very significant manner from those that are found in Yājñavalkya and others. In Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra*, in the chapter on *Dāya-vibhāga*, the sons share the father’s property. In those cases in which any of the sons may be dead, his share would go to his direct descendants up to the 4th generation; but when a man has no son, the property would go to the brothers, provided they are living together, as also the daughters. Under certain conditions the nephews also may share, but there is no provision for the property of a person going to distant relations, the inheritors being limited to sons, daughters, brothers and sons of brothers. In the case of those who have none of these, the property should go to the king after providing for the maintenance of the wife and the funeral ceremony of the deceased excepting in the case of a Vedic Brahmin.¹ Now in the Manu or Yājñavalkya *smṛtis*, there is no such law and the property of a person may go to his wife and other relations. In the Yājñavalkya, in the absence of the son or sons the property would go first to the wife and then to daughters, if the wife is not living.² Nowhere in the Hindu legal literature

² pāti-duhitaraściva pitarau bhrātarastathā l
   tattutā gotrajā bandhu-sīṣya-sabrahamāćarināh II
   esāmabhāve pārvasya dhanabhāguttarottaraḥ l
   svaryātasya khaṇḍuṣrasya sarvavarnesvavam vidhih II
   —Yājñavalkya, II, 8. 135, 136.

Mitakṣarā in supporting this view quotes Vṛddhamanu
   aputrā śayanam bhartuḥ pālayanti vrate sthitā l
   pātīvṛṣa dadyāt tatpindāṃ krīśnamamam labheta ca II
Vṛddhaviṇī states—
   aputradhānam pātīvṛṣagāmi.
Kātyāyana states—
   pātiḥ pāturddhanahari.
Bṛhaspati also says—
   asutasya prāmitasya pātī tadbhāgahāriṇī.
Manu states—
   anapātasya putrasya māśā dāyamanāyanaye śayaḥ l
   mātyāsya ca vṛddyaḥ pitarāḥ haredhānam II —(IX, 217).
Manu further says—
   pītyā haredaputrasya rākṣitam bhrātara etva vā l
do we find that there is any provision for the property of a person to go to the king except in those extreme cases where not only no relatives are available but not even a disciple or a class-fellow of the person (śiṣya and sabrahmacārin) is available.¹

From a study of the older legal treatises it appears that it is quite against the spirit of Hindu law that property should be allowed to go to the king. It is only when no relations of any description, not even disciples and class-fellows, are available that property should go to the king. In Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra only do we find that in the absence of a dāyāda, property should go to the king but the number of dāyādas or inheritors is extremely limited, as we have shown above. This was probably due to the fact that the Mauryas were greedy and needed wealth and therefore changed the older Hindu laws in their own interest, so that by restricting the number of inheritors and by providing for transmission to the king in the absence of such limited inheritors, the state could acquire enormous wealth from rich merchants and others. That the Mauryas had the monopoly of making images for being sold, shows that they were often in want of money and took to such means as selling images for money which is quite undignified for a state.² It is quite consistent with such a behaviour of the Mauryas with regard to collection of money by any means whatsoever that they should revise the old Hindu law in their favour so that they could secure as much property of the people as possible by restricting the number of inheritors and by debarring the wife from inheriting the property of the husband. Now in the 6th Act of the Śakuntalā, the minister sends a letter in which it is stated that a merchant named Dhanavrddhi had died in an accident on the sea leaving

¹ Thus Manu (IX. 189) says:—

itareśān tu varṇāṇāṁ sarvabhāve harenṛśaṁ
d(at) 1

² See Pāṇini’s rule Jīvaikārtha cāpanye and the Bhāṣya on it—
apanye ityuṣyate tatraṁ na siddhatti śivah śandah viśākhaṁ iti. kim kāraṇam. mauryaik hiranyārthikhiṁ arccah prakalpitah bhavettāsu na syat yāstāḥ stāḥ sampṛati pujārthāṁ tāsu bhavisyati ||
no child and he had millions of gold and suggesting also that under the circumstances this gold should go to the state. The king, Duṣyanta, says that equiry should be made if he had any among his wives who was pregnant. The Pratiḥāri replies that one of his wives is in a state of pregnancy and the king orders that the gold of the merchant should go to the child in the womb. This would lead to the supposition that Kālidāsa who was in all probability referring to a law prevalent in his own days, lived at a time when the Maurya laws of inheritance were in force even with Hindu kings. This conclusion seems so obvious that we think that we may rely on it and place Kālidāsa at a later period of the Suṅgas. He may have been either a contemporary of Agnimitra or came shortly after him.

We have now to see if there are any facts which can be adduced against such a conclusion. We find from the Gupta inscriptions that in the time of Chandragupta II or Skandagupta, Brahminic laws were in force. We know also that Puṣyamitra had performed an Aśvamedha sacrifice and probably thereby sought to establish his claim as an orthodox Hindu king and it is reasonable to imagine that he had made considerable or wholesale changes in the Maurya law and established the old Hindu laws. Consequently, it is reasonable to imagine that Kālidāsa lived sometime after Puṣyamitra and Agnimitra, when the Brahminic renaissance had started and when the inheritance law of Yājñavalkya or other Dharma-śāstras had not yet been re-introduced by the repeal of the Maurya laws. Had he lived in later days, say in the time of Candragupta II, he would have found the state laws to be based entirely on old Hindu laws and

---

1 Rājā—(वचयति) viditamastu devapādānām dhanauṛddhivreṇāma vaṁk vārīpathopājīvī nauryasaṇonān vīpanaḥ. sa cānāpatyah. tasya cānakaśūnabkhyam vasu, taddidānya rājaśvaṁāṇāpatyate. iti vasta devaḥ pramāṇamiti. (saviśādām) kaśaṁ khalanaṁ apanāyate, Vetravati mahādhanatāyā bahupatnikannāna bhaṅgournān tadanyālatāṁ yadi kālidāpavanasaṭṭaṁ bhūrya syātt. Pratiḥārī—dāpiṁ jivo sākṣa urassa seṣṭhipo dukhāṁ pavattā-paṁsuyantā tassa jā-ā suṣṭāti.
Rājā—sa khalu grahaḥ pītyamāṃkhamārhati gatoṣuṣumāṃdyāṁ hṛūki.
had no occasion to refer to a law prevalent during the Maurya time as codified in Kauṭilya’s *Arthasastra*.

Now, we know by a reference to the 4th canto of the *Raghu-vamsa* that Kālidāsa was aware of the Yavanas, the Huns and the Persians. Our contacts with the Persians and the Greeks are of a very early date and in the 2nd century B.C. the Greeks had invaded the city of Sāketa. In the Bhitari inscriptions we have a passage.¹ Prof. Raychaudhuri in his *Political History of Ancient India* in commenting on this passage says that the enemies mentioned in this Bhitari inscription were outsiders, *e.g.*, the Puṣyamitrās and the Huns. The Huns after the death of Atilla, their leader, gradually overcame the resistance of Persia when king Feroze was killed in 484 A.D. Swarms of these White Huns also assailed the Kuśān kingdom of Kabul and thence poured into India. They at first came in a comparatively small body and were repelled by Skandagupta in 455 A.D. as is evident from the Bhitari inscription. About ten years after they came in a much greater force and overwhelmed the kingdom of Gāndhāra and Peshawar and penetrated into the heart of the Gangetic provinces and overthrew the Gupta Empire. The leader of this invasion was Toramāna, who established himself as a ruler of Malwa in Central India in A.D. 500. Thus if Kālidāsa had made reference after seeing the Huns in India, he must have written his *Raghu-vamsa* sometime after 455 A.D. But in the inscription of Vatsabhaṭṭi he is already well-established as a great poet in 473 A.D. and this would be unaccountable and Kālidāsa’s date in that case would not be the first half of the 4th century. We have, therefore, to assume that when Kālidāsa refers to the Huns in the 68th verse of the 4th Book of the *Raghu-vamsa*, in the North beyond Kashmir on the banks of the Indus, he probably refers to some small settlements of Huns who

¹ *pitrī dīvamupete viplutāṃ vamsalakṣāṃ*¹ *bhujabalaśajitārī yah pratiṣṭhāpya bhūyāḥ*¹ *jīvamiti paritāṇādāram sāraḥstrām*¹ *hatarīpurīva kṛṇo devakām abhyupetāḥ*¹
had already migrated up to that region. They were undoubtedly the White Huns because Kālidāsa describes that their cheeks became ruddy through fear of Raghu’s prowess. As regards our contact with China, we must first note that the author of the *Periplus* tells us of Thinae a land of silk, situated where the sea-coast ends externally, whence we may gather that the Chryse of Pliny was conceived by him as an island lying not only to the east of the Ganges but also to the southward of the Chinese Empire. The great Western State of China, Ts’in, and the city called Thinae (meant probably as the genitive of ‘This’) was its capital, situated not far above the confluence of the Wei river with the Hoang-ho river. The state of Ts’in gradually grew in power. The greatest of the Ts’in monarchs was Ts’in Chi Hwangti, who ruled from 221-209 B.C., and he was the person who began the Great Wall and who pushed the Chinese frontier across the Gobi desert making Hami under the Tien-shan Mountains his out-post and thus preparing the way for direct communication with Bactria. Regular caravan travel between China and Bactria is said to have begun in 188 B.C. We thus see that Chinese silk very well finds its place in India early in the 2nd century B.C. or even earlier. But there was another route also of the importation of silk from China by way of the Brahmaputra Valley, Assam and Eastern Bengal early in the Christian era. We have thus reasons to believe that if Kālidāsa lived in the 2nd century B.C. he would not be unacquainted with Chinese silk. A part of the Chinese trade was localised at the mouth of the Indus. Generally the Chinese silk was exchanged for frankincense which was much valued in China. Through India the silk yarn passed on to Arabia and Syria and thence found its way to the Roman market. A part of the trade also passed through Persia, and Aristotle gives an excellent account of silk and how it was produced.\(^1\)

There are some scholars who believe that Kālidāsa lived towards the close of the 5th century and was a contemporary of

---

\(^1\) See Schoff—*Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, pp. 261-270.

