | वत्स सप्तश्रोतप्रतिकामस्य परिवर्तनि | वीणातन्त्र कलातन्त्र रागातन्त्र सहितसमं | शिखरतन्त्र वाङ्गतन्त्र गीतिकालस्मितेषाय | कालाकालिष्कतन्त्र सेण्डतन्त्र सहहरसम् | जातिसहस्त्रायां मार्गंजंगंकिति किया | कालशान्व वाचवंदीशिंखायाय पुष्च च | दुर्गगतिसाधारकमहेशाचाराविभुजमावम् | अष्टाधारस्वध्यायायायवस्तुस्क्तोभाषायिकायः | पवयादीत्ति गाने वेवेदे सान्ति राजस्यः।

Of the 32 Yāmalatantras, the 9th, Kalāṭantra, treats of Rasa, Bhāva, Nātya and Kāmasāstīra, and the 19th, Vīṇāṭantra, embraces the whole field of music:

- यूक्षस्यं वीणाश्वस्यतन्त्र सहितसमांकम् | नालाकालान्त्रिकालिष्कतन्त्र सिद्धांतेषाय हः कुमारसः | विभागसाधारस्वाध्यायायाय वसाड़ीमिकते | रागाणां सेन्दृश्यम रागालालालितानम्।
985. Uddisamahamantrodays appears to have been a work devoted to the rituals of worship of Siva under the name of Uddisa. As usual with such works there are chapters in it, dealing elaborately with musical instruments, 16 in number in 16 separate chapters. The verse is fine and is in various metres.

Kāsyapatāntṛa has similar chapters on the subject.

986. Indian and Western Music Popley sums up the main differences thus:

1. "The dominant factor in Indian music is melody, while that of western music is harmony. In the one case notes are related to definite notes of a range, and in the other case to varying chords. Indian melody is produced by the regulated succession of concordant notes, while western harmony arises from the agreeable concord of various related notes. As a result of this differentiation, Indian music has developed solely along the lines of melody, while the greatest development of western music has taken place in the region of harmony. Does

1. *TO, III 3997* The name Tālaviqhāna there given does not seem to be correct.

2. The instruments are all named, Tālānīlayam, Sallari, Patana, Maddala, Bherivga, Himla, Thanthuka, Mithākkatha, Damaru, Mutava, Angullaphota, Vina, Alamani, Rāṇṇahastaka, Udyante, Ghosavats, Brahmska and each instrument has different kinds.
the fact that western music has developed a second dimension, so to speak, make it more advanced than Indian music? Can we call Indian Music has taken one line of development, that of melody, and in order to add to its charm and variety, has developed every phase of it, including time measure in ways that have never occurred to the western mind. These are two lines of development, and perhaps one has travelled as far along its line, as the other upon its line.

2. Then again, Indian melody is cast in one definite mood throughout, and both time and tune are wrought into one homogeneous whole. Variations are not allowed to alter that mood, which persists with the rage. The balance of the music is obtained partly by time variations and partly by grace. In western music mood is used to articulate the balance of the whole piece. The particular times for singing the different ragas, the rage pictures and the emotions associated with them all fit into this idea to the Indian melody.

3. Then again and perhaps most important of all, in Indian music the salient notes are fixed by long association and tradition, and any alteration of such saliency is not as a rule possible in a melody. The relation of the individual notes to one another is settled by ancient tradition. In western music, on the other hand, the salient notes are made by the momentary impulse of the harmony or of the counterpoint, and it is the cluster of notes rather than the individual note which has special value.

4. Further in Indian composition the melody is dependent upon the relation to certain fixed notes which vary according to the rage. It sets no store by any progress through notes which suggest harmony, whereas western melodies tend to circle round the notes which are harmonically related to the tonic. As a result imitation at different levels, so common in western music, is very rarely found in Indian music, and the two tetrachords are seldom identical in the character of their constituents.

5. Indian music lays great stress on grace, gamaka—‘curves of sound.’ These are not mere accidental ornaments as in western music, but essential parts of the melodic structure.

6. The use of microtones in Indian music and the general absence of the tempered scale gives a very distinct flavour to it. To those whose ears have always been tuned to certain fixed intervals, this occurrence of quite different intervals, some of them most strange to
Western ears, alters the whole feeling of the music. Mrs Mann says 'Western music is music without microtones, as Indian music is music without harmony.'

Another difference, that has a great deal to do with our appreciation or otherwise of music, is the matter of emphasis upon certain external qualities. Western music rightly has come to lay very great emphasis upon tone and tumbre, whereas Indian music passes these by on the other side and gives all attention to execution and accuracy. The melody is not determined by canons of charm or pleasure, but by adherence to certain fixed standards, and the quality of tone in which the melody is sung or played does not have the importance it does in the west.

Rabindranath Tagore goes down to the fundamental causes of the difference between music of East and West.

"It seems to me that Indian music concerns itself more with human experience as interpreted by religion, than with experience in an everyday sense. For us, music has above all a transcendental significance. It disengages the spiritual from the happenings of life, it sings of the relationship of the human soul with the soul of things beyond. The world by day is like European music, a flowing concourse of vast harmony, composed of concord and discord and many disconnected fragments. And the night world is our Indian music, one pure, deep and tender. They both stir us, yet the two are contradictory in spirit. But that cannot be helped. At the very root nature is divided into two, day and night, unity and variety, finite and infinite. We men of India live in the realm of night, we are overpowered by the sense of the One and Infinite. Our music draws the listener away beyond the limits of everyday human joys and sorrows, and takes us to that lonely region of renunciation which lies at the root of the universe, while European music leads us a variegated dance through the endless rise and fall of human grief and joy."

In the earliest literature on Gandharva there were several schools of thought propounded by Nandikesvara, Umapahesvara, Vasuki, Sarasvati, Narada, Agastya and Vyasa etc. Saradatanaya mentions thus the names:

श्राद्धिवः शिवः हन्मा महर्षिः कार्यपो भृतुः।
मत्राणो प्रहिरिको इन्द्री षडः पारेरकाहस्तः॥
In SangītamuktaValī Devendra sums up the names of earlier writers on music

989 Nandīśvarasamhitā was available about 350 years ago, but we now have the bare mention of it by King Raghunātha of Tanjore in his Sangītasudhā. Yāsha’s views are found summarised in 200 verses. Nāradasamhitā is not available, but Nārada’s views are found in Bṛhanāraṇīyapurāṇa and Nāradopaniṣat. Rāgasāgara is in the form of a dialogue between Daśūla and Nārada.

1 Samāṣṭha nāḍībāhāraḥ tāmālayoḥ śāṣṭra mārgaṇītyō 

   māṇya bhuḍhāryaścit mārgaṇītyō bhuḍāya bhuḍāyaḥ 

   viśeṣaḥ tāḥ yathātāārāḥ śāṣṭra jñanānandamārgaṇītyō 

   umāpateśarāpanikṣiptaḥ tānāṃśaḥ prīthyaḥ nāḍībāhāraḥ

2 See para 988 supra.
Aumapatam is an ancient but incomplete treatise on music, time, dancing and musical instruments, treated under 38 chapters. It purports to be a narration of Siva to Parvati, and begins with the origin of sounds (nāda) and the development of sounds into musical harmony. It differs in every respect from the works of Bharata, Matanga and Kohala. That it was a modern epitome of Nandiśvara Samhitā is mentioned by Raghunātha in his Sangītaśasudha. It was probably composed by Umāpaṭisivārya of Cidambaram, the well-known writer on the Saivite worship, who must have flourished earlier than the 12th century AD.

Bharata's work is the most renowned. Having learnt the science from the Creator, Bharata wrote two works, one the bigger in 12,000 verses and the other small in 6,000 verses. Thus says Śrādaṇānaya:

The treatment of dancing is incomplete. For instance he gives 126 minor divisions of svaras while Matanga mentions only 66 and Bharata 22.

The whole of the 5th chapter is quoted by Caitrakalinātha (p 228) in his commentary on Sangītaśasūkara who lived in the days of king Devarāya II of Vijayanagar (1428-1446 A.D.)

An important chapter is that on the interpretation of the ancient textbooks, that is, the translation of relevant passages from the Nātyāstra of Bharata and the Śaṅgītārañākara of Śrīngadēva, with the author's comments. It embraces conclusions as to the ancient system of tuning, propounds the theory that the ancient system required twenty-five sārūs (not twenty two as the textbooks say), and offers a theory as to the origin of the Indian scales. In the commentary on v 25 of Bharata's ch xxviii an interesting experiment is described, showing the relation of the sārūs by taking two sārūs tuned in unison, and tuning one of them in successive stages. The experiment works out on the theory that the sārūs are equal. As Mr. Clements says, they are not so, and the experiment is probably a merely theorshool one. But it has been the subject of great misinterpretation, and it would have been interesting to know the author's views on it. Unfortunately he breaks off his translation at this point. He has even been reproved by a critic for saying that Bharata thought the sārūs were equal in size, and the critic adduces this passage to prove that Bharata taught the very opposite. The text, it is true, is slightly corrupt, but it is in such a case where an interpreter, or at least a sound translator, is most wanted.
“Bharata attached more importance to rhythm than to time and devoted only 3 out of 27 chapters to music. He recognised the existence of 7 notes, of the four kinds thereof according to the number of sruthis between them and made mention of Grāmas, Mūrchanās and Jāthis. But it was significantly silent on those aspects, which had prior in its time degraded music, viz., the Raganas and the Puthras.”

992 Sanmukha, also mentioned as Guha was an old writer on music, but the original work of Saṃmukha is lost. Sangrahacūdamani is said to form part of Skandapurāṇa, composed by Sanmukha. In three chapters, it deals with the origin of music, and musical tones. There are verses in it referring to Sadananda and Sarngadeva, clearly showing that it must have been written far later than 14th century A.D. and could not have formed part of Skandapurāṇa. At best this must be a reproduction of the lost views of Saṃmukha.

Sangītacintāmani is written in the Purānic style, as taught by Śiva to Pārvatī, Nārada and others and apparently deals with the principles of Sāman chant.

993. Arjunabharatam is the name borne by several works. The name indicates that the author was Arjuna. A work of that name composed by Nāgarjuna is now available only in fragments and treats of music only. Nāgarjuna was a Buddhist priest and lived in the reign of king So-to-po-ha na. So says ITSing.

994 Arjunadimatasaram is an epitome on music by Madabhūthi Venkaṭācārya, son of Anantaśacārya of Naṅdhruvakasyapagotra. He lived at Samalkot in East Godavan Dist about 1880 A.D. He also wrote an allegorical play, Śuddhasatvam, after which name he was known later.

1 The manuscript is found in Andhra Sahitya Parishat Library (Madras). Oyavana is mentioned as a writer on music.
2 Tari, XVI. 7956
3 Tari, XVI. 7939.
4 Virabhadrachar (Andhruval Caritam I. 152) gives date 184–200 A.D. Tarana, the (Annals of Tibet) assigns him to 180–220 A.D. See his History of Buddhism.
5 Or. Ms. Library, Madras
995 Vālmiki has a fierce metaphor on Vīṇā play with Rāvana’s prowess thus

मस चाबकर्मे वीणां शरकोयं प्रवालिताम्।
व्याश्यामदुहुः चोरासामायितमहात्मनाम्।
नारायणसमाधानं तस ममाहिनिताहिनिनम्।
अनवाम्य महाराज वायवप्रायं यथा रणे॥

In Syāmilaka’s Pādatāditaṇa, there is a fine reference to Vīṇā play

इत्यमुनयति श्रिय कुःङ्गे वियेशानानीता प्रसीदलसि।
सप्ततन्त्रानिशेषनेन तथा कृत काकधीपन्नप्ररूपायुक्तता श्य गीतप्रेते विकोथति॥

(Mad Edn) IV 24 43-44

996 Rudra or Rudrācārya is the author of a musical treatise, engraved on a rock at Kudimyāmalai in PudukkOTA State. His identity with Rudrata, the rhetorical writer is not probable. Matanga mentions a Rudrata as a writer on music and Kallinātha says so.

"यथा शास्त्र श्रजसेव ताराति सम्भसर्यथा शब्दातिद्वात् अनाधित्वात् ताराति
श्रद्धेय कृता सम्भसेव्यति भवतांक।"

So does Sāṅgadeva

ह्यो नान्यस्वावलो मोजस्मवर्गसत्या।

Abhinavagupta probably criticises Rudrata as having misunderstood Bharata.

समानाहिर्मत संगमर्यमुपर्यः उद्दानो श्रीकपालविस्मयः सर्वनाम अपरक्षय उक्त। (?

It is quite likely that this Rudra was a far earlier writer and lived at the beginning of the Christian era.

"The tradition is that his full name was Rudrābhatta, and that on one occasion the King extorted from the poet the promise that he should remove the letter bha from his name and should be known as Rudrata, his famous namesake and predecessor."
In an inscription dated Śāka 1151 (JBRAS, XXIX 260) the following Canarese verse refers to Rudrata

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Adarol nja namekshara vide sasira} \\
\text{Ponge lottadan Bidipanu dinam} \\
\text{Padedam Rudratanembi padematam} \\
\text{Rudrabhattanurvijanadum}
\end{align*}
\]

This shows that among the letters of his name he pledged one bha for a thousand gold coins, so the world called him by the awkward name of Rudrata.

997 Madanapala was the son of Candradeva and king of Kanouj (whose inscriptions are dated 1104–1109 A.D.) of Gahadavala dynasty. He was a patron of letters and after his name go a lexicon and a work on Dharmasāstra His Ānandasānjivana is a work on music.

Virabhattadesika lived in the court of Kākaṭiya king Rudradeva and wrote Nālīyaśekhara in 1160 A.D.

998 Jayadeva's Gitagovinda has been noticed. It is akin to the Song of Songs of Solomon in the Old Testament and has been translated with inimitable grace by Sir Edwin Arnold.

"It was only a lyrical composition to celebrate the triumph of true love between Radha and Krishna. It is true that Jayadeva assigned a definite Raga and a definite Thala to each of his 24 songs or prabandhas. Jayadeva's Ragas were Malava, Gauri, Vasantha, Ramakan, Malavagowda, Karnata, Desakya, Desivaradi, Gowdakari, Bhairavi and Vibhasa, and his Thalas were Yathi, Roopaka, Eka, Hussa and Ashta. But can any one of the modern singers, either in North or South India, sing at least one of the 24 prabandhas in the Raga and Thala assigned by him? There was neither the notation to record the songs and transmit them to successive generations nor any scientific treatment in it whereby to teach or suggest the methods of singing them."

Besides commentaries already noted, there are others by Nārāyaṇa Pandita, Rūpādeva and one anonymous.

---

1 IA, XVIII 11; EI, V App 18
2 Bak 509 The manuscript is dated Sam 1595.
3 Tanj, XVI 7886 40. See para 286 supra
SANGIȚA

999 **Krṣṇadatta** (Maṅghila) interprets Gitagovinda as referring to Śiva instead of Viṣṇu and compares his feat with the work of Maṉḍhusūdana who wrested Mahimnāsūti to the service of Viṣṇu.

\[\text{विशिष्टक्षणः गीतमोत्तरः रचयितः शक्तिशक्तिः मैत्रि कृष्णदत्तः} \]

\[\text{सः न विशिष्टक्षणिः कृष्णपञ्चः विवर्तः उत्सवसैनिकतेऽपि पदः वा} \]

\[\text{श्रेयः माधिर्यते सुवर्णमिति सत्योऽपिनः वैष्णवः} \]

\[\text{श्रेयः नैव च वैष्णव निजिनासनात्माशतिः} \]

\[\text{मयेष्ठः सत्यदुस्वदनायं गुरुविद्यो महिमस्तुतिः} \]

\[\text{न्यायवेदनः जयदेवसत्तकमिः तथा श्रेयेऽन्यथिः} \]

1000 **Viṣvanāthasimha**, Chief of Rewah, of the Vaghela race (1833-1854 A.D.) wrote a poem Rāmacandrāhnikā in praise of Rāma on the style of Gitagovinda with commentary on it and under his patronage Priyadāsa, a poet of his Court, wrote a similar work Sangiṭa-Raghuñandana in 16 cantos. The latter work has also been by courtesy attributed to Viṣvanāthasimha.

1001 **Candeśakekhara Sarasvati** the 63rd Ācārya of Kāmakutipīṭha of Kanci (1729-1789 A.D.) wrote Śivagīttimālikā in 12 cantos. Cina Bommabhūpāla wrote Sangiṭa-Rāghava in 6 cantos on the story of Rāmāyaṇa.

Besides works mentioned in para 298 supra there are the following works are in the style of Gitagovinda: Sāhajavilāsagītā by Dhundhurāja, Sāharājastapadī, Sangītāsundara by Sāḍēśīva Dīkṣāta.

---

1. HRP, Cat Nos 5055, 5259. Viṣvanāthasimha's ancestor was Bhavaśimha (1660-1690 A.D.) Bhavaśimha bought a copy of Somadeva's Kothasantrāgara from Kashmir, had it revised and transcribed by pandita of his Court. Among these pandita was one Rupalumūla who added 99 verses describing the genealogy of Bhavaśimha and mentioning therein the names of the learned men of his Court, Balakṛṣṇa, Kīrṣṇa, Govardhana Vajapeyin, Lālamāṇi, Vallabha, Kamalapayana and Lakṣmanaabhatta.

2. The Vaghela Rajput trace their descent from Viradhaṃavala's son Vyaghredvā who migrated to Northern India from Gujarāt in about 1299-1304 A.D. His son Kamaṃdeva got the fort of Bandhogarh from his father in law and Bandhogarh became the capital of the Vaghela Rulers. After its destruction by Akbar in 1597 the town of Bewah was established at the capital (Rewah State Gazette, Vol IV, Lucknow, 1907). Since then the State is known by the name of Rewah State."—See Dr Har Dayal Sarma's article on "Some Vaghela Rulers and the Sanskrit poets patronised by them."—published in Dr. Kriṣnaśamam Aryan's Comm. Volume.

3. Tanj. XVI, 7828-49.
SANGITA
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Gīṭa-Gangādhara by Nanjarājasekhara,* Kṛṣṇagīta by Mānaveda,* [Krṣṇilavilāsa, Rāmastapādī, Sankarasāṅgīta of Jayanārāyana,* San-
kārīgī ṛ of Śāṅgadeva, Sāṅgīta-Raghunandana of Viśvanātha,* Gīṭa-
fāṅkara of Anantanārāyana, son of Mṛtyunjaya.*

Nārāyaṇaṭīrtha’s Kṛṣṇalilātarangini has been noticed Viṣaya-
gopāla was almost his contemporary and composed many stray songs of
devotion Bhadrādvīvasās’ name is found in his Kīrṇanas, but his real
name is not known, his songs are simple and touching and are very
popular. These are included and printed in Bhajanoṭsavaḍāmaṇḍi
published in Kumbakonam.

1002 Nanyadeva (or Rājanārāyaṇa) was a king of Tirhaut
(Miśhila). He was subjugated by Viṣayasaṇa of Bengal in 1160 A.D.
and probably (according to Levi) ruled in 1097-1147 A.D. He founded
the Karnāṭaka dynasty in the valley of Nepal. Besides a commentary
on Bhavabhūṭi’s Maṇṭiḍāndhavam, he wrote a Bhāṣya on Bharaṇatya-
śāstra, also called Bharaṇavārtika, Sarasvati-hṛdaya-bhūṣana,
or SARASVATI-HRDAYA-ALANKARA-HARA, in 17 chapters of about 10,000
grantras. The manuscript is in the library of Bhandarkar Oriental
Institute, Pùnna.

“Every step in the advancement of music was closely traced to
the rites of the Vedic epoch, and every instrument was brought face to
face with that used in the sacrificial rites by sacred Ṛkhs. He gives
full information on every subject except on flute, where he is eclipsed
by a voracious royal scholar, Kumbhakarna. Some chapters treat of
sapta-gītas, delī-gītas and the ancient dāla system which are now obsolete.
The first of these topics was elaborately dealt with by Bhārata, while
the delī-gītas the source of later prabhāndhas took a prominent place in
the grand work of Matanga Dattīla and Abhnava seem to have besto-
towed greater attention upon the sapta-gītas, knowledge of which was
undispensable to the right understanding of the Vedic rites in Ātvamāḍha
and Rājaṇya. Those seven sacred chants were first sung by Dakshā-
brahmare to propitiate gods Ekantī, Pinākī and Kinnarī vinas were
introduced to produce all the graces of the seven songs when sung by

* He was Nanjarāja, brother of Dalavo Devarāja and son of Kalave Vinarāja
See para 888 supra and summary of Papers read at 8th Indian Oriental Conference
Mysore (p. 80), that by A. N. Narasimha.
2 Trav. 94
3 Printed JSSP, Calcutta
4 Advor. II 45 Oudh, V 13
5 He was also called Pancaraṇanakavi, see para 153 supra
the rṣ̐ḥs Nānyadeva gives details for about 140 rāgas He is always careful to quote his authorities and thus on rāgas his chief masters are Kāśyapa and Matanga Sārngadēva covered a wider range of 260 rāgas, many of which were abandoned long before his day Nandin also discussed about the same number But Sārngadēva was not much indebted to Nandin for his materials which were directly taken from Nānyadeva for rāgas and from Abhinava for all critical matter, though he never mentions his creditors anywhere A close comparison of Sārnga’s work with the production of Abhinava will reveal the astonishing insight with which he studied the psychology of the great philosopher Abhivava."

1003. Sārngadēva (Svastighrī) belonged to an affluent family of Kāśmir His grand-father Bhāskara migrated to the Deccan By the worship of Bhīlāma his father Soddhala attained fame and established the sovereignty of King Singhana of the Yādava dynasty of Daulatabad (Deogir) who ruled between 1132 and 1169 A.D Sārngadēva was the Auditor-General under that king He was great not merely in music, but in medicine and philosophy His literary attainments were of a high order and in him, he says, Sarasvatī had sought repose He calls himself often as “Nissanka” and under that name he invented a Vīna

His Sangitaratnakara is a well known treatise on music which embraces in it the views of all ancient writers, and has by its comprehensive treatment attained almost the first place in musical literature. It

---

1 He quotes two sages Āstika and Chaṭṭa not mentioned elsewhere M R, Kavi, "Literary Gleanings" AHQ, III. See R C Majumdar, IHQ VII 379, K P Jayaswal, JEOBS, IX 910, X 87
2 See Bhandarkar’s Early History of the Deccan, Wilson, Theatre, gives the date between 9th and 12th centuries A.D
3 So he writes
is not a mere epitome of the older works, but proceeds on an original definition and discussion. But the lapse of centuries since Sarngadeva's time has wrought a change in the modes and practices of singing, so that his description of Rāgas and Ādīs differs from the actualities of this century. Sarngadeva recorded the art of his time and therefore gives us a glimpse of the progress of music in India.

1004 Sangitaratnakara is in seven parts and each part is divided into Prakaranas. The first, Swarādhya, treats of musical notes, scales etc. The second, Rāgādhya, contains definitions and examples of the different classes of melodies etc. The third called, Prakīrṇa has some technical terms etc. The fourth, Prabandha, furnishes rules of composition etc. The fifth, Pañthya, deals of measures of time. The sixth, Vādyādhya, deals with musical instruments and their use. The seventh, Nṛtyādhyā, explains dancing and acting.

There are commentaries on it by Simhabhūpāla, Kesava, Kallinātha, Hamsabhūpāla, and Kumbhakarna and one anonymous. Gangārāma has written an elaborate commentary in Hindi.

1005 Jagadekamalla Pratapacakravartana was a Calukya king of Kalyān (1138-1150 A.D.). Sarngadeva mentions him with respect. He was a follower of Abhinavagupta. In five chapters, he composed Sangitacudamani on music and dancing.

1006 Somesvara or Bhulokamalla, who ruled in 1116-1127 A.D. devoted his entire attention to song and dance, so much so that models of South Indian music took the appellation of Kārnāṭa, the land over which he ruled. He even condescended to get down from

---

1 Ed. by Kalyana Vedanta vaga, Calcutta (Swarādhya only). He is not the same as the author of the Rasārnavasodhakara.
2 The commentary is called Kauṭubha (Oriental Mals Library). This and the commentary of Kallinātha are said not be satisfactory by Raghumātha.
4 Named Candikā.
5 Tanj, XVI 7270.
6 See para 89 note.
7 The manuscript is in Andhra Sahitya Parishat Library (Madras).
8 Mys. Ins. Nos 81, 94, 42, 44, JBRAS, XI 258, dated 1044 to 1149 A.D. See IA, VII app 42. XII 212.
9 Henceforward South Indian music began to develop into distinct schools in the Kārnāṭa and Andhra countries and became often blended almost unconsciously by
his throne to teach a certain grace in posture in a dance called Kundali to a Mahratta dancer and henceforward it was called gondi

Prabandhas of pleasing combinations were productions of his Court. In his Mānasollāsa⁶ he has devoted 2,700 verses to music and instruments and touched on new phases of music specially Prabandhas.

One Somesvara is mentioned by Sāragādeva and Sāradātanaya along with Bhoja. The identity of this Somesvara is uncertain.

Sangitaratnavah described in the catalogues as Somarājadeva's may not be the work of the king Somesvara. Probably he is a Pratihāri of the Calukya king Ajayapāla of Gujarat (1174-1177 A.D.)⁷

1007 Natankusam contains an able discussion of rasa and abhinaya and their mutual relations. It deprecates the misapplication of abhinaya in its days and illustrates the criticism by instancing a verse from Saktibhadra's Āscaryacūḍāmaṇī. From a word Mahima in the first verse, it has been suggested that Mahimabhātta was probably its author and in any view it cannot be assigned to a date later than 14th century A.D. It refers to the drama Pratijnāyaugandharāyaṇa and to the heroine Kurangi (of the play Avimārka) and the incident of Yangandharāyaṇa's fictitious self-immolation in fire (described in Viṇavāsavatāṭṭā).

vernaacular adoption Thus says Venkatanātha in Hamaasandīsā (of the 18th century A.D.)

इत्यादये किसत्वमय तद्विमातरभुविणां
कान्ताप्रतिकरितकिलक्षरिके गीतिमेणे
घंठराहों मदनकुञ्ज गीतमातवादेया. ॥

1 Ed. GOS, Baroda.
2 See list of authors on music in Sangīṭamakaranda, GOS, Baroda, p. 58.
3 On this, see Int to Bhāvakaraka, GOS, Baroda, pp. 72 ff.
4 Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.
5 See list of authors on music in Sangīṭamakaranda, GOS, Baroda, p. 58.
6 Here the author refers to the tradition that Āscaryacūḍāmaṇī was the work of Śunaka.
1008 Jayasenapati wrote Nīṭtaratnāvali in eight chapters, and deals with mārga and dīlī kinds of music. In the former he followed Bharata and in the latter, chiefly Somesvara, but all the latest improvements in dancing were also incorporated. It was composed in the year Ananda, 1254 A.D. Jayasenapati was the commander of elephant forces under Kākatiya Ganapaṭi, king of Warrangal (1200-1265 A.D).

1009. Ragasagaram is a work in 3 chapters in Purānic style narrated in a dialogue between Nārada and Dāṭṭhāla on the different kinds of rāgas, their forms and attributes. Seeing that later theories are adopted in it, and Sārnagaḍeva is mentioned by name, it could not be earlier than 14th century A.D.

1010. Parsvadeva was the son of Ādideva and Gaurī of the race of Śrīkantha and desciple of Mahādevarāya, He was a Jain and his belief is that music is a way to salvation, while Dārsanās are not. He calls himself Sangitāsakara and Srutijnanacakravarṭī. Abhinava-Bharatācārīya etc. He refers to kings Bhoja, Somesvara and Paramārdin and is quoted by Singabhūpāla and must therefore have lived in the 13th century. His Sangitasamayasara is a dīnākaraṇas, on nāḍa and ākhwati, on sthāyis, on rāgas, on dhokki etc., on Vāḍya, on abhinaya, on śāla, on vāḍya, and on prastāra etc., and ends with ādhvayoga. He mentions writers king Pratāpa, Ṭīgambara and Śankara thus:

\[i\]

**Pramūrāyiśasye yuddha śucgarapoviṣṭo vichāraḥ**

Ārādhyateyasaṃyogenaśōkaṅgāyamūlaḥ ||

---

1. Tanf, XVI, 7288

2. For Jayasenapati’s inscriptions, dated Saka 1183, 1168, 1167, see ED, III 84, V.143, VI 39

For Ganapati’s inscription, see IA, XXII 200, and some unpublished ones from Vaddēmān in Nizam’s dominions are with M. Ramakrishnakavi, Madras.

3. DC, XXII. 6742.

4. Śrīmāladāvāyaśvatnāśaprameyaśabdāyugānubhāṣyatāt - mārābāsātvikaśārip - lābhivāś-

5. Ed GOS, Baroda. But really the 1st chapter and 40 verses in 2nd chapter are left out and as it is printed it is only the 2nd chapter and not the 1st. DC, XXII. 6781; Mgs. 307 (called Sangitāsarka-sangrāha); He mentions Tumburu, Māṭiṅga, Kāḷīga, Dāṭṭhāla, Kohala and Hanumāna as writers on music

6. There is one Vikrama quoted in Sangitāsarkaranda. Are these identical?
1011. Sri Vidyacakravartin. Vidyacakravartin II (Kālakalabha) was the son of Vaidyanātha and grandson of Vidyacakravartin I. He wrote Gadyakarnamṛta, which true to its name, is an illustration of melody in prose. For instance, there is this description of an evening walk of Śiva and Pārvatī in the celestial gardens on mount Kailāsa accompanied by Vijayā, the hand-maid of Pārvatī.

 Vasudeva was the son of Vidyacakravartin II. He had two sons Mahādeva and Vidyacakravartin III. Mahādeva was a

1. See articles by M. B Kavi and M. Doraisamayya in Tවuраa S véritable Sree Venkatarama (Journal now defunct), and pages 100 and 480 sugra.
pious Brahmin who performed various sacrifices. Thus his brother describes him —

श्रीवजयामो यथा छतोतिरात्रयज्ञा महादेवसमाह्योऽच्छुद्वः ||
बह्वद्वध्यापिन्यर्गगच्छत गर्भाण्वनवोपायो नुपालविषया. ||
यस्तोत्वशशुद्यागुरुतर्तर्माणवर्त्मानोतरितरात्रयज्ञा ||
इत्यादिष्व सोमसवे पश्चात्सारे समस्त तिष्कामचुद्वः ||
दौरागमवस्योरिष्टता हुराद्रे पसायतो हरणे यदिये ||
श्रीपुद्धुराताभिषक्तोंसन्ध्या त्रिभुविशानन्दामिनिसन्धिनिः || ।

In his commentaries on Kāvyaprakāśa and Alankārasarvasva, he immortalised kings of Hoysala dynasty and the martial glory of his patron Ballāla III (1191-1342 A.D.) Thus he says

बह्वद्वध्यापितस्तूपायीसायसबित्तिविवद्गुः ||
वस्मुरितापितग्रुपाणादेेपे पपैरपपण्वेण गीता ||
उद्विष्टाः चैन महाविलागु बह्वद्वध्याय सुलमसापः ||
उद्विष्टाः चैन महाविलागु काव्यप्रकाशादिरु यंक्षेपः ||
विनेविष्टाः चैन जगद्वस्माप व्याडित गता होस्तराजगाथा ||
वेदान्तोगागसंगमतिमाहीत्र श्रीकेरक्षत्रप्रदेश तद्भन्णेन ||
व्यास्याय वेदान्तिचितानि भोके काव्यप्रकाशाचितिचितानि ||
कान्तमानिकुंरियं परा खुशु परीप्रकरण सामग्रोहिते ||
श्रीबह्वब्राह्मणात्िक ! ददवमिसार पादी दिवोपायनं ||
यस्त्रमेयं प्रतितानासीविः सबो दुःस्ववेशाकी ||
कि नासाप्रपो चोलप्रणविश्वविशिते सम गण्येत || ।

(Kāvyaprakāśa-vyākhyā, page 144)

His life was spent in the royal courts. He grew old. He had sons who were as good and great as himself. In his old age in order to purify himself of any बाह्य काल्यप्त (sins of the tongue) he wrote the glorious deeds of Lord Kṛṣṇa in his marriage with Rukmini.

In his own words —

बह्वन्यसास्तनत्सामराये स्तात्तिकेरायाजयेक्षुत्क किः !
सत्सम राज्य च विपक्षिताः च लाहिरायाच विक्षिप्ताम ||
सोहङ्ग भूदवांच्छषध्य भस्मां भस्मायुवसपिकान्त ||
विचारे चातनासांसारायाः विवष्टे सजे भाक्षुपादके ||
पराक्षांसणेनापांविद्व यथाभवास्मभ्यं काव्याश्रीरंप ||
व्यास्यथे स्तृयमाषानिकाः पुष्मान्यराम्य हुः समविन ||
He has not altered the puranic story but by various descriptions he has heightened the poetic effect

Vidyācakravarṭin II wrote commentaries on Viṅguṇakṣhapaṃcāśika, Kāvyapraṅgaśa, Alankārasarvasva and Dasasloki. In Rūkmatīkāyāna the descriptions and trophies are fine and natural The fifth canto excels in giving a beautiful and vivid picture of Kṛṣṇa's rāṣaṅkīdā

Vidyācakravarṭin quotes from his Bharatāsangraha in his commentary on Kāvyapraṅgaśa Thus he refers to dance-eye or Nṛtyaṇḍā "

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Poc's Family.</th>
<th>Kings' Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vidyācakravarṭin</td>
<td>Bhallāla II (1173-1219 A.D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vādyanātha</td>
<td>Nṛṣamha II (1220-1255?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someśvara M. Bhipālbā (1240-67?) A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narasimha III (1261-1290 A.D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perhaps Vidyācakravarṭin II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. Pattamma dr. of Pāṇḍya King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhallāla III (1201-1243)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahādeva | Sūri Vidyācakravarṭin II

Haripala or Haripāla deva or Hārī was the son of Kumari (?) and grandson of Somannatha. He was probably king Haripala of the Yadava dynasty of Devaguni (1312–1318) who was killed by Mubarak in 1318 AD and not king Haripala of the Calukya dynasty of Anhilvād (1145–1155 AD). He calls himself Vicāracaṭurmukha and Viṣāntavravasārada and says he wrote 100 works of enchanting sentiments. He describes his own learning thus

When on a visit to the shrine of Śrīrangam, he stayed there for some time and at the request of the dancers and musicians there he composed his Sangītasudhākara

In Sangītasudhākara he is mentioned as an author on music along with Sārngadeva among Ādhunikas (moderns). In an anonymous work Abhmayasāstram, there is a reference to him

1014 Hammira was probably the King of Mewar and the

1. TC, I 1026, IV 4570, Tanf, XVI 7299
2. B. Sewell, Arch Surv of India, II 254
3. M. Duff (Chronology, 915) and Bhandarkar (Hist of D azam, III, 157) call him Hammira. He was 6th in succession from Aparājīta (990–1010 AD). The genealogy is as follows, Aparājīta—his sons Vijaya (1010-1015) and Arīkāṇi (1015-1025)—Arākāṇi’s sons, Citrākara (1025-1045), Nāgarāja (1045-1055), Mumandhrāja (1055-1065)—Sārngadeva’s son Ananta-deva Konkan-caṅkavartin (1085-1125)—his son Aparājīta I (1125-1145)—his son Haripāla (1145-1155)—his son Mallikarjuna (1155-1175)—his son Aparājīta II (1175-1200).
4. Adbhut, I, 880, TC, IV 4866, Trav. 78, Tanf, XVI, 7299
5. DC, XXII, 3720–1.
6. On several Hammiras, see para 118. A Chouhan King Hammira, hero of Nāyakṣaṭṭha’s poem, is mentioned by his son Allārjīa or Mallārjīja in his rhetorical work Rasaśayandīpikā,
fifth ancestor of King Kumbhakarna who commented on Sangitarañkara etc. Hammira died in 1394 A.D. In his Sangitasānggārahara, he mentions an earlier writer Ṣaitrasunha (King).

1015. Lakshmana Bhaskara wrote a work called Matangabharata based on Matanga, dealing mostly with dancing in about a thousand verses. He was earlier that the Nauk King of Janjore and may have lived about 14th century A.D.

1016. Sudhakalasa was a Jain and pupil of Rājaekharasūri. In six chapters on music and dancing, he wrote Sangitopanśad with commentary calling the whole Sangitopanśad in Sam 1380 (1323 A.D.) and in Sam 1406 (1349 A.D.)

1017. Trilocanaditya's Nātyalocana is widely cited by commentators such as Divākara and Čāntravardhana. Divākara lived about 1385 A.D. and this work has not been composed in 14th century A.D. He also wrote Locanavākhyaṇa.

1018. Astavadhant Somanarya wrote Svararāgasudhārasam or Nātyacūḍāmu, a learned treatise in 7 chapters on music and dancing. Among original writers he quotes Rāvana. He was a follower of Nārada's school and differs frequently from Bharata. Somanarya was probably the great Telugu poet Nācana Somana the author of Ujjara-Hanvamsa, who was the donee under a grant dated 1344 A.D. of king Bukka I of Vijayanagar.

---

1 See Rajputana Gazetteer, II A, Mewar Residency. The genealogists give them thus: Hammira-Khetasangh—sons, Lakka (1852 97) and Mokal (1897-1483)—latter's son Kumbha (1438-1465).
3 Tanj XVI, 7291.
4 Bū., 528.
5 CC, I 264, III 31.
6 Opp 2695.
7 DC, XXII, 5798, 5799, TC, I. B. No 266 in the controversy over Ṭyāgarāja's mention of svararāgasudhārasam. If it were to three works, Svarārnava, Rāgārnava and Sādhārnava. See Hudo, Dec 1922, 29th, 26th etc. Literary supplements; and V, Raghav's paper read at Music Conference, Madras, 1982.
8 EC, X 185. There seems to be some difficulty about the grant. In 1844 A.D. Bukka is mentioned here as sitting on the throne of Vidyanagar whereas a grant dated 1846 A.D. was made Harham I (EC, VI 190) Seyrell (For Empire) says Harhara died in 1848 A.D. but he himself (in SLA, II 348) as well as Eco (Mysore Car I, 346) says Harthara ruled till 1850 A.D. For a discussion on this, see B Suryanarayanarow, NEF, 144 et seq. It seems a fair suggestion that soon after Harhara consolidated his empire in 1848 A.D. he retired from the throne and Bukka took up the reigns of Government.
1019. Vidyāraṇya's Sangitāsāra is quoted by name by Cikkade-varāya of Mysore in his Bharatāsārasangraha and by Nārāyaṇa-deva in his Sangitānārāyaṇa Among the quotations by the former a reference to the number of ṭūnas reads as follows —

\[\text{[Text not legible]}\]

and bears agreement with the enumeration given by Abhinavagupta.

King Raghunātha of Tanjore while summarising his authorities for the composition of his Sangitāsudhā respectfully says —

\[\text{[Text not legible]}\]

and closely follows the sage's method.

Gauranāya Laksanadīpikā is a general treatise on poetics, music and dancing. He was the son of Ayamaprabha, who was the brother of Poṭana. Poṭana was the minister of Śingaya Mādhava, king of Rācakonda of Recerla dynasty, who ruled about 1427 A.D.

1020 Gopendra Tippa Bhupala was a scion of the Sālva Dynasty of Vizianagar of the 15th century A.D. He wrote a commentary on Vāmana's Kavyālāṅkārasūtra and Tālaḍīpikā in three chapters on Mārga and Deśī tālas

---

1. See para 125 supra

2. There is a manuscript in the Maharaja's Library at Bikanir called Sangitāsāra which consists of about 160 slokas without its author's name. The work maintains the theory of Nāndikesvara, who, we know from Aumabhā, enumerates 264 ṛgas. Whether the work is a summary or a fragment of Vidyāraṇya's production has yet to be decided. But some of the points dealt with in it appear to be developments in music attained in the 16th or the 17th century and lacks in the grandeur that we usually find in Vidyāraṇya's works.


4. TO, I 1015, Tanj. XVI 7307. See para 819 supra, S. K. De, SP, II, 84.
1021 Kumbhakarna (or Kumbha or Kumbha Rānā) was the son of Mokala and belonged to the Vijayagotra and to the race of Guhulas (Brahmin kings) of Medapata (Mewar). Kumbhakarna (or Kumbha or Kumbha Rana) was the son of Mokala and belonged to the Vijayagotra and to the race of Guhulas (Brahmin kings) of Medapata (Mewar). Apūrvadevi was his wife. Rājamalla was his son. He ruled at Citrakūṭa in 1433-1468 A.D. Mira Bai the great saint was his wife. He was a devotee of Bhavānī and Ekalūngā and he was favoured with their grace. He recites his conquests over the kings of Malwa, Yavanas and Guzarat and the destruction of Saranganagara. This brought him a number of titles. His poetry is charming and his proficiency in arts is versatile. His commentary, Rasikapriyā, on Gītāgovinda displays his aesthetic taste and there he quotes from his Sangītarāja.

1022 Sangītarāja, known also as Sangītānīmāmsa, embraces 16000 verses and consists of five Raṭnakoṣas (chapters). The first deals with dramaturgy and dramatic expression, the second with vocal music, the third with musical instruments, the fourth with dressing, dancing and gestuculation, the fifth with heroes, heroines and sentiments.

One of the quotations in his commentary on Gītāgovinda shows there was a chapter there on metres.

1. This is the genealogy of the family as given in his work and in EI, VIII, app. 18, Raj. Gaz. II-A, Mewar Residency –

Bappa (d in 1804 A.D)

Hammira

Rṣetrasimha (Khetsangh)

Lakṣasimha (1392-97 A.D.)

Mokala (defeated Sultan Firoz Shah A.D. 1428)

Kumbhakarṇa (1488, 1499, 1548 A.D.)

Rājamalla (1489, 1501, 1504 A.D.)

Sangrāmasimha

Batnasimha (1530 A.D.)

2. So he says in his commentary on Gītāgovinda,

पदवाक्यप्रमणाः यथातिरित्सरसाश्रया ।

क्रमसंक्रमित्राणां वागः न स्मादिद्वायं कान्त्यां ॥

8. Such as असिनवभरताचार्यः and मुहिंसमाणः
From the last verses in the Cantos in his Rasakapryā it is seen that Kumbhakaranā wrote works called Sangitakramādipikā, Ekalingāsraya and Kumbhāśvāmimandāra and there is his commentary on Sangitaraṭnākara.12

"About 1440 Kumbhakaranā king of Mēwad completed his sangulamāṇaśa alias Sangitaraṭyā in five sections of pūthya, gita, vadya, urtya and rasa. The whole work is not available to us. Each of the five sections is further classified into four chapters of minor divisions. The work extends over 16,000 ślokas. His treatment is thorough in gita and vadya. He sifts all the material then available to him and possessing high sastric proficiency, discusses theories very intelligently. For example we cite the theory of rasa and use of the word sattva, etc. He did not quote from Kōhala or Kāsyāpa though he says he studied them. He mentions Dattila rarely. He had with him Rāhula's and Kīruḍhara's Vārtikas on Bharata's Nāṭyasūstra. He examined the treatises of Kāśṭhara. Modern research cannot be complete without a thorough study of this grand work. The author was a profound scholar in Mimamsa and vedic rites and thus scarely misunderstands the arguments of Matanga, Dattila and Abhmvagupta whom he closely follows. His section on musical prosody was borrowed from the later writers of North India. In the construction of vinas and vamsas he gives all possible details. He touches upon chiefly Nakula, Poleh, Svaramandala Mattakohila, Kunnari, of medium and higher sorts. Sōmśvara treats of only Ekatantri, Alavam, and Kunnari of two kinds. Nānyadeva elaborates Rudravina, and Kunnari. He accidentally mentions that Nārada used Vina of 21 strings and Matanga practised upon Chatrika ann Svāti on a lute of 9 strings."

1023. Jagaddhara was son of Ratnadharā and lived somewhere about the 15th century A.D. He commented on Sarasvatīkanthābharaṇa and on Maḷaṭṭi-Māḍhava and other plays and wrote Svāstotra and Sangitasarvasva.8

1024. Catura Kallinatha was the son of Lakṣmidhara and Nārāyaṇi of Śāndilyagotra. His grand-father was Ṭuttālesvaradeva.

1. List of Bhādānkar's ORI.
2. See V. Bāghavān, Miscellanies in Annals, XVI, parts iii and iv.
3. This is quoted profusely by Buopatī and Bāghavābhatī.
He was in the Court of Immadi Devarāya, alias Malikkārjuna, son of Praudha ḍevarāja, or Devarāya II of Vijayanagar (1446-1485 A.D.)

1025 Devanacarya was probably the same as Devanabhāta who wrote Śrīṣicandrika in the Court of King Praudha Devarāja of Vijayanagar (1406-1422 A.D.) His Sangitamuktāvali deals mainly with dancing and has a chapter on music Besides older authors, he mentions Rudrasena and Somesvara.

1026 Devendra alias Devanacarya wrote another work Sangitamuktāvali. He was pupil of one Rudra who was said to have been honoured by the scholars of different countries He calls himself Tauryaṃkacintāmanī He mentions Rudrata as an author on Sangīta and Niyata He probably lived in 15th or 16th century A.D.

1027 Rama Amatya was son of Tīmāmātya of the family of Todarmal. His Svaranmelakalāmdhi contains in five chapters a detailed description of the rāgas of the Caruśa system, and their distribution into 72 melaṅkārtas He flourished in the Court of Aliya Rāmarāja of Vijayanagar, who was killed in the battle of Talikota in 1565 A.D. He was the daughter's son of Catura Kallinātha.

Kṣemakarna's Rāgamālā was composed in 1570 A.D. at the instance of Jātava Bhūpati, and another Rāgamālā was the work of Jīvāraja.

---

1 See para 124 supra For Immadi Devaraya's inscription, see EB, 110 (dated śāka 1271-1449 A.D.), IA, xxi, 182, I A, xxv 846, note 6; EC, III, 18. Kallinātha gives long extracts from Kohala's Sangitāmeru.

2 Kallinātha's commentary though extensive is defective in several places. Śrāngadeva closely follows Abhinava and adopts all his criticisms by a rearrangement of the matter Kallinātha without reading that original attempts to explain those passages and consequently he is meagre if not very wrong That is why Ragbhunātha has trenchantly put thus —

3. Ṛ. 551.
4. Tanj, XVI 7273
6. See SVR, 192
7. IO, II. 819; Ṛ. 516
8. Mitra, VII 261, CO, I. 499. There is a Dakṣiṇa-rāgamālā (BRI, Ms. No. 884, 1895 A.D) describing 6 ragas only.
1028 **Pundarika Vitthala** belonged to the village Satanurva in Khandesh and was a karnata brahmin of Jāmadagyagotra. At the instance of King Burhankhan of Pharata dynasty he began to reduce the music of Northern India into order and wrote Vitthaliya, Rāgamālā, Nārāyanarnaya, Rāgamanjari and Sadragacandrododaya. After Khandesh was annexed by Akbar about 1599 A.D., he went to his Court at Delhi and there wrote Rāganārāyaṇa at the instance of chief Madhavasimha. His expositions evidence a comprehensive scholarship of northern and southern systems of music. He was probably the same as Vitthala who wrote Sangītamātarmātānākara.

