analysis of the two works to surmise some of the important details of the Kashmirian *Bṛhatkathā*. In brief, it has been suggested that Kṣemendra was more loyal with regard to the order and Somadeva with regard to the materials.\(^1\)

It is, however, certain that we cannot regard the Kashmirian *Bṛhatkathā* as being the work of Guṇāḍhya. We cannot impute to Guṇāḍhya such incoherence as prevails in the Kashmirian *Bṛhatkathā*, nor the patternity of a good part of the material of *Bṛhatkathā*. Moreover, it does not seem also probable that Guṇāḍhya should have such an accurate knowledge of Kashmirian geography as is revealed in Somadeva’s work. The Kashmirian *Bṛhatkathā*, therefore, is to be regarded as a local work.

---

\(^1\) Sten Konow (I.A., XLIII, p. 6) holds with Lacôte that the source of the *Kathāsarit-sāgara* and the *Bṛhatkathā-mañjarī* was based not on Guṇāḍhya but on a later work compiled in the 7th century A.D. Keith in his *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 275, and Winternitz in Vol. III of his *History of Indian Literature*, hold the same view. Bühler (I.A., Vol. I, p. 319) holds that Somadeva and Kṣemendra remodelled the Prākṛt original. Speyer in his *Studies about the Kathāsarit-sāgara*, p. 27, agrees with Lacôte. Pandit Kṛṣṇamācārya in his Preface to *Priyadarśikā* (V. V. Press, Srirangam) as well as Dr. A. Venkaṭa Subbīyā in his articles on the *Pañcatantra* of Durgasimha (Indian Culture, Vol. I, Part II, p. 214) holds a different view. Now, the order of the *lambhakas* in the two does not agree. The general surmise has been that either Kṣemendra or Somadeva had changed the order of the original in Prākṛt. Mankowski (*Einführung der auszug aus dem Pañcatantra*), Lacôte (*Essai*, p. 91 ff.) and Penzer in his *Ocean of Stories* and the *Terminal Essay*, Vol. IX, p. 115, hold that Somadeva has made the change of the order of the *lambhakas*, while Speyer thought that Kṣemendra had changed the order while Somadeva followed the original order faithfully. The basis of the view that Somadeva made the changes, is the verse beginning with *yathāmūlam*, etc., already quoted. S. Rangācār (IHQ, 1938) argues that the phrase *yathāmūlam tathāvaidā* (as already quoted) refers to the fact that he was loyal to the order of the *lambhakas* of the original. The only point in which Somadeva deviated from the original, is its division into *tarāṅgas* as distinguished from its division into *gucchakas* and *lambhakas* of the original. But in the *Bṛhatkathā-mañjarī* also the following verses occur:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{seyaṃ hara-mukhod-gīrṇa kathā-nugraha-kāriṇī} & \\
paiśāca-vāci pattiṣa saṅjāta vighnädāyinī & \\
\text{ataḥ sukha-nīcayā-sau kṛtā saṃskṛtyā gīrā} & \\
\text{samāṃ bhuvamivā-nītā gangā śvabhirā-valambini} & 
\end{align*}
\]

Now, therefore, from their own statements it appears that they professed to be loyal to their own original. If this assumption is correct, we should be led to think that in their arrangement they followed the order of their own originals. But their own originals were different in their structures being two recensions of the original *Bṛhatkathā*. 
It is difficult to determine the date of the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā. But it is possible to some extent to determine the two limits. The work was regarded as very old in the time of Kṣemendra, and one may infer that it was written at least one or two centuries before Kṣemendra's time. On the one hand it could not have been very old. Somadeva in his Praśasti declared that the poem was written to please the grandmother of Harṣa and the mother of king Kalasha. The Kathā-sarit-sāgara must therefore have been written between 1063 and 1082 A.D. These dates are also corroborated by the statement of the Rāja-taraṅgini. Kṣemendra was a contemporary of Ananta, the father of Kalasha and his Bhūrata-mañjari was written in 1037 A.D. His Daśā-vaṭāra-carita was written in 1066 in the second year of the reign of Kalasha. But the exact date of the Bṛhatkathā-mañjari cannot be ascertained. Assuming that it was written more or less at the same time as the Bhūrata-mañjari, we may say that it was written 25 to 30 years before the Kathā-sarit-sāgara of Somadeva.

We have the other work called the Śloka-saṃgraha of Buddha-svāmin or Budha-svāmin, which is a summary of the Bṛhatkathā and which has again a Nepalese and a Kashmirian version. The style is simple, the vocabulary is rich, and sometimes long compounds also occur. It is probable that the author lived in the 9th or the 10th century.

The Śloka-saṃgraha of Budha-svāmin seems to be pretty faithful to the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā, though at times he also seems to introduce new details of adventure.

We must now turn to the Bṛhatkathā. By a comparison of the different adaptations of the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, Lacôte says that Buddhism had adopted some of the personages treated by Guṇāḍhya and has given them a high place in the gallery of kings contemporary to Buddha. We have no place here to discuss how far Guṇāḍhya was faithful to the legends which he found floating and about those which were availed of by the Buddhist writers and this cannot be done without any
detailed and comparative examination of the stories, which our limitations of space would not permit us to do. Some of the stories are found in the Vedes and the Brāhmaṇas as well. The central personage seems to be Udayana rather than Nara-vāhana-datta as is often maintained by many. The ideal of Nara-vāhana-datta was probably taken by Buddha himself. If we could transpose the history of Buddha in the world of adventures, we could very well imagine the formation of a Chakravartin king like Nara-vāhana-datta. The whole treatment of his character consisted in being a curious mixture of lyricism and realism so characteristic of the manner of Guṇāḍhyya. He chose for his heroes the Vidyādharas who were demi-gods and masters of the science of magic. The Vidyādharas who seemed to be the creation of popular imagination constituted the traits of old Gandharvas, Yoḡins and the Apsarasas. The Ramāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata knew the Vidyādharas. They are associated with the Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Siddhas, the Cāraṇas and the Kinnaras. But they are also, on the other hand, closely allied to the Daityas, Dānavas, Bhūtas, Piśācas and the Rākṣasas. We had before suggested in the Introduction that the Hindu society, strangled on all sides by the rules of Smṛti, was largely dissociated from reality and looking forward to following the customs of a past and forgotten age, the poets had to choose their stories from divine and semi-divine circles. This is very clearly testified by the manner in which Guṇāḍhyya chose his heroes from amongst the Vidyādharas. It is interesting to note that the choice was remarkably good and the characters are dramatic and human. Udayana was a Hindu Don Juan who served as the model of many other dramatists. Hemacandra in his Kāṇyā-νuśāsana regards Udayana as being of a light vein, tender, passionate, amorous, devoted to the arts and dancing and devoid of all kinds of barbarity. This type has been copied in the Ratnāvali and the Priyadarśikā. The other type of character was that of Nara-vāhana-datta who showed in himself a living personality. He was not a popular character and he was made up
of sterner qualities. He is sometimes passionate, violent and wilful. He has sometimes brusque explosions of unjust anger and sometimes uses cruel words of ingratitude and yet at other times is quite tender and amiable.

If Guṇāḍhya was not the first to compose the floating tales into a romance, there seems to be no doubt that he was indeed the first to construct a vast collection of floating literature or stories into the type of kathā. A work like that of Guṇāḍhya properly responds to the class of kathā referred to by Daṇḍin. It is probable that the Bṛhatkathā contained some verses but the fragments cited by Hemacandra are in prose and it is not improbable that the original work was written in prose and verse. Daṇḍin tells us that the kathā should be in prose and refers to the Bṛhatkathā in illustrating his opinion. Under such circumstances it seems better to accept his testimony that the Bṛhat- kathā was written in prose. Subandhu, Bāṇa and Trivikrama all refer to the Bṛhatkathā. Trivikrama regards Bāṇa as an imitator of Guṇāḍhya.\(^1\) Dhanapāla says that the Bṛhatkathā is the source of other kathās. Somadeva in a list which is not chronological, names Guṇāḍya between Kaṇṭha and Vyāsa.

The story of Naravāhanadatta has been adopted by the Jaina story-book Katha-koṣa and various other works where no strict borrowing is traceable. There are undubitable reflections of its characterisations.\(^2\) Bosch shows that it contained the Vētāla- paṅca-viṁśati. Subandhu finds in the Bṛhatkathā the history

\(^1\) śaśvadbāṇadvittnya namad-ākāra-dhārīṇā I
dhanusya-eva guṇāḍhyena niḥśeṣo raśijito janaḥ II

Nala-campō of Trivikrama-bhaṭṭa, I, Stanza 14.


Hertel thinks that in the Tantrākhyāpiṅkā there is the recension No. 2 of the Paścimatātra and that Somadeva represents most exactly the ancient state of the Paścimatātra. If this were the case, then the original of the Paścimatātra would be in the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya. But this is doubtful.
of Vikramāditya. Dhanañjaya quotes from the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata and also from the Bṛhatkathā. In the heroine of the Svapna-vāsavadattā of Bhāsa we probably find a reflection of the heroine married to Saṅjaya while Kālidāsa in the Meghadūta 1.30, refers to Avanti as the city of Udayana. Vallabha, the oldest commentator, finds here a reference to the Bṛhatkathā. A legend of Udayana appears in the Aṭṭha-kathā of Dhammapada and in the Divyāvadāna, and the same appears in the Chinese and Tibetan version of the Vinaya of the school of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In the Cambodian inscription Guṇāḍhya is spoken of as a friend to the Prākrit language.

We have now to say a few words and the Paisāci dialect of the Bṛhatkathā. A reference to the Paisāci dialect is found in Hemacandra, IV, 303-324. Pischel has collected in his De Grammatīsīs Pracritīsis, quotations given by Hemacandra of the Paisāci Prākrit. These quotations, when taken together, show that they were probably taken from the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya as they tally with some passages in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara.

Pischel believes that the Paisāci dialect is related somehow to the dialect of Teufel or the dialect of the Daradas of the North-West.