O.P. 150—93
Kumāragupta and Skandagupta.¹ In such a case Kālidāsa would have lived from about 390 to 460 A.D. There are others again who believe that Kālidāsa lived in the 6th century A.D.² But except for the slight difficulty regarding the possibility of Kālidāsa's knowledge of the Hun settlement in the North, I am convinced that there is no other difficulty in holding that Kālidāsa lived in the 2nd century B.C. and was probably a contemporary of Patañjali, the writer of the Mahābhāṣya. If Kālidāsa had a real knowledge of the Huns he would not have located them on the banks of the Indus.³ After conquering the Huns, Raghu passed on to Kāmboja, which was the north-eastern part of Afghanistan. In the Girnar and Dhauli inscriptions of Asoka, Kāmboja is mentioned as Kāmbocha.⁴ If Raghu met the Huns on the banks of the Indus and then passed on to Kāmboja and if that part of the Indus be such as to produce saffron,

¹ M. Chakravarti, J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 183 ff.; 1904, p. 158 ff.; B. C. Mazumdar, J.R.A.S., 1909, p. 731 ff.; B. Liebich, Indogermand. Forschungen, 31, p. 200, relies mainly on the description of Raghu's conquering expedition in the 4th canto of the Ṛaghuvaṃśa; Bühler, in his Die indischen Inschriften, p. 82, had warned us against making such sweeping conclusions; see also K. B. Pāṇḍak, Indian Antiquary, 1912, p. 265 ff.; A. Gawroński in the work The Digojaya of Raghu and some connected problems (Rozwój Orientalistyki, Polnichesk Archiv für Orientalistik, Krakau, 1914-1915) sought also to prove on the same grounds that Kālidāsa came to the court in the reign of Kumāragupta and became the famous court poet under Skandagupta. Sten Konow in Festschrift Wackernagel, 1923, p. 4, regards the Kumāra-sambhava as being written in celebration of the birth of the Gupta Emperor Kumāragupta or of his successor Skandagupta. See also E. Windisch, Geschichte der Sanskritphilologie Grundris II, 1B), p. 175, Note 2.

² A. F. R. Hoernle, Indian Antiquary, 1912, p. 156, says that Yāsodharman who defeated or helped to defeat the Huns in the legendary Vikramādiya, though Yāsodharman is not known to have ever borne the title of Vikramādiya. Such a view is held by D. R. Bhāndarkar, (Ann. Bh. Inst., 8, 1926-27, p. 200 ff. and Asutosh Memorial Volume, p. 72 ff.; MM. Haraprasāda Šāstrī (J. B. O. R. S., 2, 1916, p. 31 ff., p. 391 ff.) as also B. C. Mazumder, Ibid, p. 388 ff.) believed that Kālidāsa belonged to the second half of the period between 404 and 533 A. D.

³ The verse runs as follows:

vīntāḥvivaśramāśāṣṭraśyāṁ śindhuśravīṭuśaśnaiḥ

dudhavatūjinaḥ skandhān laganākukkumakātelān II

tatra hāgavardhamān bhārītuḥ vaṅkalviṣāramam I

kapalāḍśāvādī bābāya raghuvaṃśītam II

—Raghuvaṃśa, IV, 6728.

⁴ See N. L. De's The Geographical Dictionary of Ancien and Medieval India.
he must have passed through the Gāndhāra country on the border of Kashmir, gone westwards and then southwards to Kamboja. At the time of return he is said to have mounted up on the Himalayas and then come down. It is not described that he crossed the Himalayas for reaching the land of the Huns. Now, we know that Kashmir is the only country that produces saffron. It seems, therefore, that some parts of the Kāśmīra-Gāndhāra country was regarded by him as being the home of the Huns. Now, this would be impossible, for the Huns lived in the Oxus Valley and when they invaded India they over-ran the whole country and in such a case there would be no meaning in supposing the Gāndhāra-Kāśmīra country on the banks of the Indus to be the home of the Huns. It may, therefore, be reasonably supposed that Kālidāsa had no direct knowledge of the Huns. He only knew probably by hearsay that the Huns lived in the north and located them on the banks of the Indus quite erroneously. It is not impossible for a cultured man living in the 2nd century B.C. to have heard the name of the White Huns who lived somewhere in the north. The reference to the Huns therefore does not imply that he lived at the time of the Hun invasion or that he had any definite knowledge of the Huns excepting that they were White and that they lived somewhere in the north.¹

Just as there is a great controversy regarding the date of Kālidāsa so there is not yet a complete unanimity regarding Kālidāsa who had already established his fame on the most firm basis by the first half of the 7th century. He is mentioned by the great poet Bāṇa and also in an inscription of the year 634, as a famous poet.²

¹ The Huns are freely mentioned in the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata and it cannot be argued that all such passages were interpolated after the 5th century A. D. The Huns may have had small settlements in the Northern mountains yet unearthed by historical researches and they may have floated into India as mercenaries seeking employment.

² Refer to the inscription of the Megati temple, Aihole; see Fleet, Indian Antiquary, 1879, p. 237 ff. and Kielhorn, Epigraphica Indica, 6, p. 1-12; also Indian Antiquary 20, 1891, p. 190. It seems also evident from the researches of the above scholar that the authors of the Praśāṭā inscriptions of the 6th century and even of the inscriptions of Cambodina of the beginning of the 7th century were familiar with Kālidāsa’s Rāghu-yaṭṭa.
Aufrecht has enumerated the names of the works that pass under the name of Kālidāsa. The verses of Kālidāsa quoted in the anthologies have been collected by Aufrecht and Thomas. Some later poets also called themselves Nava-kālidāsa or Abhinavakālidāsa. It is said that there were three Kālidāsas: one under Vikramāditya, one under Bhoja and one under the Emperor Akbar. In the anthology Harihārāvali an Ākbariya Kālidāsa is quoted.

But it seems certain that Kālidāsa was the author of a drama called the Abhijñāna-Śakuntala, a drama called the Vikramorvasi and a drama called the Mālavikāgnimitra, an epic poem called the Raghuvrāma, a semi-epic poem called the Kumāra-sambhava, a lyric poem called the Megha-dūta and another lyrical piece called the Rtu-samhāra.

Kālidāsa has been regarded as one of the greatest poets of India not only on the testimony of Indian authors but also that of European authors. Kālidāsa wrote two epics, Kumāra-sambhava and Raghu-vaṃśa, of which probably Kumāra-sambhava is earlier.

Aufrecht, C. C., I, 24, 280.
Weber, Z.D.M.G., 22, 713; 27, 175 f. and 182; Peterson, Subhāṣita, 18 ff.

Other works attributed to him are Śṛṅgāra-śataka, Śṛṅgāra-tilaka, Nalodaya, a poem of 4 cantos, and Doṭārimśatputtalikā. A number of other works are attributed to Kālidāsa in Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum; Ambāśā, Kālistotra, Kāvyanāṭakālakāra, Candraśīvādakstotra, Durghaṭa-kāvyo, Naḥarata-nālā, Puṣpabāṇa-vilasa, Rākṣasa-kāvyo, Rāma-setu, Lāghū-stava, Vidvaidvīnakāvyo, Vṛndāvona-kāvyo, Śṛṅgāra-sūtra, Śyāmala-dvīpaka, Śrula-bodha. I have already spoken of three Kālidāsas. But there are at least 7 or 8 Kālidāsas. In addition to Ākbariya Kālidāsa, we have Kālidāsa the writer of Gangāstava and Mangalāśyaka; Kālidāsa the writer of Jyotirvidābharaṇa; Kālidāsa the writer of lexicon Raśa koṣa; Kālidāsa-Gaṇaka, the writer of Śairya-pratipāda-svara-mātra-sāra; Kālidāsa, the author of Śuddhi-candrikā; Kālidāsa, son of Balabhadra, author of Kuṇḍa-pravananā; Kālidāsa, son of Rāmagovinda of the 18th century, the author of Triparasundari-stuti-kāvyo. There is also a Kālidāsa Nandīn who was a poet and a Kālidāsa Miśra grandfather of Muralidharā. Most of these MSS. are available.

The Kumāra-sambhava\(^1\) deals with the story that the gods being terrorised by Tārakāsura first approached Brahmā and then being advised that only a son of Śiva could defeat him, tried through the help of Indra to fascinate Śiva with the grace and beauty of Pārvatī but failed. Pārvatī, however, resorted to tapas and thereby attracted Śiva and they were then married. This forms the story of the first eight cantos over which the most celebrated commentator, Mallinātha, has written a commentary. The other nine cantos deal with the birth of Kumāra, his leadership of the gods’ army and the final destruction of Tārakāsura. It has been often doubted with justice whether the later nine cantos were written by Kālidāsa or not. No definite opinion can be pronounced on the matter. A commentary on these later nine


Many commentaries were written on the Kumārasambhava, such as Padārtha-dīpiḳā, Aṇuvya-dīpiḳā by Kṛṣṇapati Śaran; also commentaries by Kṛṣṇamitrācārya, Gopālananda (Sārāvala), by Govindarāma (Dhiraṭjanīḳā), by Caritavardhana (Śīlūhitaiṣīṃś), by Jinaḥadhra Sūri (Bālabodhīhiṃ), by Narahari, Nārayaṇa, Prabhākara, Bṛhaspati, Bharaṭasena (Śābodha), Bhāṣamādira Maitihila, Muni-Matrata (Avacūri). Mallinātha (Sāṭhīṃśi), Raghupati (Vyaṭkhyādyūha), Vatsa, Ānandadevayāṇi Vallabha, Vallabhadeva, Vindhyēvar-prasāda (Kathambhāṭīṃś), Vyāsavatsa (Śīlūhitaiṣīṃś) and Haricaraṇa Dāsa (Devaseṇa).

Most of these MSS. are available.
cantos by Śīrāma Kaviśāra has been printed by the Nirṇaya-
sāgara Press in 1893. The first canto deals with the description
of the Himalayas which fails to impress upon us the sublimity
of the great mountain as well as the childhood of Pārvatī. The
second canto deals with the philosophical hymn of adoration
to Brahmā on Sāmkhya lines. The third canto deals with
the advent of untimely spring in the hermitage of Śiva, the
effort of Madana to captivate Śiva, his destruction by the anger
of Śiva and the final disappearance of Śiva from the scene
of disturbance. The fourth canto deals with the sorrowing
of Kama’s wife Rati, which does not rouse our sympathy
so much for the sufferer as it rouses the amorous sentiments
due to the amorous reminiscences of the wife as expressed
in weeping. The fifth canto shows the determination
of Pārvatī to attain holy and immortal grace through tapas
whereby she attracts Śiva who comes to her as a brahmačāri
and we have an excellent dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī
as also the description of Pārvatī’s tapas. The 6th, 7th and
8th refer to the arrangement and final execution of the marriage.
The 5th canto as well as portions of the 3rd canto are of real
poetic value.¹