1029 **Subhankara’s** Sangītādāmodara in seven chapters treats of music and dancing in their various aspects in relation to heroines and sentiments and being quoted in Sangīta Nārāyanasa must be earlier than 17th century A.D. It is dedicated to King Ğāmodara and so followed the name. Subhankara wrote a commentary on Nārādiyasikā.

1030 **Lakshminarayana** (Bhāndāru) was the son of Bhandaru Vithalesvāra and Rukmiṇī of Bāradvājagotra. He was the musician (Vaggeyakāra) of State under Emperor Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijaynagar (1509-1529 A.D.) He had the titles Abhinavabhāratācārya, Ṭodārāntala, Sūkṣmabhāratācārya etc. The emperor presented him with golden palanquin, elephants, pearl-fans etc. He was pupil of Viṣṇubhattāraka. He wrote his Sangītasauryodaya in 5 Aṣṭhyāyas on Ṭāla, Viṣṭa, Svarūpa, Jāti and Prabandha. The prologue gives an account of the Emperor of Vidyāpura and is of great historical value.

Govinda’s Rāgatālapāṇiṣṭaprakāśa describes music tones and time.

---

1. This dynasty ruled at Anandavalli in Khandesh in 1870-1600 A.D.
2. Tanj, XVI 7245.
3. Tanj, XVI. 7242, 7245, Bk. 575. Rāgamālā and Sadragacandricā have been printed in Bombay. See Popley, Music of India, 17-15. There is a work of the name of Rāgamalikā by Kālākūrta of Orissa (TC, IV 4705).
4. Tanj, XVI 7244.
5. IO, II. 819 Mitra’s Notes, I. 219. There is a fragment in Or. Ms. Library, Madras and a complete copy with M. Ramakrishna Kavi, Madras.
6. Dāmodara son of Lakṣmīdhara is the author of Sangītādāmodara, IO, II. 819
7. वात च रेख च कदाचि यथसाद वायोन्यकार: कवितस्ततीतः।
---Sangītasugha.
He mentions Sarngadeva and must have lived later than 13th century AD.

1031 Lakshmīdharā flourished in the Court of King Turlamaroya of Vijyanagar (1570-73 A.D.) and lived at Ceruluru in Guntur District. In his commentary on Gitagovinda, he mentions Rāgadīpi, Ranganalakśmīvilāsa and Vāmadeviya and King Pratāpa's Sarngacūdāmaṇi and he himself wrote Bharatasāstragranṭha, in which his work on sports of seasons called Rūkridāviveka is quoted.

1032 King Hardayananarayana was a King of Garrh or Gadoura (Jubbapole) and ruled about 1667 A D. He wrote Hṛdayapraṇaka and Hṛdayakautuka and used Locanakavi’s Rāgatarangini for elaboration.

1033 Somanātha was probably an Andhra of Godavari district. His Rāgavibodha composed in 1609 A D displays fine poetry in Āryā metre and speaks of rāgas and śrūtis, more with a view to their use on the Vīṇā, of which all varieties are described.

1034 Catura Damodara was son of Lakshmīdharā. His Sangitadarpapā treats of music and dancing. His descriptions of rāgas are pictorial and are mostly based on Somanātha’s Rāgavibodha. He was probably a descendant of Catura Kallmāṭha, the commentator on Sarngadeva and was attached to the Court of Emperor Jehangir (1605-1627 A D).

---

1. The manuscript is found in the Andhra Sahitya Parishad Library (Madras), under the name Sangitaraṇḍūra. He mentions among others Śaṅkara, Nāṇḍīnī, Guha, Maṭanga, Nārāja, Śarngin as writers on music.
2. See para 126 supra.
3. Tanj. XVI. 7888.
5. Printed in part. He quotes Vidyapati’s Maithlī songs. Here he referred to his work Rangaśarngasangava.
7. Ed. Bombay with the commentary of Ratanlī Līlādharā, DC, XXII, 6742.
8. In another manuscript (I o No 15017), the author’s name is given as Haribhatta (or Hariyallabha).
There are Haribhattacha's Sangitadarpana, Sangitasroddhara and Sangitakalamidhi.

1035 Veda was probably the son of Ananta, who was the son of Catura Dāmodara, the author of Sangitadarpana Shahāj, father of Śivāji, the Great, was his patron. At his instance he wrote the works Sangitamakaranda and Sangitaprapāṇja. The former treats of Rasadrṣṭi, Gāṭi, cāṇ, Hasta, nṛya and rasa.

1036 Srirangaraja was a prince of the Vijayanagar ruling family and lived about the beginning of the 17th century A.D. His Natakakapabhaṣa is a small work on dramatic conventions.

1037. Sangitasudha known as the work of King Raghunātha of Tanjore was composed by Govinda Dīkṣita. It contains a historical introduction on the Kings of Tanjore and a description of the greatness of King Raghunātha, particularly of his proficiency in music.

"Raghunātha treats at length of only 50 rāgas which he says were in use. Older writers simply gave amsa, nyasa and graha to each of the rāgas, but Raghunātha gives in detail the number of the sṛuti in each śvara with alaptika. He arranged 50 rāgas under 15 melakartas, the details given against each of them are full and useful for vṛtta. The third and fourth chapters of the work are devoted to musical compositions known as prabandhas then in vogue and to minor trophies in music."

1038 Venkatesa or Venkata Makhun was the son of Govinda-makhun and brother of Vagunaśārayana and was in the Court of King Vijayarāghava who ruled till 1672 A.D at Tanjore. He was a
pupil of King Raghunātha. He was proficient in music and rhetoric. In mīmāṃsā he wrote Vārṭikābhārana, a commentary on Tantravārtika, and performed Vājapeya sacrifice. In general he follows Bharatā. He introduced a system of notation in the expression of Śrūṭis, discovered a type of vīṇa, a mēla in Simharavarāga and called Madhyamela, and asserted that the old Vīṇa Śuddhamela (Raghunātha’s vīṇa) was unfit for illustrating Śrūṭis. He criticised the views of Sārngadeva and Rāmāmāṭya rather with too much severity, but these criticisms are considered groundless by Ahobila. His Āltanagītās are printed in Sangītasampradāyapradaśini. His Catūrdandiprakāsikā in 6 chapters is mainly intended as a treatise on music with special reference to the instrument Vīṇa.

"The work is critical and the author introduced many novel ideas and suggested new methods. It is said that he was the first to introduce 72 melakartas now in use in South India. This introduction is mnemonic rather than logical which is the characteristic of the older classification. How far Venkatamakhin is the author of this introduction is still doubtful. One may be inclined to attribute it to some innovator in the court of Vṛtyanagar. Venkatamakhin is hard upon great writers especially on Bāyakāra Rāmāmāṭya of the court of Rāmaṇa Rāmāmāṭya is not a negligible writer, and his Svaramelakalanidhi gave impetus to Venkatamakinh whose offensive trait in criticism is seen for instance here.*

Venkatamakhin’s system is taken up and enlarged in Melādhikaralakṣāna of about 18th Century A.D.*

As authority on Catūrdandī, Gopālanāyaka is mentioned thus in Catūrdandiprakāsikā.

अहेव सर्वत्रिष्णुपूर्वो गोपालायकः।
अध्यात्मिति त सर्वेश्वरिष्णु न हु परिणतः॥

1. The System of melakartas is elaborated in Sangrahachudamani purported to have been composed by Shankaram in Skandapurana. The existence was doubted by Subbarama Dīkshita of Ettiyapuram in his Sangita work. Happily an old manuscript is available with me and Venkatamakhin’s originality can be disproved.—M R Kosar.

2. Tanj. XVI. 7813.
Gopalanayaka is quoted by Kallmātha also and is said to have been a friend of Amir Khusru and respected by Aallauddin Khilji (1295-1315 A D)  

1039 Jagajjyotirmalla, son of Pribhuvanamalla, was the ruler of Bhaktapura (Bhataganva), a tributary of the King of Nepal. He was a great musician and finding no suitable work on music in the north he brought Abhilāsa's Sangitacandra into Nepal and had a commentary Sangitabhāskāra written on it by another scholar Vangamaṇi of Miṭhila, while he himself composed a treatise Sangitasārasangraha in Nepal Era 799. He ruled in 1617-1633 A D. He wrote a commentary on Padmasri's Nāgarasarvasva and an opera play Hara-Gaurivivaha in Nepalese dialect.  

Among his other works are Svarodayadīpikā, Gītāpancāśikā, and Sangitabhāskāra. His Ślokasangraha is a collection of verses on 33 subjects.

His son Pratāpamalla was also a poet and his son Jagatprakāśamalla made an anthology Padyasamuccaya. At the instance of his daughter's son Ananda, one Ghanasyāma wrote a commentary on Hasjamukjavali, a work on dancing.  

1. For a critical review of its contents by T L Venkatarama Iyer, see JI Mad Muno Academy, Vol I.  
2. Isvariprasad's Med India, 542.  
3. Nepal, 260  
5. For all this account, see Int. to Nāgarasarvasva edited by Tanusukharamasarma, Bombay.
Dhundhiraja, son of Lakshmana of Vyasa gotra, was a Paurânpika under King Shahaja of Tanjore (1687-1711 A D) and wrote Sâhavilása in 8 cantos and probably Sâharajâtapâdi 3

Mummidi Cikkadevarâya’s (III) Bharaṭasârasangraha is an elaborate but incomplete Work in 2500 verses, and embodies the views of Bharaṭa, Maṭanga and Vidyârapya Cikkadevarâya III was a ruler of Myore (1672-1704 A D)

Ahobila’s Sangitaparîjata was written in the 17th century A D and was translated into Persian in 1724 A D. He mentions ancient writers and it is based particularly on Hanumán’s work He refers to Râgatarangini and Râgavibodha and defends the views of Râmâmâtya He was the first to describe the twelve svaras in terms of the length of the string of the Vina 3

Bhavabhâta was son of Sangîtarâya Janârdana 4 Bhatta and was grandson of the musician Tâna Bhatta 5 In the Court of King Anûpasimha of Bikanir (1674-1709 A D) 6 he wrote Anûpasangitâvilása, 7 Anûpasangîtaratnakâra and Anûpasangîtânkusa (now in print) and Sangîtâvînoda, Murâlîprakâsa and Nastoddîtapraboçhaka, Dhruvapadatîkâ 8

Gopinatha Kavibhusana was son of Vâsudeva Pâtro of Karâja family Vâsudeva was priest and physician of King Gajapâṭa ārânya of Khummî of Ganga race, who probably ruled in 1766-1806 A D 9 Besides a music poem Râmâcanârâvihâra, he wrote an extensive work on poetics Kavîcintâmani in 24 chapters the last of which embraces music 10

Balaramavarman or simply Râmavarman was the nephew of Bâlâmârtanda Varman He was born in 1724 A D and

---

1 Tanj, XVI 7847-9 See para 188 supra
2 Myr. 308
3 Ed. Madras or Nellore See Popley, Music of India, 19
4 He was a musician of the Court of Emperor Shah Jahan
5 One Tânappâçârya is mentioned by Venkatamakh see II. Mad. Mus.
6 At his insistence a commentary was written on Gîtâgøvinda (SKC, 67)
7 Râgamannî, Râgakûthâla and Râgakauîtha are quoted here
8 Bsk, 513, 514, 517
9 See Sewell’s Arch S SI, II 186, where one of his ancestors and one of his successors bore the names Sarvagna Jagannâtha Nârâyana deva (1686 1702) and Jagan mãtha Gaçapaṭi Nârâyana deva (1648-1850 A D)
10 TO, IV 1225.
succeeded in the throne of Travancore in 1753 A.D and passed away in 1798 A.D. He was a valiant conqueror and kind ruler and his name is still fresh in the memory of his people. He was known by the names Dharmaraja and Kilavanaraja. He was a Vikramādiya to the poets of his period. He was a linguist and was the author of several dramatic pieces in Malayalam, called Kāthakalism Sadāśiva-makham, a poet of his court, wrote Rāmavarmayasobhāsanam in his praise on the plan of Prajāparudrayasobhāstam. Venkatasubrahmanya-thāvar, a descendant of Appayyādikṣā, wrote the drama Vasumaṭi-kalyānam in which this king was made the hero.

The king was particularly interested in drama. His Bālarāmabhāratam is a treatise on music and dancing in 18 chapters. After an introductory essay in prose on the interdependence of bhāva, rāga, and ālā, he describes music, vocal and instrumental, and the development of the sentiments by gestural.

1045 Bhaskaracarya was a descendant of Varadaguru of Śrīvatsagotra and lived at Sripurumbudur (Chingleput Dist.) probably in the 18th century. His Sāhityakalolfini embraces the whole topic of poetics and dancing and cites Rāśīnavasudhākara.

1046 Tulajaraja (Tukkoji) King of Tanjore (1729-1735 AD), wrote an extensive work in prose Sangitāsārāmṛta on all topics dealt with by Śāṅgadeva. Thus he praises Śiva, as the embodiment of nāḍā

His Nāṭyavedāgama deals with dancing.

1 See article on this book by A. S. Ramanatha Iyer in Shama'a, IV 171.
2 In the Travancore State Manual (I 417) the name Bālarāmavaram is given to the king who came to rule in 1798-1810 A.D. (See also ibid., II 495) But it is ascertained from this work, and an inscription published in Trav Arch Series (IV 108) that Rāmavaram, the predecessor of Bālarāmavaram (Trav State Manual, I. 369) was also known as Bālarāmavaram and was the author of this work. See also Trav State Manuscripts, II. 484.
3 DC, XXII 8706.
4 Tanf XVI. 7298 where the author's genealogy is given. A part of it was published by Snkthankar under the name Sangitāsārāmṛtodhāra.
5 Tanj, XVI, 7235.
1047. **Purusottama** Kaviratna lived at Parlakimidi, Ganjam in about 1790 A.D. Besides prabandhas, Rāmacandrādaya and Rāma-bhyudaya, and Bālarāmāyana, he probably wrote Kalānkurambandha or Rāgamalikā. His son Narāyana Misra Kaviratna wrote Sangita-saranam, and prabandhas, Balabhadra-vijaya, Śankaravīhara, Uśābhilāsa, Kṣaṇavilāsa and Gundicāvijaya.

Nārāyaṇamisrā classifies prabandhas as *śuddha* and *ṣūtra*. The former has several songs set to different rāgas e.g. Giṭagovrāda, the latter has all through only one rāga. While he wrote Rāma-bhyudaya, *sutra-prabandha*, his father wrote Rāma-bhyudaya *śuddha-prabandha*.

1048 King Gajapati Virasūtī Narayanadeva, son of Padmanābha, ruled at Parlakimidi about 1700 A.D. He belongs to the race of Uttungaganga. He learnt music under Kaviratna Puriwottama and the result of his study is embodied in his work, Sangita-nārāyaṇa. In four chapters it deals with music, dancing, musical instruments and musical compositions. The illustrations glorify the author himself. He refers to his work Alankāracandra. Among other works and authors quoted by him, some of which are now scarce, are Sangita-sīromaṇi, Saṅgītasāra (probably of Vidyārāṇya), Saṃgītarāja-namāla (by Mamātā), Gitaprabhāsa, Saṅgītasindhikā, Kṛṣṇadattā, Saṅgītacūḍāmani, Saṅgītalakṣapataru, and Harmāyaka.

1049 **Sadasiva Diksita** was a poet of the Court or King Tulajā of Tanjore (1729-1735 A.D.). He became Avadhūta sanyāsī of whom miracles are told. He was a friend of Śrīdhara Venkatesa (Ayyāval) of Tiruvasanallur. He lived at Pudukkota. The State of Pudukkota is believed to be under his spiritual protection and the state conducts

---

1 TC IV 4705 Rāgāmalik Composed by Kaviratna Kalānūdī
2 Gundīcā is a festival of a deity at Nolagiri.
3 “The *Sutra-prabandha* which is a composition to be sung in a single rāga throughout is the *Raga Kavya* of old, which is a variety of *Uparāja* or semi-dramatic, operatic composition described by Kohala. It is described by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the *Nāṭya Sastra*. He gives two instances of this *Raga Kavya*. Abhinava says that the *Raga Kavya* called Ruvhava-vijaya is sung throughout only in Thakkā Raga and the *Raga Kavya* called Maruvavadhā, only in Kohubha grama rāga.”

“तथा हि राजविनियमः हि उद्दारणायेऽविचिन्तनायते संप्रिपति निवाहीः, मारिव-विवस्य कक्कोकामारयोऽपि। अत हुव रागाध्यवानीयते॥” p 184 Gaek. edn

4 TC, V. 6227 There his Alankāracandrikā is quoted. See Bīk 527

5 e.g. अपरालोककशिरण मण्डितं तवरणपद्मः ||


1048 King Gajapati Virasūtī Narayanadeva, son of Padmanābha, ruled at Parlakimidi about 1700 A.D. He belongs to the race of Uttungaganga. He learnt music under Kaviratna Puriwottama and the result of his study is embodied in his work, Sangita-nārāyaṇa. In four chapters it deals with music, dancing, musical instruments and musical compositions. The illustrations glorify the author himself. He refers to his work Alankāracandra. Among other works and authors quoted by him, some of which are now scarce, are Sangita-sīromaṇi, Saṅgītasāra (probably of Vidyārāṇya), Saṃgītarāja-namāla (by Mamātā), Gitaprabhāsa, Saṅgītasindhikā, Kṛṣṇadattā, Saṅgītacūḍāmani, Saṅgītalakṣapataru, and Harmāyaka.
a festival at his Samādhi at Nerur near Karur, S India. Besides a philosophical poem, Ātmavidyāvītāsa he composed many songs of devotion. His Gītasundara in 6 cantos is devoted to the deity Somasundara (Śiva).

Sadāśiva appears have gone to Travancore and there honored by King Rāma Varma Kārtiķa Tirunal (1755–1798) he composed Rāmavarmayasobhā-sūna for his glorification.

1050 Tyagaraja was born at Tiruvārur in 1758 AD and his parents soon settled themselves at Tiruvayyar (Tiruvadi) on the Kāverī, a seat of Sanskrit learning. He was the son of Rāma-brahmam of munkinādu Vaidikī Brahmin sect.

“He lost his parents early in his teens and became the victim of harsh treatment of his wicked brother, Japyesan, who went to the length of throwing the Swami’s beloved idols of worship once into the street and later into the Cauvery itself, for the one reason that these uprāhams were the sole cause of the Swami’s neglect of domestic welfare and his spurning of wealth. The most popular kruts of Śrī Thyagaraja like ‘padudagnado’ in Thodi, ‘Nenenduvedukudura’ in Karnatakī Behag were composed ex tempore in this period which marked the struggle of his intense Bhakti with the base passions of the world, represented by his brother. The Bhagavatī then related how the saint in despair with tears in his eyes, dug in the sands of the Cauvery to get back his lost Rama and how one day as the result of a dream in which He appeared to the saint, he was able to locate the place where the idols lay imbedded, hugged them to his breast and shed tears of joy singing ‘kanugontum’ and other delightful songs on the spur of the moment. The saint’s meeting with Narada in the guise of an old sanyasin, who presented him with Swararnava, written on palmyra leaves, his refusal to yield to the lure of gold offered by the Tanjore Raja, the latter’s anger thereupon and the sudden disappearance of the pain on the Raja’s promise not to interfere with the Swami’s liberty were all related in a touching and impressive manner by the Bhagavatī whose rendering of the krutus was particularly appreciated. For want of time he had to finish his discourse after very briefly dealing with the saint’s visit to Tirupati, Srirangam and other holy places, the attack of robbers in the forest.

1. _Tong XVI, 7840_ Printed, Madras. See para 298 supra. His life is described in a Tamil work published at Pudukkota.
and the defence by Rama and Lakshmana who were always watching
his welfare, the saint's attaining Samadhi on Pushya Bahula Panchami
in the year Parabhava (1846) after taking Sanyasa Asramam to avoid
another re-birth in this world”

Tyagaraaja “was a musical star whose influence extended far beyond
the limits of India, to many other countries and continents. His music
had been recorded in Western system of notation also. The basis of
his music, in fact the motive power behind his inimitable compositions,
was his intense love and Bhakti for Sri Rama whom he regarded as
the One Parabrahmam, the embodiment of Nada. That Rama was the
saint's guardian angel was evident from many incidents of his life, one
of which was that Rama is said to have appeared to a devotee in
Maharashtra in his dream and directed him to pay a visit to His bhakta,
Tyagaraja, in Tiruvayar in the South. In obedience to this Divine
command, the Maratha devotee visited the Swami and was so impressed
with the character of the saint that he remained there permanently as
his disciple. It was on this occasion that he sang the Thodi krith, ‘Dasaratha
Nirunamu’. It was due to this contact that they found
Tyagaraja appreciating the beauties of Northern music and
incorporating them in some of his krithis like ‘Marugelara’ and ‘Mana
maleda’. His compositions present an extraordinary variety of
musical form, from the slow-timed ‘Namminavarini’ to the quick trot
of ‘Sobhillu’, and afford as much scope for the trained musical
acrobat to exhibit his skill, as for the woman in the home and the
man in the street to sing with facility and delight.”

His early songs were mostly in Sanskrit and his Raga Nata was
the first of the garland of five gems, Pancaraaptha.

1051 Govinda’s Sangitasastrasamksepa is said to represent
later day music and to have superseded Venkatamakhin’s views. In
two colophons of two chapters, it is mentioned that it is part of Skanda-
purana and composed by Saqmukha. Itti skandasasra samhithyottari
tita purana and composed by Saqmukha.

Govinda supports Tyagaraja and opponents of Govinda give out
that Govinda was probably Tyagaraja’s friend and composed this
work under the guise of an extract of Purana to put down the popula-

1. Taken for ‘Hindu’, Extract of Lecture by Muthua Bhagavathar. N Sangita
rao’s Sri Tyagaraja, Pudukkota.
nty of Venkamakhin Govinda refers to Acyutaraya's vīṇā and Acyutāraya ruled at Tanjore in 1572-1614 A.D. 1

1052 Venkata Vaidyanatha Diksita lived at Tiruvadamarudur. He was the grandson of the paternal uncle of Venkatarakham and inherited his musical talents. He was proficient in the vina and expounded Venkatamakhin’s Caturdandi-prakāśikā. Ramaswāmi Diksita became his disciple and under his tuition he blossomed forth as Vānīkāśikāmāṇi. Rāmaswāmi was the son of Venkatesvarā and belonged to Govindapuram near Maḍhyārjuna (Tiruvadamarudur). He found his place of fame at Tanjore under the auspices of his teacher, Vīrabhadrayya, the master-musician of his age. He lived in 1735-1817 A.D. and wrote Tālamāhāka.

Rāmaswāmi’s younger son Balasvāmi (Bālakṛṣṇa) Diksita was born in 1780. He was a boy prodigy. He could handle with facility a number of musical instruments and with the patronage of Manali Chinaya Mudaliar of Madras studied western music also. It is said that he had the magical power of reproducing any natural sound on his vīṇā.

The Rulers of Ettiyapuram were patrons of music for over a century and during the period of three of them Jagadīśvara Venkatesvara Ettappa (1816-1839) and his successors Jagadīśvara Rāmakumāra Ettappa and Jagadīśvara Rāma Venkatesvara he was poet laureate. “He was a prince among poets and a poet among princes and composed many kīrtāṇ and curnkas in honour of Hindu deities. Kārtikeya was his signature.” Among his friends in music were Mīnākṣisundarayya, Subbakutti Ayyar, Subbayya ananavi, Vennu Bhagavatar, and Madura Ramayyar. 2

1053 Rāmaswāmi’s eldest son Mutuswāmi Diksita was born at Thiruvālur in 1775 A.D. After some travel in the north along with a Sanyāsī, he settled down in his place. During the last years of his life, he lived at Ettiyapuram under the patronage of its ruler.

Wherever he went, whatever shrine he visited and whichever deity he saw, he worshipped with the gift of his songs. The following:

1 “Ramakrishnakavi says that Govinda was an Anāhira, that he wrote a work called Rāgamāḷakāṇṭhā, that he followed Ramamatiya and his 20 melas and that the Adyar Ms contains a few sheets in the beginning of this work which had got mixed up with an anonymous work called Sangrahāchudamani, described as a part of the Skandapurana.”

2 On this author, see article by C.R. Brinivasa Ayyangar in Hindu, Feb., 1903.
are the more important of these songs the Pancha Linga Kirtanas, his five songs on the Gods representing the five elements of Earth Water, Fire Air and Ether, at the shrines Kanchi, Jambukesvara, Arunachala, Kalamasthi and Chidambaram. These songs are ‘Chintaya makanda mula handam’ in Bhairavi, ‘Jamboo pate’ in Yamuna Kalyani, ‘Arunachalanatham’ in Saranga, ‘Sri Kalahastusam’ in Usena and ‘Ananda natana prakasam’ in Kedara, another series of songs is that on the Navagrahamas, the nine planets, excluding Rahu and Ketu. He composed a series of Navavarana Kirtanas on the Goddess at Mayavaram, the most important songs are those he composed on the many deities at Tiruvanur itself, on the chief deity Tyagaraja he has sung many pieces of which Tyagaraja yoga vaishnavam in Ananda bhararavi and ‘Tyagarajaya namaste’ in Byagadi deserve special mention; the Goddess Kamalamba at Tiruvanur was a favorite of Dikshitar and on her especially he has composed a Navavarana series, he has sung her eleven times, Tyagaraja’s consort, Nilotpalambika, is sung in one song and the renowned Vinayaka on the north eastern corner of the tank has been praised in the songs ‘Vatapi ganapatim’ in Hamsadhvam and ‘Sri Maha Ganapatim’ in Goula, in a Kirtana in Sriraga, ‘Srimuladhara chakra Vinayaka’, a form of Ganapati as presiding over the Muladhara chakra found in front of Tyagaraja’s principal shrine has been sung, besides “almost all the deities at Tiruvanur, Achaleswara, Anandeswara, Siddheswara and others have been sung, of the deities at other famous shrines, mention may be made of ‘Sri Rajagopala’ in Saveri, ‘Bala Gopala’ in Bhairavi”.

Dikstar had left the imprint of his personality all his songs Material considerations did not enter his scheme of life. He led a pious life and believed in Adwanta philosophy. He embodied the essence of Vedic teachings and mantras in his songs and showed the way for even those who could not be initiated in mantras to commune with the Supreme. His Navagraha Kritis are a masterpiece in this respect both from the point of view of music and of devotion.

1 A diligent search all over South India for the compositions of Dikshitar, a recording of all those Dikshita kirtanas known to such premier musicians as Vama Dhanam, who especially has a large stock of them as a consequence of her having come in the direct Sishya lineage of Dikshitar through Sattanur Panja, a good Deva nagari edition of such collected compositions of his—these and many more lines of work I think, will be pursued by lovers of music, etc 1935 ushered in the first Dikshitar centenary which must be celebrated not only in Madras but also in his own native place Tiruvanur in a grand manner.”—Sound and Shadow, II November, 1938.
His end came suddenly. At Ettayapuram, he was one day sitting, listening to the music of his pupils who were singing his Gamakakrīva Kirtana, 'Minakshi'. He asked them to sing it once more, they were singing the Anupallavan—Minalochan Pasamochani. When he felt that the Goddess had really released him from bondage (Pasa), he was accordingly released from mortal bondage. He passed away in 1835 A.D.

1054 Syamasastri was Tyāgaraja’s contemporary and is the third of the musical trinity of South India. He wrote mostly in Telugu, but there is an excellent piece in Sanskrit opening with Śankṛi in Rāga Śāveri.

“Thrice holy is Tiruvarur to the lover of our music, for it is this small place that gave birth to the Carnatic music trinity—the Trimurtis Sri Tyagaraja, Sri Syama Sastri and Sri Muthuswamy Dikshitar. All the three celebrated composers were contemporaries. Tyagayya was the eldest and he blessed this earth with his life for the longest period, while the two others left it earlier. Of the three, Muthuswamy Dikshitar was the youngest and he alone stuck to Tiruvarur for the longest time, while Tyagayya left for Tiruvayar or the Panchanada Kshetra and Syama Sastri for Tāñjore proper.”

1055 Pratapasimha Deva, Maharaja of Jaipur (1779-1804 A.D.), produced a musical encyclopaedia Sāṅgītasaṅgāra with the help of an assembly of musicians.

1056 Sri Swati Ramavarma Kulasekhara was Maharaja of Travancore (1812-1847 A.D.). Besides prabandhas such as Yājñiṣṭhīra and 13 musical narratives Kucelopākhyāna and Ajāmilopākhyāna, he composed Sanskrit Kirtanas like the kṛtis of Tyāgarāya, devoted to Śrī Padmanābha. He deplores the fallen musicians of his day thus:

आक्त्ता कृतजन हन्त जगदी पापीयसा गयकः-व्यूःन भिसितपालसदद्विभिँताय समन्तादि।
रुपाक्षरत्वयन्ध्वनिमीचिकरिविदेशदर-गन्द्यौहर्दस्र्युद्धदपेति दुःक्ताकाशेषस्तु न।

1. See T. Srinivasaraghavanchar’s article in Hindu, 5th Nov. 1935
2. There is a work of this name in OC, I. 668
3. See para 178 supru
4. Ed by TSS Trivandrm
5. Ed by TSS. Trivandrm
The following verse in his praise by a feudatory Chief of Malabar:

श्यामशाह्वऽ नुपतिज्ञ प्रायण विद्वत्त्वस्मृ-
शन्तसम्पुर्ति कर्माधारस्यार्थार्थाति बन्चीप्रे ।
इलालोच्य विद्वत्त्व सम्पुर्ति बुधमहिंद्रानेत्तदे
कु सोकापिनि न स्थिति कृ ः चिरदिपि इलावद्योभावे ॥

1057 Ramavarma Maharaja (Ayilham Tirunal) of Travancore (1860-1880 A.D.) was a great patron of music. Besides a commentary of Śrikaśnavilāsaśāyya and Jalandharāsaṇuravadha (Kathakali) he wrote Vṛttaratnakara on prosody.

1058 Kokkonda Venkataratnam Pantulu (1842-1916) was one of the greatest pandits of the Andhra country in the last century, and was conferred the title of Mahamahopādhyāya in 1908 by the Government of India in recognition of his scholarship. Though he remained as a Telugu Pandit throughout his service in the Presidency College, Madras and Government Arts College, Rajahmundry, he was a profound and critical Samskāra scholar and poet and wrote some works in Samskāra His Bilvanāṭhasatakam, Ṭanumadhyā-Aryāsatakam, Tanumadhyā-Gītaratnam were all printed in the early seventies of the last century, and he was the author of nearly fifty stavas, like, Varadarāṣṭruti, Tārāvalīṣṭruti, Brahmavidyāṣṭruti, Śri Kālahastīśvarāṣṭruti, which were published in his paper called Andhrabhāṣāsanjivini or 'Telugu Tongue Reviver,' and which are examples of the author's devotion and learning. His Gītamahānata गीतमहानाट was written in imitation of Jayadeva's Gītagovinda In the field of philosophy Venkataratnam Pantulu claims the discovery of the 'Aksara Sāṅkhya' system of philosophy, and wrote a work in Samskāra called Mārgadāyini enunciating the principles of the system. His knowledge of Tamil and Kanarese was commendable and his famous Telugu work Bilvesvarīyam is a translation from the Tamil classic of the name.

Venkataratnam wrote more than 25 works in Telugu, and his service to that literature covers a period of nearly half a century. He was held in high esteem by his contemporaries and was greatly patronized by the late Vidyavindha Panappākam Anandācānar, the famous advocate of Madras, who used to call him as 'Andhra Johnson,' the literary dictator of his day.
1059 Sri Vikrama Deo Varma, D Litt., Sahitya Samrāt Mahārāja of Jeypore Samasthanam, South India, Kṛṣṇāya (Solar Race) of Bhāradvājagotra, is the son of Śrī Kṛṣṇaacandra Deo Mahārāja and Śrī Rekhā Devī. He was born on 28th June 1869 and ascended the Gadi on 6th June 1931. His literary patronage is visible in a recurring annual donation of Rs One lakh to the Andhra University and various other donations amounting to fifty thousand a year. A great scholar in Sanskrit, Telugu, Oriya and English and a renowned poet in Sanskrit, Telugu and Oriya, a great astrologer and an Abhinava-Bhoja, he has composed many stūtis in Sanskrit and some in the form of songs with his name woven in accrostics.

1060 Durvasula Suryanarayana Sastrī, Vina-Gāna-Kalā-nidhi, (1843-1896), was the chief Palace Vidwan and musician during the reign of Mahārāja Sri Ananda Gajapati Raja of Vizianagaram. Samasthanam Sastrī composed several musical pieces in Sanskrit and Telugu such as Paramānanda samudravucilāyam in Kambhoji and Devi devi satatūm in Kalyānī. Viṣṇa Venkataramanadāsa is his disciple Sastrī was the disciple of Īśa's father Peda Gurācāryulū.

Śivarāma Yati lived in 1830-1900 and composed a book of songs of devotion called Nyābhasaḥnukhapaddhaṭi.

Margadarsi Sesa Aiyangar was so called as he was the light (or path-finder) of South Indian music. He mostly lived at Ayodhya and in the latter part of his life settled at Srirangam in the service of Lord Ranganātha. He signs himself Kosalapuri in his songs. His songs (some of which are said to have been accepted by the Deity) are graceful.

Mahā Vaidyanaśāh Śiva of the “golden voice” was at the top of the musicians of South India in living memory. His Melaragamānika is now available.

Aṣṭāvadhānam Anantaścārya’s extempore composition of Samasyas and enigmas was a wonder. In some of his verses he artistically wove the names of rāgas, e.g.

चिकुराढी हु बराढी वदन तव माति बद्धरामरणम्।

Under the patronage of the Zamindar of Ultrapalayam near Bezwada, Kāndun Rāmānujaścārya and Narasimhaścārya composed songs in Sanskrit.
Sangītayāyātam and Abhinavagopālapulindindīcanṭa are opera plays interspersed with songs.

1061 Sri Martand Manik Prabhu Maharaj (1860-1936 A.D.) occupied the gadi of Sri Manikprabhu who founded the Sakalamāṭa-sampradāya at Maniknagar, Nizam's dominons. He was well-versed in all the sāśatas and in music he wrote songs in several languages. His masterpiece in Sanskrit is Gñāna-martānda (son of knowledge). He bore the title Abhinava Śrīkaraśācārya.

1062, Kirtanacarya C R Srinivasaacarya (1867-1936) was born in Tanjore District. He was a profound scholar and critic in music. During the last decade of his life he took an active interest in resuscitating South Indian music and with the help of musical academies and conferences accomplished the colossal task of settling disputed points of interest in the technique of several ragas, in which for some centuries past musicians had their own ways. He was proficient in the compositions of Ṭyāgarāja and his edition of his songs is erudite; he was thence known as Abhinava Ṭyāga Brahman. He is the pioneer of musical criticism in modern India. Speaking of Indian and Western music he wrote "Instrument predominates in the West and voice in the East. This is the true meaning of the crude, yet popular statement that harmony pervades the music of the West and melody that of the East. That this is so is shown by the absence of harmony in the vocal music of the West. The East has very much to give to the West. Only three modes or so of the seventy-two melakarthas of South Indian music are used in the West, and the thirty-six melakarthas that take a sharp Ma are practically non-existent in the West, though men like Scramble have, greatly daring, made the experiment of introducing it. On the other hand, the change of keys in one and the same piece that characterises the compositions in the West is not allowed in the Indian system, though we have it in "The Ramayana." that the music of those times included seven jatis that were amplified largely later on. And these took each note in turn as the drone, if we read the Ratnakara anght. It must be noted, too, that the voice and the instrument began to take in more and more of melody in modern times in the West. In the matter of thalas the West has very little to show in number and variety, though it must be said that the practical music of the present day in India lays under contribution chiefly three or four main thalas."

1. Tanj. XVI. 7852.
Among living musical composers of South India are Rāgagopāla Aiyar of Mānārāgudi, Śrīrangācārya of Cidambaram, Śrīnivāsa-śāstra of Nerur, Venkata Bhāgavat of Kalladakurichi, Bhairavamūrti and Hannagahbusanam of Masulipatam, Anyakudi Rāmānuja Aiyangar of Kārakudi, Sangamesvara Sāstrī of Pīṭhapur, Venkataramadasa and Nārāyaṇapādasā of Vizianagaram

Miscellaneous The following are other treatises on music

Gopendra Tippa’s Tālaprabandha illustrates each Tāla by a song on Śiva A Śrī Govinda’s Tāladāśāprāpradipikā otherwise called Mahābhāratalakṣṇakāvya, where the songs are in praise of Rāma.

Gitaprakāṣa is quoted in Sangītānārāyana It gives songs of Kṛṣnaṇāśa, contemporary of Caitanya Nārāyaṇakavi in Sangītasāra quotes a song from Rāmānandakavirāya’s Kusūrāgitaprabandha called Citrapada, as found in Gitaprakāṣa which ends thus

referring to King Vira Rudra Gajapati This Rāmacanda is the author of the play of Jagannāthavallabha

Kīrtanāpadastoma, Dōlāgīta, Śivabhajanakīrtana, Vēṅdāntaguru-darsanakīrtana, Śrī Rāmacandraśadā, and Sangītakāmaṇḍā, Unjalgi by by Śāṅkaranārāyaṇa, Sangīta-Rāghunandana by Visvanāthasūrya, Sangītāsāstrasamkalpaka by Govinda and Sangītasangrahacintamani by Appalācārya [Adyar, 45-46], Abhinayamukura, Sangītalakṣṇaṇa and Bhāratasārasangraha by Candraśekhara [Mys 307], Sandeṣaṭhādīlakṣana, and Sangītasavaralakṣṇa [Mys 641], Sangītaśāstraṇaḍghāṛāyndhi [Mys Sup 51]

Sangītāsāstra (Tan, XVI 7305), Rāgarohavārohaṇapattikā (ibid, 7349), Rāgalakṣṇa (ibid 7304), Lāsyapūṣpāṇjali (ibid 7268), Tāṇangahantu (ibid 7329), Varṣapada (ibid 7328), Taddhiṭṭhonnam (ibid. 7314), Melāḍhikāralakṣṇa (ibid 7313), Tālaprastāra (ibid 7310) and Kīrtanas and Gītas (ibid 7317-27)

Abhinayādīvicāra, Abhinayalakṣṇa, and Nātyaprasāmsā (Tan, XVI 7249-62), Devendora’s Sangītamuktāvali (ibid 7272), Haripāladāva’s Sangītasudhākara (ibid 7293), Rāgapradipā (TC, II 244),
Sangitasudhāṇidhi (quoted by Rāghavabhatta), Sangītakalpadrūma of Kṛṣṇānanda Vyāsa (CC, I 685), Sangītacandrodaya (quoted by Gangārāma), Varnalaghuvākyāṇa of Rāma

Saptasvaralakṣaṇa, Svaratīlāṅdilakṣaṇa (TTrav 73), Gitāvali of Sāntana [CSC, (1907) 38, (1917) 586], Navaratuarasavilāsa, Rāgadhvāṇidikathānādhyāya (Bik, 515), Sangītasudhālaka, Abhinavatālamanjari and Rāgakalpadrumāṅkura of Appa Tulasī (composed in 1914), Laksyasangīta of Bālande and Abhinavarāgamanjari of Viṣṇusarma (Printed, Poona)

Sangītāsārakalikā of Śuddhasvarṇakāra Mosādeva (S R, Bhau Rat II 54), Sangītasuddhānta of Rāmānanda Tīrtha, Sangītarāja, Sangītakalikā, Sangītasudhā of Bhūmanarendra (Oudd, X 12), Sangītamanidarpaṇa (BRJ), Sangītasarvasva and Svaracintāmāni (Gough, 185), Sangītasārodhāra (or Rāga kañāhala) of Rāmakṣṇa Bhāṭa (Bik, 518), Rāgاكnṭūhala (quoted by Bhāvabhāṭa), Sangītāsārasangrāha (Printed, Calcutta), Bharatasāstra by Raghunātha Prasāda (Tatt XVI, 7232), Rāgacandrīkā and Catvārimsataśadāganiṅgurāṇa (Printed, Bombay)

Nātyādhyāya by Asokamalla (Bil 514), Sarvasvaralakṣaṇa (CC, I 703), Ādibharatapratstāra (Opp 4991), Sangītāngāndhāra by Kaśiṅātī, (CC, I 105), Ānandasanjīvana by Maḍanapāla, (Bil, 509), Sāroddhāra (CC, I 715)

Gāyakapārṇaṇa by Śingarācārya (Printed, Madras), Gnaṇakṛttana, Madhyamakālakārttana, Muhaṇaprasāntyapraśavayaṅāṭhā, and Śāhītyam by Aśvinī Mahārāja (TTrav 176), Mālādhāra by Mānappa Venkatappa (Printed, Mysore), Varāgaṭṭarangū (Astapaḍi) by Mānavigrama Kavirajamāra (TTrav 176), Śri Harikṛttana by Subbarayaḍāsa (Printed, Madras), Sangītarājāranga (Printed, Trivandrum), Sangītasarvārthasangrāha by Kṛṣṇarao (Printed, Madras), Angahāralaksana (TTrav 73), [Annabhavara by Hira Saravi, Anurāgarasa by S Nārāyaṇaswāmin, Abhinavatālamanjari, Abhinavarāgamanjari, Ādarsaṅgītāvalī of Jīva-rāmopādhyāya, Ānandāgāna, Kalyāṇakalpadruma, Gaṇāṣaṅgara, Gānastāvananjari, Jogavīharakalpadrūma, Pūlōṣavaddīpikā, Dharma-ṣaṅgīta of Radhākṛṣṇa, Navaratuarasavilāsa, Rāgaṭṭvabodha of Śītvā, Rāgatarangū of Locana Panditā, Gītasataka of Sundarācārya, Rāgalakṣaṇa of Rāgakavi].

1. Quoted by Hemādri (1560 1600 A. D) in his commentary on Raghuvamsa.
2. Quoted by Jagadāthara in his commentary on Veṇīśasambhāra (CC, I 687).
3. All printed See Cat of Oriental Book Depot, Poona.
Sangitamta and Sangitacintamani of Kamalalocana (CC, I 685, 686), Sangitaprakasa Ragadisvaranirnaya of Raghunatha (18th century A.D.)

Ragapradipaa (TC, II 2447), Ragaratnakara of Gandharvaraja (Tan, XVI 7302), Gitaodavaticara (TC, IV 4707)

Ragavaranarupsa (DC, XXII 8742), Talalakshana by Kohala (DC, XXII, 8725, see Tan, XVI, 7312), Taladasaprapaprakara (DC, XXII, 8723), Talakalavilasa, and Caturasabhavilasa (quoted in Narayana Swayogi's Nityasarvasvadhipika (BR (1916), No, 41), Mndangalaksha (DC, XXII, 874), Srutibhaskara of Bhimadeva (Bh. 530)

Ragatjtvavibodha of Srinivasa Pandita (Bh 517), Sangitakalpataru quoted by Rucipajee and Ranganatha, Sangitacandrika of Madhavabhatta quoted in Sangitanarayana, Sangitakaumudi quoted in Sangitanarayana.

On Indian music and dancing generally, see Kannooolmal, Indian Music (Ind Rev XVI 1054), K Bharravamurti, Music (Bhuta, 1925, 94), M E Cousins, Eastern and Western Music, (Paper read at All India Oriental Conference, 1924), Madura Ponnusami, Swaras, (ibid), K N Staram, Place of Chidambaram in the Evolution of Dance in India (ibid), K V Srinivasa ayangar, Abhinaya (ibid), M R Kavi, Nanyadeva on Music (ibid), A Wesharp, Psychology of Indian Music (JASE, IX vn) Schmidt’s Essays on Hindu Musical Scale and 22 Srutis, G S Khare’s Some Thoughts on Hindu Music, (Poonaa),Saumandra Mohan Tagore’s History of Music, Hindu Music, Hindu Drama, Seven Principal Musical Notes of the Hindus, Six Principal Ragas and Music and Musical Instruments of South India (Calcutta), Pingley’s Indian Music, Annie Wilson’s Hindu System of Music, (Lahore), Chinnasami Mudhahar’s Oriental Music in staff notation, (Madras), Singarachan’s works (Sasilekha Office, Madras), Ananda Comaramasami’s Indian Music (London), Shahindra’s Indian Music, (London), Krishnarao’s First Step in Hindu Music, (London), K B Deval’s Musical Scale (Poonaa), Gangadhar’s Theory and Practice of Hindu Music, (Madras), Clement’s Indian Music, (London), Mrs Mani’s

1 There is a commentary on it by Roya Ganeda (Bh. 512) Ranganatha commented on Sakuntala in 1555 A.D.
2 TO, IV 4801 A work of this name is quoted in Sangitanaraya (TO, V. 6927, TO, IV 4804)
3, TO, V. 6127.
CHAPTER XXVII

Kamasutra

1065 Kamasutra treats of erotics in its most comprehensive signification. For purposes of literature, erotics are on the same level as poetics and may, not improperly, be called a branch of Sahitya. The classification of heroes and heroines, the description of their qualities, the progress of their loves and the means of their union are all stated in works on poetics or erotics and these precepts are adopted and elaborated in the poetical and particularly the dramatic literature of India. Bhavabhuti, in his Maladharshana, expressly says that his play is an illustration of Kamasutra. Without a study of erotics, Sanskrit poetry cannot be appreciated.

Kama or love is the third Purusa, that is, the third object of a man’s life. From the remotest ages the idea that enjoyment of pleasures is as much necessary for a man’s salvation as Dharma and Artha, virtue and wealth, has been prevalent in India, and tradition attributes the first treatise on these three objects of life to the Creator himself in 100,000 chapters. It is out of this first source, Manu and Bhashpati formulated distinct works on Dharma and Artha. Nandin it was that related the principles of Kamasutra in 1,000 chapters and of these summaries were made by Swetaketu and Babhrawya. Babhrawya’s summary was itself a large work in 150 chapters and in seven parts dealt with seven subjects, Sadhara, Samprayogi, Kanyasamprajogi, Bharyadhikanka, Paradikaka, Vasika and Aupansadika. The first deals with the merit of Kamasutra, the nature of education and the regulation of life, the second with sensual enjoyment and copulation, the third with wooing, training and company of girls, the fourth with relations between husband and wife, the fifth with dealings with the wives of others, the sixth with public women, and the seventh with charms and medicines in relation to enjoyment of sensual pleasures.

From this vast volume of Babhrawya, the various topics were separated and related respectively by Carayana, Suvarnabha, Ghotakamukha, Gonardiya, Gonkaputra, Daatiaka and Kucimara. Of these all but the last are now lost. It was Vatsyayana who made an epitome of these writings in his Kamasutra of 36 chapters, with the object of
comprehending the whole subject of erotics in an easy and readable form. His is the resume of early literature with which Vātsyāyana begins his Kāmasūtra.

