INTRODUCTION.

I. THE SANSKRIT PROSE ROMANCE.

IS THE Dasa'kuma'racharita AN A'khyA'yika'?

Poetry in Sanskrit, from its inherent nature, as apart from its intrinsic merit, is divided into two kinds, दृश्य (what is capable of being seen or exhibited on the stage), and स्नेध (what can only be heard or read); the drama falls under the first division, while all other literary works would be grouped under the second. There is, however, another principle of division, which takes into account the form, and not the subject-matter, of a work; according to that, poetry is divided into three principal classes, गद्य (prose), पद्य (verse) and विन्यास (mixed). पद्य is all-predominant in Sanskrit literature, while गद्य and विन्यास compositions form but a small portion of it. गद्य is found employed chiefly in the writing of commentaries and similar works, and is rarely utilized for the creation of imaginative literature, whence arises the extreme paucity of prose romances in Sanskrit. Indeed, excepting four, viz., Vásavadatta, Harshacharita, Kādambari, and Dasa'kumāracharita, none of them are well-known, and the total number of those which are extant would barely exceed a dozen. According to Sanskrit rhetoricians, they fall into two classes, the कथा and the अक्षरवाक्य. As regards the exact demarcation between the two, however, there does not appear to be any unanimity.

The Agnipurāṇa defines these as follows:—

कन्तुंवक्षणां त्रयं विभक्तः।
क्रियारूपस्य साधारणतः बिन्यमितः॥
सवर्ण वचन दोषांश रूपितसम्प्ररूपः।
उच्चवाच्च दित्यं परिवर्तिते वचनं च चरणविस्ततः॥
वर्ण वापपप्रक्षा व वर्ण धार्मिकं वाच ॥

1 Under this head come the Champās, and also the dramas (in which the dialogue is carried on in prose interspersed with metrical stanzas).

2 The Agnipurāṇa gives five classes, viz. आक्षरवाक्य, कथा, सुवर्णकथा, परिकथा and कवित्व, but it will be seen that the last three are merely minor varieties of the broader division कथा.
While the rhetorician Bhāmaha practically lays stress on the same points:

Prakūtaṁ kālakṣetraṁ padavātina ।
Gobhīn n坞duśāyāṁ ṽṛṣuṣṭaṁ śāstraṁ śāstraṁ ādhiśeṣaṁ ।
Kṣatipaḥyaṁ taṁ nāyakeṁ śvēcitvā ।
Asthāṇāvaṁ ākṣaraṁ vā kāle saṁvāṁśati v ।............
Kāmāraśiṁasāmāyārṇavāmāvaśāṣṭānāt ।
N vṛṣṭrastṛtyaṁ yuṣṭaṁ nṛṣṭāsvarūpyā ।
Sarasvatī saraṇātaṁ caṇḍeṣaṁ kāśāyaśvaṁdvikaś ।
Asthāṇāvā kṛṣṇeṁ tu niṣṭhyate । (I. 25-29).

From these old definitions it appears that (i) The śāstra, or a detailed account of the poet’s family in prose, while in the kāṇṭha the same is briefly narrated in verse. (ii) The śāstra is devoted to the description of topics like the kidnapping of girl-brides, battles, the hero’s separation from his beloved and other calamities that befall him; the kāṇṭha is silent about such things. (iii) In the śāstra the story is put in the mouth of the hero himself; in the kāṇṭha it is narrated by persons other than the hero. (iv) The chapters into which an śāstra is divided are called vṛṣṭrastṛtya. A kāṇṭha is generally not divided into chapters; if so divided at all, they are there called sarasvatī. (v) In an śāstra there are embedded stanzas in the vṛṣṭrastṛtya and the sarasvatī metres, suggestive of future events; in a kāṇṭha they are conspicuous by their absence.