It is believed that there was a recension which was probably written at the time of King Durvinīta of the Gāṅga dynasty in the 6th century A.D. We have, of course, two other recensions of

---

1 Vāsava-dattā (Hall’s edition), p. 110.
2 Lévi, J.A., 1885.
3 See F. Lacôte’s Essai, etc., p. 202 et seq. Some of the passages as in Hemacandra, IV, 310, 316, etc., run as follows:— ’kim pi kim pi hitapake athanā cintayamānī. Here, hitapake is hityakase and cintayamānī is cintayamānā.
4 See Pischel’s Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen; Grierson, Indian Antiquary 30, 1901, p. 556; Z.D.M.G., 66, 1912; Anders Konow, Z.D.M.G., 64, 1910, 95 ff.; see also J. S. Speyer.
5 See R. Narasimhācara, Indian Antiquary, 42, 1932, 204 and J. R. A. S., 1913, 389 ff.; see also Fleet, Indian Antiquary, 30, 1901, 222; Kielhorn, Epigraphica Indica, VII, Appendix, p. 21 VIII, Appendix II, p. 4 note; Krishnaswāmi Aiyengār in J.R.A.S., 1906,
the Bṛhatkathā—Kṣemendra’s Bṛhatkathā-mañjarī and Soma-deva’s Kathā-sarit-sāgara, to which references have already been made, and a Nepalese recension by Budha-svāmin or Budha-svāmin. The Nepalese version of Budha-svāmin bears the title of Bṛhatkathā-śloka-samgraha.\footnote{See Haraprasāda Śāstri, J.A.S.B., 62, 1893, 245 ff.; Lévi, in Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, 1899, p. 78, 84; Hertel, Südisches Pāṭalatātra; Speyer, Studies about the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, p. 56 ff; Lacôte, J.A., 1906 and Essai, 146. This Śloka-samgraha consists of 28 sargas and has been translated by Lacôte, Paris, 1906.} We are not certain about the date of Budha-svāmin. Lacôte places him in the 8th or the 9th century. While Budha-svāmin’s book was written in verse and divided in sargas like the Epics, Guṇāḍhya’s Bṛhatkathā was written in prose and in lambhakas.

Winternitz, in Vol. III of his History of Indian Literature, would like to place Guṇāḍhya in the 1st century A.D. But Keith, while holding that Guṇāḍhya cannot be later than 500 A.D., holds that to place him in the 1st century A.D. would be quite conjectural, though no other later date can be regarded as more assured. We in our turn are troubled with the question as to whether Bhāsa drew upon Guṇāḍhya’s work, or whether he got the plot of the dramas of the Svapna-vāsavadattā, etc., from Guṇāḍhya’s work or directly from the floating stories from which Guṇāḍhya himself got his materials. Since in our opinion Bhāsa flourished near about the 3rd century B.C., in the former supposition that Bhāsa had utilised Guṇāḍhya’s book, Guṇāḍhya has to be placed earlier than Bhāsa. But if the latter supposition be true, then indeed we cannot argue anything from the existence of the story found both in Guṇāḍhya and in Bhāsa.

**Pañca-tantra**

We may assume that stories, didactic and otherwise, were current from very early times. It is difficult, of course, to
discover tales of the type of the Pañca-tantra in the Vedas. But in Rgveda VII, 103, we have a passage in which Brahmans are compared to croaking frogs. There are indeed many stories associated with the life of the gods and we hear Dadhyañcas holding the head of a horse and divulging a secret after which his own head was returned to him. In Rgveda VIII and IX we hear of the king of the rats rejoiced at heart for having eaten up through his subject rats all the corns and oblations of Saubhāri, son of Kaṃva, and there is an allusion there to Saubhāri's being begotten in an animal's womb. In the Upaniṣads also we hear of the satire of the white dogs seeking a leader and the talk of two geese and the instruction of Satyakāma first by a bull, they by a goose and an aquatic bird.1 Here we have instances of instruction of man by animals. In the Mahābhārata also we find many fables scattered about throughout the work. We also know that the doctrine of rebirth had destroyed the ordinary barrier between men and animals. Such an atmosphere was suitable for the development of the animal fables. The Jātaka stories also abound with episodes of men and animals and we find many representations in which the animals are susceptible to the greatness of Buddha. In many of his past lives the Bodhisattva was born as various animals and in and through his dealing with other animals we have the character of men reflected among the animals. It was also a strong belief from very early times that the animals had intelligible speech and in Varāhamihira's work we have a Virutadhyāya in which an interpretation is given of the cries of various animals. The references in the Mahā-bhāṣya to such expressions as Kāka-tāliya or ajā-kṛpāniya (II.1.3.) indicate that animal fables were current at that time. But the Pañca-tantra literature develops these stories in such a manner that they illustrate in a concrete way the precepts of Niti-śāstra and Artha-śāstra. The laukika nyāyas, some of which have been collected in such

1 Chāndogya I, 12; IV. 1, 5, 7. Also see Keith's History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 242.
work as *Laukika-nyāya-saṃgraha* have also little stories to illustrate popular maxims which are freely used even in philosophical literature. While *Artha-śāstra* deals with scientific polity, the *Nīti-śāstra* deals with practical common-sense.

In the structure of the *Pañca-tantra* we have tales profusely interspersed with the instructive common-sense wisdom in easy verse. Thus the popular tales were turned into the fables of the *Pañca-tantra*. The *Pañca-tantra* is a definite Indian creation entirely different in structure from the *Æsop’s Fables*.

In *Alaṅkāra* literature, *kathā* is distinguished from *ākhyāyikā* but the thinness of this distinction is apparent from the fact that while the *Pañca-tantra* tales are often called *kathā* there is a version which calls it an *ākhyāyikā* and the work is called *Tantrākhyāyikā*.

The originals of the various works which have come down to us in the name of *Pañca-tantra*, are now lost. But we can get to the substance of it. The Pehlvi translation was made in 570 A.D. but its substance can be made out from an old Syriac and Arabic version of the same. Then we have the substance of the tale in the *Bṛhat-kathā* as preserved for us in the *Bṛhat-kathā-mañjari* of Kṣemendra and the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* of Somadeva.

**PAÑCA-TANTRA Texts**

The *Pañca-tantra* texts are:—

1. The *Tantrākhyāyikā*, in older and the later recension in Kashmirian and two Jain recensions from a similar work, but not the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, well known in the ‘textus simplicior’ edited by Bühler and Kielhorn and in Purṇabhadra’s *Pañca-tantra*.

2. The text that was translated into Pehlvi.

This Pehlvi text is not really available to us but its Syriac and Arabic translations exist and these have flown into European languages and from these we can infer about the Pehlvi translation and their original.
(3) An extract from the *Pañcatantra* is dealt with in the Kashmirian *Bṛhat-kathā* and in two metrical compilations in Kṣemendra's *Bṛhat-kathā-maṇjarī* and Somadeva's *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*. Kṣemendra had written the story of the *Pañcatantra* without any break and probably Somadeva also got it from the recension of the *Bṛhat-kathā* used by him. It is clear that the story in the *Bṛhat-kathā* was the source. In the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* and the *Bṛhat-kathā-maṇjarī* many parts seem to have been interpolated and the Nepalese version which is least charged with accretion, does not contain any *Pañcatantra*. Hertel thought that if the matter of the *Pañcatantra* formed any part, it might be in the 10th *sarga*, which he believes to be the 10th book of Somadeva, and in the colophon there calls it *kathāsaṃ- lapanam*. But the dimension of this *sarga*, although considerable, could not contain the whole of the *Pañcatantra*. As a matter of fact the 10th *sarga*, no more than the other, contained various stories. It also has to be noted that the *Śloka-saṃgraha* does not contain any *Pañcatantra*. From this it would be right to argue that the *Pañcatantra* existed absolutely independent of the *Bṛhat-kathā*. In 1906 after the first edition of the *Pañcatantra*, Hertel received from Nepal a copy of a manuscript belonging to the Durbar at Katmandu, which he thought, must contain the *pañcatantra*. This was in reality the *Bṛhat-kathā-Śloka-saṃgraha*. But the book of Śaktiyasas of the Kashmirian *Bṛhat-kathā* contains a really original version of the *Pañcatantra*. The result is that the *Pañcatantra* resembles that of Somadeva's oldest recensions. Kṣemendra had reduced the matter to a small section which may be regarded as dealing with the *Pañcatantra* materials. Somadeva, however, mixed up the fables of the *Pañcatantra* all through. Hertel thinks that it might be in the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, that Somadeva found represented most exactly the ancient state of the *Pañcatantra*. It cannot be doubted that the *Pañcatantra* was retouched variously by various compilers. It is hardly necessary to add that the Kashmirian *Bṛhat-kathā* must serve as a basis of any theory regarding the antiquity of the
available forms of stories of the *Pañcatantra*. This argument practically destroys Speyer’s observations regarding the relative chronology of the *Pañcatantra* and the *Brhat-kathā*.

Winternitz says that the story in the *Brhat-kathā* appears in a twisted form though the original may not seem to have been forgotten. We have the same kind of teaching with animal stories in the instruction given by Gomukha to Naravāhanadatta.\(^1\) The same value is not attached to the stories. There is again a Southern edition of the *Pañcatantra*. As Hertel points out, it is based upon a North-Western edition of the 7th century. The importance of this text lies in the fact that it stands very near to the *Tantrākhyāyikā*.\(^2\)

A Nepalese recension of the Southern *Pañcatantra* and the popular *Hitopadeśa* drawn from some earlier version stands very nearly to the text of the North-Western edition.\(^3\)

The *Tantrākhyāyikā* is a work in the Sanskrit Kāvya style. The prose is the artistic one and as such consists of small compounds and verses containing *śleṣas* and double meanings and other *alāṃkāras*. The prose is widely different from the ornate language in the romance of Subandhu and Bāṇa and what is found in the *Jātaka-mālā*.\(^4\) Yet the editor is a man of taste and knows the Kāvya style very well. It may be held

---

\(^1\) See *Brhat-kathā-maṭhajari* XVI, p. 255 ff; *kathā-sarit-sāgara*, 60-64; Man’kowskij, *Der Auszug aus dem Pañcatantra in Kṣemendra’s Brhat-kathā-maṭhajari*, Einleitung, Text, Über-setzung und Anmerkungen, Leipzig, 1892; see also Speyer, *Studies about the Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, p. 36 ff.; also Hertel’s *Das Pañcatantra*, p. 30 ff.

\(^2\) See M. Haberlandt in S.W.A., 107, 1884, pp. 397-476; a criticism of another recension is given by Hertel, *Das südlliche Pañcatantra*, XXIV, A.S.W., Leipzig, 1906; see also Hertel’s *Das Pañcatantra*, p. 33 ff.

\(^3\) See Hertel’s *Das südliche Pañcatantra*; also Z.D.M.G., 1910, p. 58 ff. and *Das Pañcatantra*, p. 37 ff. Hertel has indeed been unable to prove that all these were drawn from one defective original.

\(^4\) Jacobi, G.G.A., 1905, p. 377 and Hertel’s *Tantrākhyāyikā* (Translation, 1.22) which is the same as the *Jātaka-mālā*. But this belongs to another class; it is a sort of *campā* with prose and verse written in Kāvya style. The *Tantrākhyāyikā* is not a *campā*, rather the verses have here a sort of twist and are also composed in a different manner.
that originally these tales were of folk-origin but the refinement with which it was later on worked up altogether changed its form. The Pañcatantra contains five books. Of these the 4th and the 5th only are devoted to universal teachings of life. The first book deals with some lessons in Politics. Though the first book deals with politics, it also deals with lessons of good life. The whole work may be regarded as a political text-book. There is a great integral relation as regards its instruction between it, Kauṭilya’s Artha-śāstra and the Niti-sāra.