It is the view of Vātsyāyana that all these three Puruṣārthas, Dharma, Artha and Kāma are equally serviceable and conducive to bliss here and in the other world. He begins by saying धर्मार्थकामेर्षे नम and traces the source of Kāmasūstr to the Creator himself thus —

वज्ञापतिः प्रजासुपद्राता तासा सिद्धितिनिवन्धन निवर्गसाधनामस्थायाना शतसहस्रे- णमे पोषाधि ।

He advocates Kāma, the enjoyment of sensual pleasures, without prejudice to Dharma and Artha, in the period of youth —

शताब्दीं उपाधीं विभव्य कालमश्यायादश्र परस्परसम्राचारक निवर्ग स्वेच्छत ।

In answer to a deprecation of Kāma as undesirable expressed thus

न कामाक्षेतु। धर्मार्थेऽर्थाय एव तता सता गुरुनीक्तवातु। अनर्थार्थस्मृतमसद्वसनाचीनचलनाथित वैते पुरुषस्य जनयति । तथा प्रमाद तस्वरस्थायमाध्यतम ।

he writes

धरीरसिद्धीतुलावादारस्वर्णे हि काम फलमृताधित कर्मिने भोजन्य तु दोषाभिव ।

न हि सिद्धन सत्तीति स्थायी नाधिष्ठायते, न हि शुद्धत्तीति यव नोष्ठते ।

and quotes an ancient verse

पुरुषर्घ च काम च धर्म चोपचरितवर ।

महादेव च विश्वविद्याविनं मुखभूते ॥

The last verses embody a counsel of good conduct thus

तदेतत्ता भ्रातर्यं परं च समाधिता ।

विहित लोकाधित्र न रागोऽविलहि सत्वित ॥

राजस्य धर्मार्थकामान्ति स्वति स्वा लोकविनीतिवः ।

अर्थ शास्त्रेण तत्त्वाद्व सक्यव ज्ञेतिन्य ॥

तेवदंक्ष्यो विद्वान धर्मार्थविवेकश्वाः ।

नातिरागात्मक कामी प्रयुक्तज्ञ प्रसिद्धिसि ॥

and then the sage predicates salvation for a life devoted to pleasure consistent with Dharma and Artha.

1 Ed by S R Schmidt Tr into German Ed Bombay with Jayamangala commentary Translated into English in 1883, and recently by K Rangasami Iyengar (Lahore) See also CO, 215, 256 On Kālidāsa’s quotations from Vātsyāyana, see Peterson, JBRAS XVIII, 110 and Mujumdar, IA, XLVII 195.
1066 Dattaka, the son of a Brahmin of Mathura, was born at Pataliputra. Having lost his mother while yet an infant, his father gave away the boy to a Brahmin woman and so he was known as Dattaka. He wanted to study the ways of the world and thinking that the best means was a resort to the homes of dancing woman, got into their company and soon learnt their artful devices to a high degree so that he was requested by them to compose a work on the principles of Kamasāstra relating to their profession. So says Vātsyāyana in his Kamasūtras and the commentary of Jayamangala gives the tradition.

The work, Dattaka-sūtras, is not available, except two aphorisms quoted by Śyāmilaka and Iśvaradāṭa in their plays and there is a parody of it by a character in Śūdraka's Padmaprabhātaka that it began with the letter āṇu.

Mādhavavarman II, the king of the Ganga dynasty, wrote a Vyākhyā on Dattaka-sūtras. He was the 5th ancestor of Dūrvalita and lived probably about 380 A.D. A fragment of the Vyākhyā which is in verse embraces two pādas only, dealing with rākta and virakta Vesyas and Sayanopacāra. It is doubted if this is a summary of Dattaka's original Tantra, for the first verse runs thus:

यथचक्षून श्रमदात्यताः कान्तात्तुं त्वस्तित्वतन्त
तत्सामाऔह्य समस्ततन्य वेश्याश्रयात्तमह स्रवायेः ||

1 Is he identical with Datt? Their probable dates are the same.
2 तस्य षड्वैशिकभिक्षुण्ड पालिकुत्तिकां गणिकान्ति नियोगात् दच्छ सयवक्ष चक्षाः || —Kāmasūtra, I
3 किंवा श्रीवश्याश्रया यद्द्वान तथा बहम्म
4 वेश्याश्रया श्रवायेः मोहानुष्ठितरथ्ययोच्या वाचे ||
5 न क्र्याते प्रयत्नो दच्छकद्वेष्विधेश्वकाः || —Padmaprabhātaka
6 See para 48 suśra EC, IX 7 and No DB, 69 दच्छकद्वेष्विधेश्व क्र्याते प्रयत्नो श्रीसमाः

6 TC IV 4785 Here are some verses:

कान्तात्तुं तत्सामाऔह्य समस्ततन्य वेश्याश्रयात्तमह स्रवायेः ||
कृपाणा जूतोत्सरमात्मसमी श्रवायेः प्रयत्नान्तरत्वस्तिति श्रवायेः ||
झुन्जे बिरस्य स्त्रीसरी निधाय तस्याः समाकय झुन्जे झुन्जे झुन्जे झुन्जे झुन्जे ||
गाभुधिते तदादलक्ष्य निवेश्य कान्तात्तुं सार्थं कथपछ्याः ||
KUÇIMARATANTRA is not fully extant. A few sections in the Aṭaprapadam (medicine) chapter have been traced and published. It is avowedly a narration of Kucimara's practices and his greatness has brought this work into repute, enough to call it an Upamāṇa. Thus it begins—

Even in its present form, the work is very old and can be assigned to a date earlier than the 10th century A.D.¹

VASTYAYANA Tradition accords to Vāṭyāyaṇa the repute of a Muni or Maharsi. His proper name was Mallanāga of the Vāṭyāyaṇa family but his identity with Paksilaswāmin, the author of Nyāyabhāṣya, is not substantiated. Obviously he flourished in the age when the sūtra form of literature was in vogue. His exact date is as usual a chronological speculation, but the uncertainty is a matter of relativity. Vāṭyāyaṇa instances the killing of his queen Malayavatī by Kuntala Sātakarni Śātavahana. Kuntala Sātakarni or Swāti Karna was the 13th Andhra king, and son of Mrgendra Svātikarna, and according to Maṭṣyaapurāṇa and Kaliyugavṛtttānta, he ruled in Kaḷi 2457-2481, that is B.C. 615-607.² His date is of orthodox acceptance leaving an appreciable interval for the act of that king to become a story of notoriety and being instanced in literature, we may safely assign Vāṭyāyaṇa to the 4th or 3rd century B.C.

¹ Imputed Lahore, D. O., VIII 2945 app 7008 (Kucimārasanulūṭā).
² See Introduction, about Kings of Magadha.
³ बत्तिकृतं कुन्तलस्वातकिन्द्रशास्त्रकाल सन्ति देवी सन्मत्वाति जचन | II vii The use of perfect tense shows that the story was already considered traditional.

But V. Smith places Purikasena (for variations of this name, see T. S. Narayana Sastri, o c 99 where he gives him the date 485 684 B. C.) in 69 A. D., from which K. G. Sankara Iyer (J. My., VIII 291) deduces the date 465 B. C. for Kuntala Sātakarni and relying on the quotation of Lankavālāsāstrī in the Nyāyasūtras he takes us through a labyrinth of cross references to Àśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna and concludes...
Kamasūtra is a valuable treatise on sociology and eugenics. The work, says H C Chakladar, (JBORS, V, part II) "furnishes a beautiful picture of the Indian home, its interior and surroundings. It delineates the life and conduct of a devoted Indian wife, the mistress of the household and the controller of her husband's purse. It describes the daily life of a young man of fashion, his many-sided culture and refinement, his courtships and peccadillos, the sports and pastimes he revelled in, the parties and clubs he associated with. The wanton wiles of gay Lotharios and merry maidens, the abuses and intrigues prevailing among high officials and princes and the evils practised in their crowded harems, are described at great length and often with local details for the various provinces of India. The Kamasutra shows, moreover, that, as in the Athens of Pericles, the hetaerae skilled in the arts, the artists, the actress and the danceuse, occupied a very mean or insignificant position in society. The book thus throws light on Indian life from various sides."

Kamasātras composed in 850 A.D. If Vatsyayana was regarded as a divine or a Rṣi by Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti, this date subverts all imagination.

"It can be shown that the book, as we have it now, was known to Bhavabhūti, who flourished at the end of the seventh century, and that he makes constant reference to it in his Mālatimadhava. There is a statement to that effect at the beginning of the play itself, the point of which has been hitherto missed. I refer to the phrase "Auddhatyamayojaṭakamasutram," which occurs in the enumeration by the actor of the qualities the audience expect to find in the play about to be represented before them. Jagaddhara sees no reference to a book here, and Bhandarker, differing from Jagaddhara, translates, "bold or adventurous deed, intended to assist the progress of love (i.e. in which is introduced the thread of love)" Bhavabhūti doubtless means it is too. But his words include a reference to this book of which he makes great use. When Kamandaki slily suggests, while professing to put aside, the tales of how Sakuntala and others followed the dictates of their own hearts in love, he is following Vatsyayana. When she tells Avalokita that the one auspicious omen of a happy marriage is that bride and bridegroom should love one another, and quotes the old saying that the happy husband is he who marries the girl who has bound to her her heart and his eye she is quoting Vatsyayana, and so many other parts of the play, one of the most conspicuous passages is in his seventh act where Buddhārakṣita breaks through her Prakrut to quote the Sanskrit phrase, "Kusumasadharmano hi yoshitah sukumaropakramah"—"For women are like flowers, and should be approached gently." Buddhārakṣita is quoting our book (p 199), and the whole of the context refers to a matter which Vatsyayana treats of at great length, and which is interwoven with the plot of the Mālatimadhava." PR, II 67

1 Ed Benares and Bombay. For an excellent exposition in Telugu see Vatsyayana's Kamasutrā, T P Adinarayana Sastri, Madras.

Besides Bhoja’s Sugāraprakāśa, which is practically an elaboration of portions of Kāmasūtras, there are commentaries on it by Yāsodhara Bhūskara Nīsimha, Virabhadradeva, Malladeva1 and one anonymous.

1069 Yāsodhara’s gloss, Jayamangala,8 is attributed by some scholars to Śankarārya or Śankarācārya,4 because other commentaries of the name of Jayamangala, such as on Cānaka’s Arthashastra, Kāmandaṇi’s Nītisāstra, Bhātikāya, śīvara’s Sānkhyasaptasati etc., are said to be of the latter’s authorship and Yāsodhara alias Indraprabha is in that case only a scribe. It is not possible to say who that Śankara was, except that this gloss is later than Kokkoka and cannot be earlier than the 13th century A.D. The great Śankara himself is said to have written a Bhāṣya on Kāmasūtras.

1070 Virabhadradeva was the son of Rāmacandra and a king of Vēghelā dynasty of the line of Sālavāhana. His Kandarpa-cūdāmanī is a running commentary in verse and gives the date of its composition as Sam 1633 (1577 A.D). Bhāskara Nīsimha lived at Benares and composed his work at the instance of one Vrajall in 1788 A.D.

1071 There is a tradition that Śankara wrote Manasiaūtras and Jyotirīśvara says that he had seen Manmathatāntara of śīvara.

---

1 OG, I 93, Bāk, 585
2 PR, IV 25
3 See TO, V 6898
4 See Weber, IL, 267 note
5 The colophon to the gloss reads thus

| हिति | श्रीवाजनयायकामसांज्ञायाः | ज्ञयधानाधिनाधिकरणार | ब्राह्म यमकामधिषणांनेव | प्रकाशात्वधिषणांनेव | प्रकाशात्वधिषणांनेव |

6 It is not possible to make out the real meaning of the underlined words and they certainly cannot mean that Yasodhara brought the Sūtras and Bhāṣya together because they are adjectival to Tika, and Tika cannot be a combination of sutras and Bhāṣya. Peterson says “The author gives his name as Yasodhara but states that he wrote this explanation of the Sūtras which Vāsīyāyana collected after he had retired from the world in grief at the loss of a beloved wife, and had, under the name of Indrapāla entered the ascetic life” (PR, II 67)

6 SKO, 64, PR, II 66, P K Goḍo, Identification of Vīrabhanu (COJ, II 256 where genealogy is given)

| हिष्माच्छादरदेभरकरसात्वधिषणांनेव | प्रकाशात्वधिषणांनेव | प्रकाशात्वधिषणांनेव |

7 DC, VIII 2931
Rantideva’s Yogādhikārī also deals with medicines, for instance

Nāgārjuna or Siddha Nāgārjuna is said to have composed Vasikaranatantra. It is not now available. There is Nāgārjunīyayogaṣaṭaka by Dhruvapāla.

Ksemendra’s Vātsyayanaśūrasā is quoted in his Aucitvavicaracarī (39).

1072 Padmasri or Padmasṛignāna was a Buddhist monk. He mentions Kattimata and is quoted in Sārgadharapaddhati, and he must have therefore lived about 1000 A D. In his Nāgarasarvasva in 18 parts, he sums up with fine illustrations in flowing poetry all that is needed for a man of aesthetic and amorous tastes. Besides describing the means of adoring one’s person and residence, it embraces all stages of love from wooing to conception, with instructions on charms and medicines.

There are two commentaries on it by Tanusurkharāma (the editor) and by Jagajjyotirmalla (1617-1633 A D). Nāgaridāsa wrote Nāgarasamuccaya.

1073 Kalyanamala wrote his Anangaranga to please a Mohammadan ruler of Oudh, Ladakhan Lodi, son of Ahmedkhan. In ten chapters it describes the sensual qualities of different clauses of women and purports to be a compendium of writings on the subject. He also wrote Sulomaṣṭaritī, a Sanskrit version of the story of Solomon, son of David, in the old Testament.

---

1 CC, I 493 He is mentioned in Sāktīvaṭnākara (Of 101)
2 See I4, IV 141, X 87, XV 952, XVI. 169
3 CC, I 258, III 01
4 Opp 998, II 1000, Oudh, XII 26
5 Ed by himself, Bombay with a valuable introduction
6 Printed, Bombay
7 Ed Lahore DC, VII 2941 Here is a verse for instance

---
1074 **Kokkoka** was the son of Tejoka and grandson of Pārīhadra. His *Ratirahasya* in 10 chapters was composed for the elecration of one Vanyadatta and is an elegant and lucid summary of āmasūtras. It is quoted by Kumbhakarna and by Nayacandra and as proudly composed in the 12th century A.D.

There are commentaries on *Ratirahasya* by Kāncinātha, Avanca āmacandra, and Kanprabha. Harihara's *Śṛṅgārasabandhaprapikā* is also a commentary.

The colophon reads द्वापरमितपितपितकाये निर्विशालितः सवलकालिनः।

'प्रतापः ब्रजविनयः मन्तव्राजः पवित्रानां भविनायः।

पुत्रेऽर्जुमधवसम्यकश्रवस्त्वः कामकृतार्धहस्व।

कृष्णकः कामकुरान्किमपि रतिकरं भक्तिसेवकम्।

The colophon reads श्रीश्रीराधाकृष्णकृष्णकिरणविगते रतिरहस्यः।

Kāmasūstram is a compilation of verses on eros with pictorial presentations, one in each sheet, but the verses appear to be from *atirahasya*, which as preserved in Tanjore has readings different from the published edition.

1075 **Harihara**, son of Rāmavidvat, bore the title Sahajasāradacandra. He also wrote *Ratirahasya* or *Śṛṅgārabhedapadīpikā* or *Śṛṅgāradipika* in which chapter IV deals with mantras, yantras and medicines. It is said that he was a Telugu poet and wrote *Bhāgavata* about 1450 A.D. But if Vidyadhara's mention of a poet Harihara and Arjunavarman is work *Bindvalankara*, as having received immense wealth from a king rjuna means this Harihara and if King Arjuna is king Arjunavarman

1. Tanj, XVI 7855
2. Ed Benares *DC*, VIII 2957, *Tanj, XXII* 7857
3. *DC*, VIII 2955 This was translated into Telugu and Tamil long ago
4. *Tanj, XVI* 7869
5. *Tanj, XVI* 7959
6. *Tanj, XV* 7866
7. Ibid 7855

There is a Kāmāsūtra by Silhapata śravakāmiṇa, quoted by Arjunavarman in gloss on *Amarukula* CO, I 61.

8. *OC*, II 2452 Ms breaks off in the 5th chapter (*Mys* 207, *DC*, VIII 2950). These chapters were published by R S Schmidt in *ZDMG* Aufrecht (CO, I 661). The reference as Burnell, 59 But the Tanjore catalogue has no such name, there is a *Śabdabhedapadīpikā* (anonymous) noted there, *Tanj* IX 9008.

9. See Viresalingam's Poets, Part III.
Rantideva's Yogādhikārīka also deals with medicines, for instance

Nāgārjuna or Siddha Nāgārjuna is said to have composed Vasikarasatāntara. It is not now available. There is Nāgārjunīyayogasatāka by Dhruvapāla.

Ksemendra’s Vātsyayanasūtrasūra is quoted in his Aucitvavīcāracarācarrā (39).

1072 Padmasri or Padmasrignāna was a Buddhist monk. He mentions Kattinimata and is quoted in Śārgadharapaddhāti, and he must have therefore lived about 1000 A D. In his Nāgaraśarvasva in 18 parts, he sums up with fine illustrations in flowing poetry all that is needed for a man of aesthetic and amorous tastes. Besides describing the means of adoring one's person and residence, it embraces all stages of love from wooing to conception, with instructions on charms and medicines.

There are two commentaries on it by Tanusukharama (the editor) and by Jagajyotirmalla (1617-1633 A D). Nāgaridāsa wrote Nāgarasamuccaya.

1073 Kalyanamala wrote his Anangaranga to please a Mohammadan ruler of Oudh, Ladakhan Lodi, son of Ahmedkhan. In ten chapters it describes the sensual qualities of different clauses of women and purports to be a compendium of writings on the subject. He also wrote Sulomaṭkarit, a Sanskrit version of the story of Solomon, son of David, in the old testament.

1 CC, I 498 He is mentioned in Sākṭiśānākara (Off 101).
2 See I4, IV 141, X 87, XV 952, XVI, 169.
3 CC, I 288, III 01.
4 Off 998, II 1090, Oudh, XII 26.
5 Ed by himself, Bombay with a valuable introduction.
6 Printed, Bombay.
7 Ed Lahore DC, VII 2941. Here is a verse for instance.

8 DC, XXI 8150.
1080 Minanatha wrote Smaradipikā or Ratiratnapradipikā. He
describes the plan of his work thus.

प्रथम आतिनिदेष्टतो नायकलक्षणः
ततः नायन्तरति स्वाम्यदाराधिकारिता
बारानाथधिकारश कमशोद्वन्ते प्रदर्शत्

Srinathabhātta wrote a treatise in 16 chapters on erotic sorcery,
as expounded in the Tantra. There is a Kāmaṭantra in 14 parts of
unknown author-ship.

1081 Rasikaranjanam of Vaidyanātha and Rasikabodhini of his
father Kāmarājadikṣita and Śrīgāratilakam of Kālidasa are small poetic
descriptions of amorous sentiments.

1082 Rasacandrīkā of Visvesvara describes heroes and heroines.
Vitavṛtta describes the relations between harlots and their lovers and
was probably composed by Saumadaṭṭhin. Madhava's Jādavṛtta gives a
humorous account of fools as dupes of dancing woman. Dhūrtānandam
in 4 parts is an attractive account of the rakshī ways of the man of the
town.

Citradhara's Śrīgāraśāra in 7 Paddhati deals with the origin.

1 CC, I 745, 456 He is quoted by Manoharasarma, Orf, 362, PR, II 190.
2 Mitra's Notes, No 991, IO, IV 921, BRI, (1925), 15 Ed Bombay.
3 OML, No 14980?
4 DO, XX 8009
5 See S K, De SP, I 820 and for quotations see Nāgarasāvya (Ed Bombay
p 117)
For instance

मन्या विश्व स्मरोधिनिसंगमाधिरि रोमापकित्तु दस्यां
होमद्वयं हि रेतो मणिमपि च वांट्रिवावरणम्
एतकामाधिरि हिबिबिहितमही सारासाहि सजसि
विकानूः विकायस विगतानिति वदति सत्तयाविविन्द्रशः

This is based on Chandogyapau sad (V 8)

“श्रेय वान गोतमामितलान उपस्य एव सविन्धुपमक्तयते सत्योऽगी। योगिनरिविर्यन्ति
कुरोति तेष्वार असमन्दवस्तिक्षिका। तस्मिन्निरस्यान्हि देवा रेतो वद्वति।

6 TO, II 18
7 The first verse of the work is quoted as Saumadaṭṭhin's in Vallabhaḍeva's
Subhāṣītavali. But a commentary on Jādavṛtta ascribes the work to Bharatjharī.
(Mangasondhi in Or Ms. Library in Madras).
8 Trav 74
9. TC, III 991 Trav, 74
emotions, progress and consummation of love and incidentally with music and dancing.

Smaradipika is a short piece of 157 verses and embraces all the topics of erotics. In the colophon of one of the manuscripts it is attributed to Mūladeva, but the third verse indicates that the author was Rudra Ratimanjari of Jayadeva is a small piece on women and copulation. Kāmāprabhata by Kesava is an introductory treatise on erotics and shows fine poetry. So is Kāmānāda in 5 patalas of Varadarāja, son of Iśvarādhvarin.

Anangadīpika (in prose), Ratisāra, Ratīcandrika, and Śṛṅgāra-kutiḥala of Kautukadeva, ṇ and ṇtiyapuruśartha-dhakasaran, and Praṇayaacintā deal with amorous sentiments and dalliance. Bandhodaya is a collection of pictures very artistically drawn upon palm leaves illustrating various postures of copulation and accompanied by the verse describing the bandhas. Śṛṅgārakanduka or Jārapancāsāt describes in two parts some amorous situations as between Kṛṣṇa and Gopī.

Vesyānganākalpadruma relates to courtesans. Raghupatiḥasyadīpika stops with Sambhogaparakaraṇa.

1083 Miscellaneous Kāmasāra of Karṇadeva, Ratisāra of King Mādhavadeva, Raticandrika.
CHAPTER XXVIII

Chandoviciti

(Metrics)

1084 Chandas-sastra or Chandoviciti, as it has been sometimes called, is the science of metrics, prosody. It is a Vedāṅga, a subject of study necessary for the proper understanding of the hymns. The earliest Sanskrit literature, Rg-veda, is in sūktas or hymns, that is, in verse. The seers (Ṛṣis) that sang those verses must have been guided by specific canons for metrical expression, for music, that is evident in the chanting of the hymns contained in Sāma Veda, must originate an array of letters yielding sounds conducive to the harmony of the ear. "In the Brahmanas the oddest tricks are played with them and their harmony is in some mystical fashion brought into connection with the harmony of the world, in fact, stated to be its fundamental cause. The simple minds of these thinkers were too much charmed by their rhythms not to be led into these and similar symbolisms.

The metrical content of the Rigveda has shown that each period except the 'normal' period, was inventive. The bards were occupied in constructing fresh metrical schemes, as well as in producing verse following established models. They frequently compare their craft to the highest kind of workmanship known to them, that is displayed in the construction of a war-chariot, and they show confidence that a 'new' song will be more pleasing to the gods than one which is old fashioned."

Principles of versification and inquiries into the nature of metres, that is, the beginning of the science of metrics, are found in Nidānasūtra of Sāmaveda, Śāṅkhyaśāstra Śrautasūtra (vv 2), and in Rk Prātiśākhya and Kātyāyana Anukramanī which almost follows it, while in the later hymns of Rk Samhitā some metres are named.

The antiquity of the Vedic metres goes far beyond conceivable history. It dates back probably to the days when the Indo-Aryans, as, ethnologists may say, were still unseparated or just separated from their Persian brethren.

---

1 Maedonell, SL, 54; Weber, LL, 235 and Weber, "Die Metrik des Indir, Berlin; Brown, Prosody, 17
2 See Weber, IS, VII 1, H Jacobi, ZDMG, XXXVIII 590, XL 886.
3 Arnold, Vedic Metre (Cambridge), 19.
"The comparison of the earlier parts of the Avesta indicates that the first Vedic poets were not far from the period when verse was measured solely by the number of syllables, without any regard to their quantity. The quantity of initial and final syllables is always indifferent in the Rigveda, and this feature is inherited from the earlier period of purely syllable measurement. But in all other parts of the verse we find rhythmical tendencies, which determine with varying regularity the quantity required in each position." Thus concludes Arnold. As works of mechanical art the metres of the Rigveda stand high above those of modern Europe in variety of motive and in flexibility of form. They seem indeed to bear the same relation to them as the rich harmonies of classical music to the simple melodies of the peasant. And in proportion as modern students come to appreciate the skill displayed by the Vedic poets, they will be glad to abandon the easy but untenable theory that the variety of form employed by them is due to chance, or the purely personal bias of individuals, and to recognize instead that we find all the signs of a genuine historical development, that is, of united efforts in which a whole society of men have taken part, creating an inheritance which had passed through the generations from father to son, and holding up an ideal which has led each in his turn to seek rather to enrich his successors than to grasp his own immediate enjoyment. If this was so, when the Vedic bards also are to be counted amongst 'great men' such as sought out musical tunes and set forth verses in writing,'

1085 The following extracts from Arnold's *Vedic Metre* (6-15) are instructive.

The units of Vedic metre are the 'verse', the 'stanza' and the 'hymn'.

A verse consists most commonly either of eight syllables, when we distinguish it as a *dimeter* verse, or of eleven or twelve syllables, both of which varieties are included under the name *trimeter* verse.

* * * * *

The most typical forms of the stanza are

(i) the *Austubh*, which consists of four dimeter verses, and
(ii) the *Tristubh*, which consists of four trimeter verses, each of eleven syllables.

Four trimeter verses, each of twelve syllables, form a *Jagati stanza*.

Stanzas may contain more or fewer verses than four. Thus the *Gayatri* consists of three dimeter verses, the *Pankh* of five, the *Mahapankh* of six, whilst three *Tristubh* verses form the metre known as *Varay* and two disyllabic verses that known as *D vipada Varay*.

Stanzas may also consist of combinations of dimeter and trimeter verses, the latter being then usually of twelve syllables. All meters of this type we group as lyric metres.
Lyric metres may also include verses of four syllables, and even of sixteen, but these are comparatively rare. The most important lyric metres are Usah (8 8 12 or 8 8 8 4), Kakusah (8 12 8), Bhats (8 12 12), Satubhats (12 8 12 8) and Atyas (12 12 8 8 12 8).

A hymn may contain any number of stanzas, but usually it consists of not less than three or more than fifteen stanzas, generally uniform in character, except in the case of strophic and 'mixed lyric' hymns. It is also not uncommon for the last stanzas of a hymn to contain one or even two additional verses.

Where the number of stanzas in a hymn is very large, or the metre suddenly changes, it becomes probable that we have a composite hymn, that is, two or more hymns combined in the Sanskrit text.

In all metres in the Rigveda the quantities of the first and last syllables of each verse are different, and (with some exceptions) each verse is independent in structure.

In almost all metres a general iambic rhythm may be noticed in the sense that the even syllables, namely the second, fourth, and so on are more often long than short: *

In all metres the rhythm of the latter part of the verse is much more rigidly defined than that of the earlier part:

* *

In the early part of the verse there is a general preference for long syllables, in the latter of the verse or short syllables. These preferences modify considerably the general iambic rhythm prevailing in both parts:

* *

Trimeter verse may be analysed in two ways:

(i) into two parts, as separated by the cesura, which regularly follows either the fourth or the fifth syllable, or

(ii) into three numbers, namely (a) the opening, which consists of the first four syllables (b) the break, consisting of the fifth, sixth, and seventh syllables and (c) the cadence which includes the remaining syllables, beginning with the eighth.

In the case of Tristubh verse, the two parts consist either of four and seven syllables, or of five and six syllables each, according as the cesura is early (that is, after the fourth syllable) or late (that is, after the fifth syllable). If the cesura is early, we have a short first part and a long second part. If late, we have a long first part and a short second part.

In the case of Jagati verse, the second part is in each case longer by one syllable.

In all cases the second part regularly begins with two short syllables.

Anustubh

बायरस उपासन्यात् गितस्ति सम जननम्।
केशी विश्रय पालिण यथोऽनु विचारसः॥
Gayatri

1 उब्ज चन सर्वामान्
अमो रहिरा विकेत न
गायन गीतमान् ॥

11 ततसात्मत्वर्षेण
सागर के स्वर्य, धीमाहि
धियो यो न मनोदयाद् ॥

Normal Tristubh

इद्वापि प्रथम जान्मान
सहा ज्योतिष परो ध्योताच ।
सत्वार्थसुविज्ञातो रवेयः
वि सत्ताल्परसन्धिमाहि ॥

Normal Jagati

अतदा अमां सहो देश्ववे
कपोल वर्षयामिन्द्रज्ञानोऽवि
मेनभवे पूर्णस्तथ शत्रुको
वित्वेतात सर्वेणु भवायाय ॥

The following passage from Mahābhārata is instructive

तथा ज्ञद्वयोऽप्रमुष्टे ज्ञदौविभेषणां। तत्र तत्र विहितवात्। तस्मातस्थतचुतुस्कारः
क्षमिष्ठ शतान्त्रवकृतपूर्वक इति तत्स्मात। गायत्रिक्षणगुप्तकुटकितश्चर्जगतीन्त्यतमां
सप्त क्षमिष्ठ। चतुर्विविधा शरा गायत्री। ततोधिप चतुर्गौरीस्वरीविश्वाकरण्यवतिकोतिकु।
प्रभुवर्तीतत्त्तविकाम अर्जुनायाय वश्यः। तथा तत्स्मातः अभिमाने गायत्रिक्षणांश्चर्धायां
श्रीदुर्भराजप्रज्ञास्तु जगतीसिंहित्वेति कर्तराया अर्जुनायामिन्ये। तत्र सर्वाय्यादिविश्वायो गायत्रिक्षणां
श्रीदुर्भराराजाज्ञास्तु जगतीसिंहित्वेति कर्तरायामिन्ये। तत्र सर्वाय्यादिविश्वायो गायत्रिक्षणां
श्रीदुर्भराराजाज्ञास्तु जगतीसिंहित्वेति कर्तरायामिन्ये।

By the time of the composition of Upanisads we find the anustubh metre settling down to a definite form, almost approaching the epic sloka. Even in Rigveda, we have that variety

वायुर्ग उपमानात् पिन्निः स्म इनमस्।
क्रेशी बिवश्च पालेण प्रहुः पिन्निः।

The tradition that the sloka metre became manifest in the unconscious effusion of Valmiki’s grief caused by the sight of killing of
Kauncī is but an indication that Vālmīki, called thereby Adikāru, was the first of the authors of classical Sanskrit poetry.

1086 “The poetry of the epic is composed in metres, chandas of three sorts. The first is measured by syllables, the second by morae, the third by groups of more. These rhythms ran the one into the other in the following course: the early free syllabic rhythm tended to assume a form where the syllables were differentiated as light or heavy at fixed places in the verse. Then the fixed syllabic rhythm was lightened by the resolution of specific heavy syllables, the beginning of mora-measurement. The resolution then became general and the number of morae, not the number of syllables, was reckoned. Finally, the morae tended to arrange themselves in groups and eventually became fixed in a well-nigh unchangeable form. Part of this development was reached before the epic began, but there were other parts, as will appear, still in process of completion. Neither of the chief metres in the early epic was quite reduced to the later stereotyped form. The stanza-form, too, of certain metres was still inchoate.

The mass of the great epic (about ninety-five per cent) is written in one of the two current forms of free syllabic rhythm, about five per cent in another form of the same class, and only two tenths of a per cent in any other metre.”

1087 “After the composition of Ramayana, and since that time prosodial genius has been very active and the variety of metres that had come into vogue was such that Bharata treated the subject Chandovīciti in chapters 14 and 15 of Nāṭyasāstra. Bharata defines the tunes of a metre in quantities laghu or guru fort fixed places. Kohala has a section on prosody. According to Bharata and Kohala, whose main sphere was histrionics, the rhythm of the metre must appear to be a spontaneous effusion of the thoughts and sentiments of the actor on the scene.”

1088 Metric Varieties are based on mere number of syllables, admixture of long and short measures, or number of morae (mātras).

Sloka is free syllabic, a stanza of four pādas (feet), in two verses (hemistichs) of 16 syllables restricted to guru and laghu syllables in some fixed places. This is the definition —

1. Hopkin’s, Great Epic, Ch IV
2. Regnaud, La métrique de Bharata, AMG, 2, Paris.
Akarachandas is fixed syllabic and this is varnavṛtta, e.g., Rāṭhoddhati, Praharṣipī, Rucirā Mitrāchandas counts by morae such as Puspitāgrā, Aupacchandasikā, Aparavaltra and Vaijalija

Ganacchandas has morae in groups e.g.,

"Arya, Aryagiti, Upagiti, stanzas of two verses, each verse containing eight groups of morae, the group of four morae each, but with the restriction that amphibrachs are prohibited in the odd groups, but may make any even group and must make the sixth group, unless indeed this sixth group be represented (in the second hemistich) by only one mora or four breves, and that the eighth group may be represented by only two morae. The metre is called aryagiti when the eighth foot has four morae, upagiti, when the sixth foot irregularly has but one mora in each hemistich."

1089 Among earliest writers on Laukika or classical chandas, are Kraustuki, Tandin, Yāska, Kāsyapa, Sañjaya, Rāṭa and Māndavya and these are mentioned by Pingala Abhinavagupta quotes from Kātyāyana, Bhatta Sānkara and Jayadeva

यपेक्ष कालायनेन—
‘वीरस्य मुद्रणानां कर्णेन सर्वमा संयज्ञ |
नायिकावरणेन कार्य वसरस्तिष्ठादिकयम् ||
शारूरविदिंशा आयंदेशु मन्दाकान्ता च दक्षिणे।’
यथा ज्ञ्यातित्वेनिन्द्रस्य महाश्लोकेन अवस्तमवुधंपित्ये पदवितम्।

"This Bhatta Sānkara seems to be a Saivacārya like Abhinava. A Śaiva called Śankarakantha is known to us as the father of Ratnakara, the author of śrutikāramāṇḍalitika. Aufrecht mentions two more Śankaras, one, son of Ratnākara and commentator on mahābhāṣṭotra and another writer on prosody called jñānaratman who wrote a work on metrics called अवस्तमवुधंपित्। Bhatta Śankara quoted by Abhinava is probably a commentator on Chandoviciti

1090 Jayadeva wrote a Chandassāstra in the form of aphorisms. He is quoted as a master on metrics and music by Abhinavagupta in his Abhinavabharati and he must have therefore lived in the

1. सर्वम् उत्तमानां इत्यादि अवस्थानानि भवेद्रवेद्यादान |
"He is twice mentioned as a writer on Prosody by Namśādu in his Tikā on
early centuries of the Christian era, unless we take him to the 2nd or 3rd century B.C. when the sūtra style was in vogue. There is a commentary by Har-ata son of Bhatta Mukula who lived about 900 A.D.¹

¹091 Pingala's Sūtras² do contain a section on vedic metres, and many that are now obsolete, but they were meant only as a treatise on classical prosody. Pingala's treatment is similar to that of Agni Purāṇa (Chap 328-34). Pingala invented a code of mnemonics which has become so popular that the systems of Bharata or of the later Janasraya have not been adopted by writers on prosody. Pingala uses eight gaṇas of three syllables य, म, त, र, ज, म, न, थ and long and short sound measures guru and laghu (ग and ल) and the formula is यमातारजमातासंहणम्.

There are commentaries on Pingalasūtras by Halāyudha,³ Śrīhar-āśarman, son of Makaradhwaja,⁴ Vānīnātha,⁵ Lakṣhminātha son of Rāmayabhatta,⁶ Yādavaprakāśa,⁷ and Dāmodara⁸

Nārāyana's Vṛttotkritāta⁹ and Candrasekhara's Vṛttamauktika¹⁰ are almost Pingala's paraphrases and the latter is in 6 Prakasas called by its author Vārīka of Pingalasūtras

¹092 Janasraya Chandoviciti¹¹ begins with a reference to king Janāsraya, and his sacrifices

Budda [OC, I 199 Namisadhu, I 18] The manuscript is dated sam 1190 (1184 A.D.) Nārāyana Ḍhāti in his commentary on the Vṛttotakārah quotes Jayadeva and his definition of the Upanātras metre. Jayadeva is twice quoted in Rāmacandra Buchendra's commentary, Pancikā, on the Vṛttotakārah.

1 BRL, No 72 of 1872-3 See P K Gode in Poona Orientalist, I 33
2 Ed by Weber, Ist VIII and with the commentary of Halāyudha, Bibl. Ind., Calcuta by Visvanāthasastri and in Kāvyamala, Bombay.
On the supposed identity of Pingala and Paṭanjali, See Ist. VIII. 158. Pingala's name occurs in Mahābhāṣya
3 Printed, Calcuta
4 OSC, (1904), 5
5 Mātra, X composed in 1600 A.D
6 Tanj IX 8928
7. Adyar, II 39
8 Ibid
9 IO, II 308 There are Prākrita Pingalasūtras with commentary by Raviśa and Viṣṇunātha son of Viṣṇunivāsa (Ibid. 809)
10 Ibid 818, Adyar, II 39
11 See M B. Kavi's Edn. in part in Journal Travancore Sri Venkateswara, Madras (now defunct) with a valuable Introduction
If Janasraya is identical with king Mādhavavarman II of Vīṣu-kundin dynasty who bore that title, he would have flourished between 580 and 615 A.D.

Janasraya's quotations from various ancient writers are of historical value. Among these, are Bharata, Vararuci's Udbhayabhusāṇkā, Śūdraka's Padmaprābhāta, Kālidāsa's poems, Asvaghōsa's poems, Sunārapandya's Nitiadvıṣṭukā, Kumāradāsa's Jānakiharaṇa, Bharavi and Vikatanitambā. These authors flourished before the 6th century A.D. Apart from these quotations, there are compositions of the author, one of which a Dandaka applying to God Kumāra and king Janasraya in double entendre is worth a repetition.

Vīṣu-kundin dynasty ruled over the tract of the basin of the Kṛṣṇa and Godavari and perished by 650 A.D. and Kubja Vīṣuvardhanaa defeated them about 616 A.D.

1. Bhoja quotes the following verse as an example for Punardhu, a woman who marries a second husband.

Here it means the expression of Vikatanitambā.

Namisēdhu and Bhoja quote the following verse:

And this verse is introduced by Namisēdhu in the following words:

which means the maid ridicules the vocal clearness of the husband of Vikatanitambā.
### EXPLANATORY CHART.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janasraya's sutras indicating the code of mnemonics</th>
<th>Significant letter (consonant)</th>
<th>Significant vowel which represents the quantity</th>
<th>Prosodial symbols</th>
<th>Pugala's code for the same quantity</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangas (गंगा)</td>
<td>स्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>गाः (ga ga)</td>
<td>पराङ्गी</td>
<td>The vowel indicative of the gana (quantity) is found in the first letter of the code word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadiya (नदी)</td>
<td>न्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>नम (ma-gana)</td>
<td>परताङ्गी</td>
<td>ज in la in tarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra (चन्द्र)</td>
<td>प्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>पाः (pa-gana)</td>
<td>यताङ्गी</td>
<td>अ in स in सतव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanur (ननु)</td>
<td>न्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>नम (ma-gana)</td>
<td>अंकरा</td>
<td>अ in र in कहांत</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nûnamsâg (नूनसा)</td>
<td>न्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>नम (ma-gana)</td>
<td>बालान्ति</td>
<td>अ in रो in लेलमाल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krînsângï (क्रिंसांगी)</td>
<td>क्</td>
<td>६००</td>
<td>१००</td>
<td>क्र (kr-gana)</td>
<td>लचेनु</td>
<td>Thus III is indicated by अ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhivaráś (दीवराश)</td>
<td>द्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>दा (da-gana)</td>
<td>विमान्ति</td>
<td>Ull is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurunte (कुरुतं)</td>
<td>क्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>कू (ku-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ע in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesrkvâb (तेसरकव)</td>
<td>त्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>ता (ta-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ע in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibhâtuś (विभातु)</td>
<td>व्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>वा (va-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sâtvât (सतवात्)</td>
<td>स्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>सा (sa-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taratnâ (तारतन्)</td>
<td>त्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>ता (ta-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacharatâ (नचरतान्)</td>
<td>न्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>ना (na-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamalini (कमलिनी)</td>
<td>क्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>का (ka-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolâmâlāś (लोलमालाश)</td>
<td>ल्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>ला (la-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharryamastuteś (धर्यमस्तुतेष)</td>
<td>ध्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>धा (da-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runtimayurôma (रूतिमूरोमा)</td>
<td>र्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>रा (ra-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayamaravarâ (जयमारवरण)</td>
<td>ज्</td>
<td>निल</td>
<td>००</td>
<td>जा (ja-gana)</td>
<td>कालन</td>
<td>ع in is by आ and ए,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This was prepared by M B Kavi and used in his introduction, etc.
"The system works upon 18 symbols represented by the last indicative letters, while eleven of them are also known by the initial vowel of the word thus for 11 out of 18, symbols are indicated by two letters each (a vowel as well as a consonant). For instance, 

and a (अ) represent gana of three short vowelled-letters which according to Pingala is na-gana '||, similarly t (ट) and ए (ए) represent bha-gana of लिङ्ग, k (क) and आ (आ) represent ja-gana, आ (आ) and ए (ए) ragana, औ द (द) and ए (ए) stand for 5 letters of ra-gana and ना (ना) laga of पिङ्ग, औ द (द) and ए (ए) stand for bha and लगा (लगा) ना (ना), औ द (द) and ए (ए) stand for ra-gana and gur ना (ना). For example, we shall take vrillt called Sragdharā which consists of गाँधार, आ, ठ, द, न, त, म, ड, ब, ड, ब, ड, ब, ड, ब, ड, ब, ड, ब. The above example was cited by the author.

Take for instance Nandini of the 13th Chhandas,—hirai (हिराई) which means ध, र, ई, ए.

Again Prabarshini requires gakom which are equal to ग, अ, क, ओ, व औ द औ त्रिनम यज्ञि विनाशे श्रव्यम.

m means that यत्ति or caesura comes after the third place.

To show the relative merits of the three systems, their code words are quoted below for vrillt कॉण्वादा of the 25th Chhandas.

Janāsraya—नैण्य: = नै, आ, न, न, उ

Pingala——

भोग स्मृति श्री नौ गृहोत्त्रिक्य वश्यय १७—७—१८

सामग्ननननग

सेवक गन्धर्को पिपिको यांग रित्र गणग मारोप भि भि।
Bharata—

Another recension reads

Kavikanthapāsa is a treatise on poetical composition and deals mainly with the auspicious character of letters and their combinations. This is the last verse—

1093 Jayamangalācārya wrote the hand-book Kavisikā in the time of king Jayasimha (1094–1143 AD)

Kedarabhatta was son of Pibveka (Pathvaka) of Kāsyapagotra. His Vṛttaratnākara in 6 chapters is most popular and has been extensively quoted by commentators, Mallinātha, Śivarāma etc. He must have lived earlier than 15th century A.D.

There are commentaries by Panditacināmaṇi, Nārāyana, son of Rāmesvara, Śrīnātha, Harbhāskara, Janārdana Vibhudha, Divākara, son of Mahādeva, [Ayodhyāprasāda, Āṭmārma, Kṛṣṇavarman, Govinda-bhatta, Cudāmāni Dīkṣita, Narasimhasūri, Raghunātha, Visvanāthakav, Śrīkanṭha (PR, V 196), Somasundaragani (PR, I 190), Sulhana, son of Bhāskara, Soma Pandita, Sārasvatadasāsvamuni, Somacandragani (PR, III 396, IV 33)] Kavisārddūla, Ṭrīvikrama, son of Raghūsūri,

1. PR, I, 68
2. TC, III 3771
3. PR, III 295
4. Tam IX 8949 Is Śīrāmāsāmi, author of Vṛttapuspathprakāśana a different author? (OC, II 142)
5. Printed, Madras Tam IX 3950 Composed in 1545 A.D.
6. Tam IX 395, Mys 294
7. IO, II, 303, PR, II 190, III 546, composed at Banaras in 1676.
8. IO, II 303, PR, VI 889
9. IO, 1555 Composed in 1740 A.D.
10. OC, I 596
11. PR, V 38,
Nārāyaṇabhatta,3 Nṛṣimha,4 Kṛṣṇasāra,5 Ţārānētha,6 Bhāskararāya,7 Prabhāvallabha,6 Devarāja7 and one anonymous8

1095 Bhāskara wrote Abhinava-Vṛttaraṭṭānākara, on which Śrīnīvāsa wrote a commentary.9

Ṭrīvikrama, son of Rāghusūri and pupil of Vardhamāna, wrote Vṛttaraṭṭānākaraśūtraṭīkā.10

SRUTABODHA, by ‘Kālidāsa,’ is very well known and has several excellences. There are commentaries (CC, I 675)11 by Hārvakirtī Upādhyāya (PR, V 463), by Manoharasarma, by Tārācandra and by Hamsarāja (Mitra, IX 134, IV 297, V 278, VIII 196), [by Mādhava, son of Govindā (composed in 1640), Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva, Sūkradeva, and by a pupil of Meghacandra (PR, III 225)],15 by Caturbhuja (PR, I 391) and by Nāgājī, son of Harṣī (CC, III 140)

1096 Gangadasa was son of Gopālaḍāsa Vaidya of Bengal. In six chapters, he describes in his Chandomanjari18 varieties of metres and illustrates them by verses in praise of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He also wrote Acyutacarita, a poem in 16 cantos and Dinesācarita, a poem in praise of the sun. His father Gopālaḍāsa wrote a play Pārijātaharana.24 He must have lived in the 15th or 16th century A.D.

There are commentaries19 on Chandomanjari by Jāgannāṭhasena, son of Jāṭīdhara Kavirāja, Candrasekhara, Dātārāma, Govardhana, Vamsidhara and Kṛṣṇavarmān

1097 Prastara Works on metrics treat of Prastāra, that is, “all mathematical calculations for the number of vṛttas in each kind which

---

1 Trav 69
2. TC, VI 7176, DO, III No. 1792
3 Trav 69
4 Printed, Calcutta.
5 Mys 639, Adyar, II 39
6 Adyar, II 39
7 TC, VI 7177.
8 Tanj IX 9854; TC, VI, 7178, DO, III No 1794.
9 TC, IV.
10 PR, V, 97 A copy of his Kāṭaṇḍrapaniśkodyaṭa is noted by Aufrecht as written in 1291 CC III 62
11 Printed Benares, Bombay and elsewhere.
12 CC, I 675
13 Ed everywhere PR, V, 453 VI, 893, Tanj IX, No 5032 This manuscript is dated Saka 1608 or 1660 A.D Mitra, VI, 130, VII 246, 266
14 CC, I 885
15 CC, I 163 There is another Chandomanjari by Gopalaḍāsa and a third on Veṇho metres (CC, I. 192)
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declare the number of any verse in its group and the details of ganas of any particular vritta, its number being given," or "permutation of longs and shorts possible in a metre with a fixed number of syllables set forth in an enigmatical form" or an exposition of the science of prosody mathematically developed in the calculations of combinations Pingala describes it in his last chapter and so do other works on metrics such as Vṛttaratnakara.