¹ The authenticity of the 8th canto has been objected to on the ground that the description
of the amorous pleasure of Pārvatī and Śiva is as unsuitable as the description of
such pleasures on the part of one’s parents. But Ānandavardhana in his Dhyānyāloka, III,
6, p. 137, holds that it depends upon the talent of the poet and he himself refers to the canto
VIII of the Kumārasambhava. Māmāja in his Kavyaprakāśa, VII criticises the description
of the love-scenes of Śiva and Pārvatī. Vāmana cites examples from this canto in two
passages of his Poetics (4.3.33). The passage, referred to by Vāmana, is Kumārasambhava,
8.63. Thus in Vāmana’s time the 8th canto was in existence. Mallinātha however wrote
a commentary only on cantos I-VIII. The earlier commentator Aruṇagirinātha (Gaṇapati
Śāstrī, T.S.S., 37, Preface) also commented on the first 8 sargas. There is a great similarity
between the Śivarāhasya of the Saṅkarasamhitā of the Skanda Purāṇa and Kumāra-
sambhava. This can be explained on the assumption that the author of the Śivarāhasya had
utilised the first 8 cantos of the Kumārasambhava and the latter part of it may have been
the original of the spurious cantos of the Kumārasambhava—see Weber, in Z. D. M. G., 27, 179,
190 ff. and Pandit, Vol. III, 19 ff, 85 ff. In the 14th century the Jaina Jayādhikara wrote
another epic called the Kumārasambhava, (Peterson III, Rep., Extra, 251 ff.) Udbhāṣa
also composed a Kumārasambhava, verses from which are quoted in his Alankaśa-Śaṅgrahā.
Thus we had three Kumārasambhavas.
Mainly on the ground that Mallinātha’s commentary is not available for cantos IX-XVII, it has been held by many that these cantos did not belong to Kālidāsa. But the style and the manner of expression in these cantos do not seem to reveal an alien hand. All that was objectionable was the 8th canto but since that canto was in existence in the time of Vāmana, there is no internal evidence that these cantos did not belong to Kālidāsa. There is practically no external evidence that they did not belong to Kālidāsa. On the other hand the existence of the contents of all these cantos in the Śiva-rahasya may be regarded as a proof that these cantos of Kālidāsa were known to the author of the Śiva-rahasya. There seems to be no point in the argument that only the first 8 cantos were utilised by the author of the Śiva-rasasya and that the other portion of the Śiva-rahasya was the original from which these cantos of the Kumāra-sambhava have been spuriously put forth by some unknown author. A reference to the contents of the Śiva-rahasya shows that the story given there does not agree so closely either in the first or in the second part, as could convince us that the author of the Śiva-rahasya had based his plot of the first part on Kālidāsa’s first 8 cantos of the Kumāra-sambhava, or that the so-called spurious part of the Kumāra-sambhava was based on the other part of the story in the Śiva-rahasya though there are occasional similarities of description. There are some very essential divergences. This compels us to think that both Kālidāsa and the author of the Śiva-rahasya had based their story on some other version of it which was available to both Kālidāsa and the author of the Śiva-rahasya. The argument, therefore, that this spurious part of the Kumārasambhava was based on the Śiva-rahsaya, falls to the ground.

The other epic written by Kālidāsa is Rāghu-vamsa or the story on Ragu’s line, in which the poet takes up the life and deeds of some of Rama’s ancestors and descendants.

1 Text with Latin translation, edited by A.F. Stenzler, London, 1832. Among the Indian editions, that by Shanker P. Pandit in BSS, 1869-1874, with Mallinātha’s commen-
It is indeed difficult to ascertain what may have been the original source from which the materials regarding the kings of the line of Raghu were drawn upon. It was certainly not the Rāmāyaṇa, for the Rāmayāṇa deals mainly with the story of Rāma and partly with that of Daśaratha. As for the story of Dīlīpa, Raghu, Aja and others, we are unable to locate the exact sources. It seems to us that Kālidāsa had some purpose before his mind which stimulated him to paint in glorious colours the character, the exploits and the adventures of the old kings of the glorious days of the supremacy of the Hindu kings. Though the Rāghuvamśa paints before us in golden colours the character of Dīlīpa, Raghu and his descendants and as such may be regarded as a world devoid of unity, yet we can never feel it. It never strikes us that as Kālidāsa passes from one to another, there is any real break in the treatment of new personalities. There is one pattern of life through most of these personalities. As we pass from one king to another, we feel as if the same character is being displayed from aspect to aspect, from one side to another. It appears that most of these characters could be combined and rolled up as if they delineated the same hero in different circumstances and perspectives.

Thus, in the first two cantos we have the description of king Dīlīpa anxious for his progeny for fear of suspension of libaions and offerings of food to the ancestors. He goes to the hermitage of the priest Vaśişṭha and is told of his transgression
and is advised expiation by tending the divine cow of his hermitage. The cow tests the king by creating a phantom lion ready to kill the cow. By her magic she arrests the king's hands. The king cannot strike the lion but offers his body to the lion in lieu of the life of the cow. The cow is pleased and the king has the benediction that a child will be born to him. Here two traits of the pattern king of the golden age are shown. (1) A king should marry for the sake of the progeny who can offer food and water to the ancestors. (2) A Kṣattriya should offer his own life in protecting one who seeks his protection. The scene changes. His wife Sulakṣaṇā becomes pregnant in the 3rd canto and Raghu is born and the king is relieved from his debt to his ancestors. Raghu grows and is made the crown-prince. Dīlīpa performs the Aśvamedha sacrifice and Raghu is appointed in charge of the horse and fights with Indra and though he is defeated, he secures the boon from Indra that his father should have the merit of the Aśvamedha sacrifice. Dīlīpa takes vānaprastha and in the 4th canto king Raghu starts his conquering career (digvijaya). In the 5th canto Kautsa, a disciple of Vara-tantu, approaches Raghu, when he had just finished the sacrifice in which he had given away all, for the payment of his fees to the teacher and Raghu draws the money for him from Kuvera. Raghu has a son called Aja. The son grows, is educated and is sent to the svayamvara of Indumati, sister of Bhoja. In the 6th canto we have the description of the svayamvara of Indumati, in which Aja succeeds in being chosen by Indumati among a large number of kings. In the 7th canto he marries Indumati and is attacked by her unsuccessful suitors and comes out victorious. In the 8th canto Aja becomes king but by the accident of a heavenly garland falling upon Indumati, she dies and we have the pathetic grief of Aja for her. In the 9th, Aja's son Daśaratha becomes king and we have the hunting scene of Daśaratha. In the 10th, we have the sons born to Daśaratha and from the 11th begins the career of Rāma. Kālidāsa had the good sense not to attempt rivalling the great master Vālmīki and he passed off the
general episodes of Rāma’s story described in the Rāmāyana in a brief manner. He tried to show his skill in new descriptions of events and episodes which Vākmīki had not emphasised. He banishes Sītā though he knew that she was sinless and in the character of Sītā we have the character of an ideal Hindu wife who is prepared to bear any suffering that is imposed on her by her husband with sweetness and good grace. Execution of Śambuka is described with approbation and in the 15th canto we have the tragedy of Lakṣmana’s renouncing his life in the Sarayū and Rāma also proceeds northwards and ultimately becomes merged in his own divine form. In the 16th canto Kuśa, Rāma’s son, ascends the throne and he rebuilds the city of Ayodhya which was deserted by the citizens of Ayodhya when Rāma departed for Heaven. There is also here charming descriptions of amorous love scenes and Kuśa is married to Kumudvatī, daughter of the Nāga king. In the 17th canto Kuśa begets a son called Atithi. Kuśa dies fighting the demons as an ally to Indra and Kumudvatī also dies with him. Ministers make Atithi the king and we have the description of the ascension ceremony. We have here the description of the manner in which a dutiful king conducted his affairs. Atithi also performs an Āswamedha ceremony. He had married the daughter of the king of the Niṣāda and after him his son Nala becomes the king. He had a son called Puṇḍarīka and thus we have a series of other kings until we come to Agnivarna. He was a debauchee and spent his time with women and ultimately died having no son and suffering from diseases. At his death the ministers and the people made the chief queen the Regent and with this description in the 19th canto the work closes.

If we review the characters of the different kings that have been emphasised we find that in each of them various royal traits have been described. The race of the king degenerated by marrying princesses of Non-Aryan tribes like the Niṣādas and the Nāgas and we have the tragic end of the race with the king Agnivarna who spends his time in debauchery.
It has been remarked that in drawing Agnivarna's character, Kalidasa was displaying and illustrating his knowledge of the Kama-satra, but it does not seem to us to be correct; for, in the first place, mere delineation of sensuality is not an illustration from the Kama-satra, and in the second place, Kalidasa is never known to us to demonstrate any pedantry. J. J. Meyer in the Introduction to his edition of Daśa-kumāra-carita appreciates the joyous and purely amorous life of Agnivarna, though his end is so tragic. R. Schmidt in his work on the Love and Marriage in Ancient and Modern India, Berlin, 1904 also refers to it.

Winternitz in the third volume of his History of Indian Literature assures us that in Dhāra there existed copies of Raghu-vaṃśa containing 26 cantos, and S. P. Pandit in 1874, in the Preface to his edition of Raghu-vaṃśa, says that a person in Ujjayinī had a manuscript of Raghu-vaṃśa up to the 25th canto. But the commentators do not know anything more than the 19th canto.

Kalidasa's Abhijñāna-śakuntala is the most famous of all Sanskrit dramas. It is one of the first works of Sanskrit literature that was known early in Europe. Sir William Jones translated it in 1789, thirty-two years after the Battle of Plassey and in 1791 it was translated by George Forster into German. Herder and Goethe were struck with wonder on reading this drama in translation. Goethe expressed his appreciation of Śakuntalā in a poem in 1791 and many years later he wrote to Chezy, the French publisher of Sanskrit texts, of Śakuntalā in 1830 in the most appreciative manner.

There is a story both in the Mahābhārata and in the Padma-purāṇa which corresponds in general with the story of the Śakuntalā of Kalidasa but the kernel of the story has been worked by Kalidasa in an entirely different and masterly manner. Kalidasa's story, however, is more akin to the Padma-purāṇa
than to the *Mahābhārata*. There is a native saying that Śakuntalā is the best product of Kālidāsa and therein also the 4th Act is the best. The work *Abhijñāna-śakuntalam* had many commentaries in the past. The simple story of the drama is that king Duṣyanta had on his hunting tour visited the hermitage of Kaṇva, where he met Śakuntalā and her two friends Priyāmavatā and Anasūyā. He fell in love with Śakuntalā when Kaṇva was away and after spending some time with her, returned to the city promising to send for her shortly. In the mean while, while Śakuntalā was plunged in a state of grief through the separation, she failed to hear the call of the angry sage Durvāsā asking hospitality and was cursed by him. On account of the curse Duṣyanta forgot all about Śakuntalā. Kaṇva on his return found his adopted child Śakuntalā (daughter of Viśvāmitra and the heavenly nymph Menakā) in a state of pregnancy and sent her to Duṣyanta’s court. The latter failed to recognise her and sent her away. She was taken by her mother up in Heaven. Śakuntalā had dropped the ring that the king had given her in water. This ring was later found and the king at once remembered the whole thing and was smitten with grief. Duṣyanta later on had to go to Heaven in order to help Indra in his fight with the demons. There he met Śakuntalā and his son and they were again united.

1 Winternitz had written in 1897 that Kālidāsa had followed the version of *Padmapurāṇa* as available in the Southern recension of the Śakuntalopākhyaṇa; *Indian Antiquary*, 1898, p. 136. But Beharilal Sircar in his Bengali book Śakuntalā-rasayana had already expressed the view in 1896. But the point in question is as to whether Kālidāsa borrowed from the *Padmapurāṇa* or the writer of the *Padmapurāṇa* borrowed from Kālidāsa. It is also an unfortunate matter that we have no reliable edition of the *Padmapurāṇa* from which we may make a proper judgment. A careful comparison has been made between the *Mahābhārata* episode and the story of Śakuntalā by Berthold Müller in his article Kālidāsa’s Śakuntalā and Its Source in 1874.