Daṇḍin, who in his Kāvyādarsa discusses these details, considers the distinctions to be arbitrary, unsatisfactory and unsound, and holds that kāṇṭha and śāstra, being indistinguishable, are but two names for the same species of composition. "Prose (शत्रुष्ट्र) is a series of words not written in
measured lines; its two classes are said to be the আরবাবিকার and the কথার. Now (it has been laid down that) the আরবাবিকার should be spoken (narrated) by the hero, and the কথার either by the hero or some one else. But we find that this rule is not rigidly observed, since even in an আরবাবিকার the story is found to be told by another. In sooth, whether another is the speaker, or one's own self, seems to be a very strange basis for discrimination. Therefore the কথার and the আরবাবিকার are one category marked with a double name, and herein are comprised all the other categories of tales." This opinion of Dāṇḍin is valuable, for as the author of prose romances himself he must have known well what he was writing about. Moreover, a far larger number of works of the কথার and the আরবাবিকার type must have been accessible to him than are to be found now; but even among those he must have been unable to discover entire consonance with the definitions. The student will note that the Das'akumāra-charita itself agrees strictly with neither of the definitions (of the Agnipurāṇa or Bhāmaha). Thus, taking in order the five points of distinction recorded above, (i) one finds no mention of the poet's family anywhere in the work; (ii) from the nature of the topics included in it, the Das'ak. would appear to be an আরবাবিকার; (iii) but, since the story is not narrated exclusively by the hero, it would come to be classed as a কথার; (iv) from its division into উচ্চারণ, it is entitled to be designated as an আরবাবিকার; (v) but then again, the absence of the stanzas in the বক্তা and the অপরাজ মত্র metrical forms would seem to point to its being a কথার. One is, therefore, inclined to agree with Dāṇḍin, that these distinctions, not being supported by sufficient evidence, must be abandoned as untenable; the Das'ak. would thus be simply called a গ্রাম কাথায় (a prose romance), as neither of the titles আরবাবিকার and কথার would properly apply to it.

In spite of the scathing criticism passed on it by Dāṇḍin, the traditional division into আরবাবিকার and কথার, made by the older writers, continued to be accepted by their
successors, among whom may be reckoned Rudraṭa, A’rādavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Vidyānātha and others. But even they do not agree as regards the details. Thus the author of the Alamkārasamgraha states⁴ that an A’khyāyikā is based on historical facts, while a Kathā has a purely fictitious plot. This particular distinction, which is not to be found in the Agnipuruṣa or Bhāmaṇa, appears to have been deduced from a study of Bāṇa’s Harshacharita and Kādambarī, the two standard models of prose romances available to later writers. Similarly, A’rādavardhana, the author of the Dhvanyāloka, has introduced a new matter of detail. Daṇḍin had already laid down that an abundance of compounds constituted the very life of prose (जोक: समवेशस्तवभन्नमिष्ठ शीतितम्। काव्या। I. 80). He recognized varieties of compounds, as consisting of short vowels and long vowels in ratios of greater and less inequality (वहूः—ि। समवेशस्तवभन्नमिष्ठ शीतितम्म। काव्या। I. 81). A’rādavardhana laid down certain restrictions⁵ in the use of long compounds; but in doing so he seems to be giving his own opinion and not to be following any older authority. The last important writer on poetics is Vis’vanātha, who composed the Śāhityadarpaṇa in the fifteenth century; herein we find the following:

कथां वर्षं चतुर्वेदिन्य स्नितितसू। कवितन्त्र भवेद्यां कन्यिरकंकं। आवेद गयेन्मकारः स्त्राविरुद्धकितन्तसू। आयोवाक्सरं कथास्वामवेश्वसामाजतितन्तसू। अस्मानस्तस्तवं च यूं पदं अक्षिकिरं। कथानां व्यवच्छेदं आभासं हति बङ्गते। आयोवाक्सरं छन्दं येन केनिरं। अन्यपदेशोनासालूले समथर्धछविं। (Pari. VI.)

“In a Kathā a charming plot is composed in prose, which is interspersed with stanzas in the A’rya’, Vaktra, and Aparavaktra metres; in the beginning there should be a salutation to a deity, a description of the nature of villains, &c.

⁴ कथां कवितन्त्र स्नितितसू। स्यायां शाक्तान्त्रयाचिन्द्राविका मता। According to this, the Dā’akamāraharita would be a Kathā.

⁵ आयोवाक्सरं तु स्या। स्यायां शाक्तान्त्रयाचिन्द्राविका मता। एवं कथां। ज-स्वयमस्तवभन्नमिष्ठमधुरमा।...अति-कवितन्त्रान्त्रयाचिन्द्राविका रचना न विपलवमेघशस्तुरङ्गनयो। आयोवाक्सरं भास्मिति शोभते। &c. Dhvanyāloka, pp. 143-144 (Nirṇay. Ed.).
An A’khyāyikā is like a Kathā. [In addition] it should include a genealogical account of the poet’s family and also of other poets; verses may occur in it at intervals. Its chapters are called A’śvāsas, and these should contain introductory verses suggestive of the future incidents of the story.” These definitions read like echoes of older ones, but they do not help to clear the confusion; their reliability is further vitiated by the introduction of the term Aśvāsa, which we do not meet with anywhere else. Scholars who are disposed to describe the Das’akumāracharita as an A’khyāyikā might also note that not in a single particular does it strictly conform to the definition of the Sāhityadarpana. We are thus finally brought to adhere still more closely to the view of Daṇḍin, that the terms A’khyāyikā and Kathā lack fixity of discrimination. They should really be treated as synonyms for what is known as सूच काव्या, any further distinction being otiose.7

II. THE POET.

(1) THE IDENTITY OF DAṆḌIN.