1098 Čīndāmāni Jyotirn, son of Govinda, of Sivapura composed in 1630 A.D. Prastāręcinīndamāni is in 3 chapters, consisting of a code of rules in a variety of metres accompanied by a prose commentary on Varnapraṣṭāra, Mātrāpraṣṭāra and Khandapraṣṭāra.

Prastāraṇicāra which is anonymous, Prastārapaṭṭana of Kṛṣṇadeva, and Prastārasekharā of Śrīnīvāsa, son of Venkata, deal with this subject.

Prastāras are valuable in the elucidation of rhythms in Indian music.

1099 Other works Vṛttadarpana by Siṭārāma (TC, III 3755), Jaganmohanavṛttasataka by Vāsudeva Brahmānandita (TC, III 2735), Vṛttaraṇārava by Nṛsimha Bhagavāta, disciple of Rāmānanda Yogindra (TC, III 3767)

---

1 ISt, VIII, 425
2 IO, II 805
3 Tany IX 3982
4 Oudh, III 12
5 Tany IX 3995
6 He also wrote Balabhadraoantra and many poems in Telugu. He lived at Kuthārapura which seems to be Guntala on the Godavari.
7 The illustrations are mostly taken from nature and are very fanciful.

कश्यपनाथलच्चस्—

गतितत्त्वशिल्पिक्षितभिन्नसाध्यात शुद्धकाली मन्नदक्षाप्रय तत् |

शुक पुः शुन्दबाघार्तिः शुद्धताशिर्ष निजासूतो बवाली ||

पुष्पतालाष्टिः—

उदितितक्ष देवारें तन्माो बिलाण्डति बरे च उच्रासे पयोधि ।|

विप्रसति कृष्णदे तथा विचित सालिकात हृदकलीकशोव्व ||

रघुस्तलाष्टिः—

कालश्चर्चणे कोकित उद्रे। ज्ञाति काकस्तन्तनेश |

कृष्णत रघुस्तलाष्टिः शंबुप्रयन्ति न काक रश ॥
1100 [Vṛttakalpadṛuma by Jayagovinda, Vṛttakauntuka by Visvanātha, Vṛttakaumudī (i) by Jagadguru, and (ii) by Rāmacarāpa (Oudh XII 18), Vṛttacandrika by Rāmadajālu (Oudh VII 2), Vṛttacandrodaya by Bhāskarādhvarī, Vṛttatararānguni, Vṛttadipākā by Kṛṣṇa, Vṛttapratyaya by Sankararājālu, Vṛttapraṛdīpa (i) by Janārdana and (ii) by Badarīnātha, Vṛttamālā (i) by Vīrūpākṣayājan (Adyar, I 39), and (ii) by Vallabha, Vṛttalaksana, Vṛttavārūnika (i) by Umāpati and (ii) by Vaidyanātha, Vṛttavinoda by Fatehgrī, Vṛttavivecana by Durgāsahāya, Vṛttasudhodaya (i) by Mathurānātha Sukla, and (ii) by Venivilāsa], (CC, I 5968), [Vṛttarāmāspada by Kṣemāvartana Mīra (Oudh, XXII 68), Vṛttasāra by Bhāradvāja, Vṛttasiddhāntamāṇjari by Raghuvaṇātha, Vṛttabhairāma by Rāmacandra], (CC, II 142)

1101 Vṛttā-Rāmāyana (Oudh, V 10), Rāmaśītan Sastrin (Trav 173), Kṛṣṇavyātta and Nṛśimhavātta, Vṛttakārikā by Nārāyanā Purōhitā (Mys 294), Vṛttāmanmāhikā by Śrīnivāsa (Mys 294, 684), Vṛttādyumāna (i) by Yasvanta (CC, I 596) and (ii) by Gangādhara, Vṛttavinoda (CC III 125), Rangarat chandas (CC, I 488), Karuṇānanda by Kṛṣṇadāsa (CC, I 597), Karpasantoṣa by Mudgala (Bik 279), Kāvyajīvana by Prīttikara (Oudh, IX 8), Samavṛtvasāra by Nilakanthāçārya (CC, I 301) Vṛttāmanikosa by Śrīnivāsa (Mys 294), Vānībhūṣaṇa by Dāmodara (JO, II 305, Printed, Bombay), Vṛttamuktāvali (i) by Kṛṣṇārāma, (ii) by Mallārī, (iii) by Durgādaṭṭa (JO, II 3011), (iv) by Gangādāsa, and (v) by Han Vyāsāmīra composed in 1574 (CC, I 142)

1102 [Chandāpaprakāsa by Seacakatāmaṇu, Chandassudhākara by Kṛṣṇarāma, Chandahkalpalatā by Mathurānātha, Chandahkosa by Rāṭtanākharā (PR, III 404, V 193), Chandassloka (Oṣī 1828), Chandassankhyā, Chandascūdāmaṇi by Hemacandra, Chandassudhācūlāhārī] (CC, I 190-1, III 41), Chandāpiyūṣa by Jagannātha, son of Rāma (PR, V 194), Chandomuktāvali by Sambhurāma (PR, III App 395), Chandonūsāsana by Jinesvara, Chandassundara by Narahari, Chandoraṭnakara (JO, 2017, Oṣī 201), Chandomālī by Śāṅgagāhara (JO, 1238), Chandahkaustubha by Rādhādāmodara (Mys 293, PR, IV, 33, V. 192) [Chandovāyākhyāsāra by Kṛṣṇabhatta, Chandassuḍhā by Gaṅgāsakavyākhyā, Vṛttācintāraṭṭaṇa by Sāntarājapandita, Vṛttadarpaṇa by Bhāṣmacandra] (Mys 293)

1103 Vṛttaraṭṭṇāvali (CC, I 191) (i) by Durgādaṭṭa, (ii) by Nārāyaṇa, (iii) by Rāmakara, (iv) by Rāmadeva, (v) by Venkatesa, son of Avaḍhānasarasvati (Mys 639, Tany IX 3957), (vi) by Rāmaswāmi
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[These two extracts from Kādambarī and Avantisundarīkāthā are specimens of exquisite style and extraordinary poetic fancy inculcating ethics and are appended to show how Bāna's ideas have been elaborated as if by emulation by Dandin]

[Extract from Bana's Kādambarī]

आलोकयातुत तावकम्यातापिनिवेशी कश्मीरविन प्रथम। इस हि समस्तविवमंडलोतपलब्रज-विन्यमत्वमारी कश्मीरी श्रीरामरायारिजातपदव्यस्यो रागामिनुकलादेहकतवकताकाचूलै अवस-धनवत्ता, कालकुटा मोहनत्वशीनि, मातिरापा मद, कौस्तुम्परितुविनु, इत्यानि सहसापरिचय-विधीरियंतोदिचक्षा। नृ तेवनविधपरमपिरिवितमहु महारती नत्यतू, कमलपार-कल्लामहसिलितिसिलाप्ति विश्वरातिते अपकमति, मदजलहृदिनांकरायजारियियनमतित्वपरिलक्षितिते अपलमि, न परिचय रक्षात्नाथिनसीत्रे, न रूपमालाकूपते, न कलाम-सतति, न शील परस्य, न वैदेह गणन्यति, न शत्रुमार्यण, न चर्ममल्लक्रिय, न आगमालिक-त्व, न विशेष्यस्वती विंचारतूति, नाचार पालयते, न सल्लुस्य, र क्षण भस्मापारीुरी।

ग्राम्यनगरलेखव पवित्र एव नवयति। अथापालकमंदलपरिच्याविन्यिबिज्ञानितसर्वत्मेऽ परिश्रमति। कमलिनीसचरणवित्तकर्णननितनाभक्षितक्षेत्रे न कर्मजियमराजन्यता पद। अतिरिपतविद्य्याति परमश्रुतहु विविधगामवङ्गनकरव परिस्थलिति, पारण्यसिमपाइक-क्षितमथिसिदारणी निविषय, विश्वसूर्यसमुद्र गहुंतुमाध्यतिता नारायणदूर्विति, अलयभुछु च दिन्याता

तक्षमलिम सुधुचित्रमुदकसमजबनप्पि ढुंढति भूर्जु। तत्र शिप्तकामापारीहित। गरीब बहुनन्यापि तरगुहुदुलचकरा, दिव्यकरारितिर शक्तितविविषस्तति, पातालयहु तोऽबुधु, हिरिविं भीमसाहससच्छायिहु, पारुदिव अतिरिकतिकारिणै, दुष्क्रियाविक दशारामकुश्यपविषय, तवसत्तुमुद्धचतकरिति, सरस्वतीय गहुंतुमाध्यतिता भागिन्ति जनम, गुप्तमपत्रिश्रविभ न स्वृति उद्यासचन्द्रमानापि न बहुमयो, बहुनमिश्येश्व म परस्य, अविजातमहिमम रचयति, शुरु कालकिम परिस्थिति, दातार ज्ञानसिद्ध न स्थरति, चिनिती पाराश्रितिक सोपारप्पि, भारवन्यपारिवर्तो वहुपद, परस्परविश्रृव च बहुआलिम दशायत रजन्यति जगति निज परित्वम तथाहित। सततभृतमायमारोपयत्वपि जायुपजन्यति, उज्ज्वलित।
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सादनाविप्र नीचलसाधनतामात्मास्फोकरौऽति, तोयराजसम्बन्धिप्र तुष्णा सवर्षयति, इङ्करत stupidity देशानाथयायिकाश्रयतिसमात्मातिति, बलोपचारयाहुस्कापि वचिमानमापादति, अस्मतसहोदरापि कृपाविकार, विमहस्वापि अर्णशाददृश्यानि, पुष्पोद्वरतापि खतजनयमि, रेणसमीव लक्ष्मणि कटुष्रीरोति।

यथा यथा चेप चयला दीयादं तथा तथा दीपानिशेषं कषाठशङ्कितिनेन करं केवलपुद्माति।

तथाहि—हेष सवर्णवाचिरात्रा तुष्णापिवस्यनि, व्यायानीतीतिर्तियमुद्गानि, परमशृंगमुडळुक सारणितिचानि, विनामशव्यायो तोहाृधिनियय, विवासोरीणेवभी धनमुदपिनानिकारानि, तिमि रोदुरि शालशालानि, पुरसरापतात्सरणिनयानि, उवर्चितिद्वारा कोचवेगमाहाता, आयाता पूर्णविनियममुनि, सतीशशाला शुकविकारानाथानि, आवादरी दोषाशीविषानि, उज्जालापलुकता सउसुतस्यहुआरानि, शकाकालाब्राहु दृष्टशादुस्कारानि, विसर्जणमुमीतोका वादवशास्तानि, मस्ताना कुष्टनास्तक्ष, कदलिका काकसरिणि, वण्यशाला साधुवासिका, राहुलनिधा चरेशीस्मल्लसः।

न हि त प्रयायमि याःपरिचयत्वायायमि न विभूषणपूर्वो योगि न प्रमुखन्युः। निवायमि नाळेश्वयादापि चालति, पुस्तकापि इत्यावाचाररः, उक्तोऽपि विकमर्ति, कुलान्यिपि सवति, विवचयति वचयति। एवेविबयापि चायत्स द्राचार्य। किमापि देवकेसन परिशुष्टोति निकृष्णनस्ति नीरानाय, सर्वविभिन्नायाविश्वानि च गणिति। तथाहि—अभिप्रेतसमय पूर्वैं चैव समाजकुशलकात्मी शास्त्रे दाशिण्य, अभिकार्यपूवेन भकतिनिवर्त्ति हदय, पुरोहितव्याय सम्माजीनीसिरिस्यान्ति ही दोष, जणासरितानाकालान्यिनि धर्म, क्षत्रियप्रेमेवेवायाप्याय जरायसनसर्वमि, अतिपतिस्थलैन्य याय्यो तत्त्वोदयान्यिनि, चारापैविशिष्ठाप्याय तस्विविधिति, वेददुर्विचरित उत्तस्य युध, ज्ञानजनकाविचरित तिरस्कर्यो साधुवादि, भववशास्त्रप्राचीर रत्नमुयो युध,। तथाहि—केविच्छाद्याविश्वाशिष्ठाणिनिगृहपुस्तकालो महोदयान्यिनि दृष्टशादुस्कार्याभिनिवासिजल्लिहारियामि, सप्तक्षे महोश्याना गंगहलामालोकपरिस्तुण्ड्रममोकोदेतोपवित्ति द्रुतवचुचुवेव रागावेय साधुमाना विवेकविवशकासातास्तपि पूवपिरपनेश्वकस्थायिरेत्तीर्वायामान।

प्रकृतिचुरंतात्युपयोगायनि श्वसदहस्तातमोपगतेन मनसाकुशलविक्रमाय बिन्दुता- युणयाति।

कङ्क महारीक पुख्योधित, मूलिकविश्वास्योधित, मलेश्वरायवेश्वरोधित, वाक्यरेव विचयरेव, रिश्तारेव प्राक्षरेन इव मुख्यमात्रहास्यी चुर्वम्येति, अन्नप्राण शाख्याना इव विचेत, गाढामहासिंहति रागानि न धार्यति, क्षणी इव निर्माणरिश्तीति, क्षणिमयन्यादं रूपं इव परेश सवायति, मृणाविश्वापसाधारं दुखिदेशोऽगुणातिकर्कृच्छ्रूण सत्त्वकस्थायिकि जलपति, सत्यप्रेमितवे
[Extract from Dandin's Avantisundarikatma]

বিদিতমে পাপ বিদিতেজিতগতি পথে ভ্রিং করিতে উৎকার্ষ্য স্বাস্থ্য। যেমন দুর্গোত্র পরিত্যাক্তি পথে পাপ বিদিতেজিতগতি পথে ভ্রিং করিতে উৎকার্ষ্য স্বাস্থ্য। পথে পাপ বিদিতেজিতগতি পথে ভ্রিং করিতে উৎকার্ষ্য স্বাস্থ্য।

- {Extract from Dandin's Avantisundarikatma}
দুদবিধাপি প্যে দুরাচার শূন্যচিনিতাপি সমাচারস্থান সূচীপত্য-তায়লতা পুরুষস্তায়লতা পঞ্চমী শথং পুলাহার্ডুঃ খায়ত্যে প্রাপ্তচিনিতায় খায়ত্যে প্রাপ্তচিনিতায়।

চারত্তায়লতা পুরুষস্তায়লতা পঞ্চমী শথং পুলাহার্ডুঃ খায়ত্যে প্রাপ্তচিনিতায়।

ধারাত্মক সত্যবলিতে বানরবলিতে পুরুষস্তায়লতায় পঞ্চমী শথং পুলাহার্ডুঃ খায়ত্যে প্রাপ্তচিনিতায়।
APPENDIX

शोपिकार्त्तम्

(SRI BHAGAVATA, X, 31)

[For the early history of Gīṭa Kāvyā]

गीत्य ऋषु—

जयति तेजसिः अन्यत्र अनजस्त्वत इतिरा शशाद्वस हि।

दशिव सत्वता दिशुर ताबरस्वति हुदासवस्वां विचिन्वते।

शरदुद्र्स्वरे साधु जातसरससिरास्वरश्रीसुयमण्डा दशा।

प्रस्ऩताय प्रश्नकदायिः सरद निषिद्धो नेष्ठ सिंह सिंहः।

विषजलावयाद्वियं कराशस्वायमराजाः प्रवतनकाद।

व्रजस्यात्राजाहि श्राति भयाप्रभु के वर्षे रक्षित्रा यहुः।

भ यहुः गोपिकानवदो मध्यनिक्षतःहेरिपार्तस्वग्रहः।

विचनसाधितो विश्रुतपि यस्व उदेष्यवान् सात्स्वता कुले।

विरसितमात्र कृपिणधुर्यं ते शरणस्यवृत्ति ससुतेश्चाद।

करसरोहेऽ कात कामद गिरिः देहि मद्वीक्षराहस्यः।

भगजनातिहाः वैर यायिता मिजजस्यवेद्युतम्यस्विता।

मह लेसे मयाकोरस्य नो जलवहानेन चार दशरथ।

प्रणातदेहिना पापकर्मन दुःखचरायुन श्रीनिधेतनम।

पनिपार्षितं ते पदार्शजेन कुश क्षेत्रु गर्भि श्रुतः।

भगुर्याणां गिरी कस्यनात्वं भुधमनोहस्य गुप्तेश्वरः।

विषकरिरिस्य वैर दुःखातिरवरसौद्धम्यायायः।

सत्र श्रास्तिमुखः तपस्तीवै ताबस्तीवरसिरोहित्रत्वम्।

अत्यन्तार्थेन श्रीनिदानात्म वृद्धियुण्डेत ये सानेदा जना।

प्रहसित श्री ग्रेस्विषित विस्नुवं च ते ध्यादीक्षुः।

राजसंस्वदै या इदस्युष कुशक नो मन श्रोमयति हि।

चल्लसी सद्र्गृहांचार्यानां पद्रूव नित्यनिद्धर नाय ते पद्रू।

शििलुतुकृत्रतीव्वेतिः न कालिकाः मनः कांति गण्यति।

दिनपरिवर्ते नीक्तकुलप्रथमाहानन विउदाइत्याः।

वनरजस्तद दशस्यनु महामन्सि नस्मर बैर यप्यति।
APPENDIX

(SRI BHAGAVATA, X. 47)

[For the early history of Daśa-Kānya]

[रागप्रमाणोऽस् तथा भक्तिमवतितामपि कृप्यांगमाः।

तिक्रेत्यस्तत्तत्त्वमपि वैवन्द्रमवस्योऽविविधोऽपि नरसोविने न।]

गोपिकोवाच—

मङ्गल किंतुबंधो या सुप्रसार्ष वर्णम्। कुचविद्विळितमालात्स्यक्रमस्यविबिधिः।

वहुः मधुपरित्वादिनीन्ना ब्रह्मव यदुडयस्य विवेंद्र वस्य दूसरसेरवः।

सहदर्शवर्षा खा मोहिनां पालिका समवस्य इव तथस्तत्वन्तंस्तवावः।

परिवर्तित कर्ता तत्पदमर्छुपर्या अपि वन्हा दृष्टेत पुरुषस्मोकाकालै॥

किफिन्द्र बहुमहे गायसि तव यदुवनमविपत्तिमहायणोवर्ती न पुराणम्।

विजयसखि सहीनां गीतायात तत्त्वसः क्षणितकङ्कवर्षस्तः कल्पणतांसिद्धः॥]
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*The name Asoka is said to be found in the XIth Edict. Under the circumstances of extreme improbability of the chronology, it requires complete verification and examination. See V. Smith's *Asoka.*
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[Vidy JL Selections on various topics]
अंक 50
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अमराज 55
अमगाहार 945
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अमगाहारक लोक [Tanj, No 19098]
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अनगरेशा (d) 451
अनगवली (d) 672, 784
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�नतसाह 526
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अनतचारा (आपूरि) 541
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नाटककथासाहित्य
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अनपोतनावक 779, 879
अनभोज 620
अनवेष 888
अनवेषनवरित (d) 84, 781 1682
अनवेषाराव (d) 19, 114, 246, 666
अनवेषास्यवदेय 354, 733
अनामपत्तीले 464
अनिष्ठ 904
केनिस्तधरित 544
by देशराज
by साहित्व
Appayya Dikṣṭa's father's father was Ācārya Dikṣṭa (called Ācāṇḍikaśita). Ācārya Dikṣṭa had two wives—the first belonging to an orthodox Śaiva family and the second to an orthodox Vaiṣṇava family of repute known as Śrī Vastuntācārya vamsa. In the days of Ācārya Dikṣṭa, more than three centuries ago, inter marriages between orthodox smārtaś and vaishnava were not unknown in South India. He had by his second wife Totorāmbā four sons of whom the eldest was Appayya Dikṣṭa's father, Rangaśāyana who, like his father, performed many vedic sacrifices. He is known to have written many works on Advaita Vedanta—the Āgavastavaśyāmuktra, the Viṣṇugādārpana, etc. He had two sons, the elder being Appayya Dikṣṭa, the younger Ācārya Dikṣṭa, the paternal grandfather of Nilakantha Dikṣṭa. Appāṇa Dikṣṭa was the original name of our author and the honorific 'appāṇ' was afterwards added to it in recognition of his greatness as a literary prodigy. Ācārya Dikṣṭa was much praised by King Kṛṣṇadevarāya: "When the king, during his visit to Conjeeveram,
worshipped God Varadarāja in company with his wife and retinues, Ācārya Dikṣita composed the verse—

"Beholding a woman glittering like gold and looking like Lakṣmi, Varada fell into a doubt and looked at his bosom (to see if Lakṣmi were there) " The God mistook the Queen for Lakṣmi, suspected that His consort had quittep her permanent place in His bosom and looked at His bosom to ascertain whether she was there The king was very much pleased with Ācārya Dikṣita’s poetio description which is both original and suggestive of His (the king’s) greatness and consequently honoured him with the title Vakasīhālācarya Dikṣita [V A Ramaswami Sastri’s Introduction to Sūdhākara-banda, Annamalai University, pp 95-108]

Appaya Dikṣita is said to have lived in 1520-1591 according to Adayapalam Inscription See V Mahalingasastri’s Age of Appaya Dikštā, JOR, II, 225-237. In his Introduction to Yādavābhyyudaya, (162, Srirangam) the date is given as 1552-1626.
Abhirama [TC, III 3823]
Abhiramanakashti* 187
Abhiramanakavy 252
See Ramayana
Abhiramanagalabhy [CC, I, 26]
Ganadheevitor
Abhiramanabhyapti Saryg
Abhiramanap (d) 779
Abhiramanarac (d) 779, 879
by Anaya
by Manek
Abhiramanvar 209
Abhiramanabhyapti=(Mananshah)
Abhiramanadak (d) 586
Abhiramanabhyaptik (d) 635, 955
Abhiramanabhyaptik (d) 635
Abhirama 121
Abhirama 110
See Abhirama

Abhirahad [PR, II 197]
Abhirahad
Gaurishwarakornirkavya [Uttar 919]
Abhirahad 110
Abhiramad (Kanadabhy) 110
Abhiramad 110
Kanyamahay
Kanyadiy
Abhiramadabhyap (d) 440, 501
Abhiramad 283
by Kanyad 283
Abhiramad 900
Abhiramad [Opp II 7805]
Abhiramakashti
Abhiramakashti
See Abhirama [CC, III 7]

*In para 137 supra Abhirama Kamakshi is described as the daughter of Sahhapat (son of Abhirama) That is an error Kamakshi or Kamakoti is the son of Sahhapat and father of Rama and Krishna In the geneology at page 292 read Kamakshi for Kamakshi This Kamakshi was the son of Sahhapat, and composed the insuspension of Venkatapathraya, King of Vizianagar, in Saka 1810 (see IA, XLVII 81).

Abhiramakamakshi praises Dindima in her introductory verses thus

Prabhote yudda viduyadhipi bhavishya pune nam
Apanigita sradhukam maheke kame prabhava kahityavasastra

Abhirama was also known as Dindimaprabhu (see IA, XLVII, 83) and she might therefore be the daughter of this Abhirama Dindimaprabhu (the lat in the geneology given in page 292 who married Rajanatha and who was father of Arunagirinatha I (see para 133).

In para 137 read Abhirama (Dindimaprabhu) of Kayapagotra had a son Sahhapat and a daughter Abhiramanabhayka. This Abhiramanabhayka married Rajanatha I Sahhapat had three sons Ganaapthya, Kamakshi or Kamakoti and Swayambh Ganaapthya's son was Kama and Kama's son was Somanatha, Kamakshi or Kamakoti had two sons Krya and Rama Abhirama Kamakshi, wife of Rajanatha I, wrote Abhavana-Ramabhyanaya, a poem in 24 cantos on the story of Ramayana (TC, IV, 532).
INDEX

अमृतदन्यमः [SSP, XIX 65]
अमल Sarng
अमलक 242, 482
अमलकशस्तक 301 [MM, II 9-14]
अमलख ऐंकुक

See ऐंकुक
अम्लसाधारणती 99, 235, 949
अम्लमार्गि 364, 519
अनीर 1038
अनीदिशागति (d) 747
अम्लसाधारण p 25
अम्लसाधारण 68
अम्लसाधारण Skm, Subh, 58
अम्लसाधारण Subh, 58, 400
अम्लसाभारी [Sanskrit JI, Cochin]
अम्लसाभ जी by काकराम [CC, I. 28]
अम्लसाभन (d) 727
अम्लसाभनकान्य 730
अम्लसाभनरी 311, 880
अम्लसाभनरी 58, 373
अम्लसाभन 34
अम्लसाभनरी गीत 876, 920
अम्लसाभनरी प्रेक [PR, II 116]
अम्लसाभनरी (d) 693, 755
अम्लसाभन Skm
अम्लसाभन Subh
अम्लसाभनशा (d) 531, 779, 879
अम्लसाभनशा 57, 816
अम्ल Subh
अम्लसाधारण 254
अम्लसाधारणती 542
अम्लसाधारणती 273
अम्लसाधारणती 440

See अम्लसाधारण, 160
अम्लसाधारण 309
अम्लसाधारण 254-D

अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 253
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय अनुक्रम 242, 505
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय अनुक्रम 242
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय (G K) 468
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 160
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय (अभिज्ञानकरिणाय) 160, 718
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय Skm
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय Skm [1727]
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय Skm 305
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 259
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 110, 111, 117, 685
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 306
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 940
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 27, 28
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय I 134-5
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय II 138
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 373-B
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 733
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय Subh, 307
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय Subh, Sarng
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय [Opp, II 1727]
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय Skm 919
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय (अभिज्ञानकरिणाय) 455
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 825
अभिज्ञानकरिणाय 993
अभिज्ञानसीमा p. 42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nirmala</td>
<td>886, 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimsa</td>
<td>70, 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkāra</td>
<td>885, 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Wāmāt [IO, 2543]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Sāṅgava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Koṭlārājaśeśvar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Anonymous</td>
<td>920, 932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Śrīkṛṣṇa</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The names Nirmala (CO, I 32) and Trimalla are in correct*
INDEX

अनकेस्वर 1064
अनुसस्ति 815
अद्दशा 33, 276, 624
अक्षर 965
अद्यक्षोधरण 545
अधेश Subh
अधाराणी

by अग्नि 311
[Printed in Kāvyaraṇākāra, 258]
अर्थंषरचन्तप् [Op p., II. 2585]
अर्थमेशनाटक (d) 780
अर्थिनराज 1064
अर्थसरयू [Oudh, V 4]
अर्थमुनामक 655
अर्थमुनामक 121
अर्थमुद्रक वैश्वदत्त 286
अर्थमुद्रक 175
अर्थतन [CC, I. 35]
अर्थस्थोकी 207
अर्थस्थोकी 487
अर्थस्थोकी 257
अर्थस्थःस्तानाकारिका:
[Tan No. 10604]
अर्थस्थःस्तानाकारिका 257
अर्थस्थःस्तानाकारिका 355
अर्थमुद्रक 818
अर्थमुद्रक 919
अर्थमुद्रक Subh
अर्थमुद्रक (d) [CC, I 37]
अर्थमुद्रक 175
अर्थमुद्रक (d) [Oop 4105]
अर्थमुद्रक (अनेक) p 28
अर्थमुद्रक Subh 486

अर्थमुद्रक 758, 1041
अर्थमुद्रक (अनेक) 546
अर्थमुद्रक (अनेक) 198
अर्थमुद्रक Subh 779

आ
आह्नीक 373-A
आह्नीक 546
आह्नीक 198
आह्नीक Subh 779

आलस्यायन p 2
आलस्यायन 775
आलस्यायन 447
आलस्यायन 286
आलस्यायन 373-B
आलस्यायन 200
आलस्यायन 82, 200
आलस्यायन 180, 200
आलस्यायन 506
आलस्यायन Subh 779
आलस्यायन Subh 271
आलस्यायन Subh 122
आलस्यायन Subh 786
आलस्यायन Subh 786
आलस्यायन Subh 786
आलस्यायन Subh 786

आलस्यायन Subh 786
आलस्यायन Subh 786
आलस्यायन Subh 786
INDEX

Anjneyabijay 541
Akhyanath 752
Akhyanaraj 594
Aodat (Goda) 205
Atmanitya-vibhag 1048
Atmanabhas

Saktikshadham
Gospanadibhasa

See Suddaratanama

(He wrote his commentary on Guru rajnamala in the Kamakoti Mutt in the time of Mahadeva V (Sankaracarya)—the 69th Aarya (1704-1746)
Atmanaram (Mere) of Bombay
Saktikshas

See Saktipadhita
Atmamandjesvastuti 254F
Atmanaram 298 613, 649, 876
Atmanirdh 329
Atmanandinivas 314
Atmabhujitvad 1064
Atmanavay p 18
Atmanabhas Subh
Atmanabhasapatt 25
Atmanand (Bhadra) Subh
Atmanandbhash 172
Atmanandbhash 329
AtmanandtolraSt 143
Atmanaraham 867
Atmanaraham [Tam, No 17669]
MahaAakalashahtita
Atmanaraham 235
Atmanaraham 544
Atmanaraham 57, 528, 668

Adivaram 945
Adivaramvartar 1064
Adivaramvartar-koop 210
Adivaramkar 270, 271
Adivaramve 206
Aadad Pady
Aadad (Aanandakavyakarita) 333
Aadad (Aathwabalarakarita) 439
Aadad (Bhikshuman) 62
Aadad (=Thi Aand)
Aadad (=Aaadadar)
Aadad (Bhikshuman) 172
Aadad (Bhikshuman) 72, 820
Aadad (Rajankar) 76, 858
Aadaddeva-Par 528, 544, 546
Aadadkavya 339
Aadadkosh (d) 786, 879
Aanandjapti 899, 919
Aanandgana 1064
Aanandgiri 271
Aanandavasodh (d) 781
Aanandavadharkan [Opp, 4737]
Aanandparval (d) 711
Aanandparval 213
Aanandamoord 542
Aanandavas Sarng
Aanandwadavanishdham 28, 55
Aanandavas (=Aand) 441, 476
Aanandvani p 42
Aanandvand (Borooah) 649
Aanandvandavan 222, 223, 542
by Saraswatinanda
by Kavikunjpur
INDEX

आर्याविघ्नकान्य 881
आर्येश्चक 143, 312
by विषेश 312
by नीखठ 248
आर्यापत्ति [Taj, No 11320]
आर्यापत 180, 312, 903
by रामचन्द्र, by गोविंद 305
by विषेश 305
by अंदेश 886
आर्यस्तुतिज [CC, I 53]
by आनंद, by विद्वेश, by विद्वेश, by विद्वेश, विद्वेश
आर्याजित p 26
आर्याजित (अजु=अजु) Skm
आर्याजितक्रणा Skm
आर्याजितक्रणा Sarng, Skm
आर्याजित (रामाजीयं) 143, 831, 875
आर्याजित (सम्प्रभु) 875
आर्याजित Pmt
आर्याजित (M.A) of Faridpur
शिफात
शाश्वतीमीतिलोक SB II
आर्याजित महाभारत [Spv, III 103
by कालियाद 743
on the life of Sir Ashutosh Mukherji]
आर्याजित 318
आर्याजित महाभारत (d) 664, 1007
आर्याजित महाभारत 451
आर्याजित महाभारत 252
आर्याजित महाभारत 311
आर्याजित महाभारत 352
आर्याजित 1002

आर्याजितमृत्यु 373 B
आर्याजितमृत्यु 89
आर्याजितमृत्यु 945
आर्याजितमृत्यु
by जगतमहापात्र [BhU, 227]
आर्याजितकालक सुभक
आर्याजितकालक 210
See काल, काल
आर्याजित 305
आर्याजित अन्यगार (अण्व) 494
(=नक्कुमृत्यु)
आर्याजित अवजीर (d)
(on Ramayana)
आर्याजित अवजीर (d)
(on the prologue to Mudrārāksasā)
आर्याजित (in prise on Sri Kṛṣṇa)
आर्याजित (on the stry of Mahābhārata)
उपमान्यतःमनस्य (like Kseme dra's Cārucaryā)

इ

इण्डिक सुभक
इण्डिक p 1
इण्डिकमोरोगाणि 200
इण्डिरापरिणय (d) 165, 777
इण्डिरापरिणय
by रामचन्द्र 254
by शुद्ध 544
इण्डिरापरिणय 322, 323
by शुद्ध 544
by विनयविजयगाणि
इण्डिरापरिणय 322, 323
by विनय 544
इण्डिरापरिणय 322, 323
by विनय 544
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>935</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>इंद्रसमापिक (d) 169, 777</td>
<td>इंद्रबल 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हंसमतीराम (d) 169</td>
<td>इंद्रतम्मल 718, 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हंसबेला (d) 672, 784, 877</td>
<td>इंद्रसम्पत 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हंसबेला Subh, 374</td>
<td>इंद्रसेन 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हंसविब Sarng</td>
<td>इंद्रामुग 561, 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हंसजनी p 2</td>
<td>उ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

उदयमलूरि 112
उदयमानुकाल्य 254
उदयसज 195, 442
उदयवर्ह 844
उदयसुन्दरी 478

[See J C Ghosh, Gleanings, Annals, XIII 197]

उदयराकर 27
उदयरकरशि 330
उदयालिस 99 Sm
उदयालुकर (d) 563, 877
उदयानारायण (d) 663, 672, 955
उदयानारायण 31

उदयानारायण

by चुंबीसिंहसिंह 252
by नारायणशालिन 730
by शाक्तेश्वर 123

उद्वाहण 548
उद्वाहणवश 506
उद्वाहणवशल 125
उद्वाहणवशलीर 235
उद्वाहणवशलीन (d) 746
उद्वाहणवशलीन 169, 323, 695
उद्वाहणवशलीर 254
उद्वाहणवशलीर 323

by रुपरोहिणीभर
by माधव 323

उद्वाहणवशलीर 220, 328
उद्वाहणवशलीर (d) 790
उद्वाहणवशलीर 272, 802, 820, 925, 953, 955
उद्वाहणवशलीर 830

उद्वाहणवशलीर (Sanskrit journal Tiruvadi, Tanjore)

उद्वाहणवशलीर 318, 470

उद्वाहणवशलीर 501
उद्वाहणवशलीर 501, 575, 783
उद्वाहणवशलीर 668
उद्वाहणवशलीर 440
उद्वाहणवशलीर 76, 199, 297

उद्वाहणवशलीर 501
उद्वाहणवशलीर 501, 575, 783
उद्वाहणवशलीर 668
उद्वाहणवशलीर 440
उद्वाहणवशलीर 76, 199, 297
These are all in prose, the first three being novels. He lived at Rayarakhali, Barisal, a few years ago. 

The following genealogy of the PATTIM BHATTACHARYA (Patten) family is of much interest. [Between 1800-1850 AD] Bāl I (as Gauri) had three sons, Bhavādāsa, Sānka and Paramēśvara I. This Paramēśvara had five sons, Bāl II (Mahārṣi) (as Gopālākā) Bhavādāsa, Vāsudēva, Subrahmanya and Śākara. Of these, Bāl II had 3 sons Paramēśvara II and Vāsudēva (see para 170) and Paramēśvara II had a son Bāl III and his son was Paramēśvara III.

Bāl II (Mahārṣi) is mentioned by Uddānda in his Kōkilaśānti (See pages 169-170).

See Int to Tat Teamdu by V A Rameswami Sastri (Annamalai University) 87-92.
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कर्णाकथापूर्ण by सुङ्कराज 721
by केरलसिद्धि 179
कर्णातक 778
कर्ण युद्ध Subh
कर्ण 29, 825 848
कर्णजीवन जय Skm
कर्णमहाभाद्व य सरंग
कर्णपौर्ण्य Skm, KVS
करण 945
कर्णासाहित्य [CC, I 81]
कर्णिरिद्वंद्वक 505
कर्णिपलिन्तं नंदोदि 328
करणाकर 516
कर्णाकथादत्त (d) 879
करणानंद
भामीनिविलासलीला [NP, II 120]
करणप्रसन्नतयागीण 494
करणानंदकाव्य
by इलितिवोलालित [CC, I 82]
करणार्थहरी 311
कर्णराज Skm
कर्णोककर 291
कर्णेश Skm
कर्णकुलहुल by इलितिवोलालित [CC, I, 82]
करणीद्र 63, 70
कर्णपदक (d) 880
कर्णमार (d) 584
कर्णस्तरकार्यस्लोक (d) 254-E
कर्णमूलण 898
कर्णसताय 1101
कर्णदुरी (d) 68
कर्णज्ञा (मधुरविपुलरित्र) [Uśvar 897]
कर्णाकथापूर्ण Subh
कर्णादेव 400, Skm
कर्णानंद 544, 1101
कर्णामृत 298
कर्णांश्री [TC, VI 7257]
(Here Sātyāyaki praises Arjuna and
Kṛṭavarmī praises Kṛṣṇa)
कर्णावतास
by लोकसाहित्य [Bh, 236]
कर्णोपास Sarng
कर्णराज 477
कर्णपरमवर्ष Sarng
कर्णरसायनी
by राजनवेशम 254
कर्णरसायनी (d)
by राजनवेशम 659
[IPQ (1928), 562]
कर्णरससायनी 928
कर्णरससायनी [CC, III 15]
कर्णरससायन 286 286
कर्णरससायन 373-B
कर्ण Subh
कर्ण (करण f)
कर्ण 396 Sarng
कर्णक 69
कर्णकालाप 110
कर्णकौपिन्य 544
कर्णकुर 1028
कर्णकुरिधिः 1047
कर्णकुर 863 (a)
कर्णकुर (d) 708
कर्णकिंचित्सप 490
कर्णविलास 68
कर्णादेव 459
कर्णवती (=श्रीकिंचित्सपाय)
श्रीकिंचित्सपाय [MB I]
An anonymous poem Here in the colophon mentioned in the shikshantarit (mentioned in the shikshantarit)
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कविकथार [O.X, 135]
kविकथासरण 68, 268, 844
kविकथपूर (शरसमन्दिरसन) 228
kविकथसरसायम 194
kविकथपरिचिता 921, 922
by वार्द्वाद
by शंकर [MM, II 9]
kविकथपरिव (कवि-सरसायम) 96, 368
921
kविकथपरिविता 921
kविकथापरिवार 491
kविकथज 438, 521, 525
kविकथज (शरसमन्दिरसन) 254-H
kविकथम स्व
kविकथपपिता 251
kविकथपद 514
kविकथपदक (कवि-सरसायम) 921
by विष्णुदास
by कविकथपमुखपाल्य
kविकथपपीदी 269
kविकथपपीदीच 514
kविकथपमख [Opp, 2785]
[Quoted in Kāvyalāṅkāra Kāmadhana
kविकथम 924
kविकथपमालक शम
kविकथपमालक [of Kāśi, Surya, JI]
kविकथम (कवि-सरसायम) 921
kविकथम 318
See विकथपमालक
kविकथम
kविकथपसोवशी [TC, V, 6226]
kविकथपसोवम 806
kविकथपसोवमण 907, 1048
kविकथपसोवमन [CC, I 87]
On the present head of the Mutt Candraśekharasaraswati the present author (M Krishnamacharya) composed this Rathabanśha.

श्रीमान् कामिपि विनयविषयब्रजे कोटि परामहम्
कौटिखय लघुत्विक्रिया प्रकटयं चन्द्रार्धीकैर्ययः।
आकारान्तराभस्मूर्तिर्भुजा स्यांस्यं पीतो कोरे
काम्यवासस्य कामकोटिखचित्रो जीयांचिं मालये।

[श्रीकामकोटि-चन्द्रेश्वर]
कांदेर दाद 254, 373-A
कांसे कंचिविजय 254
कांतिकोश संदीपिका 211
कांतिक [Quoted in Aucr]
कांपण्युक्तिक [CC, I 96]
by रघुनोताम
काल 923
कालमैत्रिक 273
कालमैत्रिकार्य 216
कालहरि 144
कालिकार्यक्रयाकार 22, 235, 437
कालिकालकौटूक (d) 786
कालिकेक (d) 786
कालिकेकिथात (d) 787
कालिदास 12-24, 282, 309, 331, 615
कालिदास (सर्वकालीय) 372 378-A
[ZDMG (1883), 545
See सर्वकालीय कालिदास
कालिदास (=शुभकालिदास) 252
[CC, I. 98]
कालिदास (रामघोविनय)
लिपुरदरिंद्रशिकाय
कालिदास
माहुरुप्मालासूति [Vidy JI]
कालिदास (रत्नदास)
कुसम्बर [PR, I 114]
कालिदास (विषाकिलोद) 196
[of Katalipada, E Bengal Dled 1987]
विषाकिलोद [JSSP, X]
कालिदासशब्दिक [Opp, 6725, 6883]
कालिदाससिद्ध 24
कालिदाससिद्धि Skim
कालिदासशब्दिक [Opp, 5508]
कालिदासप्रकास 855

कालिदासभाषाः (=शब्दरभाषाः) (d) 24
कालिदासभिख (मौलिक) 1095
[MM, II 216]
कालिदासमुक्त 542
कालिकांदिराशिरोमणि
हिन्दीपालन [Lata Hiptopadēs]
कालिपालकार्य 84, 748
सलामसाक्कमाकाय
युगांश्विमी
विनिर्लाभनम
आधुनिकाविवाहमहाकाय
देवतामास 743
[Translation of Rabindranath Tagore's
work. SPV II 6, 50, III 81, 191]
कालीपादाद 323
बृहतवस्तीचित्रक [CC, II 1]
कालिशवदशाहार्य (of Barisal) [SC JI]
कालिशहस 760 [Printed Ucanada]
कालिस्तोल 309
काले (Kale M R) 262, 622
कालेकोठूल (d) 786
कालेश्वर 484
कालेश्वरिहरुमार्ध 494
काल्य (उद्वर्क) 563
काल्यकठोडार 921
काल्यकल्पक 1 0
काल्यकल्पक 544, 921
काल्यकल्पक 359
काल्यकल्पक 900, 940
काल्यकल्पक 877
काल्यकेकार [Uadh XVII 14]
काल्यकोठूल 888, 955
काल्यकोठूल 921
INDEX

काव्यकौटस्यम 918, 921
काव्यकौटस्यम 905
काव्यसार  [CC, I 101]
काव्यकारिका 921
  by रामचरिणि वाराणसीगी
  by कवित्रेद्र
काव्यचित्र 743
काव्यसार 1100
काव्यसारविचार 921
काव्यदर्पण 151
  by मनोक्षर [MM, II 17]
काव्यदारकिनी 898
काव्यदीपिका 921
  by कवित्रेद्र [Opp II 8182]
  by गोविन्द [Opp, II 919, 1048 1812]
काव्यपरिणाम 921
काव्यपरिश्रम 852
काव्यप्रकाश 116, 848, 905
काव्यप्रकाश
  महेश्वरप्रकाश
    [Ed Cal San. series with a fine analysis in English and introduction Printed Bombay]
काव्यमानोहर 285
काव्यमीमांसा
  by नारायणशास्री 727
  by राजेश्वर 828
काव्यगुण 906, 921
काव्यगुणकर
  by वेशयाम [CC, I 102]
काव्यसार 921
काव्यसंग्रह 921
काव्यसंग्रहविचार 921
काव्यसंग्रहसम्पूर्ण 921
  by शिबराम [PR, II 190]
काव्यसंग्रह 906
काव्यसंग्रहित 768, 909
काव्यसंग्रहकल्प 921
काव्यसंहित 372
काव्यसंहित [Quoted in Vṛttivārtika]
काव्यसंहितासम्पूर्ण 151
काव्यसंहितासम्पूर्ण 921
काव्यसंहितासम्पूर्ण [Bendall's List, 837]
काव्यसंहितासम्पूर्ण 919
काव्यसंहितासम्पूर्ण 496
काव्यसंहिताच 464, 816
  by सोमेश्वर 116
  by दक्षिण
    [Ed with com. by क्र्ष्णा देवा सास्त्री, Ed with com by D T Tataoarya, UP JJ]
काव्यसंहिताच 70, 339
  by बामभट 869
  by हेमचन्द्र 866
काव्यसंहिताच 852
काव्यसंहिताच 852
काव्यसंहिताच 864, 921
काव्यसंहिताच 110
काव्यसंहिताच 888
काव्यसंहिताच 921
काव्यसंहिताच 827
  by षरथ 881
  by सामभट 815
काव्यसंहिताच 856
  by नरसिंहचार्य
  by षरथ 820
काव्यसंहिताच 826
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>काशीपति [TV, IV 7596]</th>
<th>सहीतगानावर्णवाच्य</th>
<th>काशीपति 777, 787, 1064</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>काशीपति (स्त्रीतिति)</td>
<td>आशा etc.</td>
<td>[SALI /]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काशीराम 473</td>
<td>से अमृतसरजा</td>
<td>काशीकल्पन 937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>काशीविधानाध्याय 273</td>
<td>काशीविधानाध्याय 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काशीविधानाध्याय 883</td>
<td>काश्यप 955, 966</td>
<td>कासार 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काश्यप 955, 966</td>
<td>कितिश्रीमला 746</td>
<td>कितिश्रीमला 746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कासार 205</td>
<td>कितविश्राम [ULHNS 1056]</td>
<td>कितविश्राम [ULHNS 1056]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by नमस्तमार्थ</td>
<td>by नमस्तमार्थ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>किंपच (d) [CC, I 56]</td>
<td>किंपच (d) [CC, I 56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरतनवल्ल 923</td>
<td>किरतनवल्ल 923</td>
<td>किरतनवल्ल 923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरतन प्रभू 175, 251</td>
<td>किरतन प्रभू 175, 251</td>
<td>किरतन प्रभू 175, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरतनच्यायोग 'd) 180</td>
<td>किरतनच्यायोग 'd) 180</td>
<td>किरतनच्यायोग 'd) 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by कसराज (G/18)</td>
<td>by कसराज (G/18)</td>
<td>by कसराज (G/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 49, 89, 183, 490</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 49, 89, 183, 490</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 49, 89, 183, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 541</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 541</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 541</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 541</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 500</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 500</td>
<td>किरताराजीगंग 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by नरसिंहार्थ</td>
<td>by नरसिंहार्थ</td>
<td>by नरसिंहार्थ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by दोरसाभ अवयार्त 52</td>
<td>by दोरसाभ अवयार्त 52</td>
<td>by दोरसाभ अवयार्त 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किलोरक Sthik</td>
<td>किलोरचारित 544</td>
<td>किलोरचारित 544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किलोरकल्ल 542</td>
<td>किलोरकल्ल 542</td>
<td>किलोरकल्ल 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कीर्तराज 1034</td>
<td>कीर्तराज 1034</td>
<td>कीर्तराज 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कीर्तकर्ण 328</td>
<td>कीर्तकर्ण 328</td>
<td>कीर्तकर्ण 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कीर्तरूप 328</td>
<td>कीर्तरूप 328</td>
<td>कीर्तरूप 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by रामराय</td>
<td>by रामराय</td>
<td>by रामराय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by वरदाचार्य</td>
<td>by वरदाचार्य</td>
<td>by वरदाचार्य</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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कौतुकाचितामणि (in praise of Caitanya) [Bpr, I 68]
कौतुकपद्तीम 1064
कौतिकमुर्दी 111, 116, 855
कौतिनचन्द्रेश्य [CC, I 108]
कौतिनराजगि [CC, I I 21]
कौतिवंच 952, 955
कौतिनमारयण 86
कौतिनजालवल्ली 311
कौतिनज 329
कौतिलता 408
कौतिनभुव्न 67, 751
कौतिनविजयराज 440
कृंसरि (d) 786
कृंसरसंस्कार (d) 790
कृंचनालिकान 314
कृंचनक 314
कृंचनव 316
कृंचन मार 792, 1067
कृंचनमारस्त 1067
कृंचनमारु 175
कृंचनकालायान 178, 1056
कृंज Sm
कृंजर (कृंजर 9)
कृंजविवाचकवांतं 646
कृंजकुतुक [TC, V. 6220]
कृंजकुतुक राजराज (रामकृतं) 715
कृंजकथी K S [MB JI]
कृंजकथानिर्देश (B A)
साहा etc [Many JI]
कृंजसीमति 60, 310
कृंजसत्व [PR, I 114]
b)y काईदास (बलमद्युत)