1 kālidāsasya sarvasvam abhijñānaśakuntalam I
   tatāpi ca caturtho’ḥko yatra yat śākuntalā II
   —Quoted by G. R. Nandargikar in the Introduction in his *Raghuvaṃśa*.

The character of Śakuntalā was very sweet so far as in her tenderness and sympathy she had made herself one as it were with the trees and animals of the hermitage but she was more spirited than Sītā and gave Duṣyanta some hot words when she was repulsed. Duṣyanta was a type of the old Hindu kings who indulged in Gāndharva marriage and whose behaviour was quite in consonance with Vedic customs. It has been suggested that the Gāndharva marriage was at this time going out of practice and that Kālidāsa's opinion was that such passionate marriages proved often disastrous. We do not find any Gāndharva marriage among the kings of the Raghu line.

The Vikramorvaśī is a drama of 5 Acts, while Śakuntalā is one of 7 Acts. The story is as follows:—

When Urvaśī, a heavenly nymph, was returning from Kuvera, she was attacked by the demon Keśī. The king Pururavā on hearing her cries saved her from the demon and they became mutually attracted towards each other. Urvaśī then approached the king and left a note of love to him. But she had to hurry away for a dramatic performance in Heaven. Urvaśī again returned to the king. The king then went to the Kailāsa mountain for enjoyment. There finding Pururavā attached to a Vidyādhara girl called Udakavatī, Urvaśī became jealous and in straying about entered into a prohibited garden where she was changed into a creeper and the love-sick king went about from place to place searching her. The maddened king began to sing songs and dance. Urvaśī, however, came to life with the touch of a jewel. They again returned to the kingdom. In the mean while the jewel was carried away by a bird. The jewel, however, fell down from the sky with an arrow attached to it containing the name of Āyu, the son of Pururavā and Urvaśī. At that time an ascetic woman came with a boy, who was the son of Urvaśī and Pururavā. At this time Urvaśī entered. Urvaśī then told him that she had a curse that when she sees the face of her son, she should return to Heaven and for that reason she had sent away the son for training without
looking at his face and now she has to return. The king then arranged for anointing his son. Nārada came at this time and told him that Indra had allowed Urvaśī to stay with him all his life.

The story of the Vikramorvaśī is based upon the brief story given in the Matsya-purāṇa, Chapter 24.

The title Vikramorvaśī means vikramaṇa ṣrīvaśī i.e., Urvaśī who was taken from the hands of a demon by bravery. In the commentary of Kāṭayayavema the title is explained as the drama of Vikrama and Urvaśī.¹

The Mālavikāgnimitra is a drama in 5 Acts, relating the love story between king Agnimitra and Mālavikā. It is probable that Mālavikāgnimitra was the first drama written by Kālidāsa. The second probably was Vikramorvaśī, and the third Abhijñāna-ṣakuntalam.² The hero Agnimitra was the son of Puṣyamitra, a king of the Suṅga dynasty, who lived in 185 A.D.

- The Megha-dūta of Kāidāsa wherein a Yakṣa, separated from his wife, is supposed to address the cloud to bear his

---

¹ In many of the MSS. the drama has been described as nājaka, in other as trojaka.

² A critical edition of the Vikramorvaśī by R. Lenz (Berlin, 1813) and a German translation were published by Bollensen in 1846 and Śankara P. Paṇḍit also published an edition in 1789 in Bombay. The Southern recension was published by R. Pischel (Monatsberichte der akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1875).

Śankara P. Paṇḍit in the Introduction to his edition and so also T. H. Bloch in his work on Vararuci and Hemacandra, 1893, expressed a doubt regarding the authenticity of the Prākṛti ślokas in apabhramśa in the 5th Act. H. Jacobi also in his Bhavisattvakā of Dhanapāla says that the liberty in apabhramśa found here is probably due to pantomimic conditions of dancing. Pischel in his Materialien zur Kenntnis des apabhramśa, Berlin, 1920, and Konow (G. G. A. 1890, 475 ff.) hold the verses to be genuine.

K. G. A. Hoefer, Berlin, 1837, B. Hirgel, 1838, Lobenedez, 1861 and Fritzche translated Vikramorvaśī into German. Wilson, of course, had translated it in his Hindu Theatre but the work had also been translated in French, Swedish, Italian, Spanish and Czech. A. Hillebrandt and Muir also wrote on the subject of Vikramorvaśī.

message to his wife, is the best known lyric in Sanskrit literature. It is divided into two parts. In the first part the Yakṣa is supposed to describe the route that his messenger should take from Rāmagiri to Alakā and we have here a description of natural scenes of the various countries through which the cloud passed. The second part, called the Uttaramegha, deals with the description of Alakā and the message.\(^1\) Kālidāsa’s Megha-dūta has been not only widely appreciated in India through centuries but also by many Western scholars and poets. Thus, Goethe speaking of Megha-dūta said, “The first acquaintance with this work made an epoch in our life”.

The Megha-dūta had many commentaries.\(^2\) The Megha-dūta had many imitations. One of these is Pavana-dūta, written by the poet Dhoiyī, in which a Gandharva maiden sends the wind as her messenger to king Lakṣmaṇasena.\(^3\) Rūpagoswāmī in the 16th century wrote his Haṃsa-dūta, where

---

\(^1\) It was published by Gildemeister in Bonn, and the critical Introduction and Glossary by A. F. Stenzler, Breslau, 1874. The commentary of Mallinātha with the text was published by N. B. Godbole and K. K. Paraba, Bombay, 1886. The best edition is that of E. Hultzeh with the old commentary of Vallabhadeva, 1911. It was translated into English verse by H. H. Wilson in 1813 together with parallel passages from classical and English poetry. We have another edition with prose translation by C. Schutz, Bielefeld 1859. Maxmuller published a metrical translation (Königsberg, 1847). E. Muir gave another rendering of it in his Classical Poetry of India, III, 90 ff., another by L. Fritz (Chennitz, 1879) in which he had utilised the manuscript prose translation by Stenzler. A French translation was made by A. Guerinot, Paris, 1902. An anonymous English translation appeared in Pàṇḍit, Vol. II. English prose translation was made by Jacob, Pathak and Nandargikar.

\(^2\) Some of these commentaries are:—Avacūrī, Kathambhāti, Meghalata, Malaiś by Kalyāṇamalla, Manorāma by Kavicandra, Rasadipikā by Jagaddhara, Tatua-dipikā by Bhagtratha Mīra, Saṇḍhivati by Mallinātha, Muktāvali by Rāmanātha, Śīṣya-hitaśīpi by Lakṣminivas, Durdodha-pada-bhaṭājikā by Viśvanātha, Megha-dūtārtha-muktāvali by Viśvanātha Mīra, Tālpara-dipikā by Sanatana Sarasā, Maghadūtā vacūrī by Sumativijaya; also commentaries by Haridāsa, Śāsvala, Vallabha, Vīcaspatigovinda, Rāma Upādhyāya, Mahimaisphagani, Bharatasesa, Divākara, Janendra, Janārdana, Cintāmanī, Kṣemasphagani, Kṛṣṇadasa, Uddyotakara and others.

There was another Jain Megha-dūta written by Merutunga of the 14th century who wrote Prabandha-cintāmani in 1306 and a medical work called Kukkāldhāpya-vārttika.

\(^3\) It was published by N. Chakravarty in J.A.S.B., 1905; see Pischel, also and Aufrecht, Z.D.M.G., 1900, 616 ff. There is also another Pavana-dūta by Vādicandra Sūri.
the swan is made the messenger of Rādhā to Kṛṣṇa. Padāṅka-
dūta by Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa Sārvabhauma (1723 A.D.), a blind
imitation of Megha-dūta called the Śuka-sandeśa by Lakṣmi-
dāsa and two works bearing the title of Uddhava-dūta by one
unknown author and by the poet Mādhava of the 17th century.1
The poet Viṣṇudāsa wrote the Mano-dūta. Another work of
the same name was written by Vrajanātha in 1758. Megha-
dūta was again translated into Singhalese and imitations also
took place there. It was also translated into Tibetan about
the 13th century and it exists in the Tangyur collection. This
version was translated into German by Beckh in 1906.2

Ritu-sanhāra is a work which describes the six seasons in
beautiful poems.3 The work Śrṅgāra-tilaka is also ascribed to
Kālidāsa.4

The work called Ghaṭa-karpīra is a small work written in 22
verses, in which a young woman sends in the rainy season her
greetings to her husband through the cloud.5

---

1 Śuka-sandeśa has been published by Mahārāja Rāmavarman of Travancore (J.R.A.S.
1884, p. 401 ff.). The work is well-known in the Malabar (J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 638).

2 See also the article by Buth and Beck in SBA., 1895, 268 ff. and 281 ff. (Ein Beiträ
g zur Textkritik von Kālidāsas Meghadūta, Berlin, 190).

3 The genuineness of the Ritu-sanhāra has been doubted in many quarters. See J.
to prove that the Ritu sanhāra is a genuine work of Kālidāsa. He is supported in it by
A. B. Keith (J.R.A.S., 1912, 1066 ff); It is universally believed that it is a genuine
work of Kālidāsa. Yet in the Mandasor inscription of 472 A.D. verses from Ritu-sanhāra
are also found imitated. It is curious however that verses from the Ritu-sanhāra should
not be found quoted either in the works of authority of Sanskrit verses or in works of the
poetics. See Harichand’s Kālidāsā, p. 240 ff. Viśveśvara, however, in his Ṣadh-ṛtu varṇana
written in the 18th century imitated verses from the Ritu-sanhāra.