When the history of the Niti-śāstra will be properly analysed, the atmosphere of the Tantrākhyāyikā and the oldest Pañcatantra will be discovered there. The Tantrākhyāyikā does not belong to the time of Cāṇakya in 300 B.C. as much as the Pañcatantra does not belong to king Khosru-Anoshirwan (531-579 A.D.) who had it translated in Pehlevi and later on in the year 570 it had a Syriac translation from the Pehlevi. These form more or less a universal teaching of polity. Though it deals with polity and teachings about successful life, yet as Dr. De points out in the body of the text, it is an extremely pleasant animal story book as well. Winternitz thinks that the work can be placed between 300-500 A.D. or at least undoubtedly it should be regarded as belonging to the early type of work belonging to the Kāvya style. The Tantrākhyāyikā must have been based on an older version of the Pañcatantra. The way of life taught in the Tantrākhyāyikā is undoubtedly Brahminic with a Viṣṇuic tinge. Its mythology is quite aware of the

---

\[a\] In the Introductory portion of the Tantrākhyāyikā and so also in other versions of the Pañcatantra, Viṣṇuśarmā appears as the speaker. This is so also in the works of Pūrṇabhadra and Nārāyaṇa. Benfey (I. p. 29 ff.) has already shown that Viṣṇuśarmā is probably a changed form of Viṣṇugupta—the other name of Cāṇakya. Hertel in his Tantrākhyāyikā has discussed all these points. It seems unlikely that Viṣṇuśarmā was the real writer of the work or that it was written for the edification of children. See Winternitz, W.Z.K.M., 1911; p. 52 ff.; also Hertel's Tantrākhyāyikā, I. 23 and Z.D.M.G., 1906, p. 787 ff. and F. W. Thomas, J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 974 ff.

world of gods as taught in the Epic Purānas. The minister is a Brahmin and Brahminic supremacy is manifest. The ethical standpoint of the Tantrākhyāyikā is different from that of Buddhism. Hertel translates the word tantra in the Pañcatantra or the Tantrākhyāyikā as klugheitsf ell or a case of good sense. But I am afraid the word tantra has no such sense in Sanskrit. The meaning seems to be applicable here is iti-kartavyatā or way of procedure. Thus we have the Trikānda-śeṣa giving the meaning of the word as iti-kartavyatā tantram upāyaśca dvī- sadhakah. It may also mean a body of conclusions, as in the Amara-koṣa, tantram pradhāne siddhānte.

There is another edition of the Pañcatantra published under the name Textus Simplicior by Kielhorn and Bühler, B.S.S., I, III, V and translated by Fritze, Leipzig, 1884, which was best known as the genuine Pañcatantra Text, before the discovery of the Tantrākhyāyikā. It is a new work based upon older grounds. The stories are given in clear and good language and in brighter ways than in the Tantrākhyāyikā. Of the 4th and 5th books only a few stories have been touched upon in the Tantrākhyāyikā. The text of the Textus Simplicior was probably based upon the North-west Indian texts upon which the Pehlevi translation and the South Indian texts are based. It was probably originally written in the North-West Indian language after which it was probably newly written. The text was probably drawn up by an unknown Jaina between the 9th and the 11th century A.D. but it does not reveal any particular Jaina tendency.

1 Regarding the Buddhistic frame of the Pañcatantra, the Nīti history and Dharma history, see Hertel, J.A., 1908, p. 399 ff. Regarding the Buddhistic origin of the Pañcatantra see the discussion by A. Barth (Mūlasanā IV, 1888-89, p. 558 ff.) and Bühler (Verhandlungen der 42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Wien, 1893, p. 504). See also Ed. Huber (B.E.F.O. IV, pp. 707 and 755) and Hertel, W.Z.K.M. 20, 1906, p. 113 ff. Benefy, however, holds the view of the Buddhistic origin of the Pañcatantra and he tried to demonstrate it in various ways. It is true that much of the history of the Pañcatantra can be found in the Jātaka works. But this is probably due to the fact that many of the Jātakas originated from an older frame of the Pañcatantra. See Hertel, W.Z.K.M. 16, p. 269 ff.


There is a peculiar story here about a weaver impersonating as Viṣṇu based on the materials of the *Textus Simplicior* with the additions taken from the later recensions of the *Tantrākhyāyikā*. We have the *Paścākhyānaka* or the *Paścatantra* written by the Jaina monk Pūrṇabhadra in 1199. The *Tantrākhyāyikā* formed one of the earliest reductions of the *Paścatantra* stories and this recension dates probably from about 200 B.C. A Kashmirian manuscript of it was got by Bühler written in the Sāradā character and Hertel had the good fortune to get a copy of this work in the Deccan College Library at Poona. In the many Indian recensions of this work the most important is that which has been commonly called by Western scholars the *Textus Ornatus* and its author is Pūrṇabhadra Sūri as we have just mentioned. An English translation of this work has been made by Mr. Paul Elmer More. Kosegarten’s edition of the *Textus Simplicior* and his specimen were both uncritical and Hertel published a critical edition of it in the Harvard Oriental Series, 1908, though originally the venture was launched by Schmidt.

Pūrṇabhadra says in the colophon that by his time the *Paścatantra* text had become extremely corrupted and the manuscripts were such that the letters were worn out, and correction was made with reference to every letter, word, sentence, episode and śloka.¹ It is probable, as judged from grammatical peculiarities, that Pūrṇabhadra had utilised some other Prākrit work or works written in popular dialect.²

Another abridged text was made in the year 1659-1660 by the Jaina monk Meghavijaya which was called the *Paścākhyānoddhāra*.³ It contains some new stories. The chief source for Meghavijaya was a metrical Śanskrit work based upon *Paścā-

---

¹ *pratypācyam pratipadam prativākyam pratikathām I*

² *pratilokam śripārṇabhadrasūrirvisodhaydāsa āśtrāmidam II*

³ See the excellent critical Introduction by Hertel in the Harvard Oriental Series, Vols. XI-XII, 1908 and 1912.

¹ See Hertel, H.O.S., XII, p. 29 ff.

khāyān-caupaī, written in old Guzerati by one Jaina monk Vaccharāja in the year 1591-92.

Another text pretty far removed from Pūrṇabhadra's text appears as a Southern Pañcatantra. It contains many new stories probably derived from Tamil sources.¹

There is another text published by Abbé J. A. Dubois, Le Pantchatantra ou les cinq ruses.

In Nepal we have another text called the Tantrākhyāna.² This edition has slight tinges of Jainism and Buddhism. The compilation was probably made at least in the 14th century. The date of the manuscript is not probably later than 1484.

The most important of all the new works based on the Pañcatantra is probably the Bengali work, Hitopadesa. It seems to be wholly a new work. Its chief source seems to be the North-Western version of the Pañcatantra on which the Southern and the Nepalese versions are based. The author gives his name and that of his patron Dhavalacandra in the colophon.³

The Pañcatantra has played an important part in the whole world literature.

Benfey in the Introduction to his translation of the Pañcatantra, shows how the older books of literature of the three

---

¹ On another Southern text of the Pañcatantra, see Z.D.M.G., 1906, p. 769 ff.
³ We have critical forewords by Schlegel and Lassen (Bonn a.Rh., 1829-1832) and by P. Peterson, B.S.S., 1887; also Introduction given by Hertel over the text and the author of the Hitopadesa, 1897, and Pañcatantra, p. 38 ff. See also Hertel's article over a MS. of the Hitopadesa, Z.D.M.G., 1901, p. 487 ff. and Zachariae, Z.D.M.G., 61, p. 342 ff.

An old Nepalese manuscript dated 1373 exists. Hultsch has quoted from Māgha's Śīrā-pana-vadha a verse in the Hitopadesa. See Hertel's Tantrākhyānikā (translated) I. p. 145 ff.

Winternitz points out that in the Hitopadesa, Bhajāraṇaśa has been used for Sunday, but this reference to vāra of the week does not occur in Indian inscriptions before 500 A.D. and it became universal after 900 A.D.; see Fleet, J.R.A.S., 1912, p. 1045 ff.

There are many translations of the Hitopadesa, such as by Max Müller, 1844, Schoenberg, 1884, Fritze, 1888, Hertel, 1895. The West European translation is the English translation by Charles Wilkins, 1787, and the French translation by Langlès, 1790.

Translations from the Pañcatantra exist in Hindi, Guzerati, Canarese, Tamil and Malayalam. Translations of the Pañcatantra exist also in Bengali, in the Brajabhāṣā, in Hindustani, Marathi and Newari.
continents have been invaded for many centuries by the stories of the Pañcatantra.

In the Kathāmukha of the Tantrākhyāyikā an adoration is paid to Manu, Vācaspati, Śukra and Parāśara, Vyāsa and Cāṇakya. Viṣṇuśarman here says that he has written the book by examining all works on polity. It is possible that the Pañcatantra had utilised the Artha-śāstra of Kauṭilya for the composition of the work. There is also an old Nīti work attributed to Cāṇakya, but the exact relation between Cāṇakya and the Pañcatantra cannot be determined. Nothing is known regarding any personal details or the time of the author and it has been held with some justice that the name Viṣṇuśarman is a pseudonym and that Viṣṇuśarman was probably Viṣṇugupta. But this can only be a possible conjecture.

Even before the Pañcatantra was rendered into Pehlevi in 570 A.D., it was a very well-known work. The translation was probably made from a North-Western recension into which many interpolations had crept in. Hertel tries to prove that the Tantrākhyāyikā is the earliest available recension of the Pancatantra. Hertel holds that the oldest Kashmir version of the Tantrākhyāyikā existed as early as 200 B.C. This Kashmir version through one or two transmissions was utilised by the pseudo-Guṇāḍhya in the Kashmirian Bṛhat-kathā. From these we have Kṣemendra’s Bṛhat-kathā-śloka-mañjari about 1040 and Somadeva’s Kathā-sarit-sāgara about 1063 to 1082. From the Kashmirian version from another line there came the North-West Indian version from which the Pehlevi version was made in 570 A.D. and from this Syriac and Arabic versions were made which passed on to Asia, North Africa and Europe and after the 5th century from the same North-East Indian recension we have the Southern Pañcatantra and its Tamil version. From the

manavo vācaspataye śukrāya parāśarāya sarutāya

cāṇakyaṁ ca mahato nanos’tu nṛpaśastrakartāryah

saṅkalārthaśastrāṇaṁ jātasya saṃāloko viṣṇuśarmāpi

tantraśīk pañcabhūretaiṣākṛtāva sūmanaharṣaṁ śāstrām

O.P. 150—89
North-East Indian version again sprang up the Hitopadesa in Bengali by the 14th century and also the Nepalese version. There also sprang up another North-East Indian version after 850 A.D. which has been collected in the Textus Simplicior. Based upon the text of the Textus Simplicior (North-West Indian recension) and the Kashmir manuscript written in Sāradā character before 1040 and probably from certain Prākṛt materials Pūrṇabhadra’s compilation was made in Guzerat in 1199.

Holding the date of Cāṇakya from Kautilya’s Artha-sāstra as being 300 B.C., the Tantrākhyāyikā must have been written between this limit and 570 A.D., when the work was translated into Pehlevi. From many considerations we regard the date of the original Kashmirian Tantrākhyāyikā to be 200 B.C.