कृत्यवकित
श्रीकृष्णस्वरूपमालिका
कृत्तिदुहुळिदु (d)
by र्याम्पा (R)
[Many JI I 8]
कृत्तक 809, 845
कृत्तिदेशी 374
कृत्तिकालित्रि 105
कृत्तिकालित्रि 105
कृत्तीकालित्रि (d)
by उपद्रावसेन
कृत्तीकालित्रि (d) 628
[Ed with comm by Jayacandra Sastri with tr and notes by Vedavdas and Bhanoud, Bomdery]
कृत्तीकालित्रि 792
कृत्तीकालित्रि 254
कृत्तीकालित्रि 108, 849
कृत्तीकालित्रि 919
कृत्तीकालित्रि 904
कृत्तीकालित्रि Sm
कृत्तीकालित्रि 542
कृत्तीकालित्रि

नीतिशास्त्राभ्यालय [CC, III 38]
कृत्तीकालित्रि 620, 888
कृत्तीकालित्रि 10, 16
कृत्तीकालित्रि 235
कृत्तीकालित्रि 138
कृत्तीकालित्रि 306, 526, 699
[VC JI]
कृत्तीकालित्रि
See कृत्तीकालित्रि 212
कृत्तीकालित्रि

(=अपर्याप्तमात्ववस of Kanci)
चंद्रमार्टीका [TC, III 3532]
Delete in the foot-note the words "His life is described in a poem by Rangasami Tattacarya of Kumbakonam"
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कुलशेखरदेव 338
कुलशेखर आलवर, 278
कुललेखर [Mentioned in Hārāvali] [PR, II 59]
कुलोपुर गोहाल 207
कुमार (मात्र) (mentioned in Auc)
कुमारविलास [TC, VI 6924]
कुमाराधार 143, 529, 896, 927 UOJI

by J. G. J. Chatterjee 494
कुमाराधारवलय 143, 862
कुमाराधाराकथा 235
कुमाराधारदेव 941
कुमाराधारविविध [Opp 1219]
कुलाधार (d) 784 [TO, 1183]
कुलाधारकथि (d) 694
कुलाधारकथादात (d) [CC, III 33]
by बाबासाहे
कुलाधारकथाविलास 518
कुलाधारकथी (d) 709
कुलाधारगुरुदासी (d) 779
कुलश (संस्करणीय)
पटकर्कर्तीक [CC, I 118]
कुलशक्तमारमककथा [CC, I 118]
कुलशर्वचु 541
कुलशर्वविजय (d) 162, 779
See विकटकृत्तण
कुलशर्वदेव 400
कुलशर्वादि (d) 787
कुलशर्वर (d) 451
कुलशर्वविजय (d) 55, 877, 880
कुलसत्तक 220
कुलसाकारमवर्ती (विवि)
ईश्वाहानगरणि
पत्राधार [Surya JI]

कुलसाकार 514, 889
कुलसाकारचय 782
कुलसाकारक्षण (d) 786
by अचछानगर अलास तित्तलनाथ [TC, VI 7184]
[In para 786 the name कुलसाकार is wrong Ed. Vizianagaram by K Rangacarya]
कुलसाकार राज 544
कुलसाकार तित्तलनाथ 180
कुलसाकार [Oudh 896]
by रामाचर वैमिनककथा [CC, I 144]
कुलसाकारचय 207, 296
कुलसाकारम 529, 883, 922
कुलसाकारमलिक 526
कुलसाकारविजय 207
कुलसाकारविजय 919
कुलसाकारविजय [Bendal's List, 50]
कुलसाकारकथि 264
कुलसाकारकथि (d) 727
कुलसाकारमलिक 104
कुलसाकारमलिक (d) 778 [Hpr II, 33]
कुलसाकारचय (d) 565, 672, 779, 877, 955
कुलशर्वक 271
कुलशर्वदेवलक्ष 210
कुलशर्व 558
कुलशर्व (पामाकरपुन) 902
कुलशर्व
See शेषकृत्तण
कुलशर्व (पामाकरपुन) 666
कुलशर्व (पामाकरपुन) 777
कुलशर्व (पवित्रकृत्तण) Sarng, Subh
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कुश्य (श्रीकुश्य) 254
नदिनिरित
कुश्य 928, 1101
उत्तरदिपिका
कुश्य 32
भरतचरित
कुश्य (सारस्वत)
शम्भौप्रयासित (d) [Rice 264]
कुश्य (शब्दवृत्त) 110
कुश्य 545
पञ्चनासचरित
कुश्य (आचार्य) [CC, I 67]
हृद्यीर्द्ध
नंदीचरित [Opp, II 310]
कादेशचरित
भगवतचरित
कुश्य 329
नन्दोद्योज़का
कुश्य 928
साहिष्ठातरिणी
कुश्य कर्त्तारार्थ 541
कुश्यकोरापुपमजीरी 287
कुश्यकाराहिङ्ग 494
कुश्यचरित Sm, Subh, Sau ng
cuśyacarita (नारायण जय)
ताराशालक [CC, 117]
कुश्यचरित 132
उपायरिणय
कुश्यचरित 53
भारतविनयार्था
कुश्यचरित (रुद्यानाप्रतु) 346
कुश्यचरित 541
रघुनाथविजय
कुश्यचरितराज 224

कुश्यदेव 1090
कुश्यकपिलार्दर 784
कुश्यकर्मी 215, 338
कुश्यकपिलवर्मन 290, 293
कुश्यकार
See सात्तपाय्यकपिलम
कुश्यकंकर 816
कुश्यकपिलवर्माहारिण 213
कुश्यकर्मीत 251, 702
कुश्यकृ (कृ) चुंमल 225

[See Annals, XIII 1-16]
by रामजन्द्रसह 702
Anonymous
कुश्यकस्तूल (d) 702, 778
by P C Diwanji
कुश्यकोरामिक
हस्तक्राय
[On the early history of the Sikhs
Printed Lahore]
कुश्यगीत 298, 1001
by सोमनाथ
Anonymous
कुश्यगीति 176 TV, VI 7275
by सान्तेश
कुश्यगिर्यार्थ
[Of Asua, Rajpur Revis ed Subdakalga-
drama, (revd 1843 1936)
कुश्यचन्दरास्सम्हापार
मैदमजूना
(A collection of poems, SO II VI 95 )
कुश्यचन्द 330
कुश्यचन्दसह (K C.) (d)
कुश्यचन्दस्युदय (d) 733
कुश्यचन्ददेव 251
कुश्यचू 542, [TV', VI 6982]
by श्रीसुदारी (बानाल)
by परशुराम
INDEX

Anonymous 251
by उपमायजीर 306
by मानवेद 251
by गणनी 126, 451, 481

कृष्णदास [Quoted in संपीतकालायण]
(Quoted in संपीतकालायण)
कृष्णदास (कृष्णदास अत्र)
सहायक कारक
कृष्णदास
गीतगोपीपति
[MM, II 38 Composed in 1780]

कृष्णदास (मैथिल) 297, 694, 709, 999
[MM, II 45]

कृष्णदास (सत्यरामनरु) 251
कृष्णदास भद्रकीर्ति (भद्रकीर्ति) [Sury Jl]
कृष्णदास भद्रकीर्ति (भद्रकीर्ति) [Sury Jl]
कृष्णदास भद्रकीर्ति 922
कृष्णदास
कलावतीमारू (d) 787
कृष्णदास 96
मेहूत्रथपथा 318
गीतकम्यक 1064
गीतगोपीदर्पना 29
कृष्णदास (ग्राम) 544

श्रीमान्माधवार्थी स्थानिकमीतिप्रतिस्वागत सदाचार
पन्ना श्रीनमानुषीय सुवाचििसिस्वरूपः आसवमः जगदार्थः।
श्रीवार्तिसहीतेः कलिताशिर्तोस्वालकः च कल्पसारिता
हेमसारमीश्शमितिसम्पादित चतुर्दशां पारदर्शिः ॥
[श्रीवार्तिसतर्कारविवरि]
INDEX

कुष्णपाराश (of Pattambi) [I'c, I]
कुष्णपाशमासूत 225
कुष्णबालकवी [VC, I] 291
कुष्णज्ञात्मकपरकाज्ञात्मक 211, 983*
[of Hosadurga, Mysore]
परकाज्ञात्मक Edwin (of Pattambi)
[II Mys Sans College (1935) Com-
posed in 1914 ]
कुष्णमातिकाव्य 251
कुष्णमातिकाव्यक (d) 251, 801
by अनतदेव [PR, V 436, Nepal Library]
कुष्णमातिकाव्य (d) 778 II 24
कुष्णमातिकारण (d) 373-B, 767
कुष्णभक्त Sarng
कुष्णभक्त
इत्युत्तरण [CC, III 140]
कुष्णभक्त 27
रघुबल्यास्या
रामगीता [CC, II 23]
कुष्णभक्त 1102
छंदवल्यास्यार
कुष्णभक्त (हितिनगरमधुपुर)
See कुष्णमातिकाव्य
कुष्णमातिकाव्य 251, 301
कुष्णमूर्ण 546
कुष्णमातिकार्य (R) 318, 488
कुष्णमातिकार्य (कपिस्ताद) 493
कुष्णमातिकार्य (प्रारं) UP JI
कुष्णमातिकार्य (R V) 473, 477, 496,
610, 612 [Sah JI, VC, I]
कुष्णमातिकार्य 28, 863-A
कुष्णबिल 750
प्राणेशचिदंबर (d)

कुष्णमित्र

वीरविजय ईश्वरप्रसाद (d) [CC, I 595]
कुष्णमित्राचार्य 863 A
कुष्णमूर्ण 254
See सतीविवाहसादक
कुष्णमूर्ण (सतीदेव) 787
कुष्णमूर्ण (रवीन्द्रनाथ) 97, 319, 521
कुष्णमूर्णकिमसम 787
कुष्णमेन्द्र (P R) [VC, I]
कुष्णमहेन 838
कुष्णमयकर 937
कुष्णराज 266, 1102
कुष्णराजकल्याण 546, 747, 938
कुष्णराजगाप
by शीर्षकवम [Mys 7]
कुष्णराजगृहालोक 200
कुष्णराजवपु 165
कुष्णराजवर्षीय 344
कुष्णराजमहावंदय 200, 344
कुष्णराजविजय 938
कुष्णराजविजय 252
कुष्णराजबोध्यार 200, 287, 411, 486
कुष्णराजस्युद्य 200, 546
कुष्णराजीयविजयविदास 546
कुष्णराजेश्वर 200
कुष्णराम 81, 245, 353
कुष्णराम
शतरंज [On chess, Bul 707]
कुष्णराम 704
कुष्णराम (Mrs) 441
कुष्णशिला (d) 767, 778

*In para 498 delete words "among in 1934" misprint.
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by Madan 251, 316
by krishna 251
krishnagamritha 251, 289, 301
by naraayana 289
krishnagamrithasatya 251
krishnagamritha 246, 301
by Motiram [Oudh IV 9]
krisnagamrithasatya 251, 1001
by Prakash
by sheshadri
by parakrama
krishnagamrithasatya 5, 290
krishnagamrithasatya 251
krishnagamrithasatya 224
krishnagamrithasatya 1095
krishnagamrithasatya
by ramchandra
by shankaramar 169
krishnagamrithasatya 542 [TC, VII 7581]
by virendra
by krishnavamritha
krishnavamritha (d) 242
by anirvasa (bapu)
krishnavamrithakavya 873 H
by shanker 254, 542
by prakash
by sheshadri
by dukkara 169
by shankarama 141
krishnavamrithagita 1047
by naraayanaswamy
krishnavamritha 251

krishnavamrithasatya 517
by krishnaswamy
by narsimha
krishnavamritha 290
krishnavantra 1100
krishnavantra 180
krishnavantra
rasmanava [CC, I 117]
krishnavantra 883-A, 901, 1064
pramanaartha [CC, I 117]
krishnavantra (gokulam
[of Pindigheva Sury J]
krishnavantra (saraasvathi) 546
krishnavantra (panchavat) p 25, 492
krishnavantra 542
See krishnavamritha
krishnavantra [Hpr IX, 16]
harimatinupathakalika
krishnavantra 1093
krishnavantra (tataayogam) of Navadunga (1866) [CC, II 28]
rupanavyantra
aryatattvam (d) [IO, VII 4203]
krishnavantra [MM, II, 7]
amrtaashatya
krishna (upadrasta
krishna (chitraraghunath) 940
krishna 659
krishna (mushindhu)
traipadapyan (d) 777
krishna (shatadhri) 900
krishnavantra 919
krishnavantra 218, 291, [TC, VI 7127]
kashyapamritha Kola
कृष्णचार्य [Opp, II 310]
हरिजीतन
कृष्णाचार्य 153
श्री अम्बादीकित
कृष्णानद 544
सुदर्शनपुर
कृष्णानदक 542
कृष्णानद महादेव
See अत्तर्थिकरणनाथपरिशिष्ट
कृष्णानदनारायणी 301
कृष्णानदवाचपति 764
कृष्णानदपाल 1064
कृष्णासुधा (d) [Tny, VIII 8673]
by लोकनाथपत (of Kānci)
कृष्णासुधा 251, 529
by यहुविद्विशकस्रिवासराव
by बादेविक (आलेन)
कृष्णासुतरारीका 251, 301
कृष्णासुतमहार्षिब 251
कृष्णायन 251
कृष्णाराम 1100, 1101
कृष्णार्किति 721
कृष्णाबीजीय 251, 254
कृष्णाकारदर्पण 981
कृष्णावतारचरित [DC, XXVII
10108]
कृष्णावतारदाख 544
कृष्णाधक 273
कृष्णासुति 932
कृष्णाहिंदूसुदी [MM, II 34]
by विलमगन
cृष्णोदय 251
केकाल्य 314
केश 464

केदारनाथास्वामीपाठिन (of Lermores)
मधुरालाप [Sury Ji]
केदारनाथसिद्ध [of Bharatpur, MB Ji]
केदारनाथायुषयोपाध्याय [SC Ji]
केदारनाथरायण Skm
केदारपीप सkm
केदारकाठिदास 179
केदारमैव 179
[Dead in 1924. For his letters and
equisite poetry, see SC Ji]
केदारसरण 160, 537
केदारशास्त्रकाव्य 271
केदारगीत 65, 67
केदारचण्ड 314
मधुरवर्ण
विरहणविलास [Ish 59]
केदारविनोवत (d) 563, 877
केशव Skm
केशवमाधवकाव्य
[Ashī Library, Vinayapadam]
केशव Skm
केशव 852
काञ्चीमुत
केशव (उपत्याय)
मुहररानसारिलर [CC, II 106]
रामासिद्ध 252
केशव (उपकेशव) 542, 544
आनदछाएकन
सिद्धचूरु
महादेशचूरु
केशव
समीपलांकरक्षर्य
केशव (अनंतपुर) 1004
शापणवलहरी [PR, VI 28]
केशव (हरिवंशधर्म) 895
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keshavachandra Ghosh</th>
<th>783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keshavachandra</td>
<td>Skm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keshavachandra (d)</td>
<td>Pady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keshavachandra [CC, I 121]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [A poem describing the life of Keshava-
| cha, King of Multan] |
| Keshavachandra (d) [Mentioned in Natak
| canakia] |
| Keshavachandra SS, 373-A |
| Keshavacharya 777 |
| Keshavacharya (M A) (Bansidh) |
| Sankatbhatta | Keshavacharya [Buk 243] |
| Keshavacharya |
| Raman K [CC, I 127] |
| Keshavacharya (Pady) |
| Keshavacharya |
| Mahavairavaswami [CC, I 127] |
| Keshavacharya 781 |
| Keshavacharya (Marañj) 254-B |
| Keshavacharya 400 |
| Keshavacharya Skm |
| Keshavacharya 919 |
| Keshavacharya 28 |
| Keshavacharya 329 |
| Keshavacharya 702 |
| Keshavacharya [PR, III 395] |
| Nalodabyottaka |
| Keshavacharya 257 |
| Keshavacharya 632 |
| Keshavacharya |
| See Keshavacharya |
| Keshavacharya 814, 928 |
| Keshavacharya 496 |
| Keshavacharya |
| See Keshavacharya |
| Keshavacharya 783 |
| Keshavacharya 175 |
| Keshavacharya 323 |
| Keshavacharya |
| AmSCRIKAkakiri |
| Keshavacharya |
| Keshavacharya 122, 169, 323 |
| by Apragavacharya 255-K |
| by Vardavacharya |
| by Bhrupabah |
| by Udaya |
| by Narasimha |
| Keshavacharya 1074 |
| Keshavacharya [CC, III, 20] |
| Keshavacharya Skm |
| Keshavacharya 180, 323, 715 |
| Keshavacharya 24 |
| Keshavacharya 175 |
| Keshavacharya [CC, II 102] |
| Mahesavahottam |
| Keshavacharya 787 |
| Keshavacharya 280 |
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कोमिटिमेड 482
कोमाटिये 432
कोमलसार 254-J [MB, II]
कोमलचारक 254-A
कोमलधारक 504
कोलनविकायण 373-B
कोलाहल Skm
कोलिवान
[Of Āśādhara quoted in Ipi- venskā]
कोलमोसलीय 163
कोलिवानकायण
[Poem in 21 Cantos by Gangādharmica, Utkalā Brahmm of Sambhalpore
On the history of Patna Raj family of Chauhan dynasty of Chaungath
Division O P Oressa Foudatory States Gazetteer, 285 JBORS, XX 140]
कोलेक्टर (d) 672
कोलक 561, 562, 958
कोहर 958
by पंडितराज [Oudh, XV 144]
कोज़न्यासाल (d) 746
कोमलचित्रायण
कोमलमल (CC, I 131)
कोमलकलाकार (d) 199, 686
कोमलभव्य (d) 786
कोमलपुष्प 254
by विद्यार्थी
कोलुदी 714
कोलुदीआकार 544
कोलुदीदाहिल्ल (d) 575, 587, 626
कोलुदीमिश्रन (d) 672
कोलुदीधार (d) 740, 788
कोलुदीशोभ (d) 492

कौशिल्लिका (d) 784
कमलीपिता 291
कमलसौंद 836
किशोरपुत्र 182
किशोरकीर्तिवाण 346, 692
किशोरदोहाकाय [CC, I 133]
किशोराचार सरनग
किशोरसंग्रह (d) 774
किशोरसाताल (d) 563, 880
किशोरसीकाय [CC, I 133]
by श्रीमान
कृष्णपांत्र (d) 727
कालकैटे (d) 727
किशोरकीर्त (d) 727
क्षत्रियकिश्रु 479
क्षत्रियकिश्रु 498
क्षत्रियकिश्रु 919
क्षत्रियकिश्रु [Taylor I 100]
by प्राणसम्भ [Oudh, V 4]
क्षत्रियकिश्रु 53
किश्रु श्रीम [CC, I 131]
किश्रुडचित्र 255-H
किश्रुडचित्र देव 255-C
किश्रुक श्रीम [CC, I 131]
क्षरस्वत 210
क्षरस्वत 272, 779, 840
क्षरस्वत शुभ 735
क्षरस्वत 1064
क्षरस्वत (ब्रह्म) [CC, I 184]

मीमांचरित [In prose SB II]
केलमकर 1027
केलमकर 402
केलमकर 429, 1099
केलमकरक (d) [CC, I 184]
क्षेमाद्विद्रिः Subh
क्षेमसामना 867
क्षेमानादवाजपेय Kœd
क्षेमीय 669
क्षेमेण्ड्रिः 68, 195, 419, 446, 670, 883
क्षेमाचारिधि 833

ख

लङ्ग 510
लङ्गराजाकाव्य [CC, II 27, 513, 667]
by हुङ्गमान
by नाराज्ञ

ङ्गराजाचित्रित
See गौडाल्हुरी

लङ्गराजाकोकोकराजावर्गनामः
by कोटिलित [MM, II 35]
(a poem on the kings of the Darbhanga State)

ङ्गराजावसवत्तात्त्र 373
शरणधन 254
श्लोकहेतु 256

ग

गंगक 68
गंगवशाधृतिः 174
गंगवृवादः 531
गंगालंग 491
गंगालंगदिति (d) 563, 877
गंगाधर (=गंगाधर) Subh
गंगाधर (बृह) 667, 1096, 524
गंगाधरी 126, 127, 377

गंगाधर 992
गंगाधर
[Hence गंगाधर is an error for गंगाधर]
गंगाधर Subh, Skm
गंगाधर (=गंगाधर)
गंगाधर
[mentional in VIK, XVI 95]
गंगाधर 165 [CC, I 137]
गुणराजचुवःपूर्वकतिः
वहस्ताचुवःपूर्वकतिः
रसप्रभाकरकतिः
डिवीक्षरस्तुतिपारिपारिजातकतिः [Oudh, VII 28]
वृद्घचतुरश्चित्काकतिः
आनंददृष्टीतीरधकतिः
सगीतमशक्तव्याधिकातिः
गंगाधर (अगस्त्यसागिनिगेय) 687
गंगाधर (अस्ताजेयपुजु) 1517, 544, 687
गंगाधर (चूपीर) 657
गंगाधर (चाहल) 165
गंगाधर (र्थब्रुपुज) 165
गंगाधर (तदाशिथिपुज) [CC, I 129]
by गंगाधरी
by मधुकरिन्धारी
by रामस्वति
गंगाधरकिवि 165
गंगाधरसाग Shm
गंगाधरसाग 687
गंगाधरसिध्धि
See कोंडालानंदकाव्य
gंगाधरभाष्य 52

* Kṣemendra's views on Sanskrit Grammar were criticised by Dhanesvara in his Sarsvetaprarthya (Oxf 555) as Kṣemendra-khandana. See Belwalkar, SSG, 99 and P V. Goel's article in PO, I iv 80.
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Gangavignyaktamāna
(of Alipur, Calcutta) [Surya Jī]

Gangadās 397, 737

by Dhīrājadeva
by Kavitārāma
by Dānīkar
by Harīsarkara
by Gangadhāra
by Sākhamahāntīrtha

Gangāstotra [CC, I 140]
Gangāk 272, 309
Ganges 674
Ragavagotak
gajapati vīrārthe nārāyanadeva 1048
Gajatīmrahadrājirā 196
Gajapathalak 325
Gajendrāgradhā (A, B) 468
Gajendrāgradhā (d) 544
Gajendramāha 140, 170, 175
Gajendramāha (a) 256
Gajendrasāh 373
Gajendracāl Subh, Sarung

Gajendracāl 69
Gajendracāl 277
Gajendracāl (krīdāraja)
[Vrāja Jī]
krīdāraja [SMM Jī]

Gajapati SS, Prat [He was probably the father of the poet Bhāmakara]
Gajapati Skm, Subh
Gajapati 600, 661

*He was the son of Devasimhamakhin and grandson of Samrapungava Dīkṣita
of Vāghulagotra No (1) is only a preface to No (2) above. In Tāmp VII, 3277 there is a formula for chess play
INDEX

गणपति (रामपुत्र) 10, 175
गणपति (घनेशचरण) 926
गणभूतिराजी विद्यापीठ [CC, I, 141]
गणपति (कालीय) 1008
गणपतिविवाह
(वाराणसीकाल्य) [SA (1882) 108]
गणपतिदान 64
गणपतिशालिन (of Trivandrum)
गणपतिशालिन [वैषाणाद] 254
श्रीकृष्णभाराचार्यास्तिक
सुरक्षित
गुहराजसति
रुग्नातक
कारातक
तातकपारिवर्त
इत्तमाधिमाला
अन्यापदेश
भूवरित
रसिकभूषण
भूतासार
सुरसेतुक
महामायाकर
गणपतिशालिन [सुपरिचितभूषण]
धर्मसारस [Sury 77]
गणपतिस्तुति 291
गणपतिस्तुतिकादित्य 113, 182
गणपतिशास्त्र Skm
गणेश 225, 753
गणेश [CC I, 143]
गणकालपीठ [Oudh, 1298]
रसेतातिशीलकतारी
भूविदेशकतारी
द्वाराकातसोलकतारी
निद्राधारकतारी [Oudh, 128]
गणेश 886, 964
122
गणेश (अनंतपुत्र) 867, 886
गणेशचरण 166
गणेशपाणिद्वित [CC I 312]
See दुरीविनायकास्तिक
गणेशप्रसाद
ganakshara [Oudh, XII, 38]
ganakshama (भारतीकारिन) Ked
ganaksharabhir (कक्षीकर) [He lived recently at Karawura, Bombay SC II]
गद 290
गदाधर Shm
गदाधर 76
गदाधर 922
रसपाठकar
[Here the name गदाधर is wrong]
गदाधर by इहतात्मसेलद
[JASB (1870) Pro 312]
गदाधर बचनविनायक 862-A
गदाधर (वैध) Skm
गदाधरसान्तराष [SS, I 148]
देवीमानसारस्तिक
गदाधरस्तिक Skm
गदाधर नारायण Skm
गदाधरस्तिक 273
रसिकश्रीवर
[IIHQ, X 479, OJ, III 350
About 1660 A.D.]
गदाधरनन्दन (उत्तम) of Sambhalpur,
See कीसरायनांदकल्य
गदाधरतत्थापाणिय
(of Ichapuri, Ganjam) [Sury 77]
गदापुर (d) 579
गदापुर 52
गदापुरमूर्त 100, 480
गदापुरम् 446
शाश्वासन गदाधर 479
[A. Venkatasubrah, "Authors of Raghavapandavuni and Gadyaçuntamani" J B R A S, (1927) 124]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>गायत्री 306</th>
<th>गायत्रीश्रवण 902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीमहानव 225, 501</td>
<td>गायत्रीमहामन 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीमायण 242</td>
<td>गायत्रीमायण 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीकथक 506</td>
<td>गायत्रीकथक 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीसेन 501</td>
<td>गायत्रीसेन 919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीमहामन 220</td>
<td>गायत्रीमहामन 373-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीप्रकाश 1064</td>
<td>गायत्रीप्रकाश 373 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीप्रकाश 69</td>
<td>गायत्रीप्रकाश 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गायत्रीप्रकाश 213</td>
<td>गायत्रीप्रकाश (Of Khmaka, Gnya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 149]*</td>
<td>गायत्रीश्रवण &amp;c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 520]</td>
<td>[Surya Jl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 55]</td>
<td>गाययात्रास (Of Jeyphore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 12, 505]</td>
<td>संस्कृतकथन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 121]</td>
<td>[Essay on prose on Sanskrit poets, M G Jl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 289, 323]</td>
<td>गाययात्रास, 252, 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 55]</td>
<td>गाययात्रास [N II 456]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास (Of Jhalawad, Rajputana)</td>
<td>गाययात्रास [CC, I 456]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास (Of Jhalawad, Rajputana)</td>
<td>गाययात्रास, 252, 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाययात्रास (Of Jhalawad, Rajputana)</td>
<td>गाययात्रास, 252, 922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The following verse composed by the author of this book (M. Kriibnatna charya) is a summary of all the stories given in the Gayā Māhātmya on Gayākṣētra

*श्रीमत सुधासतस्वलयय स्तवत ननादेव ब्रह्म प्रेमाद्वितीया सहस्रार्थेऽस्मि

यो न: कृष्णशिवायदर्शेऽवनस्वीति सन्तारक्षन सन्तविति।

गायत्रीसेने जनकशेषं इति गायत्री ब्रह्म प्रेमाद्वितीया सहस्रार्थेऽस्मि।
[Ed by Maharudrappa Devappa, Belgam]
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[Cat CP No 1350-2]

[This Krsnadatta received a village (Pachabaraba) as a grant, from the King of Nepal. There is a rumour that Krsna datta was ordered to be hanged for using foul words about the King of Nepal. The King, while on bed, remembered a Hindi poem which he could not understand. In the morning he called the Pandit to explain it. But the Pandit was waiting for the arrival of the sad time. On hearing, he went to the King and the King remembering his past order, and desiring to cancel it, asked what prayaschitta should be done for canceling his order. Thereupon the Pandit told him, that he should offer 10 thousand Rupees, one village, one Elephant and a Salagram to a learned Brahma. So the King did and gave him the above mentioned village. That village is still in the hands of his generations, residing at Hatarba village, P O Jhanjharpur, Dharbhanga.] MM II 47
by Dīnācārya CO I 154
by Sādāsiva was pupil of Paramāsvendra
55th Ācārya of Hāmakotipītha (1584-1586 A.D.) Ātmbodha was pupil of
Advayātma Prakāśa's 58th Acarya (1692-1704 A.D.) Ātmbodha wrote also
Bhaktikalpadruma and Gaudapādolūsā)
Guhraj
Guhrajārya
(of Kallapura S(1)J)
Guhrajātri 52 154
Guhrajātrikāy 254 270
Guhrajātryushāsūny 19
Guhrajātry by Kumāra
(On the hto of Candrasokha II
47th Ācārya of Kāmakotipītha
(1200-1247 AD) mentioned by
Ātmbodha)
Guhrajātryusūny 141 544
Guhrajātri 213
Guh 346
Guhkāritikā 727
Guhkāritikākāvy quoted in SB
Guhrajātryusūny by Bālmūn
Guhrajātryusūny 240
Guhrajātryusūny 305
Guhrajātryusūny [CO, III 34]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>गौतमोक्षित्वान्तन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693, 755, 883-3</td>
<td>गौतममहामहान्, अनन्तलंकार [MM II 60]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>काव्यमहामहामहान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544, 721, 777</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590, 733</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219, 257</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222, 542, 908</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225, 251</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354, 733</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589, 787</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225, 251</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692, 787</td>
<td>गौतमस्तिश्वान्तिन्त्र महायाः सध्विंसति, च च</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

GOVINDA

by PAPATHI MM II 55
GOVINDADITYA 519, 1020, 1064
GOVINDAM 5
GOVINDA (Vakaranthi)
[SB II Stories in prose]
GOVINDAM 5
GOVINDA (of Jyolelakhu)

VIRIKAVERI (probably Godavary district)

GOVINDANATH 123
GOVINDANAND (of Benares)

GOVINDA

(Probably Godavary district
IO, VI 7184]
GOVINDANATHAKSHMAH \ 1043
GOVINDANATHDEVAR

(Principal, Govt Sans College,
Benares SB Jl)
GOVINDANATHAPRESH SHAR
GOVINDANATHAPRESH

[IO, VI 7301]
GOVINDANATHAPRESH [OCC I 164]
AANANDRAJAN

GOVINDA

by VIRIKAVERI [7th, 914,
The poem is Shubhak]
GOVINDANATHDEVAR

[OCC II Stories in prose]
GOVINDAM 5
GOVINDAM 5
GOVINDAM 5
GOVINDAM 5

[mentioned in Srikanthacanta
XXV 77]
GOVINDAM 5
GOVINDAM 5

[Statement of administration in
SB Jl]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>[OC III 144]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>[mentioned by Atmabodha]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>[PR, VI 34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>[Tanj VII 3222]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>[Printed TSJ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goswami (Vidyanand) 253**
**Goswami (Shivanivas) 251**
**Goswamibhavabhushan 785**
**Goswamibhavacharan (ã) 224, 298, 546**
**Goswaminishit 148**
**Goswaminanath 76**

- *Goswaminanath* 253 271
- *Goswamibhavacharan* 222
- *Goswamidasa* 199, 373
- *Goswaminiratna* 149
- *Goswamibhashya* 28
- *Goswamidarsan* *Slkn* 251
- *Goswamidarsan* 224
- *Goswamibhashya* 691
- *Goswamibhashya* *Slkn* 76
- *Goswamibhashya* 373, 884
- *Goswamidarsan* 253
- *Goswaminiratna* 177, 292
- *Goswamidasa* 752

- *Goswaminiratna* 303
- *Goswamibhashya* *BJS* 308
- *Goswami Pmt* 341
- *Goswamidarsan* 392, 641
- *Goswamidarsan* (ã) 563, 877
- *Goswamidasa* 60
- *Goswamita* 75
- *Goswamina* (Sunny Ji) 224
- *Goswamina* 498
- *Goswamina* 908, 1019
- *Goswaminiratna* 314
- *Goswamina* 219
- *Goswamina* 223
- *Goswamina* 220
- *Goswamina* 373-8, *SS, Pady* 373
- *Goswamina* 253
- *Goswamina* 347
- *Goswamina* 254
- *Goswamina* 323
- *Goswamina* (ã) 707

- *Goswaminiratna* 125
- *Goswamibhashya* *KCD*

*Lived in Benares about 1640 A.D.*

- *Goswaminiratna* 155, 544
  - by Chakrabarti
  - by Pancharatna Vekhtsur
  - by Kandiahramath
  - by Mahaprabhu

*Goswaminiratna* 210
*Goswaminiratna* *SMM Ji*
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[MM II 22]

चन्द्रदत्त  251
चन्द्रदत्त  323
by बिनयसेन
by कृष्णचandra
चन्द्रदेव,  Sanyog
चन्द्रदेव
हीरकीसब [CC II 36]

[Accounts in prose of authors,  MG JI]

चन्द्राधर  230
चन्द्राधर  235, 254
चन्द्राधर  354
by शीरोहिन
by ययोदेव
चन्द्राधर  784
चन्द्राधर (मन)  Anonymous  506
by विभुदेव  249
चन्द्रमांचल  733
चन्द्रमांचल  102, 254
चन्द्रमधुबिजय  235
चन्द्रधाम  102, 254
चन्द्रमधुप्रकाश्यम (prose)  (Sorada JI)
चन्द्रमधुप्रकाश्यम (of Multan)  (Sury JI)
चन्द्रमालिक  495
चन्द्रमालीनसरस्त्र  273
चन्द्रमोगिन  Shrin  260
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर (d)  782
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर (d)  787
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर (d)  314
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर (d)  176, 659
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर (d)  673
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर (d)  254, 740
चन्द्रपचिसीविखर  254

चन्द्रविलास (d)  687, 782
by गजाधर
by ग्रन्थमार
चन्द्रवाकरण  260
चन्द्रशेखर  526
अभिनवभारत
चन्द्रशेखर  1064
भारतसारस्मृति
चन्द्रशेखर (विषयनावपुन)  1096
चन्द्रशेखर (संगीतालग्नमूलिका)
चन्द्रशेखर  441
सूर्यनारायणरति
चन्द्रशेखर (जनसिद्ध पुत्र)  199
चन्द्रशेखर (विषयप्रविष्टपुत्र)  55, 618, 667
शाकुणतालटीका
माघटीका
हल्दाचाहकटीका
चन्द्रशेखर (चन्द्र)  778
चन्द्रशेखर
शीरकिशोर

[He was Editor Sarada Died 1935—In this small poem, a citrakavya, the coneguation marks धार्मिक, लिंग etc are imbedded Sarada JI, Prayag I 187]

चन्द्रशेखर (चन्द्रमान्यपुत्र)  166, 167
See दमकक

चन्द्रशेखर (चन्द्रमान्यपुत्र)
by दु खमजन
(19 Century)

See दमकक

चन्द्रशेखर (चन्द्रमान्यपुत्र)
by दु खमजन
(19 Century)

See दमकक

चन्द्रशेखर (चन्द्रमान्यपुत्र)
by चन्द्रनूड  378-A
[CC I 182]

[of Phalgang.  MB JI]
He was sometime Principal Ayurvedic College, Rushkul, Hardwai and lives at Bikaner.

Index

(by K. L. V. Sastri)
INDEX

चिदंबर (अन्नतराऴणपुज्य) 92, 338, 527
चिदंबरसमाधानम् [TC III No 2870]
चिदंबरनाथचरित [Opp 67, 32]
चिदंबरविलास 527
[On sculptures on Cidambaram Gopura, 946]
चिदंबरनाचिरिका 309
चिदिलास 271
चिन्तमनि (रामायणाली) 760
चिन्तमनि-भूपल 56, 142, 1001
चिन्तामणि राज [727]
चिन्तामणि (देवस) 1098
चिन्तामणि
मेघकंदेरस्यायम् 318
चिन्तामणि (पुराणाली) [UU I 189]
चिन्तामणि (लघु) [UU I 189]
चिन्तामणि
by चिन्तामणि प्रोसो [IHQ (1930) 573]
चिन्तामणिज्येत्थिभिः 1097
चिन्तामणि नाह 430
चिन्तामणिविजय 544
चिन्तामणिदीनि (of Naigunda) [SB J]
चिन्तामणिस्वराज
चिन्तामणिस्त्रोध [TC II No 1415]
चिन्ताहरणमहाराय
चोपिन्तिनयन (स्नेहम्) [SMM J]
चिन्तावनायक 145
चिन्तमणा (posters)
चिपुड़ादिल्ल 58
चिपुड़ा 373
चिपुड़ा 542, 768, 909
See रामदेव

चिरुतनाथ श्री
ची आक्ष सुब्रह
चुडालनवियत्य [Opp 5974]
चुडाणि श्रीम
चुडाणिकारण [JHQ (1830), 573]
चुडाणि (d) 563, 955
चुंबन 459
चूजक 326, 502
चूजका 502
चूजकमणि सुब्रह
चंदाओनारायण 168
चंदकपुरीसिलस्तक [TC II No 4199]
चंदविन्यसंस्कृत: (चंदकपुरीसिलस्तक) 219
चंदनमुझ 251
चंदनविन्यस: 223
चंदनदासपुनक 297
चंदनमुक (d) 722
चंदनाय (चान्दनाजनक नारायणपुज्य) 100
Tanj XIX xxv]
चंदनाय (द्वारकनंद) 161
चंदनाय (तिर्यकचंदिनक) 161, 544, 787
चंदनायानायक 145
चंदनायक 373 (k)
चंदनमुख 130, 194
चंदनमाय 160
चंदनविन्यस: 194, 443
[JOH III 256]
चंदनदी 123
चंदनविकारक 64
चंदनसुबुद्ध 64
चंदनसिद्धान्त 440, 501
चंदन 3445

छ्रफ़ कर
छुपित्यश्याम [MM V 2]
छछ 1002
Index

[TC I 847]

[MM II 1]

[MM II 3]

[SC VII V 261]

[a fine work of prosody reviewed in SC VII V 261]

[IO II 229-30 This is a fine summary of Rāmāyaṇa in 9 cantos exemplifying the verse
section of his Sāmāngreṣa (on elementary grammar) See P K
Gode, IO IV iv 32]

[MM II 1 194]

[SC I 194]

[IO II 373-A]

[SC VII V 261]

[SC VII V 261]

[SC VII V 261]
INDEX

Janadevamrta

Kurusapalma &c (Sury Ji)

Janadevapuran

See Khaganajitabha

Janadevamrta (of Phalagunj, Haran bagh) [SB Ji]

Janadstra (of Shahabad)

Vipinavilapa (Sury Ji)

Janadevamantra 1005

Janadevapuran 238

Janadstra 1029, 1100

Janakapuran 229

Janakadrista 235

Jananinandan 54

Janadstra (Raghurajpur) 314, 640, 1023

Janadstra (Goidhrajpur) [UU I 195]

Janadstra [UU I 195]

Janadstra (Vidha Jungle) 28, 297, 639, 646, 841

Deviyamahalayottvika

Mabhakamavartika

Vasundharatvika

Medhrutottvika

Vamaparvattika [CO I 195]

Janadstra (Medhivitaritvika) 473

Janadstra Chakradhipan [SPV]

Janadstra Pandit 422

Janadstra Mishra

See Sarasvamani

Janadasamantman 65

Janadstraamv (Sury Ji)

Janadasamant [of Dera Ismail Khan]

Janadstra [of Sury Ji]

Janadstra (Hariganjpur)

See Nandavakavya

Janadstra (Baktugundu) 158, 708

Janadstra (Raguvamsa) 700

Janadstra (Narayanpur)

Janadstra (Tany, V.1 2753)

Janadstra

ChandniSita 311

Janadstra (Kawaga) 163

Janadstra (Rampur) 1102

Janadstra

Janasita (Janapadakavya) 311

Janadstra

Janasita (Janapadakavya) 311

Janadstra 311

Janasita

Janasita (Janapadakavya) 254

Janasita (Janapadakavya) [NW 252]

Janasita (Srihari) 787

Janasita (Janapadakavya) 311, 863 (a) 819

Janasita (Janapadakavya) 254

Janasita (Janapadakavya) [quoted in Udbhata Bagaim]

Janasita (Janapadakavya) (of Bengal)

Heemapuram [SB Ji]

Janasita (Ksitigarbha) 378, 422, 435

Janasita (Janapadakavya) (of Bengal) 922

Janasita (Janapadakavya) [Oudh, 1318]

Janasita (Janapadakavya) (a) 691, 1064

Janasita (Janapadakavya) 254

by Mukundprasad [CO I 196]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE SCRIPT</th>
<th>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>दुर्विन्धीया [O&amp;T II 199, composed between A.D. 1192 and 1385]</td>
<td>Vishnu-Deviya [O&amp;T II 199, composed between A.D. 1192 and 1385]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेव 314</td>
<td>Nama Devar (Shiv Banshi) 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भगवान् श्रीकृष्ण 213</td>
<td>Vishnu-Deviya 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविन 1094</td>
<td>Nama Devi 1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविनदुन्दिन 293</td>
<td>Nama Devi 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विम्हरस्व [O&amp;T II 199, composed between A.D. 1192 and 1385]</td>
<td>Vambara [O&amp;T II 199, composed between A.D. 1192 and 1385]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविन 328</td>
<td>Nama Devi 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविनवास 583 (a)</td>
<td>Nama Devi 583 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविनस्तंब 289</td>
<td>Nama Devi 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविन 1092</td>
<td>Nama Devi 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नमदेविनदुन्दिन 318</td>
<td>Nama Devi 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डश्रीम 545</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डश्रीमंत 409</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डार्जित 295</td>
<td>Jayakunda Arjuna 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड 1092</td>
<td>Jayakunda 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डश्रीम 540</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड (जयकुण्डश्रीम) Sm</td>
<td>Jayakunda Sm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड (जयकुण्डश्रीम) Sm</td>
<td>Jayakunda Sm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डश्रीमंत 409</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डार्जित 295</td>
<td>Jayakunda Arjuna 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड 254</td>
<td>Jayakunda 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड (उपाध्याय) Kool</td>
<td>Jayakunda (U p a d h y a y) Kool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गुरुविन्धर [O&amp;T II 59]</td>
<td>Guru Vinoda [O&amp;T II 59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड See आणामिलेपाल्यान</td>
<td>See A n a m i l e p a l y a n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड Subh, Sarwh</td>
<td>Jayakunda Subh, Sarwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड Shri, Sarwh</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri, Sarwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड Shri</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड 73</td>
<td>Jayakunda 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डश्रीमंत 1100</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri 1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्ड 73</td>
<td>Jayakunda 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जयकुण्डमंत्र Shri</td>
<td>Jayakunda Shri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The NATIVE SCRIPT column contains text in an Indian script that corresponds to the English translations listed in the ENGLISH TRANSLATION column.*
INDEX

नामङ्गलावव
शिक्षात
वेदिकाश्यामि (मोस) [SU Jl]
नर्यवर्तमानमुनार्योिर 900
नर्यविनःलशः 235, 451
नर्यविनः 214
नर्यविनःस्थिनय 214
नर्यविनः 1090
छद्दशाख्य
नर्यविनः
See नर्यविनःवयरिि [S B Jl Vibly Jl]
नर्यविनः (महानेयेपुिन्त्र) 674, 887
नर्यविनः (भोजेवेपुिन्त्र)
[Makhanlal Mukherji, Jayadra, the poet and mystic, Jl of Dep of
Letteris, Calcutta, XXVIII]
नर्यविनःस्वतःसिद्धान्त (Printed Vibly Jl)
नर्यविनःवयरिि (d)
by नौरेतनमहारियाल
[an informal drama on Jayadeva's life with songs, SB Jl]
नर्यविनःविनासी
(Of Ramagad, Sikana)
सिद्धभेषणवर्तकती
[An Ayurveda kavya]
नर्यविनः 191, 863 (A) 872
नर्यविनःश्रवर्त 199
नर्यविनःश्रम
नर्यविनःरागण (क्रज्ञनक्रज्ञपुिन्त्र) 1001
नर्यविनःश्रवविनःशापिनः
(of Varanasi, Almadabad Sury Jl)
नर्यविनः Pady
नर्यविनःस्वर्त 73
नर्यविनःस्वस्त 767, 85
नर्यविनःशिल्प 101
नर्यविनःकका 494
नर्यविनः 376
124

यज्ञविलास [OC I 200]
यज्ञपराजय
[In prose, Transl of Tagore's work MG Jl]
यज्ञपुरविलास 81, 745, 353
यज्ञपुरवाम 859
यज्ञविनः 44, 866, 1093
यज्ञविनः 1089
यज्ञविनः, Skm, Subh, Sarug
यज्ञविनः
मानसीदास [Bak 708]
यज्ञ (=-भानमत)
यज्ञविनः
by शाक्तिकहम
[In 11 Kallolas Composed in saka
1714 In praise of Raja Ranabaha-
dun Saha, son of Prahnatarayana
Saha, MM No 60 863-A]
यज्ञविनः 191, 872
यज्ञम 158, 444, 540
यज्ञराज [OC I 201]
राज्ञायिनयविलासतरि
शिवराजचरित्रःशः
सस्मातीकाककती
प्रायाततस्तिरिगोतीकाकती
यज्ञराम (हरिमकर्तुः) 373
यज्ञराम विजयन 863 (A)
यज्ञराममराचारी Ked
[About 1632, OC I 201]
यज्ञरामपद्धशः 542
यज्ञराममहादेव 780
यज्ञविनःदुःधियय (Nepal Library)
यज्ञधिन Skm, Subh, Sarug
यज्ञधिनस्वर्त 28
यज्ञविनः 235
यज्ञसिनः 28
यज्ञसिनःस्वर्त 89
यज्ञसिनःगर्भरूप 89
INDEX