4 The Megha-dūta and the Śrṅgāra-tilaka were edited by Gildemeister, Bonn, 1811.
There is also a work called Śrṅgāra-tataka, which is attributed to Kālidāsa. It is, however,
a sort of compilation. Another work called Śyāmala-dāngaka, in prose, is also attributed to
Kālidāsa. It consists of hymns to the goddess Durgā, interspersed with prose and has been
translated into Tibetan as the Sarasvatīstotra and Mahgalāśaka (see F. W. Thomas,

5 Published with translation by G. M. Dursch, Berlin, 1828; Haeberlin, 120 ff; French
translation by Chézy (J.A., 1823, II, p. 39 ff); German translation by Hoefler (Indische
Gedichte, Vol. II, p. 129 ff, and Bohlen, Das alte Indien, Königsberg, 1830, 380 ff.; see also
Eggeling’s India Office Catalogue, VII, p. 1427 ff.
I have already pointed out that there is really no justification in thinking that Kālidāsa belonged to the court of Vikramāditya. But, be that as it may, it appears that Prof. Shemvanekar's article as published in the *Journal of the University of Bombay*, I, pp. 232-246, seems definitely to prove that the son of Mahendrāditya assumed the title of Vikramāditya in the 1st century B.C. This would fit in with the Vikramāditya tradition of Kālidāsa as well. Āsvaghoṣa is generally placed in the 1st century A.D. Cowell had argued that Kālidāsa is indebted to Āsvaghoṣa. Since then scholars have been dubious as to the exact relation between Āsvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa. It seems to us, however, that the arguments put forward by Prof. Chatterjee (Allahabad University Studies, No. 2, pp. 80-114) and Prof. Roy (Śakuntalā, Introduction, pp. 19-28) definitely prove Kālidāsa to be the model and fountain of inspiration of Āsvaghoṣa. We have already shown that the Huns were known to the Indians from pretty early times, and on this subject one may also consult J. U. B., I, p. 245; Allahabad University Studies, pp. 126-33; J. I. H., Madras, No. 15, pp. 93-102. The researches of other scholars, such as Daśaratha Śarman on Kaumudī-mahotsava, I. H. Q., X, 1763-66; XI, pp. 147-48; Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conferences, Vol. VIII; Summaries, pp. 25-26; Annals of Bhandarkar's Oriental Research Institute, Poona, XVI, pp. 155-57; and Introduction to Padma-cūḍāmaṇi. All these point to the same direction that Kālidāsa probably lived in the 1st century B.C. On this subject, particularly as regards religious, political and social environment and astronomical knowledge of the period, one may consult further, Roy's Śakuntalā, Introduction, pp. 1-19 and 28-30, Vaidya's Lokaśikṣanā, VII, pp. 9-17, K. Roy, Evolution of Gītā, pp. 201-22, Dhruva, Thakkar Lectures, pp. 207-13. Apte, Kane and Paranjpe also incline more

We have a Ghaṭa-karpura as one of the nine jewels in the court of Vikramāditya. It is impossible to say whether this was actually written by the Ghaṭakarpura or whether it could be attributed to Kālidāsa.
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or less to the same view. Further, Prof. Shemvanekar has adduced sufficient evidence to prove (loc. cit.) that the Guptas were Vaiṣṇavas and that Chandragupta II was not the first Vikramāditya. For all these reasons I should be inclined to think that Kālidāsa lived in the 1st century B.C. It may also be incidentally mentioned that, judging from internal evidence, one may point out that Kālidāsa had no knowledge of the Sāṃkhya as schemed out by Iśvarakṛṣṇa in his Kārikās, which were probably written in the 3rd century A.D. It may also be mentioned with force that he had no knowledge of the Sāṃkhya that is said to have been preached by Arāda as reported in Aśvaghoṣa’s Buddha-carita, or the Sāṃkhya of the Caraka-samhitā. The knowledge of Sāṃkhya displayed by Kālidāsa in Canto II of the Kumāra-sambhava and in Canto X of the Raghuvamśa is a positively monistic doctrine as found in the Upaniṣads, or rather the Sāṃkhya philosophy in the Gīta (see my History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, p. 461 et seq.).

**Subandhu**

Among the older prose romances (gadya kāvyā), the Daśakumāra-carita, Harṣa-carita, Kādambari, Vāsavadattā, Tilakamāñjari, Gadya-cintāmaṇi and Vira-nārāyaṇa-carita are available, whereas the prose work of Bhāṭṭāra-hāricandra, Taraṅgavatī and Trailokya-sundari, though referred to by Bāṇa, are not easily accessible.

For a fuller discussion of Subandhu’s date see Introduction to Vāsavadattā published from Śrīraṅgam, 1906. The Vāsavadattā of Subandhu belongs to the Kathā literature. Patañjali mentions Vāsavadattā as an ākhyāyikā in IV. 2.60 (and not in IV.3.87 as Winternitz says). We do not know if Bāṇa’s reference to Vāsavadattā is to this older Vāsavadattā, but Cartellieri (W Z K M, 1, 1887, 115 ff.), Thomas (W Z K M,

---

12, 1898, 21 ff.) and Man’kowski (W Z K M, 15, 1901, 246 ff.) hold that the reference to Vāsavadattā in Bāṇa is to Subandhā’s Vāsavadattā.¹

BĀṆA

Many works are attributed to Bāṇa, such as Kādambarī, Caṇḍi-sataka, Pārvatī-parinaya-rūpaka, Mukuṭa-tāḍitaka-nāṭaka quoted by Caṇḍapāla in his commentary on Damayanti-kavya, Sarvacarita-nāṭaka, Harṣa-carita. Kṣemendra quotes verses of Bāṇa in his Aucitya-vicāra-carca and we have verses from Bāṇa in Sūkti-muktāvali and Subhāṣitāvali.²

The historical elements in Bāṇa’s Harṣa-carita cannot very well be utilised. Thus, Keith says: “Historically we may say that the work is of minimal value, though in our paucity of actual records it is something even to have this. But chronology is weak and confused, it is extremely difficult to make out the identity of the king of Mālava³ and even the Gauḍa king is only indirectly indicated as Śaśāṇka, whose name is given by Hiuen Tsang.⁴ Bāṇa has not attempted to make intelligible the course of events which rendered it possible for the Gauḍa king to come into hostile contact with Rājyavardhana in or near Mālava and it is difficult not to suppose that he desired, writing at a considerable distance of time, to leave what was long past in a vague position. What he does supply to history is the vivid pictures of the army, of the life of the court, of the different sects and their relations to the Buddhists and the avoca-

¹ The Vāsavadattā has a number of commentaries:—Tattvadipani by Jagaddhara, commentary by Narasimhasena, by Nārāyaṇa, Čaṇḍikā by Prabhākara, Tatva-kauhumi by Rāmadeva, Vyākyṇyikā by Vikramardhi, Kāśeana-darpaṇa by Śivarāma and also commentaries by Śrīgāragupta and Sarvacandra.

² His Harṣa-carita was published with the commentary of Śaṅkara by A. A. Führer, Bombay, 1909, BSS; translated into English by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, London, 1897; see also Bhau Daji in J. B. R. A. S., X, 1871, 38 ff.; also Führer, O. C., VI, Leiden, III, 2, 199 ff.; R. W. Frazer, Literary History of India, p. 255 ff.


⁴ For a defence of him, see Majumdār, Early History of Bengal, p. 16 ff.
tions of a Brahmin and his friends.”

Even the time of the birth of his hero king Harṣa is not also probably correct.

His other important work is Kādambarī. It has a number of commentaries.

ŚūdraKA

We have only one work of Śūdraka called the Mṛchakaṭika. The work has attracted much notice in the West.

The discovery of the Cārudatta by Bhāsa, which was probably the original of his Mṛchakaṭika, fixes the upper limit of Śūdraka, the author of the Mṛchakaṭika, but we cannot decide whether he was prior to Kālidāsa or not. Vāmana recognises him in III. 2. 4; Daṇḍin cites the verse limpativa, etc., which is found in the Mṛchakaṭika but it is now known to be a citation on the part of the author of the Mṛchakaṭika from Bhāsa.

1 Keith’s History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 318-19.
2 See Winteritz, Geschichte, Vol. III; Fleet, Indian Antiquary, 1901, 12f; see also Bühler’s Vikramādityacarita, Introduction, p. 4 ff.; Epigraphica Indica, 1, 67 ff., 4, 208 ff., and Rason, J R A S, 1898, 448 ff.
4 These commentaries are by Bālakṛṣṇa, by Mahādeva, Viṣamapadaçāti by Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇda, by Śivarāma, by Siddhacandrañigaṇi and by Sukhakāra.
5 A critical edition of the Mṛchakaṭika was published from Bonn in 1847 by A. F. Stenzler. It was published also with two commentaries by N. B. Godbole, B.S.S., 1896, and by P. H. M. Sanna Śāstrī and K. P. Parab, in N.S.P. 3rd Edition Bombay, 1909, with a commentary. German Translation by O. Böhtlingk, St. Petersburg, 1877, L. Fritze, 1879 and H. C. Kellner, 1894; English Translation by H. H. Wilson (Select Specimens, Vol. I.) and by A. W. Ryder, in H.O.S., Vol. IX. See also continuation in J.A.O.S., 1906, 418 ff.; French Translation by P. Regnaud, Paris, 1876; there are translations, in Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Italian and Russian. See also an Introduction by Cappeller in Fastgruss an Böhtlingk, p. 20 ff. and A. Gawronski in Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergl. Sprach, 44, 1911, 224 ff. The drama has been played often on the European stage. In France, it was translated by Méry and Gérard de Nerval, in 1850, and in a new work by V. Barruecad; Emil Pohl translated in German in 1892, Stuttgart, and called in Vasantasenā, for the German stage. A free German translation was also made under the title Vasantasenā by Haberlandt, Leipzig, 1893. A new adaptation for the stage was made by Lion Feuchtwanger, München, 1916. The editor had the opportunity of witnessing a performance of the drama under the name of Vasantasenā in 1929 on the chief stage of Vienna.
The play represents Śūdraka, a king, as the author; king Śūdraka is described as a king in Kalhaṇa’s Rāja-taraṅgini, III. 343. The Skanda-purāṇa makes him the first king of the Andhrabhṛtyas and the Vetāla-pañcavimśati refers to him and gives his capital as Vardhamāna or Śobhāvatī. In the Kādambari he is located in Vidiśā. The Harṣa-carita also refers to the artifice by which he relieved himself of his enemy Candrabhīṣketa, king of Cakora, and the Daśa-kumāra-carita of Daṇḍin refers to his adventures in different lives. The fact that Rāmila and Somila wrote a Kathā on him, indicates that he was a legendary character of that time. Rājaśekhara mentions Śūdraka along with Śatavāhana. From all these divergent references Keith considers him to be merely a legendary person. Prof. Konow, however, regards him as a historical person and recognises in him the Ābhīra prince Śivadatta whose son Iśvarasena is regarded by Fleet to have overthrown the last king of the Andhra dynasty and to have founded the Cedi era (248-49). This inference is drawn by Konow on the ground that in the Mṛchakatika, Pālaka, the king of Ujjaini, is defeated by Āryyaka, son of a herdsman Gopāla, and the Ābhīras are essentially herdsmen. But Keith thinks that these names, Pālaka and Gopāla, are merely of a legendary character and that it is wrong that they should be taken as proper names along with Āryyaka. But Bhāsa in the Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa speaks of

1 Rājaśekhara tells us that Rāmila and Somila composed a work called Śūdraka-kathā and he also refers to Saumilla along with Bhāsa. Kalidāsa himself in his Mālavikāgnimitra speaks of Kavi-putra and Saumilla. The Śarṅgadhara-paddhati quotes a verse from Rāmila and Somila, (see Keith, Sanskrit Drama, pp. 127-128).

2 Vāsudeva-śatavāhana-śūdraka-sāhasāṅkādīn sakalān sabhāpatin dana-mānābhīyām anukurvyāt

—Rājaśekhara’s Kāvyamāṁṣā, p. 55.

Keith says that he is later the hero of a parikathā, Śūdraka-nadha (Rāyamukta, Z.D.M.G., XXVIII, p. 117) and of a drama called Vibhūnta-śūdraka (Sarasvatī-kaṇṭha- bharāṇa, p. 378); Keith’s, Sanskrit Drama, p. 129 n.