The Tantrākhyāyikā is but the other name for Pañcatantra. It is supposed to be a summary account of the tales that have floated through tradition.\(^1\) The Southern Pañcatantra I. 151 contains a verse which is identical with Kumāra-sambhava II. 55, from which we can infer that it was written after Kālidāsa. The date of the Nepalese recension is quite undecided. The Hitopadesa of Nārāyaṇa has a manuscript which is dated 493 Nepalese era, i.e., 1373 A.D. It quotes Kāmandaka and Māgha and it may be assumed that it was written sometime between 800-1373 A.D.

The popularity of the Pañcatantra is evident from the fact that excluding Hertel’s works it has at least six German translations by Brockhaus, 1844, by Boltz, in 1868, Schoenberg, 1884, Fritze, 1888; and another in 1853. It has been translated into English by Charles Wilkins, Sir William Jones, Johnson, Max Müller, Sir Edwin Arnold and by Hale-Wortham and by Manickchand

---

\(^1\) granthavistaraabhūtyān bālānām alpacetasām
bodhāya pañcatantrākhyān idam saṁkṣiṣṭaṁ kathyate
anyayop’pi likhitah śloko yāh prakramagataḥ
svaśpatot granthavistaraḥcaśeṣa na jáyate

---
Jain. Its French translation was made by Langlès, 1790, and Lancerean, 1882. It was translated in Bengali by Lakṣmīnārāyana Nyāyālaṅkāra and also into Brajabhāṣā; and also in Hindi, Hindustani, Marathi, Newari, Persian and Telegu.

Hertel had concluded that all the sources of the Pañcatantra and the Tantrākhyāyikā had been derived from a defective original which he designated by the letter T. But notwithstanding what has been said above, this has not been proved. He thought that the sources of the Brhat-kathā-mañjari, Kathā-sarit-sāgara and Tantrākhyāyikā and Pañcatantra were derivable from two sources, the original of the Tantrākhyāyikā and the source of the other three groups and in part of the version B of the Tantrākhyāyikā itself which he calls K. This also has not been proved and it seems in part implausible also because this would mean that the occurrence of any story in any two of the four versions should be a strong ground for assigning it to the original text. But according to Hertel's own view, such a significance would be plausible, only the story occurred in both the Tantrākhyāyikā and one of the K versions. Hertel further assumes apparently without much ground that there was another intermediate archetype, "N-W." which is the direct ancestor of the Pehlevi translation, the Southern Pañcatantra group and the Simplicitor of Bühler and Kielhorn. Further, it can also be argued with sufficient ground that the Tantrākhyāyikā recension was prior to others. Its omission of stories may not necessarily be the sign of its loyalty to the ultimate source. The recension containing fuller stories need not necessarily be the later one. The word tantra in the Pañcatantra probably means śāstra or siddhānta. Thus in the Amara-koṣa we have tantra in the sense of siddhānta and in the Anekārtha-saṅgraha the word tantra is used in the sense of śāstra. Pañcatantra thus means Five Śāstras or Five Siddhāntas. From the name it seems that the Tantrākhyāyikā represented the main story of the Pañcatantra. This explains why the Tantrākhyāyikā should contain less stories than the Pañcatantra.
Bhāsa was probably a Brahmin and a devotee of Viṣṇu. Our knowledge of Bhāsa was first acquired merely from the reference to him along with the other poets Saumilla and Kaviputra as dramatists of great distinction by Kālidāsa in the Mālavikāgnimitra. But as yet we know nothing of Saumilla and Kaviputra. It is, however, difficult to say whether Kālidāsa had used Bhāsa as the model of the frame of his dramas as Winternitz suggests. The poet Bāna in his introductory verse 16, of his Harṣa-carita, refers to Bhāsa with high compliments. Vākpati in his Gauḍavaho mentions Bhāsa in verse 800. In commentaries from the 9th to 12th century a drama Svapna-nāṭaka or Svapna-vāsavadattā is often quoted. But Rājaśekhara refers in a verse in an anthology called Sūktimuktāvalī to Bhāsa’s Svapna-vāsavadattā and Bhāsa is generally referred to in most anthologies. This was all that was known about Bhāsa till 1910 when Gaṇapati Śāstrī discovered in South Travancore ten dramas of Bhāsa in palm-leaf MSS. all in one bundle and this was regarded as a good ground for recognising in them the lost dramas of Bhāsa. Later, however, two other dramas were found. (There is an initial difference between the

1 prāhitayāsāśām bhāsa-saumilla-kaviputrādīnām prabandhānatikramya vartamāna-kavān kālidāsaya kriyādyān kathān bahumānāḥ.
2 Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, p. 184.
3 sūtradhāraṅkārambhār nāṭakairbhubhāmilikāh 1 saṭākāsīryaḥ lebhe bhāso devakulairiva 11
—Harṣa-carita, Śl. 16.
4 bhāsammi jalaṃamitte kantīdeve a jassa rahuḍre 1 sobandhave a bandhammi hāriyende a āpande II 800

The verses of Bhāsa in the anthologies have been collected together and translated by Aufricht in Ind. Stud. 17, 168 ff; Z.D.M.G.: 27, 65; 36, 370 ff; and Peterson, Subhāṣita-muktāvalī, p. 80 ff; J.R.A.S., 1891, p. 391 ff also pp. 105 and 159.
ordinary classical drama and the dramas of Bhāsa. In the ordinary classical dramas we find that after the nāndī the sūtradhāra steps in (nāndyante sūtradhārah). But in the newly found dramas the sūtradhāra steps in after the nāndī and begins sometimes with an introductory adoration to Viṣṇu as in the Avimāraka and the Dūta-ghaṭotkaca; and at other times starts with introducing in the usual manner by suggestion the names of the important personages. In the ordinary classical dramas again we find a little praise of the drama and the name of the author, but it is not so in the newly found dramas. The plays are generally short and sometimes of one Act. The dramas generally begin with one adoration hymn and end also with one. But in the dramas of Bhāsa generally there is the same type of the Bharata-vākya called generally sthapanā in which a benediction is referred to the king, as in the Svapnanaṭaka, the Pratijñā-naṭaka and the Pañcaratrapaṭaka. The king is often called Rājasimha. We cannot ascertain that this Rājasimha is a Pallava king.

The nāṭakas of Bhāsa are as follows: Svapna-naṭaka, Pratijñā-naṭaka, Pañcaratrapaṭaka, Cārudatta, Dūta-ghaṭotkaca, Avimāraka, Bālacarita, Madhyama-vyāyoga, Karṇa-bhāra, Uru-bhaṅga, Abhiṣeka-naṭaka, Pratimā-naṭaka. These were all in old Kerala characters.

That these dramas were written by one and the same person appears to be certain on account of the identity of style and the fact that some of the verses are repeated from drama to drama and the same ways of speech occur in several dramas.

1 evam āryamīśrān viṣṇāpayāmi
  aye, kiṁ nu khalu mayi viṣṇāpanayagro sabda iva śrūyate
  anga iva paśyāmi.

This passage occurs in all the dramas excepting Pratijñā, Cārudatta, Avimāraka Pratimā and Karṇa-bhāra. Again, the passage

imāṁ sāgarāparantarāṁ himaaod-vindhyo-kundalāṁ
mahīmekaṇḍarākān rājasimhaḥ praśāstāṁ

occurs in Svapna and Bāla-carita.' Again,

bhavantaraśaṅkavā hitasvā praśāsakaṁ praśāmyatau
imāṁ api mahīṁ kṛtyamaṁ rājasimhaḥ praśāstau nāh

The *Svapna-nāṭaka* has been referred to as *Svapna-vāsavadattā* by Abhinavagupta and the name of Bhāsa has been referred to by Kālidāsa and Bāṇa. The *Svapna-nāṭaka* appears in another MS. as *Svapna-vāsavadattā*. It is from this scanty evidence that it has been suggested that Bhāsa was the author of these dramas. This raised a storm of discussion amongst scholars, both Indian and European. Since the publication of the new dramas by MM. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, scholars like Jacobi (translation of the *Svapna-vāsavadattā*), Jolly (*Nachrichten*, 1916), Winternitz (*Festschrift Kuhn*, pp. 299-304), Konow (*Festschrift Kuhn*, pp. 106 et seq. and *Das Indischen drama*, p. 51; *Ind. Ant.*, 49, 1920, 233 ff.), M. Baston (translation of the *Svapna-vāsavadattā*), Suali (*Giornale della soc. As. Italiana*, XXV, p. 95), Pavolini (*Giornale della soc. As. Italiana*), Lesny, Dr. Lindenau (*Bhāsa Studien*), Dr. Morgenstierne, M. Lacôte, Dr. Printz, Dr. Barnett, (B.S.O.S., I., 3, 1920, p. 35 ff), Dr. Thomas (J.R.A.S., 1922, 79 ff.), Pisharoti, Dr. Sukthankar (J.A.O.S., 40, 1920. 248 ff; 41, 1921, 1 ff.; J.B.R.A.S., 1925, p. 126), Rāmāvatāra Pāṇḍeya, Bhāṭṭanāthasvāmī (*Ind. Ant.*, 45, 1916, 189 ff.). Raṅgācārya, Ruddy, Kane and Stein, A. Banerjee-Sastri (J.R.A.S., 1921, p. 367) and many others have continued a controversy since the publication of the Bhāsa dramas by MM. Gaṇapati Śāstrī in 1912. If one has to give a full account of this controversy it may well-nigh fill a volume and yet the controversy cannot yet be regarded as having reached a conclusive stage. It cannot be expected of us to enter into any elaborate detail about this controversy, but it may be regarded desirable to state some of the salient features regarding the controversy.

occurs in *Pratijñā, Avimāraka* and *Abhiseka* and the 2nd line occurs also in *Pulcaratra.* Again, the passage

\[ \text{limpatīva tamo'ārāni vaiśati-dhājanam nobhaḥ} \]

\[ \text{asatpuraṇasūra deśa vīpaha-dām gataḥ} \]

occurs in *Cārudatta* and *Bāla-carita.*
MM. Gaṇapati Śastra came across a bundle of palm-leaf MSS. of nāṭakas in the Manalikkara Maṭham near Padmanābhapuram, written in old Malayalam character. These MSS. proved to be 10 rūpakas and subsequently an eleventh rūpaka was found and later on he found from one Govinda Pisharodi two nāṭakas of a similar character named Abhiṣeka-nāṭaka and Pratimā-nāṭaka. Subsequently to this he found that the Palace Library of Travancore contained a MS. of each of these two books. So altogether these 13 rūpakas were discovered which were never seen or heard of before. In this connection it is well worth noting that there is the practice in the Malayalam country from very ancient times of having Sanskrit nāṭakas staged in the temples by the priests in which often kings participated.