- जीवनान्द विवासागर 646, 649, 656, 658, 741
- जीवनोध Slo
- जीवराज 542, 757, 886, 903
- जीवराज [CC I 208, II. 32]
- जीवतामणिक [OCS 250]
- जून 373-A
- जूनीवातुक (d) 727
- जूनीसिद 118
- जैनाचायविषय 546
- जैनवादिदृढ 53, 72
- जैनलिनारा p 43
- जैनविवाहकल्पमूष 1064
- जैनत्रानाथुदोपायम (of Purnea) [SB Ji]
- जैनक Subh
- जैननार 59, 188, 370
- ज्ञानसीर 1064
- ज्ञानक्यावृद्धिक [CC I 209]
- ज्ञानचरण प्रकरित [SO Ji]
- ज्ञानधुरपरवय 253
- ज्ञानयमूर (मदुर) Subh, Sarng
- ज्ञानवारित p 21
- ज्ञानबिलास 163, 311
- ज्ञानबिन Slo
- ज्ञानसागर 235, 441
- ज्ञानसुन्दरी (कविता) 382
- ज्ञानभूषणपतिविद्यांकन वैभवसिद्धिकासागरा etc [MG Ji]
- ज्ञानदूरवदय 323, 767
- ज्ञानकुर 544, 547, Slo
- ज्ञानसुन्दरकलासरसैन 308
- ज्ञानसुन्दर p 43
- ज्ञेन्द्र 27

- ज्ञेतिविद्वाररण 14, p 55
INDEX

श्री
शंकानिधि Śhm
शल्पलम्बाच्छेद Sanyu

द

भमद्रक 166

[In *Tivy* XIX p xi the commentary is said to be the work of Candias'ekhan, son of Sabdas'esa and in Ms No. 3793 that father's name is not given]

समस्थानम 618

बंगोरक्क (ढोरक्क) कुडोरक) Subh

<

विभिन्न 72, 134, 138

विभिन्न (बिभिन्न) 69

बिम 561, 563

बिम बिस्क (बिम बिस्क, बिम बिस्क) Kyś Śhm

बिमिका 562

बिक्षुम 769

बिक्षुमकोत्सवकाश्य 200

बिक्षुमकाश्य 246

बिज्ञक Śhm

बोलिफैका 563

बोलिफैन 352, 1064

बोलिफावालिगितम्

[IO VI 7408 This is in praise of ऋषिदर्शिंग of सिंहाचुल in Viag District]

बोलोस्वादिगितिका 1064

ह

वकारव 904

ढक्ष 272
INDEX

[Quoted in Bhoja prabandha]

[Arsha Library, Visagapatam]

[He was uncle of Nadindla Gopal]

[Died about 1924 at Cocanada]

[Son of Des'ikacarya Born 1892]
His father Peda Tirumalācārya and his grand-father Annamācārya have composed samkītā gītas, Songs on Śrī Venkatesa, in all the rasas [Printed T T D Press Madras]
लोमलदेवम 118
लोकान्य 180
लोकमन्दिरम 180
लोकमन्दिरमहदेव 180
लोकमन्दिरमहदेव 699
लौल 69
खाराज 1050
खाराजबुद्ध 505
शतक्रत
भाषामार्कालिका
[BTC 160 not now seen in Tanjore catalogue]
शिरंबस्र 445
शिरंबस्रकर 27
शिरंबस्रत 86
शिरंबस्रत 491
शिरंमदवर (d) 65, 331, 715
शिरंपंदवर चम्पू 544
शिरंपंदवर (d) 551 A, 877
शिरंपंदवर (d) 563, 877
शिरंपंदवर प्रताप 286
शिरंपंदवर 829
शिरंपंदवर जप (d) 726, 727
शिरंपंदवर जय (d) 125
शिरंपंदवर जय चम्पू
by शिरंपंदवर 779
by रामचंद्र 158, 165
[Tang VII 3044 In paia 158 the name is wrongly given as Sh'sala]
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज 359
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज 359
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज 359
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज 203
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज 359
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज [CC. 1 99]
शिरंपंदवरसदिकर्ज 273, 257, 359
by जगदेव
by राधाकृष्ण
शिरंपंदवर 199
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 646, 666
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (d) [Opp 1849]
शिरंपंदवर श्रम । 125
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 727
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 877
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 280
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 59, 116, 771
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 89
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 987
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (d) 291
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 486
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 277
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 277
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 661, 876, 889
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 251
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 1017
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (विधा) 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (वैश्व) 473
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (दिशादिख) 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (दिशादिख) 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम (पुष्पवाण) 1074
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 787
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 787
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 787
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 513
शिरंपंदवर श्रम 214
INDEX

दक्षिणावर्तनाय 27, 28, 618
dक्षिणीरागमाला 1027
dक्षयान्त्रिक [TC VI 7221]

[Mss R Nos 5284 and 5292 contain other works of Nārāyaṇa Bhattārī]
dश्र No

(- तांत्रिक दशक)
dश्रम बौद्ध 401
dश्रम 503
dश्रमाध (=-साध्वतिक्षा)

[Tanj in 3705]
dश्रंद्व [Opp 6859]

अनात्मायर्म

dश्रंद्व 459, 568, 800, 876
dश्र Shm
dश्र 1066
dश्र सुभूत 1066
dश्र सुभूतिः 1066
dश्रुतुव्र (भारतकृत)

[TC IV No 3425]

by श्रीमानन्दन छोरपाण्याय

[JSSP XVIII & XIX

Translation of Saint Chandan’s novel]

dश्रुतानुय 254, 544
dश्रुतानुय (शंगाद) 517
dश्रुतानुय वृहद 517 544
dश्रुतानुयुज्ज्वलतात 273
dश्रुतानुयालिखित 531
dश्रुतानु 561, 562, 955, 957
dश्रुतिकोह्लौ 960
dश्रुतिकोह्लौय 958
dश्रुतिवन्दुरुत 969
dश्रुतिहस्त श्रवेश 323
INDEX

Srimuulpan kAmpatarieh
Sriataparin [Vidy Ji]
Dnosok [Srom]
Dasaari [Tang No 10482]
Dasaari [Tang No 10355]
Dosapati 842
Dosapati 512
See Nalchampu
DosapatiKampan (d) 85
DosapatiPurpan 78, 501, 544
DosapatiRaham 263
DosapatiNarpan 440, 546
Dosapati 162
by vaekunad
by ShivaVedendoesha
Dosapati (Daraif Khan, a Mahomedan ascetic)
Gakrata [Vidy Ji]
DasaariKampan (d) 576, 955
Dasaari 68 [CO I 245]
by kamsen
by Jagaodar
Barat Subh
DosapatiRaham 869
Dosapati 401
Dosapati (= DosiatiBairiNia) Subh
Dasakpar 286
DasaariKampan
by Gopinath [CO I 247]
DasaariKampar 166, 464, 465, 863-A
DasaariKamparShesh 463
DasaariKamparShesh
by ArupHunter [See Kanyamala I 91]
by GuruNarayan Sen [CO Ji]
DasaariKamparShesh 143, 468
Anonymous
by Dromanbarche N.V.
125

Dasarup Shom, Pady
Dasarup Ram [Sion Kaimn a] (of Soron) [SC Ji]
DasarupPom [Opp 7314]
Dasarup 529, 883
DasarupKambar 833, 922
DasarupKambaran 922
DasarupKambar 104
Dasarup 1012
DasarupKambar 68
DasarupKambar 256-P
DasarupKambar 217
DasarupKambar 121, 273
Dasarup 904
DasarupKambar 252
Dasarup Shom
DasarupShom 235
DasarupKambar 1075
DasarupKambar 162, 220, 563
by Srrangamsham
by MahadevKambaruvarTarka
[Tang VIII 3579]
DasarupKambar 219
Dasarup Shom
Dasarup (d) 588, [TO VI 6911]
Dasarup (= Mahari) 48
Dasarup Shom, Kev, Subh, Pady
Dasarup (ShnamaraPamshaa)
Swarnikayala [TO VI 7061]
Dasarup (Shomyo) 1101
Dasarup
[mentioned in ShomKambar 68]
Dasarup (Gompherep) 10, 30
Dasarup 667
Mahagatak (d)
Dasarup
Kambar (d) 667
Dasarup (Bhishnaput) 667
दामोदर उपाध्याय (सैमिथ) कोड
दामोदरपुत्र 310
दामोदरेव सरंग
दामोदरदेव चक 
सभाविनोद [CC I 251]
दामोदरहट (कल) कोड 
दामोदरदश (खेल)
अद्भुतकरमाल  [CC I 250]
दामोदरमिश्र 53
दामोदरचन्द्रा गोस्वामिन
(of Brundavan)
[Tady नै]
दामोदराकाशिक्षा 49
दाराजा 311
दरवाजा बीघाट 314
दारारि च 309
दारिकाज
पत्रधारुकासूरी [MM II 36]
dिगलिभरणजीवान गये (Suryा नै)
dिविजय महाकाव्य 93
dिव्यानाथ 17, 470, 818
dिनाकर 27
dिनाकर
रूखंशात्तिका [Opp II 201
composed in 1385 A.D]
dिनाकरदेव सरंग
dिनवन्सु (साहित्याकाशिक्षा) JSSP
dिनेशा [CC I 253]
रायाविनोदकाव्य
dिनेशाक [Suryा नै]
dिनेशाचरित 243, 1095
dिनेशचरित by महरानाथसुक [CC I 253]
dिनाकर पद्य, 877, 886
dिनाकर (भागदेशपुरुष) 55, 318, 1024
dिनाकर (उच्छासन्दरपुत्र) 541
dिनाकर (विशेषज्ञान) 237, 541
dिनाकर (नेत्रियोदित्तक) स्तम्भ

| दिनाकर कविवंदन 254 |
| दिनाकर (खुश्राज) श्रीम |
| दिनाकरकिसोर सरंग |
| दिनाकरदेव सरंग |
| दिनाकर महोपाध्याय 45 |
| दिनाकरसत्ता |
| कार्यमातासूरी [Opp 1209] |
| दिनिर किशोर सरंग, सुभि |
| दिनिरवेशदिस्य सुभि |
| दिव्यलीलाभास 919 |
| दिव्यकृति प 2 |
| दिव्यदेवमातालंक नैभ 254-F |
| दिव्यनातिपिन्य 545 |
| दिव्यनन्दन 355 |
| दिव्यपुर परिचय 205 |
| दिव्यपुरुषमाभावदीपिका [Opp 8009] |
by रामाजनसुणि
dिव्यपुरुषवैभव 494
dिव्यवादन 446
dीर्घिता (P V) 752
dीर्घनाथवासु? [Opp II 2251]
दीर्घितकाव्य [TO II no 1440]
dीर्घनाथ
शीर्षकोपकाव्य [CC I 254]
dीर्घनाथसारस (of Multan)
कामाभिषा (Suryा नै)
dीर्घनाथनन्दनातित 286
dीर्घ 69, 604
dीर्घनाथ 235
dीर्घनाथ 581
dीर्घनाथ [TO IV No 3731]
दे खजन 254, 351
बिलामकाव्य [MM II 158]
dुर्गति स्तम्भ |
dुर्गदास 347
dुर्गसिंह 86
dुर्गदेव सुभि, सरंग
dुर्गदेव 1100
Kuppuswamy Sastry's Rep (1919) Poem in 6 Cantos It deals with all artificial forms of enigmatic poetry

by Ramanath [Opp, 2618]

by Ramachand [Nepal Library Th us seems to be a new work]

[Opp 5997]

[TO III No 2475]

(d) 116, 771

(d)

310

(Vidy Ji)

Skm

706, 777

549

[OU I 234]

(Vidy Ji)

(254)

[OU I 258]

Sarung

96

32, 235

Subh

673

Subh

258

Rabindranath Tagore's work SPV III 96

[OU I 258]

430, 923

545

(d) 786

1025

[OU I 259]

(254)

254

922
INDEX

[Ed by Kshitishchandra Sastri, Calcutta]

देवराजसब 210
देवसम [OC III 7]
अमरविलासकाव्य
देवसमस 125
देवसम 129
देवविलासगी 235, 483
देवविलासगी
See हीरसौभाग्य
देवविलासगी by माधवसिंह [OC I 260]
देवशाकर नुसमित 920, 937
देवशालर 308
देवग्रामस्तोत्र 275
देवावतरण 254
See दीर्घानुदान
देवीचन्द्रपुत (d) 634, 672, 955
देवीचन्द्रशास्त्रिन (of Jodhpur)
[OC J]
देवीचारित 170
देवीचारिता 507
देवीचारिता 273
देवीचारिण (d) 783, 877
देवीचारिण 742
देवीचारिण 742
होतिकोलस
वाणीविलास (d) [Sury JI]
देवीकाठामिरतसाहित्य 714
देवीकाठामिरतसाहित्य [OC I 197]
देवीमागव 75
देवीमहानसङ्गलोक 273
देवीमहासंहिता (d) 563, 877, 880
देवीमहाशय 728
देवीमहाशय 825
देवीवीण 180
देवीवीण विभाषितम
by अशोकदास [Sury JI VI]
He is said to be the minister of Lakshmanasena JASB (1905) vol II p 367.

[Lakshmanasena JASB (1905) vol II p 367]

[See paper by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97]

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)

(by B V Viraraghavan in K B Pathak's Comm. vol 97)
INDEX

भंजन (जैन) 102
भंजन (विश्वमुख) 808, 833
भंजन (ब्राह्मदेवपुर्ण) 66
भंजणभिविव (प) 52
भंजणभिविव

by श्रीराम 677
भंजणभिविवलास 25-4
भंजणप्रेत 440, 501
भंजणदेव 374, 400
भंजणदास 266
भंजणपति 56
भंजणपति 271
भंजणपति 410, 501
भंजणपति (सवदेवसुल) 332, 477
भंजणपति (प्राकालोक्त) 477
भंजणपति (उपायुपाय) Subh
भंजणसार 262
भंजणसार 803, 834
भंजणश्रद्धा मिश्र (दिनमणिन)

[of Patan, Sury Ji X]
भंजणबाबा 282, 668
भंजण Padra
भंजणकायाविरित 228, 232, 235
भंजणकायाविरित 104
भंजणकाय 273
भंजणकायाविरित Opa, 6450
भंजणपति Skrn 68, 814
भंजणपति

See राजविन्दुशाक (IO 2079)
भंजणदेव 143, 600, 646
भंजणपति Skrn Krs 69, 470, 637,
817, 818
भंजणपति 323
भंजणपति श्रीमहाविन्दुशाल्य
भंजणपति (रामदासगुळ)
भंजणकायाविरित (d)

[composed in 1360 CC, I, 268]

पर्वाचोर 338
पर्वाचन्द 659
पर्वाेट Subh, 860
पर्वादास 347, 876
पर्वादास Subh
पर्वादेव Subh
पर्वादेव

पुराणरत्नाल्लासक (Printed Bombay)
पर्वादभिविव 25-4, 423
पर्वादभिविव 36-4
पर्वादभिविव 59, 672
पर्वादभिविव 27
पर्वादभिविव 545
पर्वादभिविव 190
पर्वादभिविव 373-A
पर्वादभिविव 547
पर्वादभिविव 816
पर्वादभिविव (d) 758

[Com by सुभाषिक 1860]
पर्वादभिविव 53
पर्वादभिविव 162, 759
पर्वादभिविव

See हलायुध

[IIpr I 193, Haobaron, 507]
पर्वादभिविव 47
पर्वादभिविव 1004
पर्वादभिविव

साहित्यलााक (Odih V 10)
पर्वादभिविव (=पर्वादभिविव) 522, 932
पर्वादभिविव Skrn
पर्वादभिविव pp 23, 24, 165
पर्वादभिविव 552

Skrn

[JASB (1906), p 171]
INDEX
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धोयी 303
भान्नधूषिका 242
ध्वनि 7.55
मुखचरित 254
[TO VI 7305]
मुखचरित (d)
by गणपतिदाहिनी
by जयकृष्ण
मुखवत्स (d) 732
मुखपाल 1071
मुखाभ्युदय 354
मौलपदोष (d) 1042
मूनिकाय (Yady JI)
मूनिन्धापरिका 58
मूनिनमबी 892
मूनिनविक (OC I 273]
मूनिनिद्रामलंग 855
मूनिनतलोक 825

न

नक्षत्रमाला 209 [TO IV No 4800]
[Printed Kavyamala, Bombay]
नक्षत्र 950
नम Smn
नमजित Subh, Sury
नमस्कर 27
नमसूपितम (d) [Opp II 2362]
नमराज
ंशोहलसोल [Opp II 4899]
नमायाप Smn, Subh
नक्षत्र

[He was known as Navabhojara-ja and his Court poet Nysimha author of Nanjaraja Yasobhusana p 19) as Navakahdasa

नक्षत्र 988, 1001
नक्षत्राणयात्रासयुक्तसंप्लु
by नीलकंठ [Mys Sup II]
नन्दराजकृष्ण 9
नन्दराजकृष्ण 1001
नम्बुद्र 527
नगरासिंह Skm
नन्दनकाठियास 252
नन्दमुख 553, 814
नन्दपुरा 1007
नन्दपुराण 162, 241, 781
नन्दधरकृष्ण 273
नन्दराज अनात्र 160
See अनात्र
नन्दभुक Subh
नन्दबाई Subh
नन्दकृष्ण 746
नन्दकुंवारमाओ (गृहसंकल्प)
(of Muttra)
[SC JI etc]
नन्दकुमार 251
नन्दकुमार र 28
नन्दकुमार 363
नन्दकुमार
[mentioned in श्रीकृष्णचरित]
नन्दकुमार (p) 42
नन्दकुमार क वर्णमल्ल 198
नन्दकुमार 307
नन्दकुमार विनायकनाथ (d) [SC JI]
नन्दकुमार 963
नन्दकुमार (p) 42
नन्दकुमार
अभियुक्ताद्वितीय
[Ed and tr by Manmathanath Ghose, Cal Sans Series, Calcutta]
नन्दकुमारकृति 975
नन्दकुमारविजय (d)
by विनायकरामास [IO 607]
नन्दकुमार 563
नन्दकुमार

by गोवर्धननामित्र
[Novel printed in VC JI]
नन्दकुमार 283
नन्दकुमारसिंह 798
नन्दकुमार 254
नन्दकुमारमहाका 432
नन्दकुमारमहाका 230
नन्दकुमारप्रसंगिता 963, 989
नन्दकुमारप्रसंगिता [PR III 394]
नन्दकुमारधिकत 863-86
नन्दकुमारधिकत (of Mewad Sury JI)
नन्दकुमारधिकत 506
नन्दकुमारधिकत 832
नन्दकुमारधिकत Samaq
नन्दकुमारधिकत Samaq

नन्दकुमारहाट

[In para 205, Read 48th day of Kali]
नन्दकुमारहाट 113, 118
नन्दकुमारहाट 543
नन्दकुमार 285
नन्दकुमारविजय 475
नन्दकुमारविजय (d) 932
नन्दकुमारविजय (d) 130, 235
नन्दकुमारविजय
by बेंगलराा [Rasa 326]
नन्दकुमार 109, 666
नन्दकुमार 111, 114
नन्दकुमारकाव्यन 111
नन्दकुमारकाव्यन
by सरदार (शेखमन)
[A very learned poem like
Magha Compd Sam 1912
Printed Bikaner]
नन्दकुमारकाव्यन
नन्दकुमारकाव्यन
नन्दकुमारकाव्यन
(He gives a date 1298. It must be Saka and not samvat. That will be 1376 A.D. Nidavole Venkatarao says: “In the manuscript copy I possess there is an invocation to Bharatu-Tirtha, the desciple of Vidyaranya and hence this date is conclusive. In the commentary of Nashadam Narahari invokes Vidyaranya as his paramaguru. Moreover there is a tradition among the Alankurkas in this country that Kumaraswami was a desciple of Nara-hari Suri and as such he quoted the book twice. His date may therefore be assigned to 1376-1340.”)

नरसिंहचार्य (S) 546
नरसिंहचार्य (∆ V) 81
नरसिंहचार्य (वेिनताचर्येविष्य) 578
नरसिंहचार्य (कारपूर्ण) 1060
नरसिंहचार्य (सिक्कौँ) 365, 919
नरसिंहचार्य (कोशा) 323
नरसिंहचार्य (अलिया) 915
नरसिंहचार्य (पतळळुऱ्व) 500
नरसिंहचार्य (रमादि) 933
नरसिंहचार्य 919

रग्नीर

(He gives a date 1298. It must be Saka and not samvat. That will be 1376 A.D. Nidavole Venkatarao says: “In the manuscript copy I possess there is an invocation to Bharatu-Tirtha, the desciple of Vidyaranya and hence this date is conclusive. In the commentary of Nashadam Narahari invokes Vidyaranya as his paramaguru. Moreover there is a tradition among the Alankurkas in this country that Kumaraswami was a desciple of Nara-hari Suri and as such he quoted the book twice. His date may therefore be assigned to 1376-1340.”)

नरसिंहचार्य (आलाह) 53

नरसिंहचार्य 1102

नरसिंहचार्य 252

(He gives a date 1298. It must be Saka and not samvat. That will be 1376 A.D. Nidavole Venkatarao says: “In the manuscript copy I possess there is an invocation to Bharatu-Tirtha, the desciple of Vidyaranya and hence this date is conclusive. In the commentary of Nashadam Narahari invokes Vidyaranya as his paramaguru. Moreover there is a tradition among the Alankurkas in this country that Kumaraswami was a desciple of Nara-hari Suri and as such he quoted the book twice. His date may therefore be assigned to 1376-1340.”)

नरसिंहचार्य (आलाह) 53

नरसिंहचार्य 28

कुमारसम्बन्धशिवाय [Tattu VI 2459]

नरसिंह
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 316  | नरदरि (क्रमांक नं. 316) 850 कुमारसम्बन्धीका (क्रमांक 28) नरदरि [OC I 279] नरदरि [OC I 279] कर्वकोस्मूरी शम्भमवरामणनन्तित्व 220 नरदरि दामोदरशालिन्य (MS JI) नरदरिमूल 876 नरदरि यात्र 214 नरदरिशालित्व रसिश्रवमू [Race 250] नरसारण 267 नन्दः Subh नन्दः विवाहश्री [Spu] नन्दः वर्णम् 111, 112, 114 नन्दः वर्णमयु 181 नन्दः वर्णवर्ण 663 नन्दः वर्णमयु 251 नन्दः वर्णभाषाभित्रकामय [OC I 279] नन्दः वर्णकल्पन (of Peshawar) [VO JI] नन्दः वर्णमार्थशिब्धित्व [PR II 196] रक्षकलाभिन नैलमान्वित्व 1028 नैलम्बती (क्रमांक 853, 850 नैलकल्पम् 254 नैलकल्पकृष्णदी 126 [Published in J of Telugu Academy] नैरचित (क्रमांक 84, 154, 742 by देवीसारस्वतेश्वर by नरकाक्ष 84 नैशस्मानीय 84, 743 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य (क्रमांक 84) नैशस्माचार्याद्वारपाण्डवीय [OPp 6595] नैशस्मिक 513 नैशस्मिक (क्रमांक 513, 733, 877 नैशस्मिक (क्रमांक 672 नैशस्मिकशाय 78, 96 नैशस्मिक (क्रमांक 84 नैशस्मिकशाय 78, 128, 146 नैशस्मिक 108, 849 नैशस्मिकशाय 175 नैशस्मिकशाय [JSSP XIX 19] नैशस्मिक 78, 329 नैशस्मिक 777 नैशस्मिकशाय जिविनव [Aisha Labary, Vizagapatam] नैशस्मिकशाय (क्रमांक भूमिनाथ) [Tanj XIX xxxi], 162, 787 See भूमिनाथ 759 नैशस्मिक श्रीम नैशस्मिक धर्म 300 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य 1053 नैशस्मिक (क्रमांक 163 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य 254-18 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य 1047 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य 919 नैशस्मिक वामुख्य (क्रमांक 545 नैशस्मिक वामुख्य 254 नैशस्मिक (क्रमांक VO JI) नैशस्मिक वामुख्य 885 नैशस्मिक वामुख्य 28 नैशस्मिक (क्रमांक 312 नैशस्मिक 14 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य 278 नैशस्मिकालक्ष्य 1064, 1364
Dasavatma Sarma on Nagaraja of Bhavasataka, Jt of Indian History III, 308. The following note is found Manuscripts in Mithila, II. 9, Bhavasataka. "It was written for Ganapati Naga, the Naga king of Padmavati and the adversary killed by Samudra Gupta in battle. Although the book has been once printed in the Kavyamala our manuscript gives the correct name and establishes the identity in the opening verse.

Nagarkrishnam (Sanskrit) = Sri Ganapati Naga was a worshipper of Siva (Siva). The style anticipates Amara."
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[Quoted by Arjuna Varman in his Commentary on Amara Nectar, and with translations and notes by Sankaranama]

[Printed Ahmedabad]

[D. B. Mankad, Types of dancing found in the temples of Bharatpur and Komorka near Piru and in Ahmadaba, and with transla- tion and notes by Sankaranama]

[Printed Bikaner]
Narayana

1005

Narayana Skm
Narayana (कैनठी)
स्वभाववेदी 323
Narayana
अविरदीनी (Gpp II 1104)
Narayana
रसिविलासकाव्य [TO III 2508]
Narayana (वक्षपातरुच्य) 76
Narayana (वक्षपातरुच्य) 782
Narayana [Rice, 256] (d)
चन्द्रकिडा (d) [Tang XVI 7456]
Narayana 427
हितोपदेश
Narayana (कृपणशिव्य) 27
रुद्रचारिका [TO V 6227]
Narayanaकवि 1064
सजीतसर
Narayana पुरुषामित [VO J1]
Narayanaचन्द्र
(कायस्तुतितीर्थ) SFV J1
Narayanaचवैद् Kad
Narayananविरित 210
Narayana नित्य 251, 301
Narayanaदश Skm
Narayanaदश 1063
ोमरकामू
Narayanaदश 297
गीतगीवितादिका [Tang XVI 7337]
Narayanaदशभारातालय p 48
न-राय गदीशित [OO I 290]
रामचन्द्रचित्र
Narayana नित्य [T, MB, J1]
Narayana (पवित्रचार्य)
(पवित्रचार्य) 214, 217
Narayana पुरोहित 1100
Narayanaबालकुम्भ 439
Narayana Brahma 649

Kuritaaranyasa-vrata-parvayya
Narayana-brahma (Bhaskarabur) 777

[VOC I 291]

Narayana-brahma 777

[Tantra-samhita](d)
Narayana-brahma (Bhagavata) 173

[Tradition says he lived 109 years]

Visnu-champa
Vigatukku

Subhadravirajita (Trav 93)
Narayana-brahma [p 23]
Narayana (Maitha) (of Vaigu) [VOC Jl]

Narayana-brahma 1047
Narayana-brahma (Vaigu) [VOC Jl]
Narayana-brahma (SC Jl)
Narayana-brahma [p 26]
Narayana-brahma

[Oudh XI 8]

Narayana-brahma

See Visnu-mandana-brahma [Tang No 4148]
Narayana-brahma (Narayana-brahma) Skm
Narayana-brahma (SC Jl)

Narayana-brahma

See Visnu-mandana-brahma [Tang No 4236]
Narayana-brahma 130
Narayana-brahma (K) of Pattambi [SC Jl]

Narayana-brahma

See Visnu-jan

[Ed by Karunakara, Karai Sarman, Pur] Narayana-brahma 441
Narayana-brahma T S

[Printed Madras]
Narayana-brahma (Kumar) 496
Narayana-brahma (Kumari) 727

Narayana-brahma (Raghavacharya) 254, 266, 734
Narayana-brahma (Niguma) 610
Narayana-brahma (Subh) 1064
Narayana-brahma 198
Narayana-brahma

[OC, I 290]

Narayana-brahma 273
Narayana-brahma (SC Jl)
Narayana-brahma (Subh)
Narayana-brahma 1064
Narayana-brahma 782
Narayana-brahma 121
Narayana-brahma 174

Narayana-brahma (d) [UU I 294]

[At page 217 the word Narayana-nilasa is wrong ]
Narayana-brahma [p 1]
Narayana-brahma

See Visnu-mandana-brahma
Narayana-brahma (SC Jl)

by Vedanta (Anvay) [TIV IV No. 5742]

Narayana-brahma

Nigamanta-pandara-vrata 122
Nigamanta-pandara-vrata 507
Nisargdeva 70
Nisarg 17
Nisargavaksha 1060
Nisargavaksha SS
Nisargavaksha (SC JSP)
Nisargavaksha (SC JSP)
Nisargavaksha (SC JSP)

[Tr of Vivekananda’s Song \Sanyasam, JSSP XIX]
नियान्त्रकहासिन (कौशल्य)
गम्भीरपदी
[of Jodhpur 50 Jl]
निवाचनिकृतियों [SMM Jl]
निर्देशित 40
निरुद्धसिद्धांस 175, 339
निरन्दरसन 919
निर्देशरायण 926
निर्म 1
निर्देशकमदल
See कलोदपाद तक़ौचाउर
निर्देशनिरुद्ध (d) 727
निर्देशदायक (d) 779
निर्देशधिम निर्देश (d) 672
निर्देशलोकावती 106
निर्देश 919
निर्देशरायण Sarng
निर्देशकिंरब 919
निर्देशमुख 314
निर्देशदायक 919
निर्देशकपत्र 68
निर्देशकपत्रा 268
निर्देशकाम 256
निर्देशकपत्र 218
निर्देशित्रिकात्त 259
निर्देशनकामताला 254 F
निर्देशदोसी 268
निर्देशकरी 268

by रामप्रसाद
by बारहनाथ
nिर्देशकन्या 268
निर्देश 268
निर्देश 356
निर्देश पाद 721
निर्देश 68
निर्देशक 328
निर्देशकाव्यासूत 268, 514

नीतिनविवास 268
नीतिविवास 268
नीतिविवास 268 by बेड़हराय
नीतिविवास by श्रीनिवासय से
Anonymous
नीतिविवाससूत्र 268
नीतिविवास 268, 316
Anonymous
नीतिविवाससूत्र by बदलपूर
नीतिविवास 268
नीतिसेन 514
नीतिकालुका पाद
See अध्यायवर्तित (d)
नीति Seium, Pady
नीतिकाल 921
नीतिकाल आयुष्मान K [UP Jl]
नीतिकाल (of पुरात) p 42
महामात्याभाष्या
नीतिकाल Pmt
नीतिकाल (अभिभाषण) 621
नीतिकाल [Mys, Sup 11]
See नागालंकारसूत्रसूत्रासभाचयुष्मान
नीतिकाल
See कालोद्रशास 154
नीतिकाल (कुलिघस) 695
नीतिकाल (कर्त्तिक) of Kudalur 369, 695
नीतिकाल (कामद्वय) 233
नीतिकाल (कुलिघस) 65
नीतिकाल (ज्योतिज्ञान) 320
नीतिकाल (चिह्न) 154, 354
नीतिकाल

विमानवर्तित 154
नीतिकालसूत्र 186
नीतिकाल दीक्षित
शक्तिविक्षेत्राभाष्या [TO IV No 4080]
[Ed by K D Vreese, Leiden, with critical notes on manuscripts Ed by Ramlat Kunjilal, Lahore] 

[The word Srisaila in para 158 is wrong. It much be Nrsimha] 

'Srisaila (Mahanand) 496 
'Srisaila (Mahanandpur) 938 
'Srisaila Chittor 96, 544 

by Bhaskara 
by Daksinamurthi 
by Mahesvara 

'Srisaila 544 
'Srisailapuram 505 
'Srisaila Shrikanth (= Narasimha) 816 
'Srisailam 833 
'Srisaila Devarajaswami 1098, 1099 
'Srisaila Prakasam 509 
'Srisaila Vihar 688 

'Srisaila [See TO III. 659, 8821] 
'Srisaila 563, 785 877 
'Srisaila 211 
'Srisaila [TO IV. 5107] 
'Srisaila 1101 
'Srisaila 329 
'Srisaila Shrikanth (Bhagavat) p 25 
'Srisaila 206 
'Srisaila Pandurangi (= Bhagvanta) 787 
'Srisaila 214, 298, 311 
'Srisaila Vidyarshi (Vedantadevishikopan) 526 

[Quoted by Venugopala] 

See Krishna Pashupata

See Krishna Pashupata
INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100Q</td>
<td>^m 373-B #7RSHI£lo«r 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>^tF^ (d) 242, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108,235</td>
<td>^tJ^mMw 235,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254-F</td>
<td>StgfaPT 74, 242, 312, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>[Ed with translation and translation by translation, Poona Oriental Series XX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>^54R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>^ra^rc? 74, 242, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>^Ta^W 276, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254,423,932</td>
<td>[Ed with translation by translation, Poona Oriental Series XX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>^gW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529,1212</td>
<td>T^JRmsPTrrRn^W 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>Tf^JRmsPTrrRn^W 529,1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159,273,1050</td>
<td>^gW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>^N&lt;tafti!fcH.('bFni&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>^aW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463,56&amp;</td>
<td>^463,56&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>^707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>^ra^rc? 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>^ra^rc? 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254,423,932</td>
<td>[Ed with commentary, Madison, See Panduvarra and Hitropadana by A. S. Panchariya, Aryan IGS]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This seems to be a page from a book or a manuscript written in a script that is not clearly legible. The text appears to be a series of numbers, symbols, and possibly some Tibetan script. There are also a few words in English, such as "Haritaka," "pandits," and "Siva." The page includes references to various dates and page numbers, possibly indicating a table of contents or an index. The text is not easily translatable into a coherent natural language representation without expert knowledge of the script and context.
INDEX

पदार्थम् 325
पदपुस 61, 515
पदपृवित
by रंगरथ्न (prose) 440
by रंगेशन [DC, XXVII 7261 in 123 parvans]
पदपृवित (= पदपृवित) 235
पदपृवित 409, 588
पदपुसामध्यकाल (of Sylhet, Assam) [SC JI]
पदपुस 252, 781
पदपुस (G.V) 200
पदपुस (क्षेत्रीयभाष्य)
रामार्केितकाय [OC I 520]
पदपुस (क्षेत्रीयभाष्य) 787
पदपुस (कामार्केितकाय) 726
पदपुस (बलभुदुश्चिक)
वीरभद्रेश्वर 32 [PH I 101
Composed in 1578]
पदपुस 466
पदपुसामध्यकाल (of Sylhet, Assam)
पदपुस
रामार्केितकाय [OC, I, 321]
पदपुस (कामार्केितकाय) 1056
पदपुसामध्यकाल 254-5
पदपुसामध्यकाल 545, 1230
पदपुसामध्यकाल 55
पदपुसामध्यकाल 251
पदपुसामध्यकाल 214
पदपुसामध्यकाल 9339
पदपुसामध्यकाल 178, 290
पदपुसामध्यकाल (of Trivandrum)
कामार्केित (in prose MG JI)
पदपुसामध्यकाल (CM) (1863-1919) 732
पदपुसामध्यकाल 254
पदपुसामध्यकाल 75
पदपुसामध्यकाल 225
पदपुसामध्यकाल 105

पदपुसामध्यकाल 325
पदपुसामध्यकाल (d) 605
पदपुस 961
पदपुसामध्यकाल 283
पदपुसामध्यकाल 72, 522
पदपुसामध्यकाल 522
पदपुसामध्यकाल 229
पदपुसामध्यकाल 237, 825
पदपुसामध्यकाल 922
पदपुसामध्यकाल 268, 544
पदपुसामध्यकाल 110
पदपुसामध्यकाल 922
पदपुसामध्यकाल 374
पदपुसामध्यकाल (d) 784
पदपुसामध्यकाल 544
पदपुसामध्यकाल (d) 783, 877
पदपुसामध्यकाल 258
पदपुसामध्यकाल (d) 721
पदपुसामध्यकाल 168, 456
पदपुसामध्यकाल 36
पदपुसामध्यकाल 372
पदपुसामध्यकाल 352
पदपुसामध्यकाल 286
पदपुसामध्यकाल 359, 373
by धार्मिक
by गोविन्दसुभक
पदपुसामध्यकाल 76, 373
पदपुसामध्यकाल 373
पदपुसामध्यकाल 373
by कवितास [Vidy JI]
padapushpa 1039
पदपुसामध्यकाल 491
पदपुसामध्यकाल 378
[By Han Bhāskara, Composed in sam 1730 (1673 A.D.]]
padapushpādi 373
INDEX

parameśvara

Shenk, Kad
parameśvararājita
parameśvararūpaṇa
[Aisha Inbiary, Visagapatam]
parameśvara
319, 359
[For minor person, SC Jit]
parameśvararāja
459
parameśvara
(TO) (Manj Jit)
parameśvarasūtra
281
parameśvaracaritā
Kad
pārshvam 904
pāršvam Shen
pārṣvam 542

parāśurāma
358, 501
parāśurāmaśeṣa
50
parāśurāmaśeṣa
210
parāśurāmaśeṣa
210
parāśurāma
207

[In another book his dates are given as sāka 1020–1371 (1097–1148 AD) and year of birth Isvāra]
parāśurāma
207
vāsāvārya (d)
parāśurāma
207
pārśvatana Suhh
parāśurāma
Shenk

parāśurāmaśeṣa
61, 515
parāśurāmaśeṣa
50
parāśurāmaśeṣa
618, 621
parāśurāmaśeṇa
329

parāśurāma
207
vāsāvārya (d)
parāśurāma
207
pārśvatana Suhh
parāśurāma
Shenk

parāśurāmaśeṣa
61, 515
parāśurāmaśeṣa
50
parāśurāmaśeṣa
618, 621
parāśurāmaśeṇa
329

parāśurāma
207

This play is referred to by Vedānta Desi in his Rāhavvāvatsarasāra
when he quotes the Nāndi

Anvāśāņūsya[ paramparaśaṃkāraśaṃ] | sarvāśāņūsya[ paramparaśaṃkāraśaṃ] (dus=vadāśaṃ)

[See Telugu Edn p 747] and also in Sārasāra p 196

“svārā parāśurāmāsvaramāstāśitasūtyā akāriṇā parāśvāśastra vachanā sa bhavatātma
svāstikāya rājya”
INDEX

by शुभचन्द्रा
by वारिकेश्वर p 44
पाण्डवविजय (d) 780
पाण्डवविजय
by करणमण्डलः 684
by हेमचन्द्राय 250, 358
पाण्डवानन्द (d) 780, 955
पाण्डवाशुद्धि (d) 772
पाण्डवाशुद्धि
by शिवानि 137
Anonymous 550
पाण्डुक 442
पाण्डवविजय 5
पालिका 688
पार्वतक (d) 593, 955
पांडुक (पांडुक) Skm
पांडुकाशुद्धि (d) 177, 939
पांडुकास्त्र 121
पांडुकास्त्र-अवतारकथासंह 498
पार्वतकास्त्र 769
पाप्यदह 323
पापप्राप्तिः 293
पापपापापापार 544
पापाक Skm
पापाक (पापाक) पापाक Skm
पापाक Skm
पारिजातनाटक (d) 146
See कुमारतालाचार्यः
pārijātanātak (d) 678
पारिजातनाटक 568
पारिजातहरण (d) 806, 682
by गोपालकुमार 248, 1095
by कविचन्द्रिय 237
by विद्वान् 257
पारिजातहरणम् 692
पारिजातहरणम् 306
by कविराज 87
by नारायण 214

पारिजातक 69
पारिजातक (राजपुत्र) Subh
पारिजातकविज्ञानम् 158
पारिजातकविज्ञानम् 160
पारिजातमण्डल 786
पारिजातज्ञातक [SC JI]
pārijātanātak 245
पारिजातकरण 200, 303, 323
by प्रसन्नम
by वादिप्रव ब
by ध्वामी
पारिजातावशिष्या 68
पारिजातावशिष्या
बादकस्मल [TO VI 7221]
पारिजातावशिष्या Skm
पारिजातावशिष्या Skm
पारिजातावशिष्या 373-A
पारिजातावशिष्या 733
पारिजातावशिष्या (d) 777
पारिजातावशिष्या 737
पारिजातावशिष्या 175, 544
पारिजातावशिष्या
[TO VI 72922]
पारिजातकर
तीर्थभद्रपद्यः (d)
पारिजातकर 291, 534, 796
पारिजातकर 488
पारिजातकर 252
पारिजातकर 46
पारिजातकर 549
पारिजात (D V) 618
पारिजातकर
by देवप्रभुसुधारी P 44, 109
[Printed Bombay]
by भूषणराय 250
Anonymous 171
पारिजातकरितविज्ञान 407
पारिजातकरितविज्ञान 230
INDEX

by रघुनाथ 146
by उमादत 306
पारिवारिक 560
पा०क्षेत्र 171
पार्वपालक (d) 676
पार्जनीया 52
पार्जनविजय 661, 672
पार्वतार्थि (द्वारिका) 729
पार्वतिक 739
पार्वतीय 510
पार्वतीपरिणय (d)
  by शंकराचार्य 733
  by वामनदेव 128, 457
पार्वतीपरिणय
  by रामचरित 544
  by इश्वरचरित 156, 253
पार्वतीशिखरमणय 89
पार्वतीशिखावति 181
पार्वताशाली 728
पार्वतीप्रवास 175
पार्वतीप्रवास (d) 777
पार्वतंत्रिम 235
पार्वतदेव 1010
पार्वतन्युक्ताव 231
पार्वतन्युक्तितिर 839
  by बादिरावालिर 283
  by भागवेन 235
  by विष्णुचंद्र 103
पार्वतपापस्व 105, 229
पार्वतस्वर 235
पार्वतस्वयं 57, 320
पार्वत स्वयं 235
पार्वतदेव 323
  by बासुदेववेशन्तु [SB N]
प्रकाशिक 560
प्रकाशन्देश 423

by राजनाथाचार्य (राजदुर्ग)
by नरसिंहाचार्य (कोच
पिन्नाचार्य
  [Commentary by विवामनदेव. MM II 15]
पितामह 551-A
पितमहनवन Swarna
पितवेश्वरसुरि 544
पितौलिकाचार्य 209
  [He lived for 121 years in 1205-1326. The date given in para 209 appears to be incorrect]
पीयाक Share
पीतामह (अश्वर (प) धीर्यातावर) Share
पीतामह (स्वाभाविक) 297, 659, 305
पुजाराज 892
  काव्यालंकारशिकाय [CU I 103]
पुज्यरीक Share
पुज़्यरीक Share 825
नाटकश्रण (CU I 284]
पुज्यरीकविठल 1028
पुज्यरीकविठल 44
पुज्यरीक Share
पुज्यरीक (रामालीग) Share
पुज्य Share
पुज्यकोटि 251
पुज्यकोषमुखरी
  by उत्तरदासविश्वाध्याय
  (Printed Madras. He was the 54th Acarya of Komakotapthta in 1524-1539 A.D.)
पुज्यरसस्वामिन Share 235
पुज्यरसस्वामिनितिलब 919
पुज्यरोक Share
पुज्यकोटि 709
पुज्यरसस्वामिन 546
पुज्यरसस्वामिन 373
पुज्यरसस्वामिन 217
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>1015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पुराण pp 72-77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणद्यान्तशक्तक</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See धर्मेन्द्र</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणप्रेमस्थ p 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणप्रेमस्थी p 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणचरित 668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणचरितम [Tanj VII 3221]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणकांड 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणपरिशा 439, 441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by विद्यापित                                             by लभ्यनिश्चित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराण स्म्रम</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराण (व्व्याळा) 44, 666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराण स्म्रम</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व्व्याळा (वीरूत)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रावणहृदांगक (d) 781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[He was son of Govinda of Sunkesala village Tanj VIII 3504]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमबिर (d) 1047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमबिरप्रद 544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमबिरप्रद वस्रम 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमदेव वस्रम 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमदेव 294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमपिर 252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमपिराधि 921, 934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणस्म्रमस्थव 919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेन स्म्रम</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरोक स्म्रम</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेनपिरित 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेनस्थव 792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेनस्थवमायन 373-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेन स्थव</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेनपिरित (d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरसेन पिरित Pady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरबक Shmr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित 286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित (d) 306, 672, 753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित (d) 309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित (d) 606, 880, 955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित 880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरश्चरित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by श्रीपर                                       [MM II 80, on flowers useful for deities]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालक 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालक Sarng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालक 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालकसन्त 252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालक 585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालक 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालकाद (De) [of Calcutta]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्त्रवयस्मुद</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उल्टसागर</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a composition like Bhoga-&lt;br&gt;        cantra) [SB II ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणपादपालकाद (d) 762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणमद्र 104, 424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणस्तरस्तति 318, 323, 646, 649, 966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरणमद्रहरावनारी Kend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुररक 560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरभीचरित 235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by शापििधूरि                                             by साधारणगणि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by जनसाधार</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरभीश 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरभीशधरम Sarng, Subh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरभीशधरम [CC I 345]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवादसस्तोत्र</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवादसस्तोत्रसंहल</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सरस्वतीलोक</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुरभीशस्तोत्रसंहल्र [Rice, 234]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्त्रोतसारिनी 192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शाहदुल्ला (Novel MG II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 188, 191, 192, 872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 53, 55, 76, 373, 927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 323, 719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 1722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 561, 563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति Subh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 53, 922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति Subh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रवाहवाद प्रभूति 272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रसायन [IHQ V 178, 771]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (सन्देह) (Warangal) 126, 481, 681, 926 |
- अलापनकामात्मक 113, 319, 927 |
- अलापनकामात्मक 738 |
- अलापनकामात्मक 198 |
- अलापनकामात्मक 157 |
- अलापनकामात्मक 293 |
- अलापनकामात्मक by हृसनकर (Printed Bombay) |

- अलापनकामात्मक (of Jurn) 1055 |
- अलापनकामात्मक |
- राजकृष्णदत्तोल |
- राजकृष्णदत्तोल [Jury, No 21326, 21429] |

- शिक्षित 745 |
- शिक्षितार्गत (d) 500 |
- शिक्षितार्गत (d) 575 |
- [See Jurn XXIII, 235] |

- प्रकाशदर्श Subh |
- प्रकाशदर्श 81 |
- प्रकाशदर्श [Sanskrit J/ Dacca] |

- प्रकाशदर्श Subh (d) 662 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh (d) 677 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh (d) 666, 955 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh (d) 154, 779 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh (d) 746 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh (d) 122 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 122 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 50, 107 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 22 |

- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 806, 826 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 660 |

- प्रकाशदर्श Subh, Subh [PR II 59] |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 660 |
- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 229 |

- प्रकाशदर्श Subh 229 |
INDEX

Prabhuvarit contd
by Prabhuvarit 235
by Prabhuvarit 235
by Prabhuvarit 230
by Prabhuvarit 229