3 K.F., p. 107 ff; also Bhandarkar’s Ancient Hist. of India, p. 64 f.; C.H.I., I. 311; also Keith’s Sanskrit Drama, p. 129.
Gopāla and Pālaka as being sons of Pradyota of Ujjayini, and it is probable that the Bṛhatkathā contained the story of Gopāla as surrendering the kingdom on Pradyota's death to Pālaka and Pālaka had to make room for Āryyaka, his brother's son.¹ But Keith brushes it aside and regards Śūdraka as being merely a legendary person. We are ourselves unable to believe either Prof. Konow or Prof. Keith. The universal tradition of the existence of a poet called Śūdraka cannot be regarded as purely mythical or legendary. All that we can say is that he probably flourished after Bhāsa. The reference to Śakāra and Viṭa as in a comparatively respectable position, in which the ganikā Vasanta-sena is also placed, clearly refers to an atmosphere of social existence depicted in the Kāmasūtra, which was probably written in the 2nd century B.C. Our conjecture is that Śūdraka probably lived between the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D. It is peculiar that when Cārudatta is asked in the court scene why he, a respectable person, should associate with a ganikā, he fearlessly replied that it was a fault of youth and not of character.

The Mrčhakatika has a number of commentaries by Gaṇapati, Prthvīdhara, Rāmamaya Šarmā and Lallā Dīkṣita.

HARṢA THE DRAMATIST

Three dramas, Nāgānanda, Ratnāvali and Priyadarśikā, are attributed to Śrīharṣa, the patron of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, of the 7th century. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa in his commentary to the Kāvyapradīpa said that an author called Dhāvaka wrote the Ratnāvalī under the name of king Harṣa in return for money received from him. But this late version of the story cannot be relied upon. In most manuscripts the name Bāṇa is mentioned, which probably means that Bāṇa received money from the king Harṣa not in lieu of allowing king Harṣa to enjoy the reputation of authorship of a new work written by Bāṇa, but for his own poetical talents. Nāgeśa's version of the story is also found in Mammaṭa, but as

Ibid, p. 130.
has been pointed out, this is a wrong reading of Dhāvaka for Bānas (see Bühler, *Indische Studien*, 14, 407).

Over the three dramas, see F. Cimmino in *O.C.*, XIII, Hamburg, 1902, p. 31 ff.; and Jackson in *J.A.O.S.*, 1900, 88 f.


The drama *Priyadarśikā* has been modelled on the *Mālavikā-gnimitra*, but the story was utilised by Bhāsa and also by Mātrarāja or Anaṅgaharṣa in his drama called the *Tāpasa-vatsarāja-carita*. The *Nātya-darpaṇa* quotes profusely from this work. See also E. Hultzsch in *N. G. G. W.*, 1886, 224 ff. Abhinavagupta also cites from it. The work must have, therefore, been written before the 9th century. Probably Mātrarāja utilised the story of the *Brhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya. See also C. Lacôte, *J.A.*, 1919, 508 f.

The *Nāgānanda* has been published by G. B. Brahme and D. M. Paranjape, Poona, 1893 and by Gaṇapati Śāstrī, in the *Trivendum Series*, with the commentary of Śivarāma. Translated into English by Palmer Boyd, London, 1872 and into French by Bergaigne, Paris, 1879 and into Italian by Cimmino, 1903.

The story of the *Nāgānanda* is drawn from the *Kathā-saritśāgara* and Kṣemendra’s *Brhatkathā-manjari*. The story is unknown in the older *avadāna* literature. I-Tseng, however, refers to king Silāditya’s story of Bodhisattva Jimūtavāhana and that this story was shown on the stage of his time. The *Nāgānanda* has a commentary by Ātmārāma.
Viṣākhadatta

Viṣākhadatta is the author of the celebrated work Mudrā-rākṣasa. It was published by K. T. Telang, BSS., Bombay, 1884, with the commentary of Dhuṇḍhi-rāja and also by Hillebrandt, Breslau, 1912. See also Hillebrandt, ZDMG., 1885, p. 107 ff.; also in NGGW, 1905, 129 ff. and Über das Kauṭilīyasastra und Verwandtes, Breslau, 1908. Translated into German by L. Fritze; in English by H. H. Wilson; in French by V. Henry, Paris, 1888; in Italian by A. Marazzi, Milan, 1874.

In many manuscripts, however, the name given is not Viṣākhadatta but Viṣākhadeva.

There is a discussion as to whether Viṣākhadatta lived in the time of Candra-gupta II. On this subject, see Jayaswal, Indian Antiquary, 1913, p. 265 ff., wherein he gives the date as 410 A.D. See also Konow, Indian Antiquary, 1914, p. 64 ff.; V. A. Smith, Early History of India, 120 n; Hillebrandt, Über das Kauṭilīyasastra, 25 ff.; ZDMG, 1915, 363. Hillebrandt places Viṣākhadatta in the 4th century A.D. and so does also Tawney (JRAS, 1908, p. 910). In some manuscripts, in the bharata-vākya, Avanti-varmā is mentioned instead of Candra-gupta. See the discussions of Jacobi, WZKM, 1888, 212 ff.; Dhruva, WZKM, 1891, 25 ff.; Telang his own Introduction to his Edition; Keith, J.R.A.S., 1909, 148 ff.; Rapson, ERE, IV, p 886. We know thus with certainty that he cannot be later than the 10th century A.D. as he is cited in the commentary of the Daśa-rūpaka.

Murāri

Murāri is later than Bhavabhūti, as he cites from the Uttaracarita, as the verses 31 and 32 of the 6th Act of the Uttaracarita are cited in the 6th and 7th Slokas of the 1st Act of the Anargharāghava. Ratnākara (9th century A.D.) in his
Haravijaya refer to Murāri. Konow does not believe that Ratnākara referred to Murāri but he believes that Maṅkha’s Śrikanṭha-carita (A.D. 1135) refers to Murāri. Konow thinks that Murāri was earlier than Rājaśekhara. The Dasa-rūpaka also refers to the Anargha-rāghava (III. 21) in his II. 1. Keith further thinks that Jayadeva imitated the Prasanna-rāghava (cf. Jayadeva, II.34 with the Prasanna-rāghava, VII.83). But no definiteness can be arrived at regarding Murāri.

Caturbhāṇi

vararucirivaradattah śyāmilakah śūdrakasca catvāraḥ
ete bhāñān vahāṇaḥ kā saktīḥ kālidāsasya

The above verse—which says that bhāṇa could only be written by Vararuci, Iśvaradatta, Śyāmilaka and Śūdraka, and that Kālidasa was incapable of writing any bhāṇa—occurs at the end of the Padma-prabhṛtaka.

It is difficult to say which Vararuci is here referred to. In the Mahābhāṣya we hear of a Vararuci (vārarucāḥ ślokāḥ). According to the Kathāsaritsāgara, Vararuci was a co-pupil with Paṇini. Vyāḍi is said to have introduced him to his preceptor Upavarna. According to the Avantisundarikathāsāra, Vararuci is said to have lived somewhere on the banks of the Godāvarī. He wrote on grammar, astrology and dharma-śāstra and two Kāvyas called Kaṭhābharaṇa and Cārumati. A verse from the Cārumati is quoted in the Subhāṣitāvali and Bhoja-deva also in his Śṛṅgāra-prakāsa quotes a verse.

After Vararuci we have Śūdraka, the author of the Mṛcchakaṇṭika and the Vatsarāja-carita. It is said that Śūdraka was a Brahmin attached to the court of Svāti, an Andhra-bhṛtya king of Ujjainī. When still young, he quarrelled with the king and

---

1 Bhāṭṭa-nātha Svāmin, in Indian Antiquity, XLI, 141, and Lévi in his Indian Theatre, Vol. I, p. 277, contradicts it.
2 Indian Drama p. 83.
O.P. 150–96
his friends. His intimate friend Vandhudatta saved him from difficulties and he had also later in life given him a good turn, when a Bhikṣu called Saṅghilaka was prevented from his murderous attempt on him by Śūdraka. The adventures of Śūdraka as have been described in the Avantisundari-kathā by Daṇḍin, have much resemblance with the heroes and the plot of the bhāṇa ascribed to Śūdraka. The adventures of Śūdraka are also found in the Śūdraka-kathā of Rāmila and Somila, the Vikrānta-śūdraka and the Śūdraka-carita by Paṇcaśikha.

In this bhāṇa we have Devadattā as the heroine, her sister Vipulā and the friend Śaśa. These characters are referred to by Bāṇa in his Kadambari. Kāmadatta, a work referred to in this bhāṇa, was probably a prakaraṇa written by Śūdraka himself.

Īśvara-datta, author of the other bhāṇa, leaves nothing behind him by which we can infer his date. He is mentioned by Bhojadeva in his Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa and also by Hema-candra. We also find a verse in the Subhāṣitāvali under the name of Īśvara-sena and it is not improbable that Īśvara-datta and Īśvara-sena are the same persons.

Śyāmilaka was probably a native of Kashmir. He has been referred to by Kṣemendra in his Aucitya-vicāra and Abhinava-gupta quotes from the Pāda-tūḍitaka. It is not improbable that he may have lived between 800 A.D. and 900 A.D.

The above four poets, Śūdraka, Īśvara-datta, Vararuci and Śyāmilaka, wrote respectively the four bhāṇas, viz., Padma-prabhṛtaka, Dhūrtta-viṭa-saṃvāda, Udbhayābhīsārika and Pāda-tūḍitaka. All the four bhāṇas consist of poems and prose.

**Bhaṭṭa-nārāyaṇa**

His work, Beṇi-saṃhāra is quoted by Vāmana, Ānandavardhana, Ruyyaka, Nami, Kṣemendra, the Kāva-prakāśa and the Daśa-rūpaka. It was published by J. Grill, Leipzig, 1871, and with the commentary of Jagaddhara, by K. P. Parab and K. R. Modgavkar, Bombay, 1898, 2nd Edition, 1905, NSP.
EDITOR'S NOTES

A free translation of it has been made by S. M. Tagore, Calcutta, 1880.

BHAVABHŪTI

Bhavabhūti's three dramas, the Mahāvīra-carita, the Uttara-carita and the Mālati-mādhava, are famous in Sanskrit literature. The first two are based on the legend of Rāma. The Mahāvīra-carita was published by F. H. Trithen, London, 1848, with the commentary of Vīra-rāghava, by T. R. Ratnam Aiyar, S. Raṅgar-cariar and K. P. Parab, 2nd Edition, Bombay, 1901, NSP. See also the English Translation by Wilson; also, English Translation by Pickford, 1871.


KUMARADĀSA

For general information regarding his poems, see J. d'Alwis, 1870; Zachariae, Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, 5, 1880, p. 52 and GGA, 1887, p. 95; Peterson. JBRAS., 17, 1889, 57 ff. and Subhāṣita-muktāvalī, 24 ff.;

Rāja-sekhara mentions him as an example of genius, though blind, in the sentence yā sabda-grāmam ratha-sārtham alaṅkāra-tantra-yukti-mārgam anyadapi tathāvidham adhihrdayaṁ pratibhāsayati sā pratibhā apratibhasya padārtha-sārthāḥ parokṣa iva ṛ pratibhāvataḥ punarapaśyato'pi pratyakṣa iva iva yato medhāvirudrakumāradādayo jātyandhāḥ kavayaḥ śṛṣyante ।

This proves that he must have flourished long before Rāja-sekhara. Keith thinks that he knew the Kāṣikā Vṛtti (A.D. 650) and that Vāmana (about A.D. 800) also refers to Kumāradāsa, when he censures the use of khalu as the first word. Keith further thinks that he was earlier than Māgha. See also O. Walter, Übereinstimmungen in Gedanken Vergleichen und Wendungen bei indischen Kunstdichtern, Leipzig, 1905, 0. 18 ff.