In the ordinary nāṭakas generally a nāndī verse is given and then the stage-direction (nāndyante sūtradhārah) but in the newly found dramas we have first the stage-direction (nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhārah) and then we have a maṅgala-śloka. Again, instead of the word prastāvanā these nāṭakas use the sthāpanā. There is, again no mention of the name of the author and of the work in the sthāpanā as is usual to find in the prastāvanā of other dramas. In these dramas again there is at the end of the drama a sentence announcing the fact that such and such a drama (giving the name) is finished. In the dramas of Bhāsa we have always a prayer to the effect “May our greatest of kings or may our king rule the land.”

Now, since the author’s name is not given in any of the dramas, two questions naturally arise; (1) who are the authors of the dramas, (2) are they all from the one hand, or they are written by different men? Further questions arise as follows: Assuming, for reasons presently to be adduced, that Bhāsa is the author of one or two or all these dramas, was there one Bhāsa, or an earlier and a later Bhāsa; and about some of these dramas a further question may be raised as to whether there was more than one drama of the same name written by
different authors, or by two authors of the same name, an earlier and a later.

The earliest mention of Bhāsa is made by Kālidāsa in Malavikāgnimitra along with Saumilla and Kaviputra. We know practically nothing of Saumilla and Kaviputra. MM. Gaṇapati Śāstrī has urged that these newly found dramas are the dramas of this pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa. His view has been endorsed by most European scholars excepting Dr. Barnett. Dr. Ottozein seems to be unable to pronounce any judgment while Dr. Barnett, Pisharoti and Rāmāvatāra Pāṇḍeya and some other scholars hold that these dramas cannot be of any pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa, but that they were probably written sometime in the 7th century A.D.

Regarding the supposition that all these dramas were written by the same author, MM. Gaṇapati Śāstrī points out that the verse limpativa occurs both in Čārudatta and Bāla-carita. The sentence kim vaksyatiti hṛdayam parisāmkitaṁ me occurs in the 6th Act of the Svapna-nāṭaka and the 4th Act of the Abhiṣeka and a few such other points of similarity can be detected in the plays.

On the point that Bhāsa was the author of the Svapna-vāsavadattā, he refers to the verse of Rājaśekhara in the Kavi-vimarsa quoted in the Sūkti-muktāvali and Bhāsa has been spoken of as being the author of the Svapna-vāsavadattā.⁠¹ He also refers to Kālidāsa’s allusion to Bhāsa as well as Bāṇa’s.⁠² From this MM. G. Śāstrī argues that the word sūtradhārakṛtārmbhaiḥ means a reference to the stage-direction found in these dramas and therefore here Bāṇa’s reference proves that these dramas were written by Bhāsa; and we have the sūkta of Rājaśekhara that Svapna-vāsavadattā belonged to the group of Bhāsa dramas.

---

⁠¹ bhāsānāJayacakrāpi ecchakaiḥ kṣipte pariṣekṣitaṁ
   svapna-vāsavadattasya dāhako bhānā pāvakaḥ

⁠² sūtradhārakṛtārmbhaiḥ nājakairbhuhūmīkaiḥ
   sapata kairyato lerbho bhāso devakukaiṣvai

—Hṛṣi-carita, Sūkta 16.
Now, this argument does not appear to be conclusive. Pisharoti refers to the verses of the Kavi-vimārṣa in the same context and shows that Rājaśekhara there attributes Priyadarśika and Ratnāvalī to Bhāsa.¹ Rājaśekhara further in the same context says that Śrīharṣa made Bhāsa a sabhā-kavi. Doubts have also been raised by other scholars as to whether the Kavi-vimārṣa is at all a work of Rājaśekhara or not. In any case, if this Bhāsa was the writer of the Svapna-vāsavadattā he flourished in Śrīharṣa’s time and cannot be the pre-Kālīdāsa Bhāsa. Again, all dramas are really begun by the sūtradhāra. In the ordinary dramas he is already on the stage, recites the nāndi-śloka and then begins the drama. In the newly found dramas, it is suggested, that some one else or the sūtradhāra himself recites the nāndi without entering the stage and after the nāndi-śloka has been recited probably from behind the stage the sūtradhāra enters and recites a verse in which he introduces the principal personages and in the course of that also offers a benediction. Under the circumstances, it is difficult to suppose that Bāṇa’s reference sūtradhāra-kṛtārmbhāiḥ refers to the special feature of the introductory stage-direction of the dramas. Moreover Bāṇa seems to have introduced the word sūtradhāra-kṛtārmbhāiḥ as well as bahubhūmikaiḥ and sapatākaiḥ for maintaining his imagery through a double meaning. Had this not been so and had the verse any intention of referring to the special features of Bhāsa’s drama this would have applied to the terms bahubhūmikaiḥ and sapatākaiḥ and such new features would have been discoverable in the newly published dramas.

It may be worthwhile to consider a few other references. Sarvāṇanda, who probably lived in the 13th or 14th century, wrote a commentary on the Amara-koṣa called Amarakoṣa-jīkā-sarvasya. In this work there is a reference to the Svapna-vāsavadattā and MM. Śāstrī holds that there is a reference to the

¹ ādau bhāsena racitā nāpiḥa priyadarśikā 1
lau laukālī nāman ratnamālāvena rājate II
See Pisharoti’s articles on Bhāsa Problem, Indian Historical Quarterly, 1925, p. 109.
Q.P. 150—90
marriage of Udayana with Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā here. But owing to considerations discussed in the foot-note, it may well be doubted whether there is any reference here to the Svapna-vāsavadattā of MM. G. Śāstrī. Again, Abhinavagupta also mentions Svapna-vāsavadattā and Daridra-cārudatta. Here also we have no reason to suppose that the Daridra-cārudatta is the same as our Čārudatta-nāṭaka and all we can know from here is that there were these two nāṭakas, Svapna-vāsavadattā and Daridra-cārudatta, and we know really nothing of their authorship. Again, Vāmana in the 3rd adhyāya of the 4th adhikaraṇa of his Kāvyā-laṅkāra-sūtravṛtti quotes a passage without naming the book or the author and this passage is found in the printed text of Svapna-vāsavadattā in the 4th Act. There are also two other quotations from Vāmana which may be traced in the 4th Act of the Pratijñā-yaugandharāyana and the 1st Act of the Čārudatta-nāṭaka. The verse limpativa tamōṅgāni found

---

1 The passage in the Amara-jīkā-sarvasva is as follows:—

\[ \text{triādhiḥ śṛṅgārāḥ dharmārthakāmabhinnāḥ tetrādyo yathā nandayantiḥ brāhmya-brhojanam duśtiḥ svadesam ātmasāt kartum udyanasaya padmāvatipariṇayḥ arthaśāngāra-stṛtiḥ svapnasaṃsavadattā tasyaiśa vāsavadattopariṇayah.} \]

The passage has been otherwise put by MM. G. Śāstrī in his Introduction to the Svapna-vāsavadattā:—svadesamātmasāt kartum udyanasaya padmāvatipariṇayah arthaśāngārah svapnasaṃsavadattā tṛtiyāastavya-vāsavadattopariṇayah kāmaśāṅgārah. It will be seen that by translating the word svapna vāsavadattā before tṛtiyā the meaning has been absolutely changed. If the former is the right reading as I suppose it is, then the work Svapna-vāsavadattā referred to here, would describe Vāsavadattā-pariṇayah and not Padmāvatī-pariṇayah as is found in the printed text of the Svapna-vāsavadattā published by MM. G. Śāstrī. Granting that MM. G. Śāstrī's reading is correct, we have only the evidence here of a Svapna-vāsavadattā in which two marriages are described of Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā. But in the printed text only one marriage is described and even then, as a story is taken from an older source, it does not rule out that there may have been two Svapna-vāsavadattās and it does not prove that it is a work of Bṛhaspadī. See Pisharotī's article on Bhāsa Problem, Indian Historical Quarterly, 1925.

2 sarvacchādakagaurena vātavīdhaḥ bhāmīni ī
kālaśupalacṛdenāṃ sāśrupātāṃ mukham mama ī

—Vāmana, IV. 3.

Cf. 4th Act of the Svapna-vāsavadattā.

\[ \text{yu bhartīśeṣaṃa kṛte na yuddhyet ī} \]

—Vāmana, V. 2,

Cf. 4th Act, Pratijñā-yaugandharāyana.
in the Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin occurs also in the Bālācarita and the Čārudatta. But so far as these are concerned, these prove practically nothing regarding the authorship of the dramas or their being the works of the same hand. Again, in the 3rd uddyota of the Dhvanyāloka-locana a passage is quoted as belonging to the Svapna-vāsavadatta, but it does not occur in the printed text. This śloka is not only to be found in the Svapna-vāsavadatta but M.M. G. Śāstri himself admits that we cannot imagine any situation in the Svapna-vāsavadatta in which such a passage could have occurred. It is rather curious that an authority like Abhinavagupta should make any error of this type. Again, in the explanation of the 85th kārikā of the 6th chapter of the Sāhitya-darpaṇa a śloka is referred to as having been quoted from the Bāla-carita but this is not available in the printed text nor can a proper situation be imagined for it, in it. But Bhāmaha gives a description of events in his chapter on Nyāya-virodha which tallies with similar descriptions in the Pratijñā-nāṭaka and a passage from it is found repeated in Prākrit in the same nāṭaka. But Bhāmaha does not mention anything about the name of the nāṭaka or its author. Again, the same reference that is found in Sarvānanda's Tīkā-sarvasva, is found in the Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa. In the Kaumudi-mahotsava we find reference to Avimāraka the hero and Kuraṅgī the heroine but this is not probably a reference to the printed drama Avimāraka. A 14th century commentary on the Šakuntala says that the sūtradhāra of the play Čārudatta uses Prākrit and this is testified in the printed text of the Čārudatta. The Nāṭya-darpaṇa again mentions a drama called the Daridra-čārudatta but the verse quoted in the Nāṭya-darpaṇa from the Svapna-vāsavadatta is not found in it though we may imagine a situation for it in Svapna-vāsavadatta IV. Again, in the Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa a verse is quoted from the Čārudatta, the contents of

Again, yāsāḥ balirbhavati, etc.

—Vāmana, V. 1.