Prabhuvarit (d) 538, 680, 707
Prabhuvarit 433
Prabhuvarit (d) 529
Prabhuvarit 680
Prabhuvarit 153
Prabhuvarit 887
Prabhuvarit 785
Prabhuvarit 303, 410
Prabhuvarit 779
Prabhuvarit (d) 764
Prabhuvarit 205
Prabhuvarit 1006, 1047
Prabhuvarit 111, 201, 433
Prabhuvarit 103, 111, 115, 119, 433

Prathandhi 908
Prathandhir 24
Prathandhir (d) 679
Pratibandh (d) 126, 145, 166, 750
Com by Pratibandh TSS

Pratibandh 235
Pratibandh 920
Pratibandh

Pratibandh (Pratibandh) 298, 473
Pratibandh (Pratibandh) 169, 251
Pratibandh (Pratibandh) 28, 478, 902

Pratibandh [OJO I. 353] (Born 1564)

Pratibandh (Pratibandh) 529

Pratibandh (Pratibandh) 529

Prabhuvarit Skm
Prabhuvarit 400
Prabhuvarit Subh
Prabhuvarit Skm, Subh
Prabhuvarit Skm
Prabhuvarit 329
Prabhuvarit 781
Prabhuvarit 235, 275, 433
Prabhuvarit 235
by Prabhuvarit
by Prabhuvarit
Prabhuvarit 782
Prabhuvarit (MG JI)
Prabhuvarit (d) 263, 880
Prabhuvarit 781
Prabhuvarit (d)
by Prabhuvarit (Nepal Library)
Prabhuvarit 1073
Prabhuvarit 441, 500
Prabhuvarit 254-X
Prabhuvarit
Prabhuvarit 374
Prabhuvarit (d) 767

[Hall’s preface to Das’arapa]

Pratibandh 314
Pratibandh (d) 783
Pratibandh 32
Pratibandh Skm, Subh
Pratibandh
by Pratibandh [MII II. 88]
Pratibandh [MII II. 91]
Pratibandh [MII II. 92]
Pratibandh 881
Pratibandh [MII II. 93]
Pratibandh 565
INDEX

आज्ञामुद्रां 373-D
प्रणवनाम (of Kasi) [Sury Jl]
प्रणामश्रण 311
प्रदेशस्थपतिनिवेदन 50
प्रास्तिगाय 919
प्रास्तिगाय 919
प्रास्तिगाय 156, 338
प्रास्तिगाय 160
प्रियज्ञकरण 254
प्रियज्ञकरण (d) 612
प्रियज्ञकरण 1000
प्रियज्ञकरण Subh
प्रियज्ञक Subh
प्रियज्ञक Subh
प्रियाचिति 798
प्रियाचिति 401
प्रीतिकर 1100
प्रीतिकर 563
प्रेमचंदनदवागीचा 76, 88, 618, 816, 649
प्रेमशिर 330
प्रेमशिर 305
प्रेमसोइनीरणधीर (d)
by विश्वानन्द [Printed SC Jl]
प्रेमशिर 323
प्रेमसूत 219, 225, 251
प्रेमद्वायर 251
प्रेमसोइत्युद्युम 251
प्रेमशिर 888
प्रेमभावद्वाय 76, 126, 135
प्रेमभावद्वायकल 514
प्रेमभावद्वाय (d) 727
प्रेमभावद्वाय (d) 727
INDEX

क

फेहरिसीर 1100
फरी 603, 700
फल्गनातक [7°(m) 937]
फल्गन 131
फल्गनक (d) 842

ब

बकलार 543
बकलार यात्रार वि 171-V
बकलार प्रतिबीं 373 A
बकलार नाम वि 1099
बकलार उपाध्याय ‘मील’ कुक
बकलार वि 846
बकलार (d) 727
बकलार (m) 783
बकलार (d) [7°(m) 117]
बकलार (m) [7°(m) 167]
बकलार म्र 846
बकलार म्र 846
बकलार म्र 846
बकलार (बकलार)

स्वामिर [7°(m) 1, 661]
बकलार विबाधारण 814, 905
बकलार म्र, स्वामि
बकलार प्रथम 140, 1098

[Printed Bombay]
बकलार प्रथम 1047
बकलार प्रथम (of Multra) [7°(m) 1]
बकलार प्रथम (of Umea) [7°(m) 1]

बस्तवन्त कन्याक (of Ujjain) [7°(m) 1]
बस्तवन्त (d) 554
बस्तवन्त (d) 100, 515
बस्तवन्त (d) 274
बस्तवन्त 211
बस्तवन्त 506

बस्तवन्त (केलिव) 161, 373
बस्तवन्त (1697 (1702 ?)-1714]
बस्तवन्त (केलिव) 161, 373

बिधितलकव 197
बामालिनु हुम 373
बरमाहल्यदर्पण (7°7 150)
बाराजन्द्र 161
बाराजन्द्र (d) 218
बाराजन्द्र 534
बाराजन्द्र 548
बाराजन्द्र 694
बाराजन्द्र (d) 727
बाराजन्द्र

दुराहतिका (7°7 Trivandum)
बाण 279, 471, 477, 818, 932
बाणपृथिवा 254
बाणपृथिवा 254
बाणपृथिवा 544

बाणपृथिवा (d) [7°7 VII 751]
बाणपृथिवा (d) [7°7 VII 751]
बाणपृथिवा (d) [7°7 VII 751]

* [Sivaprasad Bhattacharya, Subandhu and Bana, Who is earlier ? IHQ (1929) 699 Sivaramamurti, Printing and allied arts as revealed in Bana's works, JOR. VI 895, VII 59]
INDEX

बांधकुंड (रामदेवपुर) 548, 254
बिश्णुमू (1744)
बाँधारण 21
बालकवि 695, 767, 923
बालकाविवास 945
बालकाव्य (Opp 6022)
बालकुमार 920
बालकार
बालकुमार 252
राममृत 79
बालकुमार (वे दरकाएभु) 455
बालमरुटा
बालकुमार [CO I 370]
बालकुमारचुक 542
बालकुमारपति कोड
बालकुमारसाहित्य [AM II 91]
बालकुमार (पायरुण) 330
बालकुमारसाहि (अधिक)
बिस्मुखगानकाम [CO I 370 composed in 1600]
बालकुमारसाहित्य (of Guptakasi)
बालबाटक &c., [Sury JI]
बालकुमारसिका of Bombay [SO JI]
बालकुमारविविद 618
बालकुमार (d) 578, 733, 880
बालकुमार
Anonymous
by शास्
बालकुमारी 113, 115
बालकुमारिका (d) 727
बालकुमारिक (d) 727
बालकुमार
बालकिरतांमिरत [Vady JI]
बालकिरतांमिरत (d) (of Ramagada Sikara State) [SB JI]
बालकिरतांमिरत (देवि) [Sury JI]
बालकिरतांमिरत 257, 521, 932
by एकाधार
by बद्धस्ति
INDEX

by रुद्रेश [MM II 153-158]
बित्रमणिमाला 90
वाल्लकणकीडाकाव्य [OU I 370]
बित्रण 62
बित्रणचरित 64
बित्रणसत्व 64
बित्रणीय 727
वीजक Shm, Subh, Seung
वीजकर Seung
बृहस्पति

by संभाजी (सिंहाजित्य) 157
[Ed Gov Orient Series, Poona
by H D Velankar See JBRAS (1925) 253 This is S’unblun, son
of Srvaj, the great This is an
anthology ]
हथेलानोलान 912
हदसा 1143
वेदान्तिम 418
ब्रह्म Subh
ब्रह्मचार 36
[B M Barma, Two Budhahousus,
Indian Culture, I 294]
ब्रह्मचारित 34, 231

[Ed, with Int by E H Jhon-
stone, Lahore, Sukumar Sen on
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It gives the contents of each parva of "Māheśhādāta",
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The image contains a page from a document with text in both Devanagari and Roman script. The content appears to be a list or index, possibly from a book or manuscript. The text is dense and contains a mix of numbers, names, and possibly page references. Due to the nature of the content, it is challenging to transcribe accurately without context from the rest of the document. The page seems to include references to various topics or names, possibly related to Indian culture, history, or literature.
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*A very large collection of excellent poetry* Printed at Jaipur
Mentioned in मार्कस्यपुराणः. She is said to have taught her son, and her words are here quoted (Sury JII)

धरामारण पर्यंत तत्तदेः। समीहितं चन्द्रु दृश्ये॥
भाषा प्रयोगिन निवारणे अनिवतानेव निवारणे॥
सदा सुरारि हदि चिन्तयेवासात्हथानात्तथान्तरपद्यस्तवः॥
भति परशुरुपु निवर्त्ये भाराभुताशेष निविन्त्ये॥
राज्यं कुर्वं दहंद्रे नन्दवेये॥ साधूं राजस्वतं वैवेये॥
इत्यष्ट्रि वै रैविणयाकं गौरिणयं बलस्य श्वेते भवेये॥
बालो मनो नन्दवं भाष्यवाङ् अुर्वेत्याशस्त्राकंगे मुमार।॥
श्रीणि शुक्ल साक्षातभूवानि इति वत्स बनेष्टशानाम्॥
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Problem of Mahanataka. IHQ (1931) 629, 709, and Shivaprasad Bhatta charyas’ paper on Mahanataka problem, read at 7th Oriental Conference.

* This book appears to be a history of King Lalitāditya (Raj IV 131-145) and the following verses from it are quoted as for the 5th Ullāsā by Ātmanandā in his commentary on Gururātānamālā alluding the installation of the son of Queen Batta who had been deposed by the Kashmir invader, on the Kanataga throne (See N Venkatarāma’s Sankararama The Great, 78-9, pp 78-9)

† Edited by PPS Sastri, Madras. Ed by PKunjampdek, Bombay with Nilakantha’s commentary Ed by VSukthankan (ādīparvamālova) with illustrations.

N V Thādam, Mystery of the Mahabharata, Age of Mahabharata. (Mys Arch Rep (1927), 8.

E P Rice, Mahabharata, Analysis and Index Jagannatharow, Age of Mahabharata War Pramāthanātha Malīk, Mahabharata, A critical study (Allahabad), and its review by VV Ramanam in The Hindu, 27th Nov 1984.
This is one of the finest poems in S India e.g.

This poem is *Käkas'itaka* directed against Käkäji friend, of King Pišhūja e.g.
* [Is he the same as महेश next subra. Ed Cal Or Series with a fine analysis in English.]
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by रामप्रसूत्र or राम (चारापुरुष)

माधवसेन (King) 903
माधवसेन, Skm, 130
माधवसेन [JASB (1906), 172]
माधवनाम 286, 542
माधवनाम 476
by कांकुसुदर [Udāh V 6]
माधवनामवानक 858
माधवनामा (d) 476
माधवनामवानक 439
माधवनामवानकमक्शुदाकर 476
माधवनामवानक (d) 441, 476
by आनन्दपर
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माधवसंसूचककाव्य [CO I, 450]
माधवी 373-A, 879
माधवविस्तारी (d) 783
माधवपुरी Pady
माधवानी 373-A
माधवक Skm
माधवकी 314
माधवकु (K V) [VO J]
माधवकु 143, 283
स्वामस्तोत्र
माधवित्व 514
माधवित्व 279, 283
सिद्धिविमोहिति
माधवित्व 514
माधवित्व [Zamorin] 168
माधवित्व 777
लक्ष्मीकालिय (d)

| (CC I 260 BRI, No 436 of 1887-91 It contains 135 verses composed at the instance of King Madhavasimha, son of Jasimha II of Jaipur about 1750 Gangarāpta, Jāmesvāna, Gopīrātha, Vyasaśētha, Suśākara, Handatā, Kevalarāma, Srdāsva, Raviṣṭa, Sambhāradatta are mentioned in the poem as the learned men of that Court. |
His songs are printed at Madura in Sri Guhagopiṣṭhānam in which Navarāṇa Kirtanas express devotion to Universal Mother.

† [Ed. Translation by H. Dhrurva 'Srikumtha Sathar Date of Madhurakshasa, IHS (1981), 168 K H Dhrurva, Verses mistaken for prose, PO Oct 1936]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>मेघुदूत (अन्त)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>मेघुदूतासमालेख</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373-B</td>
<td>मेघुदूति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>मेघनाद-सदनमजसीवकया</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>[Bendall 47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83, 319</td>
<td>मेघनादवर्ण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PB V 21]</td>
<td>सेन  स्त्रातादविवधान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>मेघासार</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>सेवाराज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1899-1915]</td>
<td>M M Patankar, PO Oct 1936 He must have lived between 1172 and 1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93, 320, 424</td>
<td>मेघविनयणि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373-B</td>
<td>मेघविनोद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>मेघसन्देश (मविदु)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>मेघसन्देशविवधान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, 646</td>
<td>मेघसमुदर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>मेघकश</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37, 271, 566, 951</td>
<td>मेघारुप</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>मेघारुपिका</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 319</td>
<td>मेघारुप</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>मेघारुपिका</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>मेघारुपिका</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of Brundavana Gurukula)</td>
<td>मेघासाठवासरिद्धि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Vidy JL]</td>
<td>छव्यसन्नातत्त्वसरिद्धि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>मेनककार</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563, 877</td>
<td>मेनकानहुस</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563, 880</td>
<td>मेनकाहित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111, 119, 321, 515</td>
<td>मेनकाहित</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

(On the life of the singer Tyagaraja, 1050)

नागोधन (of Runala SC II)

विनयाचार तेर्जी [SC II 470]

विनय (श्रृंवेदेनाथ) 863-A

विनय (येदुवे) 150, 636, 987

विनयान भवन [of Khalapma SC II]

विनयालिखित

जागृति विश्वविद्यालय

विनयाचार 520

विनयाचारनियम 546, 718

विनयाचारविधान 209

विनयाचारसंस्था 121

विनयाचारविधान 944

विनयाचारमूर्त 203

विनयाचारमूर्तविधि 496

विनयाचारप्रणाली 209

विनयाचारप्रणाली 545

विनयाचार 726

विनयाचारतांतिक 255

विनयाचार 251

विनयाचार 46

विनयाचारमूर्त 494

विनयाचारमूर्त 121

विनयाचार 326

विनयाचार 213, 388
[On the Marriage of Sampat Kumāra of Melkote, Mysore with the Mughal Emperor's daughter]
INDEX

युगाञ्जकीय (omitted)  
by कार्तिकेय तरकार 
[SB J]

युगकर्षण [Shy J]

युगित p 56

युगन्दरिन्य 919

युगितिरिजय 65, 161, 863

Com by श्रीकृष्ण द्वास [TC VI 7007]

युगतिःसम्प्रभुगाकार Shm

युगर शिव

See रससदनभाषा

युगराज

कस्तनताभरण (d)

अनुजतिलक (d)

मदनमकरी (d)

रामजास (d)

प्रवश्वाणविजय

[Aisha Library, Vizagapatam]

युगराजविवाहक Shm

युगराजदेव (कीयूरम्भ)

युगराज महादेव

युगराज रामसिंह

जलकीराय (d)

[Nepal Library, Bendal, 28]

युगसेन Shm

योगान्धकर 919

योगान्धकर [काशिदासपुरुष]

कीवालीकाथा [CO I 133]

योगिनीमहालघु 817

योगिनिमय 44, 252

योगेश्वर Kes [JSSP (1936) 169]

योगेश्वर Shm, 373

योगीक (पायो) Shm

योगनिःविलास 249

योगोत्तर 314

र

रक्तरास 727

रक्षानाथ (जनार्दनरुप)

शिवभक्तानन्द [TC VI 6963]

रविलाल्लन्यायरल [SMM J]

रक्षेम 863 (a)

रक्षनदन 254

उद्वचारिन

रक्षनदन 675

प्रभुभरायव्यःर्याः

रक्षनदन हिबेर Ked

रक्षनदनविलास 252

by वेदेनाथाय

by पद्मचाय

रक्षनाथ उपाध्याय Ked

(lived in Benares about 1616 A.D.)

रक्षनाथ (गोक्ताची) 224

रक्षनाथ (जसरामपुर) [CO I 485]

रसिकमणकाय

(Written in 1564 A.D)

रक्षनाथ 541

मारतिविजय

रक्षनाथ 252

रामचरित

रक्षनाथ 782

शामावत (d)

रक्षनाथ Pady

रक्षनाथ 217

See तस्तनाथीिथ

रक्षनाथुशुग्रुप 252

रक्षनाथृतभ 128

रक्षनाथवाक 220, 221

रक्षनाथवाक 145, 146

चाहिदापुत्र

नरतिथुरा

नरतिथितार्थ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[It is said that the other works mentioned in para 146 are in Telugu See Tanjavur-Andhra Rajula-cantram p 26]</td>
<td>145, 146 (contd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed (N W recension) Bombay Ed with Com of Brahmāsankara Misra Ed by PPS Sastri, Madras Tr into English by M L Sen, Calcutta]</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[In para 406, read for thus]</td>
<td>31, 252 779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by N W recension) Bombay Ed with Com of Brahmāsankara Misra Ed by PPS Sastri, Madras Tr into English by M L Sen, Calcutta]</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>25, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed (N W recension) Bombay Ed with Com of Brahmāsankara Misra Ed by PPS Sastri, Madras Tr into English by M L Sen, Calcutta]</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>545, 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>455, 473, 622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>254, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ed by T R Chintamani, Madras]</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

1045

[Ed with translation by P V Ramanujaswami, Madras]

Ramanujaswami 922

Ramanujaswami [CO I 492]

Ramachandra 254

Rameswar 863 A

Rameswaraswamy 141

Ramanubhim 841

Ramakrishna

Ramakrishna

[Asima Library, Visagapatam]

Ramanuja Slm

Ramanuja 904, 1071

Ramapati 314

See Sattvarao Nalasahakar

Ramapati 314

Ramadhar 252

by Shri Ram [CO I 493]

Ramar 352

Ramanujacharya

Ramnath

Ramnath

[SC JI, XII]

Ramnath

Acharya

[CO I 493]

Ramanujacharya

Ramanujacharya 289

Ramanujacharya 764

Ramanujacharya

Bhakacharya &c, (in prose) [MG JI]

Raman 964

Raman 724

Ramanath 680

Ramanath 342

Ravi (Ramananya) 863-A

Ravi 318, 1103

Ravisen 632

Ravisen 58

Ravisen [LI, VIII 242]

Ravisen [BTO 161]

Ravisen 102, 255, 254, 873

Ravisen 308

Ravisen Subh Samag

Ravisen 767

Ravisen 329

Ravisen (Ramananya) 331

Ravisen 924

Ravisen Slm

Ravisen 152

Ravisen 170

Ravisen 716

Ravisen 72

Ravisen 680

Ravisen 501

Ravisen 227

Ravisen 903, 922

Ravisen 251

Ravisen 922, 923

Ravisen 922

by Bhakacharya

by Brahman

by Chasirama

by Bhakacharya [MM II 44]

Com Jaggu Venkatacarya (494)

Ravisen 922

Ravisen 906

Ravisen 863-A, 885

by Ramacandra

by Ramana

See Visharada
[Composed about 1680 A.D. See Hardutt Sarma, Some unknown Sanskrit poets of Mithila published in commemoration Volume For index, of verses, see COJ III]
INDEX

शिवमदानद 767 [TO VI 6963]

समित "Skm"

See अप्रापितरक्षति

सम्स "Skm"

रामश्याम 330 [MM II 123]
रामश्यामप्रसिद्धि "Sarng"

रामासौलविक "by नारायणभाट [Opp 2085]
रामाश्यामभकुर 1064

रामाश्याम 1064
रामाश्य 1047
रामाश्यवर्द्ध 1042, 1064
रामाश्यवर्द्धक 1042
रामाश्यवर्द्धक 1064
रामापत्र "(हिंदी)" कोष 1064
रामापत्रका 1052, 1064
रामापत्रका 1052, 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1028
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 969
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1028, 1042
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1027, 1028

See अप्रापितरक्षति

रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1028
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064

रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064

रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064

रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064

रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064

रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064
रामापत्रका राष्ट्रपति 1064

[AVenkataasubbah, Authors of
Baghavapandavya and Gadyancontāmam, *JBRAS* (1937) 134
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya [OC I 499]
Rājanāyādāgāracākāya

Thānrāma
Rājanāyādāgāracākāya

Bhūmatak [OC III, 91]
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 92, 152, 339
by Viṣṇuṭantra
by Rājañāyādāgāracākāya
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 91
by Sīvamānu
by Rājñāyādāgāracākāya
by Śrīvatsavātā[82]
by Siva
dīrghatāntak
by Śrīvatsavātā[82]
by Śrīvatsavātā[82]
by Śrīvatsavātā[82]
by Śrīvatsavātā[82]

by nariśa [A.M II 125 on the Maharajas of Darbhanga State]
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (विजयदुर) 520, 787
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (श्रीवाससारायण) 532
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (केतन्यपुर) 520

Uttarāma
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 649
Uttarāma
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (d) 252, 706
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (d)
by Gātuttāra 681
by Ṛṣabha[10] 185 [DO XXVII No 10048]
by Gātuttāra 672
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (गामिन्दःजुप्त) 209
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (कविवर्षज) Śrīvatsavātā[82]

[His son Rāmacandrācārya Vidyāraṇyapancanāman wrote stunts They are great astrologers]

Rājānyādāgāracākāya 177 [TSS Trivandrum]
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 768
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (सुर्याचार्य)
Rājanāyādāgāracākāya

Aśtarāma
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 150, 217
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 280
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 290
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 252

by Āduśordāmāstha[82]
by Purumaśānavāna[82]
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 923
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 197
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 53, 55

Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (=कुलराज?) Skm
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya Subh
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya Chakravartī, 491
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya (मथालसुबिध) 1063
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 100, 152, 271, 518
Rājañāyādāgāracākāya 373-B, 184, 188, p 18
by जोतराज
by श्रीवास
by कल्याण

[Translation by Ranjit Sitaramapandita, Allahabad]
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 134-139
Rājānyādāgāracākāya (मेघिन)

[Mahmohapadhya Surya Jl Died at Benares in 1933]
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 278
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 495
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 815
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 874
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 874
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 180
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 874
Rājānyādāgāracākāya 273
राजस्थानी में क्रमजोड़ित

[of Vivaie, VO JI]

राजपाट 675
राजकिशोरी
पत्थरालय
राजवंशवालकर [of Salwah] [SC JI, Sury JI]
स्विदानुक्षमित्व, चुम्बित्व, विजय
काव्य [Printed Madras]

राजवंश 515
राजवंडोद 195, 442 *
राजवेश (कोल्हार) 524, 912, 941
राजवेश (वाप्यर) 828
[V V Mirashi, The chronological
order of Rayasekhara's works—A full
review in Patakh's Com Vol
Poona, D R Bhandarkar's Guryaras,
JBRAS XX 10]

राजस्व 298
गीतवाया
राजस्वपथित 483
राजस्वसूची 201, 440
राजस्वुपलित 199
राजस्व 175
राजस्व 867
राजस्वीयारातक (d) 356
राजस्थानमोहब्बास 200
राजस्थानकोपाल 254
राजस्थानकरिक 820
राजस्थानलल्लुक 183
राजस्थान 150
राजस्थानवाल 158
राजस्थान 63

राजास्थानी पत्रक 188
राजवंशीयपत्रोध (d)
See राजस्थान
राजस्थानी (d) 727
राजस्थानके दूर 72, 183
राजस्थान ठिक 52
राजस्थानिः [Sury JI]
राजस्थान व कारतावलिण्य [Sury JI]
राजस्थान रविवाल, रविवाल
राजस्थान सार्नो
राजस्थान तालाबवाली
राजस्थान कारतावलिण्य [Sury JI]
राजस्थान रविवाल, रविवाल
राजस्थान सार्नो
राजस्थान तालाबवाली
राजस्थान कारतावलिण्य [Sury JI]
राजस्थान रविवाल, रविवाल
राजस्थान सार्नो
राजस्थान तालाबवाली
राजस्थान कारतावलिण्य [Sury JI]
राजस्थान रविवाल, रविवाल
राजस्थान सार्नो
राजस्थान तालाबवाली

* There is a manuscript in the Bhandarkar O R institute B K R (1874-5)
p 9 10 has a critical notice The hero is not Sultan Mohammad of Ghazi, but
Mohammad Begada of Ahmedabad In the colophon the line of Gujarat Kings
from which this Mohammad came is given I am in debt to this information
to P K Gode, Curator, Bhandarkar O R Institute,
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रामकृष्ण (केशवप्रसाद) 716
रामकृष्णनिर्माणकथायिनी p 26
रामकृष्ण 252
  by रामनाथराय
  by बालकृष्ण
रामकृष्णत्तर्तत्त्वादि [SBh Ji]
रामकृष्णद्वैतवल्ली 513
रामकृष्णलुभ 252
रामकृष्ण p 42
  सभात्वर्गया
रामकृष्ण 863-867
  काव्यम् रामकृष्णायाय
रामकृष्ण 544
  भाग्यचंद्री
रामकृष्ण (कौमाल्वालसयुत)
  इनामिलातमालकालय [CC I 256]
रामकृष्ण [CC I 509]
  शहइरस्वरूप
रामकृष्ण 781
  प्रमाणितपरिणय (d)
रामकृष्ण (नागर) Kod
  (कौमाल्वालसयुत) [CC I 507]
  [Laved in Benares about 1616 AD]
रामकृष्ण अथायार (तिकनकैनहर)
  [UP Ji Short prose stories]
रामकृष्ण (तिकनकैनहर) 779
  उपकृष्ण (d)
रामकृष्ण 286
  पदपुराणकलिक
रामकृष्ण 941
  बलकृष्णपौराणिक
रामकृष्णचिन्तामणि
  by राववेंद्रसिंह
रामकृष्णमल 1064
रामकृष्णवद्वर p 77
रामकृष्णायायितम 296
रामकृष्णायायितमालकालय 98

रामकृष्ण 251, 709
रामायणाभविष्यी 160, 251
रामाहरिसूत्र (d) 778, 955
रामाविलास 251
रामायंक 224
रामायणार्थकर 251 314
रामाविलासमयरी 251
रामावतंत्र 919
रामकर 955
राम (श्रीनाथपुरुष) 298
राम
  कैलानिधनकालय [CC I 505]
राम (कौमाल्वालसयुत)
राम (कौमाल्वालसयुत) 541
राम (म्यो, M's.) 521
राम (कवित) 922, 941
राम (नातिहिंस) राम आचार्य
  सल्लमायापरिणय [CC I 506]
रामकृष्ण 298, 331
रामकथा 152, 172, 175
  by राजवृक्षभारत
  by रामभरत
  by नारायणमहेन्द्र
रामकथासूत 252
रामकथासूत्र 252, 541
रामकथासूत्र 298
  by रामभरत
  by नारायणमहेन्द्र
रामकृष्ण 298
  गीतासूत्र
रामकृष्ण (कालपं) 787
  [About 1550 AD]
रामकृष्ण 407
  पांडवबिधिविज्ञक
रामकृष्ण [CC I, 506]
  मदनगोपालबिलास
Kesava's father was Patanjali, Patanjali's father was Kesava and Kesava's brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni]

Kesava’s father was Patanjali, Patanjali’s father was Kesava and Kesava’s brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni. Patanjali's father was Kesava and Kesava's brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni.

Kesava’s father was Patanjali, Patanjali’s father was Kesava and Kesava’s brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni.

Kesava’s father was Patanjali, Patanjali’s father was Kesava and Kesava’s brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni.

Kesava’s father was Patanjali, Patanjali’s father was Kesava and Kesava’s brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni.

Kesava’s father was Patanjali, Patanjali’s father was Kesava and Kesava’s brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni.

Kesava’s father was Patanjali, Patanjali’s father was Kesava and Kesava’s brothers were Iśvara and Rājacūḍāmāni.
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Ramchandrasahit 44
Ramchandraivany 719
Ramchandraivany 162
by Vekkata (Bhadrabha) [TV VI 7390]
Ramchandraivany 1043
Ramchandraivany (A.D.) [VC JI]
Ramchandraivany (of Muradabad) [Sury JI]
Ramchandraivany (of Hanumaduniga) [Sury JI]
Ramchandraivany (T) bhikshani
Huvanta [UP JI X]
Ramchandraivany 708
Ramchandraivany 904
Ramchandraivany 291
Ramchandraivany 1000
Ramchandraivany
by Vekkata (Abhay) 156, 239, 336, 341
by Goparaksh 337
by Vekkataivany 355
by Kuvandam 252
by Purushottamivany 252, 1047
by Ramdas 252
anonymous 787
Ramchandraivany 541
Ramchandraivany 1099
Ramchandraivany 252
Ramchandraivany (prose)
[Ramghat Jain Mandir, Benares]
Ramchandraivany 59
by Abhinand
by Kaishonay
by samvarangird 339
by Kamasri 383
by Venkateshaivany 383
by Ramkumar 177, 544
by Gopardas 714

Ramcharit Upanayana (of A1a) [VC JI]
Ramcharit (Yoga) p 22
Ramcharit 252
by Raghava
by Vishvakshet
by Kaishonay
by Mohanasahasr
Ramcharitmatv 180
by Edut
Ramcharitvanishan
Har [MM II 133]
Ramcharyasut 541
Ramcharyasut 160
Ramcharyasut Har
Ramcharyasut
Chaurapanchakavakika
BhaviniVilasatidika [OU I 505-6]
Ramcharyasut 297
Ramcharyasut 505
Ramcharyasut 297
Ramcharyasut 581
Ramcharyasut 1099
Ramcharyasut Srik
Ramcharyasut (Vinayakpur) 752
Ramcharyasut 252
Ramcharyasut
Ramcharyasut
Ramcharyasut [OO I 515]
Ramcharyasut 1102
Ratnagiri
Ramcharyasut (Vyasat) 772
Ramcharyasut (Vyasath) 252
Ramcharyasut (of Muzafarpur) [Sury JI]
Ramcharyasut (of Muzafarpur) Ked [OO I 584 Visvanatha wrote com-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on Nyāyasūtras in 1634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामदेवभिष</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामदेवभिष [CC I 575]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामदेवभिष 473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वालवदात्मसार्या</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामदेवभिष (of Datapuri, Muzafarpur)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sury J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथ 252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अभिरामकाल्य</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथ 544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वन्देशेकरचन्द्र</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मेधकुत्मसार्या 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथसरसी [Sury J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथकल्य</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मायमात्मी (आयाल्लही)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Printed Calcutta]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथसांकेरबाबा 254, 863-A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासुदेवाजी</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथभिष</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्वानाजी [MM II 98]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथवधावल्लकक</td>
<td>863-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथसंभाषी (मेहरेले)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[of Amagarava SC J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथसंभाषी (S) 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामनाथसंभाषी (मेहरेले) (of Bombay)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति 177, 779, 939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[This has double entendre and has stories of Rāma and king Rāmapāla]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति 399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति (of Raiganj)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कालविश्वकान्ता etc, [MG J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति 618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामाशक्ति p 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| रामवाणी | 160 |
| रामभत | 513 |
| मदाल्ला 01 उजावितमदाल्ला (d) | |
| [CC I 505] | |
| रामभत | |
| See मित्रकामी | |
| रामभत 787 | |
| तारातिरिक्ति (d) | |
| रामभत (कैत) 679 | |
| रामभत (थावाल्लह) 27, 88, 618 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित 293, 939 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित | |
| श्रीमदकालु | 939 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित [Sury J] | |
| रामभतवाणीन Kal | |
| रामभतवाणीन 721 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित 160 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित 721 | |
| रामभतमा 146 | |
| रामभतमा 507 | |
| रामभत 622 | |
| रामभत (महूर) 1052 | |
| रामभतर्कन 600 | |
| रामभतर्कन साधन 286 | |
| रामभतिकालिकितिराज 778 | |
| रामभतित (R) | |
| रामभतित [UP J (1936) 37] | |
| रामभतित | |
| वानवकल्यासकाथा [CC I 513] | |
| रामभतकाल 156, 336 | |
| रामभतकाल 252 | |
| रामभतकाल 252 | |
| रामभतर्कन बाबु बाबु बाबु 723, 779 | |
| रामभतर्कन (बैंकोंद) 288 | |
| रामभत 307 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित 273 | |
| रामभतसिद्धित 373-A | |
| रामभतसिद्धित (K A) JSSP | |
| रामभतसिद्धित 388 | |
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Ramaśāṅkara 252
Ramaṁatāółākāraṭō [TO VI 6991]
Ramaṁśeṣa (of Cranganoon) 714
Kōṣṇḍi
Ramaṁśeṣaprāca 939
Ramaṁśeṣa 695
Ramaṁśeṣapāraja 1057
Ramaṁśeṣapahārapāraja 161, 939, 1044, 1049
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 544
[Love in Kollam 975-1025]
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 715
Ramaṁśeṣapahārapārajan 713
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 695 -
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 180
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan [Ramghat Jann Mandin, Benares]
Ramaṁśeṣa 252
Anonymous
by Raksana
by Śrīnātha
Ramaṁśeṣa Bhuṇḍeśa (of Mehadivagana, Vardhamana) [Sury Jī]
Ramaṁśeṣa 323
Ramaṁśeṣa 116, 290
Ramaṁśeṣa 373
Aśtaśāṅkaraṭölādun
Ramaṁśeṣa 815, 922
Narākāroṣeṇa
Ramaṁśeṣa 459, 815
(mentioned by Dandin)
Ramaṁśeṣa Meṇḍa (of Toloda, VO Jī)
Ramaṁśeṣa 83
Ramaṁśeṣa (Vāraṇsa) 941
Ramaṁśeṣa (Vānapu) [of Amritsar, Punjab SC Jī]
Ramaṁśeṣa (Marā) 544
Ramaṁśeṣa (Mahā) 3, 19, 50
Ramaṁśeṣa (Ākṣara) 522

Ramaṁśeṣa (Vātaśāñcaraṇa Vēmūrī) 769
Ramaṁśeṣa (A L) [VO Jī]
Ramaṁśeṣa See Śrīnātha
Ramaṁśeṣa (Padmaṇīvar) 541
Ramaṁśeṣa (Vairāgoṇi) 522
Ramaṁśeṣa
Ramaśāṅkara [Printed Madras, on the
Deity of Yanomaddala of Andhra country]
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 200
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan (G) 441
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 546, 1103
Vivaśāṅkaraṭeśāla
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan (K S) 744
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 841
Ramaṁśeṣa 862
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 1100
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 917
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan (Ramaṁśeṣapārajan) 917
Ramaṁśeṣa 254
Kumāratīva
Ramaṁśeṣa (d) 784
Ramaṁśeṣa 253
Ramaṁśeṣa 44
Mābhikāvyaṃśa
Ramaṁśeṣa (d) 783
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 1064
Jagadāsāṅkrahamsaṅkhaṭeṇa (d) [Vidy Jī]
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 252
Ramaṁśa
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 1064
Sākṣatāśāla
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan p 24
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan
Ramaṁśeṣapārajan 691
Ramaṁśeṣa (Vānaḍa) (Paṇḍaṇ) [SB Jī]
The Ramayana is the story of Atma Vijayam. Ramais the Atma who is in quest of Sita who is Brahmavidya with the help of Lakshmana, who is Buddhi, and Hinum, who is Manas, by destroying Ravana, the Yogasastra with the ten
senses for ten heads, and Kumbhakarna, Tamoguna, after enlisting the services of Vibhishana, the Satyavatana Lanka, wherein Sita is made captive, is Muladhara Chakra and Rakshasas are the evil forces that lie coiled up in Muladhara. In fact, all the characters and all the geographical names that occur in the Ramavana are identified with certain portions of the human body, and every such identification is sought to be supported by the meaning which the word is capable of yielding or other reasons are given why it ought to be so.

See also for a similar exposition, *An esoteric study of Ramayanan* by D. Doraisami Aiyangar, Chittoor. *Articles in Dharmaraja*, Delhi.
Rāṣṭhakrīḍā is this finely described in Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta

अष्टामश्रमन्तरे माधवो माधवे माधवे चालितेयारञ्जनः ।
हर्षाकारिति मन्दे मध्यः समगी जी जुना देवकीनन्दनः ॥
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श्रमक्ष

जगशायविज्ञानकाव्य 254

श्रममेंद्र 308

श्रमवर्ण 593

श्रमसौर (निपाठन) 282

श्रमविज्ञान (d) [OO I 528

श्रमसत्त 314, 442

श्रमसत्त 32

श्रमचर्य (सेवा) 996

श्रमक Subh

श्रमक 72, 812, 870

श्रमक 561, 563

श्रमोदिकारु (सेवा) 220, 323


श्रमदेव 297, 998 [Tanj XVI 7388]

श्रमदेव Shm 400

श्रमाणि

श्रमपानिर 50

श्रमपानिर 440

श्रमशक्तिःकरणकाव्य [Rao, 242

श्रमावधार 518

श्रमकासोत BTO 190

by मालेनी

by श्रवंक

श्रोदीकी 50

श्रोटक Shm

श्रेणीकान्तमहानचर्य 468

श्रेणीहासिक (०) 781

श्रेणीरचना 218, 515

श्रेणी 873-4

श्रेणीत

See शीतमाधव

शाहधिमी (अहसन)

श्रमक Subh

श्रेणीभानिका (d) 563, 880
रोजनार्न (d) 682, 725
रोजनार्नतक 225, 312
रोजना 373-A
रोजनार्न (सब्रह्मण्यास) [Printed, Bombay]
रोजनार्न (सब्रह्मण्यास) [Bendall, 51]
रोजनार्न (सब्रह्मण्यास) [of Purapadha, Dacca] [SC II]
रोजनार्न (सब्रह्मण्यास) 672
रोजनार्नय चरित 235

स
रोजनार्न 889
रोजनार्नमालिका 908, 1019
रोजनार्नमालिका 915
रोजनार्नदेव 45
रोजनार्नकारणकर (P) 42
रोजनार्न (भागानपुर) 517
रोजनार्न (अंकेकांडी) 252
रोजनार्न (भागानपुर) रूवरीकालिस [TC IV 5460]
रोजनार्न (रामाजुजुजु) 376, 517
रोजनार्न
सहस्याचरित [CG I 536]
रोजनार्न Subh, Pady
रोजनार्नदेव 541
रोजनार्नमालिका 68, 373
रूपिंकसूत्र (रूपिंकसूत्र) 76, 373
पदरचना
नैवध्वनया [composed probably in the first half of 16th century A.D. COI II 300]
रोजनार्न (P) 42
माहात्माकर 959
रोजनार्नमालक 959, 1015
रोजनार्नमालक Ked

रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव 694
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव [Tang No 3963] by नान्दिनित्रित
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव
रुद्रविनाहकार्य 270
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव (शैलीय) (Sury II]
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव (of Nagour, Marwai)
रामायनार्न कालयादेव [A citralakṣya, acoustics Sarada I, I 282]
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव 441
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव (मराठिक) 526
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव (मराठिक) 932
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव 246, 254, 323, 610, 639, 649, 656, 666
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव 119, 294, 806, 398
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव 252
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव 282
See किताबोंकर
रोजनार्नमालिकयादेव (P) 541
रोजनार्न Sarng
रोजनार्न 374
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण (d) 777
by सदाशीवदेवित 939
by मानविविक
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण (G) [UP I]
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण by रोजनार्नकालवर्ण [Printed Bombay] by उत्सराय 253
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 212, 649, 650
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 212
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 506
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण (prose) [SC II]
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 107
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 505
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 250
रोजनार्नकालवर्ण 323
† He must have written his commentary on Murări after he became an ascetic and assumed the name Bāmānārdāśṭrama [Tanj VIII 3222] He had a brother Kondubbhata (Pandratapattabhadra)

† He was son of Visvanātha and Pārvati of Haritagotra. In his colophon to the commentary on Saundaryalahārī (Tanj No 20664) he describes his ancestors, all great in learning. Of these were Mahādeva (para 899) Lakṣmīdhara, (author of Sabityaparjñāta), Vīrmcsiśtra, (author of Bharatārnavapoṣṭa and Śabityamāmsā) He was in the Court of King Gajapati Virarudra of Orissa and wrote Sarasvatī vilāsa (on Hindu law) and poems Lakṣmīdhara, Barhāvatamsa and Karna vatamsa. After Kṛṣṇadevarāja married the daughter of Pratāparudra, Lakṣmīdhara appears to have gone to Vijayanagar and lived in the Court of Kṛṣṇadevarāja, whom he thus praised

Viraraghavacharya gives his date as about 1465–1580. Inscriptions in Kondavidū mention Lakṣmīdhara [EI VI 280 dated 1620 A.D.]

Has the same Lakṣmīdhara written a commentary of Anālalahārī? [CO I 528] Here his name is noted as Lakṣmīdhara Desīṭka]
विषमिनरामण 441 [सिंग्रे I 538] contd
मेगालवशक
मदमुखप्रेतिका
रामचन्द्रपरवश
विनयवासिनीदरशक
विशेषवासिनीदशक
विपुलसिरान
श्रवस्तोत
पुरुषपत्री
विषमिनरामणकिििि 311
गाजावर्त्तिरतक
विषमिनरामणकाव्य 742
विषमिनरामणदृश्य 242
विषमिनविवाह 318
विषमिनिदिवङ्ग
अनुभवकृति (d) 787
विषमिनिदिवङ्ग 544, 547
श्यानानुर
विषमिनिदिवङ्ग 213
भारतात्मकर्णिनर्ग्यावस्था
विषमिनिदिवङ्गश्चारण 492
विषमिनिदिवङ्गश्चारण 210
विषमिनिदिवङ्गश्चारण 223
विषमिनिदिवङ्ग 981
क्षणिकासत्पर्य
क्षमिविज्ञ 301
क्षमिविज्ञ [सिंग्रे I 539]
गिराणीरतिकाव्य
क्षमिविज्ञ (विनशष्टपुत्र) 196
अवदुभचरित
क्षमिविज्ञ
क्षमिविज्ञ 544
क्षमिविज्ञ
क्षमिविज्ञ 777
क्षमिविज्ञशतक 737
क्षमिविज्ञनन्द (d) 541
क्षमिविज्ञ 380, 180
क्षमिविज्ञनामलिका 922
क्षमिविज्ञ 311

शब्दीविज्ञ 28
शब्दीविज्ञ 312
See ब्रेकीविज्ञ
शब्दीविज्ञ 544
शब्दीविज्ञ 919
शब्दीविज्ञ 496
शब्दीविज्ञ 342
शब्दीविज्ञ (d)
by त्रिपोविना 777
by तदारसू 551, 783, 842
See यात्रारत
शब्दीविज्ञ 379
by देवश्री
by देवश्रीरतन
शब्दीस्तुल्ल 254 P [TC VI 6957]
शब्दीस्तुल्ल 126
शब्दीस्तुल्ल 1064
शब्दीस्तुल्ल 378
शब्दी 904
शब्दीविज्ञ 255
शब्दीविज्ञ 746
शब्दीविज्ञ 220
शब्दीविज्ञ 746
शब्दीविज्ञ
See द्वितीयनाथ (d) [सिंग्रे I 541]
शब्दीविज्ञ 902
शब्दीविज्ञ 309
शब्दीविज्ञ 72
शब्दीविज्ञ 286
शब्दीविज्ञ 880
शब्दीविज्ञ 786
शब्दीविज्ञ 880
शब्दीविज्ञ 786
शब्दीविज्ञ
See नामीवत्त्राधि
शब्दीविज्ञ 706
शब्दीविज्ञ 922
शब्दीविज्ञ 286, 600
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>दौलदास्कथा Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौलदप्त Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौलमुखर (d) 880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौलवती (d) 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौलवतीकथा 70, 106, 441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौलवतीसार महाकाव्य by विनाश [Jesu 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौलातुलित 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौक Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौका Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकाद्वारण 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ प 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथभाट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथद्रु (d) [TangvIII 50/3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथद्रु 68, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथद्रु 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथद्रु 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथद्रु 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथद्रु (पिता) 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[He lived for 121 years in 1205-1326 The dates given in para 209 appear to be incorrect Vedaantadesika has written a pancasat in his praise]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकाविकारक 1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ (d) 53, 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ (d) 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ 836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ 1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ 983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ (नवम्पहक्त) Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ (हृदयक्त) Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ Sany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ भोज 373-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौकानाथ Skm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दौस्मयराज 129, 251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1062
INDEX

1063

It describes the life of Manavalamatamum See para 209]

These were enacted in the courts of king Paramardadeva and his son Trailokyavarmadeva of 12–13th century Paramardi—wrote Pias’asti to Siva (JASB XVII 33)

and ruled 1163–1203 See Id XXXVIII 121]

[Quoted in Sāhityadarpana ]
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by GOS, Baroda as Rūpakā-ṣatka These were enacted in the courts of king Paramardadeva and his son Trailokyavarmadeva of 12–13th century Paramardi—wrote Pias’asti to Siva (JASB XVII 33)

and ruled 1163–1203 See Id XXXVIII 121]

[Quoted in Sāhityadarpana ]

by GOS, Baroda as Rūpakā-ṣatka These were enacted in the courts of king Paramardadeva and his son Trailokyavarmadeva of 12–13th century Paramardi—wrote Pias’asti to Siva (JASB XVII 33)

and ruled 1163–1203 See Id XXXVIII 121]

[Quoted in Sāhityadarpana ]
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बर्दाचार्य 160
रक्षणांपरिणय
बर्दाचार्य (= अद्वादु, अममल) 160, 718 [of Vatsagotra Born at Kann in
1165]

महादायण
हैतिप्रत्स्वत
वस्त्रतितिक (d)
परतर्चादिपकक्षतति
बर्दाचार्य
महायुक्तमालिका [OO I 550]
बर्दाचार्य (= परिक्राम कार्य अममल) 160, 718
बर्दाचार्यकपरिणय 133
बर्दाचार्य 529
बर्दाचार्य 582
परातुषणबिशिष्टि
बर्दाचार्य 6, 268, 331, 429, 591
बर्दाचार्य 718
पश्चामी मित्र [MM II 75]
बर्दाचार्य 209
बर्दाचार्य 505
बर्दाचार्य 254
बराह शिम
बराहमु 242
बराहमिहि 19
बराहिनिवय 242
वर्णव्युत्त 345
वर्णनिसरसुहृद 369
वर्णपद 1064
वर्णव्युत्त [TV VI 7396]
वर्णव्युत्तमालिका 1064
बर्षमान (= बीर = सहवीर) 13
बर्षमान (विजयसिद्धविद्य) 235

बर्दाचार्य 1064
वरुणाकुमार 727
बरद (अवध्य) 160, 777
बरद (श्रीविनायकपुर) 529
बरद (वैशिक) 787
बरद (= नायानाथ) 122 (1316 1415)
देविकस्तोत
विप्रकृत्व
प्रायिनाष्ठक
हैराणसदेश
कोकिलसेवत
सुधाकर
बरदान्तिविवाल 50
बरेकुमार, चार्य 504
बरदानुंगाराक्ष तक [Bundall 65]
बरदेशिक (चन्द) 251
बरदेशिक (चन्दिक) 242
बरदेशिक रूप 506
बरदेशिक गुरु 505
बरदराज 251.
बरदराज
See कविजनकिलोड़ु
बरदराज (वज्रान) pp 24, 43
रामायणवाल्य [TV VI 7055]
बरदराज (तालान) p 52
बरदराजस्व 143, 207
बरदृश्य 254 D
बरदाचार्य (नारायणपुर) 254 E
बरदाचार्य 922
उल्लेखलायी
बरदाचार्य 701
अनकुनाओग्रास (d)
बरदाचार्य
साविनीपरिणय 253
बरदाचार्य 160
चोठागण (d)
बरदाचार्य 160
अनकुनाओग्रास (d)
The correct name seems to be this and not वाष्ठेश्वर as printed in para 168.