Nīlakaṇṭha Dīksita

He was not only the author of Śiva-lilārṇava but also of Kali-vidambana, Sabhā-raṇjana-sataka, Anyopadeśa-sataka, Śānti-vilāsa, Vairāgya-sataka and Ānanda-sāgara-stava. His major works are, besides Śiva-lilārṇava, Gaṅgāvataraṇa, Nala-caritra-nāṭaka, Kaiyāṇa-vyākhyāna and Śiva-tattva-rahasya. He lived in the middle of the 16th century near Conjeevaram and was a grandson of the brother of Appaya Dīksita. Contemporaneous to Appaya Dīksita there was a number of well-reputed poets, such as (1) Ratna-kheṭa who wrote Śiti-kaṇṭha-vijaya-kāvya and Bhāvanā-puruṣottama-nāṭaka, (2) Bhaṭṭojī Dīksita, (3) Govinda Dīksita. Ānanda-rāya Makhin’s father Nṛśimha-rāya wrote Tripura-vijaya-camāṇī and the nephew of Bhagavanta-rāya was the author of Mukunda-vilāsa-kāvya and Rāghavabhūyayasvānātaka. Ānanda-rāya Makhin wrote at least two dramas, Vidyā-parīṇaya and Jīvānanda, in the 18th century. Govinda Dīksita,
father of Venkaṭesvara Makhin, who was the teacher of Nīlakaṇṭha Makhin, not only wrote a commentary on Kumārila’s philosophy but also a drama called Raghunātha-vilāsa. He also wrote a work called Harivamsa-sāra-carita, a mahā-kāvyā of 23 cantos, on which Appaya Dīkṣita wrote a commentary. Veṅkaṭesvara Makhin’s teacher and elder brother Yajña-nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita wrote at least 3 works, Raghunātha-bhupa-vijaya, Raghunātha-vilāsa-nāṭaka and Sāhitya-ratnākara. The great scholars who were contemporaneous with Yajña-nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita, were Krṣṇa-yajvan, Somanātha, Kumāra-tātācāryya, author of the Pārijāta-nāṭaka, Rāja-cūḍāmanī Dīkṣita and Bhāskara Dīkṣita. Cokkanātha Makhin also was a contemporary of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita. The great poet Veṅkaṭesvara also lived at this time who wrote a mahā-kāvyā called Rāmacandrododaya. Nīlakaṇṭha Makhin’s younger brother, Atirātra-yajvan wrote Kuṣa-kumudvati-nāṭaka. Śrī-cakra-kavi of this time wrote Citra-ratnākara, Rukmiṇi-parinaya, Jānaki-parinaya, Gauri-parinaya and Draupadī-parinaya. Nīlakaṇṭha’s son Gīrvāṇendra wrote a bhāṇa called Śrīṅgāra-koṣa.

MAHENDRAVIKRAMA-VARMAN

Mahendravikrama-varman, the son of the Pallava king Siṃhaviśṇuvarman was a contemporary of Harṣa and was himself a king. His work Matta-vilāsa has been published in the Trivendrum Series. The scene of the drama is Kāṇcī, where he ruled in the 7th century A.D. It is a prahasana and it comes from the South and shows the same technique as regards the prastāvanā and sthāpanā as we find in Bhāsa. The Matta-vilāsa is probably the earliest of the prahasanas that have come to us. The story is amusing and probably suggests a reflection on the character of the degenerate Buddhists and the Kāpālikas.

VEŃKAṬANĀTHA

Veṅkaṭanātha was primarily a writer on Rāmānuja’s system of philosophy. The details of his philosophy and his works may
be found in Vol. III of the *History of Indian Philosophy* by the present editor. But Veṅkaṭanātha was not only a philosopher but a writer of good poetry as well, as may be seen from many of the poems of the *Yādavābhyyudaya*, a work on the life of Kṛṣṇa. He does not appear to be in any way a laborious writer but his diction is rather simple and charming and in many places he indulges in new forms of imagery. Thus for instance in Canto II of the *Yādavābhyyudaya* there is the following verse:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{diśastadāṇimavanīdhārānāṁ} \\
\text{sagairikaiḥ pāradapaṅkalepiḥ} \\
\text{cakāśire candramasō mayūkhaiḥ} \\
\text{pañcāyudhasyeva saraiḥ pradīptaiḥ}
\end{align*}
\]

**Udayasundari-katha**

(11th Century)

Soḍḍhala, a native of Guzerat, wrote a *Campū* called *Udayasundari-kathā*. He belonged to the Kāyastha caste. He lost his father when a mere boy and was brought up by his maternal uncle Gaṅgādhara. He went to Sthānaka, the capital of Kaṅkaṇa. There he flourished in the court of three royal brothers Cehiṭṭa-rāja, Nāgārjuna and Mummani-rāja. He was a contemporary of Vatsa-rāja. The *Udayasundari-kathā* was written between 1026 A.D. and 1050 A.D. The author compares himself to Bāṇa and Vālmīki and is quite proud of his achievement. The *Udayasundari-kathā* is based upon an original story. King Vatsa-rāja, at whose suggestion the work was written, was a king of the Lāṭa country (Southern Guzerat including Khandesh).

**Udayavarma-carita**

(11th Century)

The *Udayavarma-carita* is a small work in verse describing the glory of king Udayavarmā who was a Kerala king and lived
in the latter half of the 11th century. The author of the work is one called Mādhavācāryya. This Mādhavācāryya could not be the same as Vidyāraṇya or the author of the Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha who lived in the 14th century. But there was a Mādhava Paṇḍita who is reputed to have written a commentary on the Śāmaveda, who was attached to king Udayavarmā. His father Nārāyaṇa was a contemporary of Skanda-svāmī, who along with Nārāyaṇa and Udgītha wrote a commentary on the Rgveda. The work has been published in the T.S. series by K. Śāmbaśiva Śāstrī. There are also other conjectures about Udayavarman's date but I prefer to accept the conclusion of the 'earned editor.

Kumārapāla-pratibodha

(12th Century)

The author Somaprabhācārya is a well-known Jaina scholar who lived towards the end of the 12th century and wrote his work in 1195 A. D., only 11 years after King Kumārapāla had died. He was thus a contemporary of King Kumārapāla and his preceptor Hemacandra. He composed the work dwelling in the residence of the poet Siddhapāla, son of the poet-king Śrī Śrīpāla, who was one of the best poets of Guzerat. Śrīpāla's son Siddhapāla was also a poet and a friend of King Kumārapāla. Somaprabhācārya was the author also of Sumatinātha-caritra, Śūktimuktāvalī and Śatārtha-kāvyā. The author's aim, as usual with such other poets, was not writing a history, but to write a kāvyā with special emphasis upon religion. We find here a picture of Hemacandra and his relation with Kumārapāla who was converted into Jainism. Information about Kumārapāla is also available from the three works of Jayasiṃha Sūri—Prabhāvaka-caritra, Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, Kumārapāla-caritra, and Cāritrasundara's Kumārapāla-caritra and Jīnanaṃḍana's Kumārapāla-prabandha.
We know that Kumārapāla held his court at Anhilwara and he zealously preached the sanctity of animal life and had censors like Aśoka’s for the preaching of dharma to the people. The Kumārapāla-pratibodha is a sort of campū written in Prākrit prose and verse and is full of the principles of Jaina religion and contains many stories.

Rūpaka-śaṭka

(12th Century)

We have a collection of six dramas by Vatsa-rāja, the minister of Paramardi-deva, whose reign extended from 1163 to 1203 A.D. and the reign of his son Trailokya-deva extended till the end of the first half of the 13th century. Vatsa-rāja lived between the second half of the 12th century and the first half of the 13th century. Paramardi-deva was the immediate successor of Madana-varmā who was defeated by Siddha-rāja, king of Guzerat. Both Madana-varmā and Paramardi-deva lived a luxurious life according to the description of the Prabandha-cintāmani. Paramardi was so much given to cruel pastimes that he killed a cook every day at the time when he served him and people called him Kopakālānala. Paramardi was defeated by Prthvi-rāja as recorded in a short inscription at Madanapura in 1183 A.D. He was later on defeated also by Kutubuddin Ibak in 1203 A.D. His son Trailokya-varmā, however, recovered the capital of Kāliṅjara. Paramardi was also a poet as we know by his composition of a long praśasti to Śiva. But actually the composition was done by Vatsa-rāja and an allusion to it is found in the Karpūra-carita. This Rūpaka-śaṭka was edited by Mr. C. D. Dalal, Baroda, 1918. It contains a nyāyoga on the same subject as Bhāravi’s Kirātārjuniya, and an ihāmrga called Rukmini-haraṇa, a dīma called Tripura-dāha, a samavakāra called Samudra-mathana and a bhāga called Karpura-carita describing the revelry, gambling and love of a gambler with a courtesan and Hāsyacūḍāmaṇi, a farce in one Act in which an ācārya of the Bhāgavata school is ridiculed.
A verse from Vatsa-rāja is found quoted in Jalhana's Sūktimuktāvalī. The style is excellent and the plot well-executed.

PARTHA-PARĀKRAMA

Mr. Dalal in his Introduction to Partha-parākrama states that the entire Sanskrit Dramatic Literature of India consists of about 600 works. He gives us a list of contributions from Guzerat as given below, which is not out of interest:—


We have also taken a more or less detailed note of a number of other Gurjara works in other sections of these Editorial Notes.

There were other dramas of this type, such as Dhanañjaya-vijaya of Kaṅcanācārya, Nirbhaya-bhima of Rāmacandra, Kirātārjuniya of Vatsa-rāja, Narakāsura-vijaya of Dharmapāṇḍita, Pracaṇḍāhairava of Sadāśiva, Saugandhikā-haraṇa of Viśvanātha and Vinatānandana of Govinda.

Our author was the son of Yaśodhavala. He was not only a poet but a great warrior. He is described by Someśvara as having attained his celebrity as a Lord of Victory. He is also presented as being a great philanthropist in Surathotsava.

O.P. 150—97
Someśvara. He founded a city called Prahlādanapura, the modern Pālanpur, in Guzerat.