Cf. 1st Act of the Čārudatta-nāṭaka.
which is traceable to the Mṛchakatika but not to the Cārudatta-nāṭaka. But we have nowhere in these passages any reference to Bhāsa. Again, Sāradātanaya has a quotation in his Bhāva-
prakāśa from the Svapna-vāsavadatta. It is not available in
the printed text but a situation corresponding to it can be ima-
gined in the 5th Act of the Svapna-vāsavadatta. In an article
MM. Gānapati Śāstrī refers to a passage from the Śṛṅgāra-
prakāśa of Bhojadeva of the 11th century wherein the plot of
the 5th Act of the printed text of the Svapna-vāsavadatta is
delineated, but unfortunately there is no mention here of Bhāsa
as the author of the Svapna-vāsavadatta.1 The Nātya-darpaṇa,
however, mentions Daridra-cārudatta but not the author, but he
refers to the Svapna-vāsavadatta as being a work of Bhāsa and
gives a quotation from it, as we have already said.2

Now let us sum up the position. There is undoubtedly an
old pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa. Bhāsa is known to Bāna-Bhaṭṭa, but
whether this Bhāsa was the pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa or of we believe
the testimony of the Kavi-vimarśa of Rājaśekhara, a contemporary
of himself, we do not know. Practically none of the verses quoted
in different books as belonging to the Svapna-vāsavadatta or other
texts, are found in the printed text. Of all the dramas only
the Svapna-vāsavadatta has been mentioned as being the work
of Bhāsa in the Nātya-darpaṇa, but the quotation does not
tally with the text of the printed book. The quotation from the
Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-koṣa also shows that there existed a version
of the Svapna-vāsavadatta with at least a different sthāpanā and
there were at least some scenes in it which were not found in
the printed text. These and other evidences, when put together,
lead us to conclude that we are prepared to agree that Bhāsa
had written the Svapna-vāsavadatta. But that the present text

1 The Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa (11th century) describes the plot of the 5th Act as follows:

svapnavāsavadattra padmāvatīm aryanāthām draśṭaṃ rāja samudra-gukaṃ gatah
padmāvatīkāya ca tavalo-kaś tasyā svan śyāne susodhatā vāsavadatīm ca svapnavad
arsygo daśā vivaśy padmātālakṣaṇa vāsavadatīm aha
svāpac ca svapnadrākṣeṇān ya svapnādyamātaṃ vāsavadatīm aha

2 Nātyadarpana, pp. 53 and 84.
should be identically the same work is more than what we can say. It is strange that there should be no reference to the works of Bhāsa that are now attributed to him in the printed texts of the T. S. Series. It is also strange that the few quotations that have referred to the Svāpna-vāsavadatta should not be available in the printed text and that other references to other texts, like the Bāla-carita or the Daridracārudatta should not be traceable to the printed text. It may be that when other MSS. are available such quotations may be traceable. But I doubt it very much. In any case, until such MSS. are available we cannot say that the printed text of the Svāpna-vāsavadatta is the Svāpna-vāsavadatta of pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa.

Judging the evidences as a whole it seems to be probable that these works probably are texts adapted from the work of an old Bhāsa by castigation and insertion to suit the convenience of the theatrical audience at the temples in Travancore. It is for this reason that though the name of the drama is given in the end, the name of the author is not given, for the editor who pruned the text of Bhāsa could not pass it off as a work of Bhāsa before an audience which knew what Bhāsa’s works were. Neither could he advertise his own name as an editor of Bhāsa, for the editing was made for the convenience of staging and not for the improvement of the text. It may in this connection be pointed out that the so-called Svāpna-vāsavadatta of the T.S. Series is actually called the Svāpna-nātakam and not the Svāpna-vāsavadatta. The shortening was unnecessary if it was not intended to distinguish it from the Svāpna-vāsavadatta. The fact that the Ūru-bhaṅga is not a tragedy in one Act but a detached intermediate Act of some drama is also quite obvious. It seems to me, however, that probably all these dramas, to whosoever their authorship may be due, were edited either by the same editor or by the same circle of editors.

Much has been made by the different scholars regarding the difference between nāndyante sūtradhāraḥ and nāndyante praviśati sūtradhāraḥ. It should be observed in this connection that
there may be three classes of nāndī—a nāndī may be maṅgala-śloka, written by the author of the drama, as is found both in the Śakuntalā and in the Vikramorvaśī. There is another class of nāndī which is an auspicious ceremony to be performed for the performance of the drama, which varied differently according to local custom and practice. As this did not form any part of the actual drama this was left out of consideration and was included within stage-directions. It is for this reason that this position is left off as nāndyante, i.e., after the nāndī has been finished. The writer of the drama does not bother himself as to what may be the nature of this nāndī. The third class of nāndī was an auspicious verse which was recited by a sūtradhāra, pāripārvīka or a sthāpaka. In a drama like the Śakuntalā, we have first the auspicious verse yā sṛṣṭiḥ etc. which is intended by the poet for the auspicious ending of the work. This is no part of the actual drama that is played. Then came the nāndī, about the nature of which the poet is silent. The sūtradhāra was present on the stage when the nāndī ceremony was performed. When the ceremony was over, he started his speech in order to introduce the drama. In the so-called Bhāsa plays the sūtradhāra is not supposed to be present when the nāndī ceremony was being done. I fancy that this may be due to the fact that some articles of the auspicious rights of the temple wherein the play was staged, was made and the sūtradhāra being of a lower caste was not present there. When this nāndī of auspicious rights was finished he entered the stage and recited his own nāndī. In most cases the sort of verse as prescribed for the sūtradhāra’s nāndī tallies with the sūtradhāra’s nāndī of the so-called Bhāsa play; but it does not tally with the nāndī of Kālidāsa, for a nāndī should be either of 12 or 8 syllables; which condition was not satisfied in a sragdharā or a śārdūla-vikrīḍita metre.

Regarding the date of Bhāsa, the argument of MM. Gaṇapati Śāstrī based on the priority of Bhāmaha to Kālidāsa and Bhāmaha’s possible reference to the story contained in
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Bhāsa's dramas, seems to be extremely improbable. His statement that Bhāmaha was prior to Guṇāḍhya is also wholly unbelievable. Our reasons for this contention may well be consulted in our treatment of Bhāmaha's date in the Chapter on Alāṃkāra and our note on Guṇāḍhya. But it cannot be gainsaid that Bhāsa was already a celebrated and old writer in the time of Kālidāsa, for Kālidāsa refers to him as prathita-
yaśāḥ (of well-spread celebrity) and contrasts himself as a new (nava) writer; while Bhāsa's work is regarded as old (purāṇa). We can, therefore, safely place him at least two to three centuries before Kālidāsa. There is no reference to Bhāsa in any pre-Kālidāsa documents. This pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa may thus be believed to have lived in the 3rd century B.C. In the Pratimā-
nāṭaka (5th Act) a reference is made to a Mānavīya-Dharmaśāstra, a Bāhrapatya-Arthaśāstra, a Nyāyaśāstra of Medhātithi and a Prācetasa-Śraddhakalpa. But nothing can be made out of it. The Yogaśāstra and the Arthaśāstra have been referred to in the Avimāraka and the Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa. But nothing important can be made out of this for the Yogaśāstra, the Artha-
śāstra and the Mānavīya-Dharmaśāstra are certainly older than Bhāsa. We do not know of any Nyāyaśāstra by Medhātithi. In language, the style of Bhāsa seems to stand between Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa. The Prākṛt also is older than that used in the classical dramas. On this evidence, Winternitz would place Bhāsa in the 3rd century or the first half of the 4th century A.D. ¹

Most of the stories are drawn from the Mahābhārata. Kṛṣṇa and Rāma legends also play their part in the Bāla-carita and the dramas Pratimā-nāṭaka and Abhiṣeka-nāṭaka. The story of the Svapna-nāṭaka and Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa are drawn from Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhat-kathā and probably also that of Avimāraka and Daridra-cārudatta.

¹ See Lesny, Z.D.M.G., 1917, p. 203 ff., see also Lindenau, Bhāsa Studien, p. 14 ff., who believes Bhāsa to have lived after 200 A.D. Aśvaghoṣa and Bharata probably lived between 100 and 200 A.D.
The plays of Bhāsa have been differently classified by different people.1 We may thus divide them as follows: (i) the Udayana plays—Swapna and Pratijñā; (ii) Fiction or original plays—Avimāraka and Čārudatta; (iii) the Mahābhārata plays—Bālacakita, Duta-ghaṭotkaca, Duta-vākya, Karṇabha, Pañcarātra, Urubhaṅga, Madhyama-vyāyoga; (iv) the Rāmāyaṇa plays—Pratimā and Abhišeka—altogether 13 plays.)

Some of the South Indian plays, e.g., the Matta-vilāsa, Kalyāṇa-saugandhika, Tapatī-saṃvarana, etc. and the southern manuscripts of the Šakuntalā and the Nāgānanda, display some structural peculiarity.2 But the plays of Bhāsa show some special structural peculiarity: (i) they begin with the same stage-direction.3 (ii) The śūradhāra recites only one maṅgala-śloka and in some of the dramas the dramatic persons are introduced in the maṅgala-śloka.4 (iii) Excepting Karṇabha, we have sthāpanā instead of prastāvanā. (iv) The name of the book is given in the conclusion but the author’s name is absent. (v) Excepting some of the dramas, they all begin in the sthāpanā with the same kind of phraseology.5 (vi) The epilogues are nearly identical.

The dramas of Bhāsa not only ignored the rules of the Nāṭya-śāstra in introducing death and violent action on the stage, but they also used the word ārya-putra as a term of address from a servant, whereas ārya-putra is generally the term of address from a wife to her husband. The dramatic devices

---

1 Winternitz, O.Z. IX, followed by Devadhara, Plays, etc. Lindenau, Bhāsa Studien, p. 16; Jahagirdar, I.A. 1931, pp. 42-44; Svarupa, Vision. Introduction, p. 10.
2 See Bhāsa—A Study, Pusalker, 1940. They all begin with the lines: āye kinnu khalu mayi vijñāpanayagre labda iva śrūyate.
3 nādyante tataḥ praticiṣṭa śūradhāraḥ.
4 Swapna, Pratijñā, Pañcarātra and Pratimā.
5 ecam āryamitrān vijñāpayaṁ. āye, kinnu khalu mayi vijñāpanayagre labda iva śrūyate. an̄ga paśyami. The Pratijñā, Čārudatta, Avimāraka and Pratimā use a different form.
6 They use the verse:

imam sāgaraparyantam himavat-vindhya-kūpdaṁ
mahīmekatapatrāṅkan rējasimhaḥ prajāṣtu naḥ

Čārudatta and Duta-ghaṭotkaca have no epilogues.
are also similar in most of the plays; such as, the constant recourse to ākāṣabhāṣitam, description of battles, duels, etc. The entrance of persons of high ranks preceded by the words uṣsaraḥa, uṣsaraḥa. The communication of the intervening events is by a chamberlain, who addresses the female door-keeper in somewhat the same phraseology. The door-keeper is often addressed with the same phraseology, such as nivedyatām, nivedyatām. The dramatic characters often know what is passing in others' minds. ¹ We also often notice the same kind of ideas, such as, (i) the best weapon of a hero is his hand; (ii) Nārada is described as inciting quarrels. (iii) Dhṛtarāṣṭra is described as having been made blind through the jealousy of the gods. (iv) Arjuna's exploits with the Kirāta is described in the same terms in Dūta-vākya, Dūta-ghaṭotkaca and Īru-bhaṅga (v) Inference of the existence of cities from the watering of trees. (vi) The idea that kings live in their sacrifices.

The dramatic device of patākāsthāna is used in Pratijñā, Act II, Abhiśeka V, Avimāraka, Act II, Pañcarātra, Act I, Pratimā, Act I.