The senior Vāṇchēṣvara was a poet of the Court of Pratāpāsūrma and his son Tukkory of Tanjore. His forefathers were the donees of Shaharajapuram. He wrote Mahīṇāsāṭaka or Lulayasāṭaka (Tanj VII 2954). He was a rival of Ghanas Yāsma and directed his satires against him whom he alluded to as Vṛṣula. His great grandson Vancheswara wrote a commentary on it (Tanj VII 3066). His commentary on Hiradnyakṣaśīlutra (Tanj No 2072) is dated 1818 A.D. See under Mahīṇāsāṭaka.
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वासुधरशंकरप्राण (d) 704
वातीपति 698, 904
विक्रतिलम्बय 374
विक्रम (सरस्यपुर) 320
विक्रमविक्रमाकादक (d) [OC I 569]
विक्रमेश्वर (राजारघेश्वर) 456
विक्रमेश्वरवर्षा 1059
हथनतार
पिकासाव
नक्षनाक्षक
वासुदेवतेजस
राधिकायामसी
विक्रमभारत 250 408
by श्रीकारकामकार 250, 254
by श्रामुच्चक 408
विक्रमराय 252
विक्रमसागर 405
विक्रमसेनदम्मु 544, 546
विक्रमसेनचत्रित 432
विक्रमाकृष्टिर 254
by हसकाहि
विक्रमाकृष्टिरचित्रत 63
विक्रमाकृष्टिरचित्र 429, 432
by नन्दीशवाणिक
by केमकर
by सरस्यनीद्वाकर
by शिव
by रामचन्द्र
by वर्णवि
by कालदासा
विक्रमदिशा 87, Subh, Sarang
विक्रमदिशा (पुलकेरितु) 459
विक्रमदिशा 385, 400, 470
विक्रमदिशा (विलसयनम) 62, 89, 459
विक्रमदिशा 202, 432
विक्रमोक्ति (d) 166, 622
विक्रमानकौर (d) 668

विक्रान्तभाग (d) (mentioned by Hema candrā)
विक्रान्तराधृत (d) 785
विक्रान्तातन्त्र (d) 783
विक्रान्तीवर्मण 400
विक्रान्ताजय (d) 694
विक्रान्तरा Subh
विक्रान्तराघेश्वर 671
विक्रान्तरामुृत 509
विक्रम (भाकृत) Subh
विक्रान्तसेनिनग 116
विक्रान्तप्रलोष 27
विजयचन्द्र 73
विजयचन्द्रविचित्रित 235
विजयचन्द्रविचित्र 235, 440
विजयचन्द्रमहावध 231
विजयमहान 75
विजयपरसाधित (d) 786
विजयपाल 400
विजयपुरूष 442, 500
विजयपुराण 2001
विजयभाव Subh
विजयसंपाठ 727
विजयराज (बवनश्वर) 254-F
विजयराम 53
विजयरामसंपत्य 356, 919, 938
विजयरसी 738
विजयरसेन Subh
विजयविञ्जयमायोग (d) 96, 785
विजयविञ्जय 544
विजयविदासकल्प्य Opp II 484
विजयविदास 53
विजयधूर 818
विजयमन्दिर 370
विजयथल 374
विजयसिद्ध 816, 863-A
काठवादशीवाक्या
He is son of Maliadeva and Sāvarni of Sandilyagotia and belongs to Badahārīa state [Printed SC JI]

[He is son of Maliadeva and Sāvarni of Sandilyagotia and belongs to Badahārīa state [Printed SC JI]
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विज्ञानन्दन

देवमोहनीराणार (d)

[He is son of Maliadeva and Sāvarni of Sandilyagotia and belongs to Badahārīa state [Printed SC JI]

विज्ञानन्दनिक श्रीरत्नकविश्व [Samudra N]

विज्ञानिशिक्षा 50

विज्ञानीज्ञान 200

विज्ञान विज्ञान [TC VI 1957]

विज्ञानविद्वारिण不应该 (d) 777

विज्ञान 374, 462, 626

[See JMy XXIV 156]

विज्ञानसिद्धि 321

विज्ञानावलिका

[Printed at Nagpur with the comment of Krishna Sarma This is said to be a fourth sātaaka of Bhartārā on review see SC JI, VI]

विज्ञानसिद्धि Skm

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 247

[Sanskrit Journal, Pattambi, Malabar]

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 442

विज्ञानसिद्धि

[Aisha Labiary, Vizagapatam]

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 180, 715

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 180

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 262

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी Subh

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी

हासातर (d) 128

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 219, 225, 297, 772

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 273

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 213

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 1028

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 894, 922

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी Skm *

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी Skm

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी (d) 220

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 347, 876

[For commentaries see MM II 144-149]

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 514

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 516

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी (d) 727

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी (d) 166, 568

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी 374

विज्ञानविद्वारिणी नारायणावलिका

Compare

अर्थ दानबौद्धिक गिरिजाध्यापिक विविधाहृत वेदेष्ट धारणाते पुरातात्वे वरुणनिशिक्षितः।

गाजा लालधम्ममयं शास्त्रिक नागाधमिकः क्षमालं सक्षमास्वेत्वेश्वरविमत्वमत्स्त त्वा मा च भिक्षादेन॥

दानबौद्धिक गिरिजाध्यापिक विविधाहृत वेदेष्ट धारणाते पुरातात्वे वरुणनिशिक्षितः।

गाजा लालधम्ममयं शास्त्रिक नागाधमिकः क्षमालं सक्षमास्वेत्वेश्वरविमत्वमत्स्त त्वा मा च भिक्षादेन॥
He was descendant of Jivadeva, author of the poem Bhakti Bhagavata and lived during the time of King Mukundadeva II (1658-1692) of Orissa. Nārāyanānātha is in praise of Lord Jagannātha of Purī edited with Pāṇḍava mīra's commentary by Karunākara (Kara) Sarman Principal, Sanskrit College, Purī. Jivadeva was son of Purusottama and wrote his poem at the request of King Prataparudra and lived in 16th century in Orissa.

Jivadeva was descendant of Jivadeva and lived during the time of King Mukundadeva II (1658-1692) of Orissa. Nārāyanānātha is in praise of Lord Jagannātha of Purī edited with Pāṇḍava mīra's commentary by Karunākara (Kara) Sarman Principal, Sanskrit College, Purī. Jivadeva was son of Purusottama and wrote his poem at the request of King Prataparudra and lived in 16th century in Orissa.

(by mentioned in Bhojaprabandha)

(mentioned in Bhojaprabandha)
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बिनूकेरक 255-I
बिनूर Skm
बिनूक Skm
बिन्येथरीसाठ 28, 316
बिन्येथरीपाद बाणिज्य (Swy Ji)
(Edtr Supr Ji Benares)
बिन्तानन्द (d) 692, 785, 787
बिनवयस्म विनायक 235
बिनवदेह Skm 400
बिनयमाल
चन्द्रूत [OO II 36]
बिनयवती 460, 604
बिनयवती 68
बिनयविनयकविरुद्ध 943
बिनयसिंहकीतिरंज 941
बिनयपूर्ण (=विनयराम)
(किताबाभीमा मीठका [OO I 576]
बिनयक 314, 467
बिनयकप्रणित Sarug
[mentioned in Bhojprabandha]
बिनयकभाष
See आज़ूजवन्दितःका
बिनयकपव [Swry Ji]
बिनीलान (भागवत) Subh
बिनोदर (d) 786
बिन्ननारयण 205
बिनंदन्त्वा 180, 246, 323, 715
बिनुभोगन (d) 786
बिनुभद्रन (d) 790
बिनुभद्रस्वतन्त्र 535
बिनुचन्द्रबन्धु 938
बिन्दा 369
बिन्दकर्मकर Subh, Skm
बिन्दासमाला 134
बिन्दासपालमायण 373-B
बिन्दुविलास Subh
बिन्दुविलासम वन 352
बिन्दुविलासव पुस्तका Subh

विभौक Skm
विभूत 235
विभूतनाथचरित 440
(Printed, Bombay)
विभूतीतोष p 42
[Agr. Artch Rep (1927), 8]
विभूतहंसचरित 440
(Printed Bombay)
विभूताचाँ 235
विभूतां 374
विभूतालापन (d) [Bendah, 19]
विभूताज्ञातव 741
विभूतासिन्ध 562
विभूतिभविषय 491
विभूतिमनविदोद 314
विभूतिमोदसुधा 314
विभूतिरसोली (d) 741
विभूतिरसि Skm
विभूतिरसोलित 501
विभूतिरशोधनम् 194
वि विभूतिरशोधनम् 194
विभूतिरशोधनम् 887
चन्द्रूतकरणीका
विभूतिरशोधनम् (रूप) 124, 130
विभूतिरशोधनम् 1099
विभूतिरशोधनम् 130
विभूतिरशोधनम् p 23
विभूतिरशोधनम् (= विभूतिरशोधनम्) (d) 672, 780
विभूतिरशोधनम् 294
विभूतिरशोधनम् 251
विभूतिरशोधनम् 491
विभूतिरशोधनम् (d) 787
विभूतिरशोधनम् (d) 563, 880
विभूतिरशोधनम् 563
विभूतिरशोधनम् 514
विभूतिरशोधनम् 696
विभूतिरशोधनम् (d) 767
विभूतिरशोधनम् (= विभूतिरशोधनम्) 134
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बीरब्रह्म 86, 100
बीरब्रह्म (ब्रह्मचर्य) 887
बीरसेन 1070

बीरसेनदेवस्वय
        by पूर्णानन्द [PB I 101 composed in 1578]
बीरसेनपुज़ 509
बीरसेनविजय
        by एकालनन्द 298, 544, 789
        by मलिकापुर 544
बीरसेनविज्ञानकाय
        See सुकेश्वर
बीरसेनविज्ञान (d) 879
बीरसेन 900
बीरसेन SS
बीरराज 388

विशेषणात्मक

बीरराज (स्नेहपुली) 163, 777
बीरराज (स्नेहपुली) 163, 723
बीरराज (वनभर) 323, 769
बीरराज (चतुरपुली) 621, 647, 649, 650

बीरराज भाराय (I) [UP Jr]
बीरराज भारायकर्त्तव्यविवाह 704
बीरराजवामत 210
बीरराजविजय (d) 790
बीरराजवंशम 289
बीरराजीम 785
बीरराजविकाय [BTO 162]
बीरराजविकायपति 1064
बीरराजसंग्रह 459
बीरराजबाला 275
बीरराजनय 124
बीरराजनार 727
बीररारस्त्री Slom, Pady, 374, 401
बीरराहे (SS)
बीरसिद्धेश [OC II. 141]

बीरहटसेरतपुरकाय
        See केशवप्रभ
बीरहट 110
बीरहटाचार्य 57
बीरहटपुरस्वाम 484
बीरहटनद (d) 788
बीरहट 542

कृष्णविजय
बीरहट 522

सतरामकीली

बीरहटरदा (= इंदरदश) 592
बीरहटरदा (कृष्णचतुर) Ked
बीरहटकायारायत (of Vaidhamara) [SB Jr]

बीरहटसेरतस्मिन 529
बीरहटसेरत 235, 254
बीरसेनसेरत Slom, Kus
बीरहटथंड 110, 671

इतिहासनाटक (d) [OC I 596]
        by सुकुचानाय

इततक 502
इततकस्मूच 1100
इततकस्मूचालिका 1101
इततकौलुक 880, 1100
इततकौलुक 1100
        by राजसुहु
        by रामप्रवीण
इततकालिक 502
इततकनिरूप 1100
इततकनिरूप 1100
इततकनिरूप 1101
इततकनिरूपण 1100

इततकनिरूपण
        by सीताराम 1099
        by गाजार [Oudh XIX. 58]

इततकनिरूपण
        by जानकीनदन
        by भीष्मप्रभ [MM II 15, 17]
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उत्तरीयका 922, 1100
by विज्ञेश्वर
by श्याम
उत्तरुपामित 1101
by यशन्त
by गदाधर
उत्तरायण 1100
उत्तरदीप 1100
by जनानदन
by वृंदावनी
उत्तराणिका 1101
उत्तराणिका 1101
उत्तराभाषा 1100
संस्कृतयज्ञ
बहाजी
उत्तरासुजनरावचित्र 494
उत्तराकाव्य 1101
by कुंभाराम
by महारी
by दुर्गदत्त
by गणपति
by हृदिसामभ
उत्तराकृति 1094
by हृदिसामभ [MM II 22]
उत्तराकृति 1074
उत्तराकृति 1099
उत्तरारामित 1103
by दुर्गदत्त
by नारायण
by रुबिकर
by रामदेव 768, 909
by वेंकेश
by रामदेवमिश्र
by यशन्तसिंह
by सदाबिंदु
उत्तरारामित 1103 cont’d
by काठिदास
by रामचूडामिति 152
by श्यामराम
by विक्रमसानन्द
उत्तरामार्ग 1101
उत्तरामालदा 1100
उत्तरालक्षण 1100
उत्तरावलिक 1100
by उमापति
by वैवनाथ
उत्तरातिलोक 1100
उत्तरावेचन 1100
उत्तराराम
by भारदास 1100
by रामपति उपाध्याय [MM II 24]
उत्तराविक्रमदर्श 1100
उत्तरायुक्त 1100
by महुराजसुकर
by वेणीवंशास
उत्तरावर्मान 1100
उत्तराचार 922
उत्तर 325
उत्तरावलिक 143
उत्तरोद्धरण (d) 877
उत्तरहर 945
उत्तरविभाषक 373
उत्तरकेश 271
उत्तरावलिक [TO V1 7311]
by सुबोधकृष्ण (in 20 cantos) [DO XXVII 7311]
उत्तरावलिक 477
उत्तरावलिक 252
उत्तरावलिक 701
उत्तरकेश 55
उत्तरकेश 92, 124
उत्तरकेश (क्लकणथ) p 25
उत्तरकेश 323
He was the disciple of Siva Sūrya Yajvan whom he describes thus

कलाधरवत् कमलपालिरिवत् पद्माश्रेष्ठतुरानुभवत्।
मूःश्रीरामाचार्य विषुद्धसर्वो ये राज्ये विषुद्धर्मकारित:॥
He is son of Srinivasaragha of Srinivasa Gotra. Born Srimumuka in the town of Conjeevaram. He wrote in Sanskrit and Tamil. His works are preserved in the library of Vizagapatam.

- "He is son of S. Srinivasa Gotra of Srinivasa Gotra. Born Srimumuka Lives at Conjeevaram Composed Sanskrit poetic renderings of Tamil works, Desika-prabandha, Periyalwar's Tirumuli, Namalwar's Tiruviruttam and Tiruvaisinyam and Tiruvandadi (1 to 4 dasakas)

- "Ed by M.M Anantakrishna-sastri, Prof of Sanskrit Calcutta"

- "He is son of S. Srinivasa Gotra of Srinivasa Gotra. Born Srimumuka Lives at Conjeevaram Composed Sanskrit poetic renderings of Tamil works, Desika-prabandha, Periyalwar's Tirumuli, Namalwar's Tiruviruttam and Tiruvaisinyam and Tiruvandadi (1 to 4 dasakas)"

- "Ed by M.M Anantakrishna-sastri, Prof of Sanskrit Calcutta"

- "He is son of S. Srinivasa Gotra of Srinivasa Gotra. Born Srimumuka Lives at Conjeevaram Composed Sanskrit poetic renderings of Tamil works, Desika-prabandha, Periyalwar's Tirumuli, Namalwar's Tiruviruttam and Tiruvaisinyam and Tiruvandadi (1 to 4 dasakas)"

- "Ed by M.M Anantakrishna-sastri, Prof of Sanskrit Calcutta"

- "He is son of S. Srinivasa Gotra of Srinivasa Gotra. Born Srimumuka Lives at Conjeevaram Composed Sanskrit poetic renderings of Tamil works, Desika-prabandha, Periyalwar's Tirumuli, Namalwar's Tiruviruttam and Tiruvaisinyam and Tiruvandadi (1 to 4 dasakas)"

- "Ed by M.M Anantakrishna-sastri, Prof of Sanskrit Calcutta"
† He is also said to have translated the Tiruvaimthu into Sanskrit I heard a verse repeated from it though I have not been able to trace any such manuscript.

शोक पुक्तलमेकनाथकत्वाय शासितारी उपा,
कथायनेन शुना प्रदशस्यास्आति ममक्निष्ठाय।
आसिंप ज्ञानिः साध्यलीकितृत्वाय बिश्वामहत्तिः सर्वे
श्रीनारायणप्रदेशभवताऽगो नेतृसमाधितां॥
was son of Ramaçandra.

He was born in 1499, in 15 cantos on the Krishna's side of killing of Kamsa.

He was son of Ramaçandra.
### INDEX

#### Shankaracharya

**Subh, Sarng**

Shankaracharya was mentioned in the Madhava-Simhasanatarka, composed in the court of King Madhavasimha of Jaipur. Vajranatha's Padyatarangini was composed there in 1753 AD.

- Shankaracharya's name is given as Vajranatha in the poem Madhava-Simhasanatarka composed in the court of King Madhavasimha of Jaipur. Vajranatha's Padyatarangini was composed there in 1753 AD.

**Shankaracharya's Works**

- Shankaracharya's works include Subh, Sarng.

**Shankaracharya's Contributions**

- Shankaracharya's contributions include *Subh, Sarng*.

**Shankaracharya's Works in English**

- Shankaracharya's works in English include *Subh, Sarng*.

**Editors**

- Shankaracharya's works were edited with Srinivasachar's commentary and English Translation by B. Dass Jam with Trans and Notes.
- Shankaracharya's works were also edited with commentary by Ramavarma and Ramaji Sastri, Pattambi.

**Other References**

- Shankaracharya's works are mentioned in the Theosophist, XIV 258-56 & XVI 292-96.
- Shankaracharya's works are also mentioned in N. Venkataraman's *Sankaracharya, The Great and His Successors* in Kanci, Madras, and Gopinathrao's *Sri Sankaracharya Mutt Inscriptions*.

---

* [On Dwaraka Mutt Chronology, see The Theosophist, XIV 258-56 & XVI 292-96 For a full discussion of these mutt histories, see N Venkataraman's *Sankaracharya, The Great and His Successors* in Kanci, Madras, and Gopinathrao's *Sri Sankaracharya Mutt Inscriptions*]
by Nanan Fpati and Pratapasimha mentioned in the poem are respectively Nanasahib Peshwa (1740-61) and King Pratapasimha of Tanjore (died 1765), Bhfsabala (भन्षाला) means Bhonsla]
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[Printed JSSP Calcutta]

[on the life of 36th Acarya of Kamakoti Peetha, 788-840 AD]

शतमभवरमायण
[In Vasisthaamayana, pun Bombay]

शतप्रभुरक्तोति 277
शतप्रभुक्ति 513
शतप्रभुक्ति 94, 339
शत्तानन्द Smn
शतालप्रभुरक्तोति 920
शतालप्रभुरक्तोति 199, 8
शोधक Smn

शन्तरत p 2

शतप्रभुरक्ति 382
शैव (= शक्तीयतावर) Smn
शवदुसिद्धांक 128
शवदुसिद्धांक 128
शवदुसिद्धांक 848
शवदुसिद्धांक 327

शवदुसिद्धांक [OQ II 150]
शवदुसिद्धांक 325
शवदुसिद्धांक 70
शवदुसिद्धांक Smn

शवदुसिद्धांकन्तरिणि 527
शवदुसिद्धांकन्तरिणि 350
शम्मासरासिद्धांक 589, 544, 731
शम्मासरासिद्धांक Subh

शम्भासिद्धांक 310
शम्भ 72, 183, 269
शम्भुकादिवास 252
शम्भुकादिवास 403
शम्भुदास 314, 373, 922, 923
शम्भुदास 920

शम्भुपरिवत
आलमविलास [OQ II 8]

शम्भुदास 330
शम्भुदासिद्धांक [Uttar 973]

by शम्भुदास [1793 AD]
[mentioned in Bhqaprabuddha]

Shakthipathy Subh
Shankhia 123
Shanatk Shm
Shanakopadyam 730
Shankarat Shm
Shanakvachita 949
Shahadatpadam 842
Shamiity Surng, Shm, Subh
Shamiitalyaparinajak (d) 786
Shamiityagavah p 42
Shattacarit 450, 788
Shatvaran 305, 598
Shah Subh
Shantrajapradit 1101
Shattasr (Sorn) 255-J
Shattirik Pady
Shattivintaka 922
Shattivirizes 108
Shattirikat 613
Shattivitakas 915
Shattivatmaka 93, 103, 108, 235
by Shabindeswari
by Shambhuvar
by Sachindra
by Ananta
by Sampurna
by Mchetraswana
Shattinacharit (prose) [Ramghat Jam Library, Benuies]
Shattiprabhiti 262, 767
Shattiss 767
by Shankhajit
Shattivinma 275
Shattivitas 154, 268
by Shankhabhy
by Hrisna
An extract for Sārngadharapaddhati)

Sāṁśūntaṇḍavāla [Opp 1334]
Sāml 305
Sāūḷaṇāśāṁśūnta [Sury J]
Sāravāna Sūn
Sāravāna Sūn
Sārānāntāya Sūn
Sārāntāya 297
Sāreṇīsambandh (d) 783
Sāreṇāvahāna 202, 203, 204, 305, 598
Sāreṇāvahānacharitā 203, 204, 432
Sāreṇāvahānśatātāti
by Dāmarāja [Oj I 110]
Sārāntāya Sūn
Sāmrat Sūbh
Sāmrat 318
Sāmratā 373-A
Vidāntāntākaṇḍa
See Vaiśnavi-pitī
cīvāmāni 235, 254

See Śītrāveṇi-gaṇaśūnta (d)
[He was brother of Śrīsaṅgārya of Sērṅgapatam (see post),
17th century]

Śīttākṣara (Javā) 494

[Printed Tumkui]

Śīttākṣara 255
Śīttākṣaraṇāśāṁśūnta
Śiśāṇīti
Āraṇādvarṇa
[He was a native of Navadvipa,
Bengal and lived in 1668-1936]
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शिवराम
शिराजमलाविवाद [PR III 394]
शिवराम 254
देवतावतरण
शिवराम (कुष्णामुनि) 254, 455, 468, 473
शिवराम
चुपचापकाव्य [CO III 64]
शिवराम
काव्यकर्मप्रकाश [PR II 140]
शिवराम
नागान्तुस्थाप्तया
शिवरामचक्रवर्तिन 254
बाणविजयकाव्य [CO III 78]
शिवरामब्रह्म 314
शिवरामब्रह्मवेद
बालुवेदराजनद [PO I 69]
विगुमहिष्टस्तोत्र
शिवरामस्थापित [CO I 652]
रामायणदीका
शिवरामनाथ 1060
शेषरामस्वति (of Laskari, Gwahor
VO Ji Sarada Ji)
शैक्षानाथस्वाति etc
शिवरामस्विनि
See श्रीमुखदर्पण
शिवरामकक्ष 273
शिवविगुमहिष्टपुल 482
शिवविगुमहिष्टपौर्ण (d) 763
शिवलोका
[TO VII 7828 in 8 cantos on
the deeds of Siva]
शिवलीलार्थ 154
शिवलिलासतमू 544
शिवलिलासकाव्य
by हृदेपद
[TO VI 7061 (a poem in 6
cantos on Siva) Sury Ji]
शिवविष्णु (of Janakpura Dur-
bhanga)
शिवविष्णुस्वातिनि
नक्तिःब्रह्मन [JSSP XVII & XIX]
शिवविष्णुस्वातिनि (कस्तुरी) 285
शिवहनुक 475, 753, 912
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He was the brother of Śrīnāvaśatācārya probably of Tīrūpati, Chittoor District and son of Annāyārya.

[Ed by Rāma Pisharoti in O.O.J.]
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The life of Jivadhara as Jivaha and concerned with the narrative of Tam.
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<td>He is Curator of Sanskrit</td>
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<td>Manuscripts, Trivandrum</td>
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<tr>
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<th>Page</th>
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<tr>
<td>Aks'apada, Kuntales'vara, Bhoja, Vindhyavasun, Dhanadaṭṭa and Bhagavadajjuka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bhavabhūti is thus praised

**The following are quoted**

- Aks'apada, Kuntales'vara, Bhoja, Vindhyavasun, Dhanadaṭṭa and Bhagavadajjuka

---

* * Bhabhabhūti is thus praised

**The following are quoted**

- Aks'apada, Kuntales'vara, Bhoja, Vindhyavasun, Dhanadaṭṭa and Bhagavadajjuka
[Ed. JSS, Trivandrum]
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saññihūdayaṇī 150, 154, 937
   by yājñārājaṇa
   by śambūsvar
(Ed. by T.R. Chintamani, mādhas)

saññihūdayaṇi 923
   by yājñārājaṇa
   by yājñārājaṇa
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saññihūdayaṇī 923
   by karṣu
   by śambūsvar
saññihūdayaṇi 151
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saññihūdayaṇi 923
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saññihūdayaṇi 162
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saññihūdayaṇi 1019
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saññihūdayaṇi 31, 113
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saññihūdayaṇi
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saññihūdayaṇi 70
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saññihūdayaṇi 235, 433, 541
saññihūdayaṇi
   by mānasīna
   (On the life of Saññihūdayaṇī, 23rd acarya of Kāmakottipātha (527–548 A.D.) mentioned by Atmabodha.)
saññihūdayaṇi 276, 429
saññihūdayaṇi 1064
saññihūdayaṇi 70
saññihūdayaṇi 782
saññihūdayaṇi Subh
saññihūdayaṇi
saññihūdayaṇi 336 [Opp 3074, 3077]
saññihūdayaṇi 61
saññihūdayaṇi KOD
   [lived about 1630–1670 A.D.]
saññihūdayaṇi
   by pāyāgākṣarāratī
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<td>सिद्धमन्त्र 459</td>
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<td>सिद्धविनोद 48, 459</td>
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<td>सीताविनायक 674 मीतारामचर 253</td>
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<td>सिद्धासत्यागाय 919</td>
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<td>सिद्धासनदातिष्ठत 427</td>
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<td>मुझतंत्रश्लेष्मन्त्र 111, 117 [Printed Bhownagar See Buhler, JI of Imperial Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Volume 119 (1887) and English Translation in IA XXXI. 477-85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतानन्द (d) 779</td>
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<td>मुखरुसुद्दिनी 112, 888</td>
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<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
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<td>सीतापितविजय 252, 541</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
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<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
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<td>सीताकथाहरण Subh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामविषय 252</td>
<td>मुझमार 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीताराम 28</td>
<td>मुझकालितकोलेखिनी 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मुझसम्बन्धाया</td>
<td>मुझतंत्रश्लेष्मन्त्र 111, 117 [Printed Bhownagar See Buhler, JI of Imperial Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Volume 119 (1887) and English Translation in IA XXXI. 477-85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतामयण 1098</td>
<td>मुखरेजमित्र 923 मुखरुलमित्र 314, 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मुघदपम</td>
<td>मुखरुसुद्दिनी 112, 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामभवच (of Mysore) 546</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामनम्मू 942</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामदातामहरी 541</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामविषय 252</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामविण्य 252</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामविण्य (बादु) 225</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामविण्य (आनिकेल) 541</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीतारामविण्य (of Jeypore)</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
</tr>
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<td>मुखवर्तिका (in prose. Sury VII 91)</td>
<td>मुखरशहीद 111, 117</td>
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Sundar (Jagajyoti) 779
Ambaraman (d)
Nagabhushan [CC I 285]
Sundardev 129, 251
Sundardeva
Sundardas
See Ram Sunder Mahakavya
Sundarpalabh 259, 268, 373
[Mys Arch Rep (1925), 13]
Sundarah 254
Sundaragautama 207
Sundararajavarchy 721
Sundaray 778
Sundarabrai 381
Sundaravijaya 727
Sundarvarsham 515, 724
Sundaravarchy 268, 298
Sundari 106, 377
Sundariabhadr 253
Sundareswar 305
Sumahat [Sushil J. Kase]
Sumabhav 54
Sumat 185
Sumabhow 286
Sumati 470, 699

[Saraprasad Bhatacarya, Subandhu and Bana, who is elder]
IIIQ (1926)]
Sumitra (Asthana) 564
Sumodaravarchy 251
Sumodarabrahma (d) 716
Sumodhibhushan 857
Sumvat (Antabri) 1052
Sumvatsabhirat p 20
Sumvatsarala 1064
Sumvatsapat (PS) [UP IV]
Sumvatsaralakshin (Deviupadi) 769
See Avertisments

Dasharavana 268

Kalyanam (d) [TO VII 7566]

Dasharavanaddhi 293

Atharvashastravini (AV) 278

Dasharavashastravini (AVK) [VC J]

Dasharavashastravini (KVS) 752

Dasharavashastravini (KVS) 135

Dasharavashastravini (d) 323

by Kshemprabha

by Narasimha

Dasharavana (d) 786

Dashat 116, 771

Dashat Skm

Dashat 374

Sarvepanadhyaya (d) 141, 781

Sarvepanadhyaya 529

Sarvepanadhyaya (d) 668, 772, 777

by Bhunintha (Nabakari)

by Bhuninatha

by Ramandas

Sarvepanandhi 180, 877

Sarvepanandhi (d) 781

Sarvepanandhi (d) 668, 781

Sarvepanadhyaya [TO VI 7298]

Sarvepanadhyaya 358

by Narasimha 48, 175

by Bhuninatha 358 contd

by Hemabhadra

Sarvepanadhyaya (d) 668

by Bhuninatha 781, 130

by Narasimha 727

by Ujijjvati 668

Anonymous 783

Sarvepanadhyaya 361

Sarvepanadhyaya 373, 529

[Printed Conjeevaram]

Sarvepanadhyaya 121, 373, 879

[Com in UP JJ]

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

by Bhuninatha & Anonymous

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

by Vishalakshamadara

(Sarvepanadhyaya 373)

by Bhuninatha

by Madura

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

Sarvepanadhyaya 373

by Bhuninatha

by Bhuninatha

by Bhuninatha

by Madura

by Madura

Sarvepanadhyaya 373
S*nfarai¥§;8i6 3*nfarer%=r
S*irf^mRrg^^ 373
S^rrf^TS^FF^SSItf 373
SWfiagqiftflr 125, 373
%}*& ?m<*ftm 197, 373
[k1697-1702 1714 ?]

S*irfar^aap()

[See Monograph by Hardutt Sarma, IHQ X 478 COJ III 85 Annals XVI 262-391 P K Gode says that he was a post of the Court of King Sambhaji of Tanjore]

S*irfaritap^e 373
S*irfarita^alki 370
by b^candp^ 368
by A^ier 370
by m^or^ 188
by s^k^hn^t 373
Anonymous 373

S*imast^ot 291
S*imast^italim m^d^c^v 780
S*imast^it^am P 71
S*imast^it^ 27, 318
S*imast^i 163, 214
S*imast^j^l^ 163
S*imast^i 798
S*imast^a 450
S*imast^s 289, 314, 545
S*imast^i 235
S*imast^ 455
S*imast^ 116
S*imast^ t^k^ 3

(Fromt Bombay)
S*mn KVS Shm
S*mn Subh
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S*imast^n 254-F
S*imast (a^m^r) Shm
S*imast^ 400
S*imast Subh
S*imast 655
S*imast^t 254
S*imast^nma^s^t^a^ (of Daoca)
S*imast^ 643, 933 [SB J1]
S*imast^ 489, 1073
S*imast^ 193
S*imast Shm
S*imast l^x Shm, KVS
S*imast^ 3514
S*imast^ Shm
S*imast 295
S*imast Shm
S*imast 69
S*imast Shm
S*imast [B 11]
S*imast Shm
S*imast Shm
S*imast l^x
S*imast n^h^p^t (prose)
S*imast^nma^s^t^b^ (SB J1)
S*imast 488
S*imast 260
S*imast 82, 366 373
S*imast 373
by A^ish^na
by l^d^nn
by m^n^t^n
Anonymous

Sanjivini 373
by Brijeswar Singh
by Dnyanapriya
by Brijeswar"}

Tiruvanmiyur
Tiruvanmiyur
(Trinity Thiruvanmoolam)

Sanjivini 373
Sanjivini 373-A

P. V. Gode, on its date, PO I 52

Sanskrit Journal, Kolhapur

Chittaranj

Chittaranj

Sanskrit Journal, Kasi

Sanskrit Journal, Kasi
Somakavi was the son of Subhnanaya. He wrote the "kāmakār-maṇita". His father Subhnanaya wrote "Cūrugāhālacakmākāraśāra", a collection of verses, with his own commentary.

Somakavi 229
Somakavi 338

[JS 54 in praise of his gun Jinaṇaṇabha]

Somakavi 434
Somakariṇaṇipana 234, 235
Somakavi 218, 548 [1190-1260]
Namakārśā
Abhānākāryā
Pṛthvīkārśā
Vasvātakāryā
[V Prabhakaraśāstrī's Int to Basavapuśṣa]

Somakavi
(Mentioned in Bhopabandha)
Somakavi 269 [JC 735]
Ramākāryā
Bhairavākāryā
Abhīṣṭakāryā
Abhīṣṭakāryā
Somakariṇaṇipana (Adāśārayā) 1018
Somakākāryā 190
Somakākāryā 267
Somakākāryā 71, 94
Somakākāryā 135, 786
Somakākāryā 7229 in 8 cantos]
Somakākāryā 116
Somakākāryā 524
Somakākāryā 70
Somakākāryā 446
Somakākāryā (Prabhakaraśāstrī) 853
Somakākāryā (Subhnanaya) 1006

* (According to Punyaślokaṁaṇaṁ this Somes'vāra became Bōdha II (Sandrananda) the 44th Ācārīya of kāmakotipīthā in 1061-1098 A.D. Mr Duff gives dates for Somes'vāra 1030-1082)
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सोमेश्वर (कुमारपुल) 858
सोमेश्वर (विजय सूरी) 91
सोमेश्वर (चालकव) 89
तोम्बरै स्त्री 116, 672, 779
सोलक (- शीर्षक) Skm
सोलक Skm
सीनालाल पाठक (of Muttia) [Su y J]
शीर्षक Skm
शीर्षक Skm
मीणिकापरिणय 253
मीणिकापरिणय (d) 777
मीणिकापारण (d) 689
मीणिकापारण (चौड) (d) 553
मीणिकापुर्ण 883
मौदरतद 34
मौदरतदी 500
मौदरतदल 180
मौनस्क (d) 877
मौनस्क सीमका 254
मौनस्क लकी [UO I 738]
मौनस्कलकद (d) 760
मौनस्कलकदी 542
मौनस्किक 557, 558
मौनस्कांतापूर्व 209

[Another account gives dates 1370–1446 Under para 209, note 12, read His Guru was Sīns’āle’s called Tiruvoymalpallai (1323–1400)]

tमौंधवर 209
मौंधवर 566
tमौंधवर 566
तम्भए Sarnąg
tम्भए Sarnąg
तम्भएगुम 16
tम्भएगुम 16
tम्भएगुमपुल 373-C
tम्भएगुमपुल 549
tम्भएगुमचर्ग 232
tम्भएगुमचर्ग (d) 727
तम्भेण्टरमक (d) 563, 877, 880

स्तवचित्रनामगी 281
स्तवचित्रनामगी 254 C
स्तवचित्रनामगी 286
स्तवचित्रनामगी 286
स्तवचित्रनामगी 863, 286
स्तवचित्रनामगी 257, 257
स्तवचित्रनामगी 258
स्तवचित्रनामगी 257
स्तवचित्रनामगी 205
स्तवचित्रनामगी 70
स्तवचित्रनामगी 318 (9–10th century)
मेघवत्तमत्त [Edited by V G Paranji, Poona]
स्तवचित्रनामगी 818
स्तवचित्रनामगी 75
स्तवचित्रनामगी (d) 721
स्तवचित्रनामगी 140
स्तवचित्रनामगी 804
स्तवचित्रनामगी [Bose 246]
स्तवचित्रनामगी [TC VI 6913]
स्तवचित्रनामगी 254
स्तवचित्रनामगी 175, 494
स्तवचित्रनामगी 175, 494
स्तवचित्रनामगी 70
स्तवचित्रनामगी 178
स्तवचित्रनामगी 256
स्तवचित्रनामगी (d) 662
स्तवचित्रनामगी (d) 573, 955

[Ed by N S Khuste, Benares with commentary Ed by Deodhar with notes Tr by V S Sukthankar, London
Ed. with Commentary by Anantaramasastin Vetal and Jagannata Sastin Hoslinga Benares]

स्तवचित्रनामगी 876
स्तवचित्रनामगी 842
INDEX

by Vaidyaratna [DC XXVII 100365 on the shrine of Brhadavana]

See also

Surya VII 51 For his other poems, see ind VI & VIII]
He praised Shajakhao thus in a poem on Vasalbanamah (of Varahi). In a poem on Vasalbanamah (of Varahi) he is called Enugandana.

The name is given as [SII, XXXVII, 7027](SB I, 787) [SB III, 818, 466, 741, 183]

[DDB XXVII, 7027] [DDB I, 781]

Composed at the instance of Yuvanji Rama Sumbal in 1625. [SB II] 25, 96, 568

[(of Bengal)] [SB II]
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IFDEX

STASIS

[Of Bhatpara, Bengal, Vuty Ji, SSM Ji]

[Quoted by Caturbhuja]

[Written as a Purana on the lives of Bhaktas like Pralada, Dhruva etc.]

[On Sankara’s successors. Mentioned by Atmabodha]

Anonymous 254
by bivulikar 249
INDEX

[Nepal Library, Bendall 2r
Composed on the reign of Sunyavarma, son of Bandlekand]

हासिका 562
हास्यबुद्धिमणि (d)
by वटसराज (Ed 7085)
हास्यविलक (d) 786
हास्यवर्ण (d) 786
हास्यनाटक (d) 373-0
हास्यशतक (d) 373-B
हितहरियंग्य 251
हितोपदेश 427
हीर 73
हीरकवि

[Arsha Library, Vizagapatam]

हेरनकर
See प्रतापसिंहचरि
हस्तिपात 1089
हस्तवल 17
हस्तमुख 285
हस्तमलक्षात्रि 286
हस्तदुर्गमयि
by वेदान्तदेशि 323
by रुपमोहिनिन 323
by बेदप्रेम
by पुराणस्वति

[Q Is he the same as Hastamalasena?]

हरवर्षकृति 59
हरावसिंह 372
by हरिकवि
by पुरुषार्थम
हाल 305, 450, 598
हसाज्ञत (d)
by विठुल विश्वासिनी

[G. Buhler’s Life of Hemacandra]
SUPPLEMENT

अच्युत [Swishrul II Kashi]
अण्डाराज्य 255
अनन्तदास (विश्वनाथकविराजपुत्र)
अनन्तदेव (आपदेवपुत्र)
Set क्षणभक्तिविभक्ति [Bejull 29]
अनन्तभग [I'O I i 29]
अनन्तरामशाहिन्य, (वेताल) [Sury II]
अनन्तराम (ब्रम्बकपुत्र)
स्वातुमूर्ति (d) [Bennell,]
अनित्यमिथ
सारस्वतीस्वति [Sury II]
अनुपालमण [254]
अमरमार [Swishrul II Benaras,]
अश्वारम्भरुम [For content, see I'O I]
आशारामशाहिन्य (of Lekshmanamalu) [Sury II]
इलुसीतीरणाय (d) [Tamy No 23844]
इल्लुमराद तिपाठिय [Sury II]
इल्लुमरादशिकाशाहिन्य (of Mirzapur)
मक्किन्दरी etc [Sury II]
इन्द्रास्यवर्ण [Sury II]
उत्तरामचरि
by नारायणमहोदिष्य [TSN]
उद्यवर्मचरि [TSS]
उद्दृत्तकित्र (d) 790
एकादशी व्रतनाटादक (d) [Bennell 22 1480 A.D]
एकावली See [I'O I ii 15]
कथाकोष (1803) [Ramghua Jain Library, Benares]
कमलकिनारकेश (d) [TSS]
कमलकीर्तिप्रमणन (d)
by बिन्दुरोधक (Printed Plona)
कप्पूरस्वति (d) [GON]
by बस्सराज
कल्लुमीन (d)
b) पखाननर्केश्वर

[on a tale in Bhāgavat about Rādhā, JSSP XX]

कविता राजसूय

बिंदलाहर [7SS]

कविरक्षत

[E. V. Venkataramanagopalan says that he was a native of Drakṣa-
rama, N. Godavari Dist, and lived between 1050 and 1220
Sec. Venkataraman's Tirupi Poems]

कवितावनन्दन [73-7]
काव्यदल [12-33 709, 717, 615-623]
काव्यासाथित [Bendall 52]
काव्यादित्त [7SS with two commentaries]
संस्कृतकथा [Bendall 50]

चन्द्रेश्वरसरसति [Present Head of Kamakotiputha]
सिदेशचारक (on Prayag)

गानांवांतिक विचार

[See R. Subhano's History of Eastern Ghanges of Kalinga,
AILQ, V 193]

गांगसिन्नम

[The verses about ten days have been sung in Tulu Records
by Mudumari Dikshitar Varma, Teacher, Board
High School, Chittoo who is an adept in singing this
poem and Rāmāyana. Some verses have also been sung
by Chittoo sisters in M. M. V Records]

वाक्याचार्यत

हि भाणिकमसूचर अ (अचलस्वच्छ) [A collection of tales Bendall 64]
हि विश्वास (य एस्वार्य)
विश्वासस्वति

[He was disciple of Rāmānuja. Born at Mathuramangalam
lived 1020-1129]

कविराा [1 23]

[Bhaviṣṭa on Varma of Śrīrāmāsūrya made a gift to Tirupati
Temple on 5-7-1535 and lived at Tirupati, see Tirupati
Darshrām Inscriptions]

वस्त्रपार्शव (d)

[Δ last Ms. dated sam 1731 Bendall, 28]
[See V V Manjhi on Rajasekhara's works in Puthak's Col Vol Poona]
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The poetess, Sang [BTO 164, Ms Petrison's Edn does not contain it]

Jnanaraghava (d)

by Suvorara Sarasvati, son of Jayasimha (1625) [Bendall, 28]

Dutta (novel)

by Bhaskar Chandra Chatterjee [JSSP XIX]

Dutta (d)

by Ramchandra [Bendall, 28]

Devaraja [For date, see PO 1 n 14]

Devashikarmane [For contents, see PO 1 n 19]

Purushottamakatha

[An illustrated introduction to Hindu dancing, Bombay]

Nepalavardhini [See Table of Inscriptions in Bendall]

Pavamana Thakuran

[See Kalabookhch [JSSP. XX]

Purvabhi [PO 1 n 54]

Purnachandra Udupatmaka (of Calcutta)

Purnachandrama

[An anthology of fine verses of the *author and of all
Printed Calcutta]

Pralipakasikamsha [PO 1 n 16]

* Here is a verse of the author for benediction to live for 120 years

(Nos. 1-255, Bhatpara, Bengal)

See [Table of Inscriptions in Bendall]

Pavamana Thakuran

[For contents, see PO 1 n 19]

Srivatsamukha

[An anthology of fine verses of the *author and of all
Printed Calcutta]

Kshatrapakasikamsha [PO 1 n 16]

* Here is a verse of the author for benediction to live for 120 years

(PO 1 n 19)
Pramalki (d)
by Harjivansinh [Bendall 28]

Amamohini (d)
See Vijnananadan

Deviom (d) [Printed Poon]

Vopadev 205

Nash [O K Venkataraman, Ghasa's Plays (in Canarese) Bangalore an extensive book reviewed in Hindu, 22nd August 1937, Madras]

Madarvind [Ramghat Jam Mandu, Benares]

Mahamantra [PO I in 5]

Madvashint [Bendall 60]

by Rajakri (Adversaria on Magha)

Mangalvishvantra (Achutmochan)
See Guravamdevatram supra

Mukarvijjati [Ed by T S Sabesa Iyer, Madras]

Rasapura [Ed IHQ 1929 by Venkataramasarma and by E V Veeraaghavacharya, Jt of Tel Academy (1934-5)]

Rashatmakya
See Vignasw (Chief of Askal)

Ragh (Kumar}

Syanarasindu (d) [CO 1 661]

Ramanjan
[Miss P C Dharmaw, Some customs and beliefs from Ramayana PO II 113]

Baravacarya (STG) [STG Vaiadacarya, M.A, himself maintains a Sanskrit College at Chittigudai, Masulipatam]

Naravarakaka

Tarakrashan

Shastishatram (a short poem on India past and future)

Varadabakaparipiyay
[Edited with commentary by M M Girndhar Sharma and Handatta Sharma by Lakshman Sarup, with introduction, Lahore Introduction fixes date of composition between 1529—40]

Bhutatama (Nepal Library)
could not continue the work of the Index, the last obstacle in the progress of the work, that has been done by Vavilla Press from page 960 to the end
A NOTE OF GRATIFICATION

---

I am indebted to the following gentlemen for various kinds of assistance in the progress of this work:

A. Venkatarama Aiyar, B.A., B.L.,
   Subordinate Judge, Chingleput.

S K. Srinivasaschar,
   Triplicane, Madras.

M S. Subramania Aiyar,
   Formerly Manager,
   Advocate-General's Office, Madras.

V. Narasimha Aiyangar,
   Gopalapuram, Madras

M. Ramakrishna Kavi, M.A.,
   Madras.

N. G. Sardesai,
   Proprietor, Oriental Book Agency, Poona.

A M Srinivasacharya,
   Pandit, Triplicane, Madras.
BY

M KRISHNAMACHARIAR
M.A., M.L., Ph.D., M.R.S.

1. History of Classical Sanskrit Literature
2. Law of Registration in British India
3. Law of Execution in British India, 2 Vols.
4. Trial by Jury in British India
5. Negotiable Securities in British India
6. Presidency Small Cause Courts
7. Provincial Small Cause Courts
8. Succession Certificates & Curators
9. Court fees and suits Valuation
10. Indian Edition of Will’s Circumstantial Evidence
11. Indian Edition of Underhill on Torts
12. Revised Edition of Das on Ultra Vires (Tagore Law Lectures)
13. Revised Edition of Agnew on Trusts (Tagore Law Lectures)
14. The Madras Estates Land Act

[Note: B Anu B]