NARANĀRĀYAṆĀNANDA

(13th Century)

The poem Naranārāyaṇānanda is a kāvya in 16 cantos describing the friendship of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa and the abduction of Subhadrā by Arjuna. Vastupāla the author, also called Vasantapāla, who wrote the work in 1277 Śaṃvat, was the minister of king Vīradhavala of Dholka, and was celebrated for his tolerance and cosmopolitanism. He even built a mosque for the Mahomedans. His glories are not only sung in the Prabandha-cintāmani, and the Caturvimsati-prabandha but also in the Kirti-kaumudi of Someśvara and the Sukṛta-saṅkīrtana by Nṛśimha and also in the mahā-kāvya Vasanta-vilāsa by Bālacandra and in Jinaharṣa’s Vastupāla-caritra. He was a minister, warrior, philanthropist, a builder of public places and temples, a patron of poets and himself a poet. He had established three great libraries. He encouraged the writing of great works and Kāthā-ratna-sāgara of Bāla-candra Sūri and Alañkāra-mahodadhi of Narendra-prabha were composed at his patronage. He was very liberal in his gifts to the poets and patronised such writers as Someśvara, Harihara, Arisimha, Dāmodara, Nānaka, Jayadeva, Madana, Vikala, Kṛṣṇa-simha and Saṅkara-svāmī. He was himself a great poet and his verses have been quoted in works of anthology, such as Sūkти-muktāvalī and Sāṅgadhara-paddhati. The work Naranārāyaṇānanda is excellent in style and poetic fancy.

SRĪNIVĀSA-VILĀSA-CAMPŪ

(c. 14th Century)

Srīnivāsa-vilāsa-campū is a campū in which Bāṇa’s alliteration and śleṣa or punning have been imitated with a vengeance. It is, however, a pleasant love-story of a Southern king Srīnivāsa.
It was written by Veṅkaṭadvarin or Venkaṭēsa. It is written in two parts, a Pūrva-bhāga with 5 ucchvāsas and the Uttara-bhāga with 5 unucchvāsas. The poet seems to have been a disciple of Vedānta-desika of the 14th century and Śrīnivāsa, a Southern Chief, was his patron.

**Nalābhuyudaya**

(15th Century)

It is a work by Vāmana Bhaṭṭabāṇa, who is the author of Śrīgāra-bhūṣaṇa, Pārvatī-parinayya and Vemabhūpāla-carita. He was also called Abhinava Bhaṭṭabāṇa. At the commencement of his work Vemabhupāla-carita, the poet says that it has long been said that none but Bāṇa could write charming prose—Vāmana now will wipe away that bad name (bāṇa-kavindrādanye kāṇāḥ khalu sarasū-gadya-saraṇiṣu iti jagati rūḍhamayaśo vatsakulo vāmano' dhunā māṛṣṭi).

Vemabhūpāla was the ruler of the Trilīṇga country during the middle of the 15th century and he was himself well-versed in all arts and wrote a commentary on Amaru-śataka, called Śrīgāra-dīpikā, and Saṅgīta-cintāmaṇī.

The Nalābhuyudaya is a mahā-kāvyā in 8 cantos and the style is lucid and clear. As a matter of fact, the style seems to be approaching Kālidāsa in sweetness. The work has been published in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series by MM. T. Gaṅapati Śāstrī.

**Kathā-kautuka**

(15th Century)

The Kathā-kautuka is based on the story of Yusuf-Zuleikhā of the Persian poet Jāmī, written by the Kashmir poet Śrīvara, who lived in the 15th century. This is one of the few successful adaptations of Persian tales into Sanskrit poetry. The work is written in easy Sanskrit poetry and divided into 15 chapters called kautukas. The author seems to have been well-versed in
Persian and Arabic as he calls himself *yavana-śāstra-pārangama*. But he does not follow the text of Yusuf-Zuleikhā in any faithful manner.

**Rāṣṭraudha-vaṃśa-mahākāvyā**

(16th Century)

The *Rāṣṭraudha-vaṃśa* is a *mahā-kāvyā* in 20 cantos. It is a historical poem containing the history of the Bāgulas of Mayūragiri, from the originator of the dynasty, Rāṣṭraudha, king of Kanauj, to the reign of Nārāyaṇa Shāh, ruler of Mayūragiri and patron of the author (1596 A.D.). Rudra-kavi wrote another work called *Jāhāṅgīr-shāh-carīta* in prose, at the order of Pratāp Shāh, son of Nārāyaṇa Shāh. Mayūragiri is in the Nāsik district. The work is historically more faithful than other works of this nature.

**Kamalini-Kalahaṃsa**

(16th Century)

*Kamalini-kalahaṃsa* was written by Rāja-cūḍāmani, son of Srīnivāsa Dīkṣita and Kāmākṣī Devī, towards the end of the 16th century. Rāja-cūḍāmani wrote a number of works of a philosophical type. But he also wrote *Śṛṅgāra-sarvasva* (a *bhāṇa*), a supplementary work on *Bhoja-campū*, the *Bhārata-campū* *Śaṅkarābhhyudaya*, *Ratnakheṭa-vijaya*, *Maṅju-bhāṣini*, *Kaṃsa-vadha*, *Rukmini-parīṇaya*, *Ānandarāghava-nāṭaka* and many other works.

**Acyutarāyābhhyudaya**

(By Śrī Rājanātha)

(16th Century)

Acyuta-rāya was the son of Narasimha who succeeded his brother *Kṛṣṇa-rāya* to the throne in the year 1527-30 and ruled
from 1530 to 1542, as the Emperor of Vijayanagara. In the poem Acyutarāyābhyyudaya the poet describes the genealogical history of King Acyuta-rāya. There was once a king named Timma among the Tuluva dynasty of kings in Vijayanagara, who had a wife called Devakī and their son Īśvara had a wife called Bukkāmmā. Their eldest son Narasimha became the Emperor and captured the Fort of Mānavadurga, but when the Nizam of the place submitted himself to him and begged his pardon he returned the fort to him and then took Seringapatam. He then overcame the Marawas and took hold of Mādura and conquered Konetirāja and made Vijayanagara his capital. His three sons became kings one after another and Acyuta-rāya was the youngest. His queen was Varadāmbal. Being informed that the Cola king had fled from his kingdom and sought refuge with the king of Chera, who had usurped the Pāṇḍya kingdom, Acyuta-rāya marched to Kālahastī and Viṣṇukāṇṭī and finally went to Srīraṅgam. After this he sent one of his generals to punish the Chera king. A regular fight took place later on between the king of Travancore and Acyuta-rāya; Acyuta-rāya became victorious. The Chera king took refuge with Prince Salaga-rāja who gave the Pāṇḍya chief his former dominions. He then went to the Malaya mountain in the sea. This story is narrated in the first six cantos of this Kāvyā.

The work Acyutarāyābhyyudaya was published in the Śrīvāṅga-vilāsa Press, Srīraṅgam, in 1907 and bears with it a commentary by Srīkṛṣṇa Śūri.

ÅNANDAKANDA-CAMPŪ

(17th Century)

This work is attributed to Mitra-miśra. He is the reputed author of the Viśramitrodaya, a work on Dharma-sāstra. He also wrote a commentary on Yājnavalkya Smṛti and also a mathematical work, both of which were called Viśramitrodaya. But it appears that Mitra-miśra used to get many books written by other
scholars, to all of which the name *Viramitrodaya* is given. Thus in the commentary on Yājñavalkya Smṛti it is said that the commentary was written by Sri Sadānanda under the orders of Mitra-miśra. So also was the mathematical work written by Rāma-daiivajña and called *Viramitrodaya*. So Dharmayya Dīkṣita wrote a commentary on *Advaitavidyā-tilaka* under the suggestion of Mitra-miśra.

Mitra-miśra’s patron, Raja Vīrāsimha-deva of Orchha, reigned from 1605 to 1627, and as Mr. Gopinath Kaviraja says, was probably identical with Birsing Deo who is said to have killed Abul Fazl. The *Ānandakanda-campū* treats of the birth of the Divine Joy as Śrīkrṣṇa. The Editor, Pandit Nanda Kisore Sarman, says that the work was composed in 1632 A.D. It is divided into 8 *ullāsas* or chapters.

**Nārāyaṇiṇīya**

This work by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa with the commentary Bhaktapriyā, by Deśamaṅgala Vāryya, has been published by K. Sāmbaśiva Sāstri in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series. Its essence has been culled from the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda. It is one of the finest examples of the *stotra* literature and consists of 100 *daśakas* or decades. It is not only a *stotra* but also an excellent *kāvyā* on account of its poetic merit. It is regarded in the Kerala country as reverentially as the *Śrimad-bhagavad-gītā*. The author was born in the Mepputtur Illam in the village of Perumanam on the river Nila in North Malabar. His fame as a poet grew very high and excellence of his works was recognised by all and he was entertained at the court of king Deva-nārāyana. He wrote the following works:—(1) *Nārāyaṇiṇīya*, (2) *Mānameyodaya*, (3) *Aṣṭami-campākāvyā*, (4) *Prakriyā-sarvasva*, (5) *Dhātu-kāvyā*, (6) *Kailāsā-taila-varnana*, (7) *Kaunteyāṣṭaka*, (8) *Ahalyā-sāpa-mokṣa*, (9) *Śūrpaṇākhā-pralāpā*, (10) *Rāma-kathā*, (11) *Dīta-vākyā-prabandha*, (12) *Nalayani-carita*, (13) *Nṛga-

Bharata-carita

Bharata-carita, a mahā-kāvya of 12 cantos, was written in different metres on the life of Bharata, son of Duṣyanta, by Kṛṣṇakavi. It has been published in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series by MM. T. Ganapati Sastri. Nothing can be made out regarding the identity or nativity of Kṛṣṇakavi, the author of this poem.

Candra-prabhā-carita

This work has been published in the Kāvyamālā Series, 1902, Bombay, by MM. Pandit Durga Prasad and Mr. K. P. Parab. It was written by Vīrānandī, a pupil of Abhayānandī, who again was a pupil of Guṇa-nandī. The poem consists of 18 cantos and contains many charming scenes and descriptions. The style is lucid and clear.

Kāvyā-ratna

The author of this work is Arhaddāsa and it has been published in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series by K. Samvasiva Sastri. It deals with the life of Muni Suvrata, a Jaina Tīrthaṅkara and it is also called Muni-suvrata-kāvya. Muni Suvrata is said to have been a teacher of Mallinātha. It is difficult to say whether this Mallinātha is identical with the commentator Mallinātha.

Bāla-mārtanda-vijaya

This is a drama in 5 Acts by Devarāja-kavi, published in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, edited by K. Sāmbāsiva Śāstrī. According to tradition, the poet Deva-rāja belonged to a Brahmin family that migrated from Pattamadai in the Tinnevelly district.
and settled at Asrama, a village near Suchindram in South Travancore. He was patronised by Prince Rāma-varmā, a nephew of His Highness Mārtaṇḍa-varmā and became the chief of the pandits attached to the Palace. His father Śeśadri was a Vedic scholar. King Mārtaṇḍa-varmā ruled from 1729 to 1758. The drama deals with the conquests of King Mārtaṇḍa-varmā and the dedication of his Empire to the deity Śrīpadmanābha, reserving to himself the position of Viceroy and servant of the deity and governing the country in his name.

The dramatist tries to follow the style of Kālidāsa and in this work one can sometimes trace expressions similar to those of Kālidāsa. Sometimes he follows also the style of Viṣākhadatta’s Mudrā-rākṣasa. Mārtaṇḍa-varmā has figured largely in Malayalam literature also.