Again, similar forms of irony and dramatic situations Prati., V. 20 (p. 107) and Abhiśeka, II. 18 (p. 27), in Bāla. (p. 61) and Pañca. (p. 87) are sometimes introduced. The same expressions are sometimes used in different dramas. The use of common imagery of a peculiar character, the introduction of similar dramatic scenes and even the use of similar unique expressions and vocabulary and the recurrence of the same verses and long prose passages, grammatical solecisms and Prākṛt archaisms all go to prove that whatever may have been the original of these plays, they all were the products of the same hand.²

But howsoever Professor Pusalker and others may try to explain the absence of the verses quoted from Bhāsa by other writers in the printed T. S. texts by inventing situations where

¹ See Bhāsa, Pusalker, p. 8.
² See Bhāsa by Pusalker for details.

O. P. 150—91
their verses might have occurred and by attributing everything to clerical error, the facts remain that these are not found in the T. S. texts, so even though we are willing to believe that the texts originally belonged to the author, it cannot be denied that they suffered much alteration and nothing is settled about the point that they were written by a pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa.

Bāña refers to a Bhāsa and it is possible that this is a reference to a pre-Kālidāsa Bhāsa. Now patākā means anka and banner and bhūmikā means composition and change of dress. Thus the verse may be translated thus:—Bhāsa attained fame by his introduction of dramas with the stage manager (carpenter) and with many actors and its division in many acts like the houses of gods which are commenced with the carpenter’s line and have many floors and banners. In my opinion this suggests that Bhāsa was the first to start the classical drama as starting with a Sūtradhāra and a compound of many players in diverse dress and also of many acts. This would make Bhāsa a very old writer who according to Bāña gave the structure and form to the classical drama and therefore attained such great fame. But yet we have no evidence that this Bhāsa was the writer of the T.S.S. plays, as they now stand. But we are prepared to agree that though there may have been castigations, modifications and changes, on the whole they reveal the composition of the old Bhāsa. Since we have placed Kālidāsa in the 1st century B.C. and since we find that there is no Aśokan influence of the prohibition of sacrifices and since we also find the great prevalence of image-worship at the time; and for sundry other reasons as

---

\[ \text{sūtradhārakṛtārmbhair nāṣakairbahuḥbhūmikaiḥ} \]
\[ \text{sapatākairvāsa lebhe bhāso devakulairśv} \]
---Harṣa-carita.

\[ \text{patākā vaijyantyāṃ ca saubhāgeḥkṛte dvajaspi ca} \]
---Vīva

\[ \text{bhūmikāraśanāyāṃ syd vāśantarāparīgrahe} \]
---Medīnī

\[ \text{Kulāṃ janaśad gṛha} \]
---Vīva
the style and the like, our conjecture is that he was probably a writer of the Mauryya times. It seems also probable that he lived at a time when the Mahābhārata tales had not been worked up in the present form. The characterisation of Duryyodhana and his consent in giving back to the Pāṇḍavas half the kingdom are such radical changes of the story of Mahābhārata that no writer could have introduced those tales without giving a rude shock to public feelings at a time when the Mahābhārata had been codified in the present form. His tendency to write different types of dramas also supports the view that he was writing at a time when these various forms of drama were gradually evolving out.

In the Dīta-kāvyā a scene from the Udyoga-parva is depicted. Bhīṣma was being appointed as the general. When Kṛṣṇa comes with a message of conciliation and peace, Duryyodhana tries to insult him by looking at a picture portraying the scene of the pulling of Draupadī's hair and clothes and has a wordy conversation with him. After this he tries to arrest him but Kṛṣṇa shows his cosmic form and Duryyodhana flies away. Kṛṣṇa's weapons, Sudarśana, etc., appear but finding Kṛṣṇa pacified, go away. Dhṛtarāṣṭra falls at his feet and mollifies him. The portrait scene and the appearance of Kṛṣṇa's weapons are new modifications on the story of the Mahābhārata. In the Mahābhārata, Dhṛtarāṣṭra is the Emperor but here Duryyodhana is the real Emperor as well as a mighty warrior, whereas in the Mahābhārata he is only a wicked man. It is either a vyāyoga or a vīthi.

Karṇa-bhāra

Karṇa was appointed general after Droṇa. He asked Śalya to drive the chariot where Arjuna was fighting. He is held back for a moment by the memory of his relationship with the Pāṇḍavas and tells Śalya the story of how he received new weapons from Paraśurāma. In the meanwhile, Indra in the form of a Brahmin asked for his natural armour which he gives
away to him in spite of the warning of Śalya. Indra sends Vimalā, a Śakti, to Karna. Karna asks Śalya to drag the chariot to the battle-field.

In the Epic, the story of the giving away of the natural armour happens earlier, while the Pāṇḍavas were in the forest. The introduction of the episode in the midst of the work makes Karna appear nobler. Śalya is more sympathetic to Karna than in the Epic. It is a vyāyoga and also an instance of utṛṣṭikāṅka.

Dūta-ghaṭotkaca

In this play Ghaṭotkaca is represented as going to Dhṛtarāṣṭra on the death of Abhimanyu, to tell him that this foul deed will be avenged. Dhṛtarāṣṭra himself was quite angry with his sons and Jayadratha for the commision of the act and had assured them that nothing would save them from the arrows of the Pāṇḍavas. The embassy of Ghaṭotkaca is a new introduction, which does not occur in the Epic.

Ūru-bhaṅga

Whereas in the Epic the family of Duruyodhana is far away from the battle-field, in this drama after the club-fight between Bhīma and Duruyodhana, when Duruyodhana was struck in the thigh against the rules of fight, the poet utilises the opportunity of demonstrating Duruyodhana's softer sentiments towards his father, wife and child. Duruyodhana also shows great patience and forbearance in trying to dissuade Balarāma and Aśvatthāmā from avenging his death by killing the Pāṇḍavas. He also confesses that he has done more ill to the Pāṇḍavas than they had done to him.

It is an utṛṣṭikāṅka.

Madhyama-vyāyoga

It is a story which is wholly invented. It depicts the meeting of Bhīma and Ghaṭotkaca; the latter was out for secur-
ing a victim for his mother and the three sons of a Brahmin were all vying with one another for being made a victim. The middle one was chosen but as Ghaṭotkaca was calling for him as *madhyama, madhyama*, Bhīma appeared on the scene. Bhīma offers himself as a victim if Ghaṭotkaca was able to take him by force, in which he fails. Bhīma then accompanied Ghaṭotkaca to Hiḍimbā who recognised him.

**Pañcarātra**

In this play Duryyodhana performed a sacrifice with Droṇa as the priest and as the *daksinā* of the sacrifice Droṇa requests Duryyodhana to settle with the Pāṇḍavas by giving them half the Empire and Duryyodhana agrees if any news of the Pāṇḍavas would be got within five days. This being fulfilled, Duryyodhana agrees to part with half the kingdom in favour of the Pāṇḍavas. We have nowhere in the Epic the performance of the sacrifice, agreement with Droṇa and the final parting of half the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas, which would have made the Kurukṣetra battle impossible. It is a *samavakāra*.

**Abhiṣeka**

The scene opens in Kiṣkindhyā and the agreement between Suvṛīva and Rāma to help each other. Suvṛīva challenges Bāli to fight but when he is worsted in the fight, Rāma kills him with an arrow. After the death of Bāli, Suvṛīva is anointed king. There is much deviation here from the description in the *Rāmāyana*.

**Bāla-garita**

It deals with the early life of Kṛṣṇa. There are some elements in it which does not tally with the description of Kṛṣṇa as we find elsewhere. Though the dancing of the Gopinis is mentioned, we do not find any of the amorous scenes described in the *Bhāgavata* or the *Brahma-vaivartta*. The girl that is killed
by Kaṃsa has been given birth to by Devakī. After Kṛṣṇa had killed Kaṃsa, the old king Ugrasena was released from prison and was crowned.

**Avimāraka**

The story of the Avimāraka seems to have been taken either from the Bṛhat-kathā or from some floating stories of the time which were taken up by the Bṛhat-kathā; yet the story, as it appears, is slightly different from that found in the Katha-sarit-sāgara. It is a long story. It refers to the union of Kuranta, daughter of a king, with Avimāraka, who was also a prince in disguise in clandestine ways. It is a full-fledged nāṭaka.

**Pratima**

The Pratimā which is a full-fledged nāṭaka, is based on the story of the Rāmāyana, with many deviations, both as regards plot and as regards the depicting of characters.

**Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa**

It is a story from the Bṛhat-kathā with deviations. In this play king Pradyota, willing to give his daughter Vāsavadattā in marriage to Vatsarāja, took him by a ruse and carried him off to his country. There Vatsarāja fell in love with Vāsavadattā. By a cunning device of the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa, Vatsarāja succeeded in eloping with Vāsavadattā. It has been regarded by some as a prakaraṇa and by others as a nāṭikā and by others as an ihāmṛga.

**Svapna-vāsavadatta**

Udayana Vatsarāja lost a part of his kingdom by the invasion of Āruṇi. The minister Yaugandharāyaṇa conceived of the plan of making Udayana marry the daughter of the king of
Magadha in order to make an ally of him for restoring the kingdom conquered by Āruṇī. Udayana’s wife Vāsadatta agrees with the plan fixed by Yaugandharāyaṇa and arrives at Rājagṛha in an āśrama, posing herself as a sister of Yaugandharāyaṇa. Padmāvatī, the daughter of the Magadha king, comes there and meets Vāsadatta in disguise. Padmāvatī agrees to the request of Yaugandharāyaṇa to keep with her Vāsadatta. A rumour is afloat that there is a great fire at Lavaṇaka in which both Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vāasadatta perished. Vāsadatta describes to Padmāvatī the beauty of Udayana. A betrothal of Padmāvatī with Udayana is arranged. The marriage of Udayana takes place. But the king Udayana, though he had heard of the death of Vāsadatta in the Lavaṇaka fire and though he had married Padmāvatī, was still in very much grief for her. In one scene Udayana was asleep on bed and Vāsadatta, mistaking him to be Padmāvatī sleeps beside him. But the king, in his dream calls out for Vāsadatta and recognises Vāsadatta. But she leaves hastily. Udayana then with the combined forces that belonged to him and the king of Magadha, regains his kingdom. His mother-in-law the Queen Aṅgāra-vatī, had sent him a picture of Udayana and Vāsadatta. Padmāvatī recognises in the portrait Avantikā, who was in the disguise of Vāsadatta with her. At this time a Brahmin, who was Yaugandharāyaṇa in disguise, is announced and Vāsadatta is brought in and when her veil is removed, she is recognised and Padmāvatī pays her homage to Vāsadatta.

Cārudatta

No precise information is available regarding the source of the story. It is very closely allied to the story of the Mṛcchakaṇṭha. It is a prakaraṇa.¹

¹ For materials in the study of Bhāsa and a masterly treatment of the subject in detail reference may be made to Bhāsa—A Study, by A. D. Pusalker.
KĀLĪDĀSA

Much has been written in the East and the West about the date of Kālidāsa.$^1$ There is a story that Kālidāsa was the son of a Brahmin, but early in life he was a cowherd, boy. He, however, succeeded in marrying a princess and being shamed by her, he adored the goddess Kālī through whose grace he became a great scholar and poet. Hence his name was Kālidāsa.$^2$ Another Ceylonese tradition makes him a contemporary of the poet Kumāradāsa of the 6th century A.D.$^3$ Hoernle says that Kālidāsa was like a hook to which many stories hanged, although they have no historical validity.$^4$

All that we may learn from Kālidāsa's own works is that he was probably devoted to Śiva. He also adores Viṣṇu as the incarnation of Brahman and he praises Brahman as the original cause of the world. He seems to have been quite familiar to

---


$^3$ See T. W. Rhys Davids and C. Bendall, *J.R.A.S.*, 1888, p. 148 ff., and p. 440; W. Geiger, *Literatur und Sprache der Singhalesan* (Grundriss I, 10), p. 3 ff.; H. M. Vidyābhūṭa, *J.A.S.B.*, 1893, p. 212 ff.; J. E. Seneviratne, *The Life of Kālidāsa*, Colombo, 1901. The life of Kālidāsa has been dramatised in Ceylon. The life of Kālidāsa is found in later works like the *Bhoja-prabandha* and is current in the oral tradition of the pundits, wherein he is said to have been at first a very foolish man who was cutting the branch of the tree on which he was sitting. A princess had made the wager that she would marry the scholar who would defeat her in discussion. Many scholars were defeated by her and some of them, wanting to take their revenge, put forth Kālidāsa as their teacher who was so wise that he remained silent. By a clever ruse they convinced the princess of the scholarship of the speechless man. The lady discovered her mistake in her bridal night. She kicked him out of her bed. He then adored Sarvasvatī and became a great poet and went to see the princess. The princess asked him what he wanted. He replied—*asti kaścid vāg-viśaṁḥ*. To immortalise his first speech with the princess he wrote three works beginning with *asti* (*Kumāra-sambhava*), *kaścit* (*Maha-dāta*) and *vāk* (*Raghu-vampa*).

the doctrine of Vedānta, Sāṅkhya and Yoga. ¹ He seems to have travelled much over India and was well-acquainted with the geography of India and outside India. He shows his acquaintance with the geography of India in his Megha-dūta and it seems that he had carefully observed the actual progress of the monsoon in India. He was a well-known scholar and often loved to depict the old picture of living the varṇāśrama-dharma. He is not only acquainted with the science of poetry and dramaturgy but has sufficient knowledge of the pictorial art as well. He was well-versed in all the sciences including Astronomy and Grammar, as well as in Erotics and Polity.² He frequently in many places uses the śabdālaṅkāra called yamaka and refers to and uses many alaṅkāras in it.³ He had also, as is evident from the Vikramorvaśī, sufficient knowledge of music, singing and dancing. From his special partiality to Ujjayini it has been suggested that his home was probably in Ujjayini. The title of the drama, Vikramorvaśī has an allusion, it has been suggested, to Vikramāditya, in whose court he might have lived.⁴ Tradition says that he was one of the nine jewels of Vikramāditya’s court,⁵ the others being Vararuci, Dhanvantari, Kṣapañaka, Amarasimha, Saṅku, Vetāla-bhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpāra and Varāha-mihira. But this traditional account seems to

¹ See Harris, An Investigation into some of Kālidāsa’s Views, Evansville, Indiana, 1884; M. T. Narasimhi Ivengar, Kālidāsa’s Religion and Philosophy, Indian Antiquary, 1910, p. 236 ff.; also Kiranmacharya, p. 73 ff.
³ See Hillebrandt, Kālidāsa, p. 107 ff.
⁴ See Bhāu Dāji in Nandargikar’s Introduction to his edition of the Rāghu-yāmāṇa, p. 35 ff.
⁵ Haraprasād Śāstrī, in J.B.O.R.S, I, 1915, p. 197 ff., thought that it could be proved that Kālidāsa’s home was in Malwa. Paṇḍit Lachmādhar in his article, The Birth-Place of Kālidāsa (Delhi University publication No. I, 1926) says that his home was in Kaśmir. It is also supposed by many that he was born in Vīdarbha because he wrote in the Vaidarbhī style; N. G. Mazumder, Indian Antiquary, 1918, p. 264; F. G. Peterson, J.R.A.S., 1926, p. 725. Even Bengal has been claimed by some to have been the birth-place of the poet.
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have little historical value.\(^1\) Further, the astronomer Varāhamihira lived probably in the first half of the 6th century. No king at his time had the title of Vikramāditya. The style of Kālidāsa as well as his astronomical views are other than those of Varāhamihira.\(^2\) So also Dhanvantari, the author of a medical glossary, is older than Amarasiṃha, and he has in his glossary utilised Kālidāsa.\(^3\) Kṣapaṇaka was a lexicographer. He wrote a work called the Anekārtha-kosa, which is quoted in the Guṇaratna-mahodadhi. Ghaṭakarpara wrote a kāvyā called the Ghaṭakarpara-kāvyā. It has commentaries, such as, those by Vaidyanātha, Vindhyaśvaraprapāda, Tārācandra, Govardhana, Kuśalakavi and Abhinavagupta, the last-named one being called the Ghaṭakarpara-kulaka-vṛtti. Vararuci is known as a grammarian. About 22 books are ascribed to him of which 13 are works on grammar, one on lexicicon, the Prākṛt Grammar, Prākṛta-prakāśa, one on medicine, one on rāja-niti and two kāvyas called the Rākṣasa-kāvyā and Vararuci-vākyā-kāvyā and other works. But it is doubtful whether all these were written by him. We know nothing of Śaṅku, but we know one called Śaṅkuka, who wrote

\(^1\) It has been sometimes erroneously asserted that Kālidāsa had written an astrological text Jyotirvidābharaṇa which was probably written in the 16th century A.D.; see A. Weber, Z.D.M.G., 1868, p. 708 ff.

\(^2\) A reference to the nava-ratna is found as early as 948 A.D. in an Inscription in Buddha-Gayā. The Inscription is however lost and it is only on the evidence of a doubtful copy of Wilmot and a translation of it by Charles Wilkins (Ariastic Researches, 1806, p. 284 ff.) that it is known. Winternitz says that Wilmot was a victim to erroneous belief. See also A. Holtzmann, Über den griechischen Ursprung des indischen Türkreises, Karlsruhe, 1841, 18 ff., p. 27 ff. See also Zachariae, Die indischen Wörterbücher, p. 18 ff.; Fleet, Indian Antiquity, 1901, p. 3 ff.

\(^3\) Jacobi, Z.D.M.G., 1876 p. 304 ff.

Bhuvanabhuyadaya and a work on alamkāra and also a commentary on Bharata’s Nātya-śāstra. We know nothing of Vetālabhaṭṭa. Amarasiṃha was undoubtedly the celebrated writer of the lexicon called Amara-kośa or Nāmaliṅgānuṣāsana. It had no less than 37 commentaries, some of which have been published and the others are available in manuscripts. He is also reputed to be a grammarian and as such he has been mentioned in Bopadeva’s Kavikalpadruma. It is difficult to say how many of the nine jewels lived in the court of Vikramāditya, but many scholars of the present day believe that at least Kālidāsa lived in the court of Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, who is supposed to have started the Vikrama era to signalise his victory over the Śakas in the year 58 B. C.¹

There has been a great controversy regarding the date of Kālidāsa. Some have tried to prove that he belonged to the 1st or 2nd century B.C.² If it could be proved that Aśvaghoṣa in his Saundarananda or the Buddha-carita borrowed from Kālidāsa, the contention could be proved.³ But on this point, no infallible judgment can be made, though there are evident similarities between the writings of the two authors.

Chandragupta II and Skandagupta assumed the title of Vikramāditya as evidenced by numismatic proofs. Chandragupta

---

¹ See Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, p. 532 ff., 571, 581 (E. J. Rapson); Kielhorn, Indian Antiquary, 1890, p. 316, had for the first time demonstrated that the Vikrama era was identical with the Mālava era.

² K. G. Śaṅkara, and K. M. Shembavnekar and Dhīrendranāth Mukerji in the latter’s article on the Gupta era (Daulatpur College Magazine, 1934), tried to prove in an unconvincing manner that the Gupta era was identical with Vikrama era and thereby to prove that Kālidāsa lived in the 1st century B.C. A terracotta medallion found in Bhita near Allahabad is a scene of a hermitage and it belongs to the Suṅga period. It has been suggested that the beautiful scene is that of the hermitage of the Īśākunda. But Sir John Marshall says that it resembles the reliefs of Sanchi and probably represents a scene from the Jātakas. Sec. J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 138; Cambridge History, Vol. I, p. 643, Plate No. XXIX, 81; also Kṣetresh Ch. Chatterjee’s article, The Date of Kālidāsa, when he tries to prove an earlier date of Kālidāsa.

³ Opinions are available on both sides. While Kṣetresh Ch. Chatterjee holds that Aśvaghoṣa was the borrower, MM. Haraprasāda Śāstri, in J. B. O. R. S., 1916, p. 186, holds the opposite view.
II had his capital in Ujjayinī. Winternitz, following Bloch, thinks that the *Raghuvaṃśa* contains many allusions to Chandragupta II.¹

The present writer does not think that there is any evidence that Kālidāsa lived in Ujjayinī for a long time or that the *Raghuvaṃśa* contains any allusion to Chandragupta II. The poet Kālidāsa, of course, is very reverential to Vālmīki, but he does not say of him as a mythical seer of antiquity as living in another *yuga*, as Winternitz says. Jacobi is supposed to have demonstrated that certain astrological data in Kālidāsa’s epics reveal an acquaintance with Greek astrology and that the stage of Greek astrology as represented in the works of Indian astrologers correspond to that which is evidenced by Firmicus Meternus about the middle of the 4th century A.D.² Bühler has shown that the author of an inscription in the Sun temple at Mandasor, one called Vatsabhaṭṭi, had not only imitated the style of Kālidāsa but he actually borrowed some of Kālidāsa’s poems as the model on his own verses.³ If this is correct, Kālidāsa must have lived and attained fame before the year 473 A. D. But as the present writer is unable to weigh the astronomical evidence of Jacobi, he is unable to place the other limit of Kālidāsa’s date to 350 A. D. But the argument for his date being 375 A. D. gains in strength if we can believe that he lived in the court of Vikramāditya and that this Vikramāditya was Chandragupta II. On this point we have no conclusive evidence. Our conclusion therefore is that Kālidāsa lived pretty long before the middle of the 6th century A.D. But how long it was, we are unable to decide.

I now wish to adduce an altogether new point, which I hope, may throw some light on the date of Kālidāsa. The principle of inheritance in Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra* differs in a

² *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1873, p. 554 ff. and Z. D. M. G., 1876, p. 302 ff.
³ *Die indischen Inschriften*, p. 18 ff. and 24. f; also Kielhorn, N. G. G. W., 1990, p. 251 ff.