All students of Sanskrit literature are familiar with the difficulties which beset the path of the earnest inquirer after truth in the matter of the chronology and the personal history of Sanskrit writers, not excluding such famous names as Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. There is little to be found by way of data from contemporary records, and many of our conclusions are at best surmises based on scraps of information collected from various sources, such as inscriptions, or quotations, or casual references in other works. The case of Daṇḍin is no exception to the general rule. By tradition he is credited with the authorship of the Das’akumāracharita and the Kāvyādarsa, and in the very beginning of our further search after information concerning him, we are confronted with the possibility of there being more writers than one who

6 This may, however, be a mislection for उच्चरण.

7 Cf. Keith, Classical Sanskrit Literature (p. 72)—“The distinction between A’khyāyikā and Kathā is presented to us in a puzzling confusion in the writers on poetics, explaining and justifying in large measure the refusal of Daṇḍin in his Kāvyādarsa to have anything to do with the distinction.” (The Italics are ours).
bore the name Daṇḍin; and when we bear in mind that there have been really more than one Kaḷīdaṇa, and as many as five Śrī-Harshas, the existence of different authors who were all known as Daṇḍin does not seem to be so very improbable. And so we find Mr. Agashe, the learned editor of the Das'ak- in the Bombay Sanskrit Series, propounding a theory that there must have existed at least three different writers named Daṇḍin:—(i) the poet Daṇḍin whose works are no longer extant; (ii) the critic Daṇḍin, better known as A'chārya-Daṇḍin, the author of the Ka'vya'darsa, a manual of rhetorics and poetics; and (iii) Daṇḍin the creator of the prose romance Das'akumāracharita. We might state at the outset that we are unable to agree with Mr. Agashe, nor has his theory yet found acceptance among Indian or Western scholars of note. We shall briefly discuss below, in order, the chief points raised by him.

(i) Mr. Agashe refers to a tradition about Daṇḍin having been a contemporary of Kaḷīdaṇa (for which see our next Section), and their rivalry as poets; this, coupled with the fact that there are stanzas attributed to a poet Daṇḍin in the various Sanskrit anthologies, and Subhāshitas\(^8\) eulogistic of Daṇḍin the poet, leads him to assume the existence of a poet Daṇḍin, since in his opinion the authors of the Ka'vya', and the Das'ak., whoever they were, could hardly be designat ed as poets in the highest sense, and they do not merit such high-flown eulogiums as we meet with in references to Daṇḍin. [Mr. Agashe has of course to assume that the works of this Daṇḍin have been lost]. The argument does not seem to us to be convincing. It is true enough that the Ka'vya', and the Das'ak. do not stand as the highest patterns of poetical excellence. But then, every author is known to have written works of various degrees of excellence and perfection; and secondly, it is equally plausible to urge that the same Daṇḍin, whom we know as the author of the Ka'vya', and the Das'ak., also wrote other works, which are now no longer extant and on which those eulogies could have been based. There is not sufficient

---

\(^8\) E. G., (a) जाते जगति वाल्मीकिको काव्यसम्बन्धामात्र। कथी हैत स्त्री व्यस्ति कवियभाव्यो द्विवर्णी। (b) कविद्वेष्यको कवियद्वेष्यको कविवेशको, कविवेशको न लांकय:। (c) त्रिधारप्रमुखो द्विधारो द्विधारो गुण:। (d) द्विधारप्रमुखो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्विधारो द्वि
ground, in our opinion, to make out the existence of a separate Dāṇḍin by following the trail of the single word Kavi. (ii) The Kāvyādāras' promulgates and expounds many canons of poetic composition which show that its author had refined notions about style and its functions, and was a literary purist to whom impropriety of diction or of matter was an abhorrence. Now it is an admitted fact that the style9 of the Das'ak. offends against some of the rules10 of the Kāvyā', and that its stories, as the student will find later, are not all of them in the best taste, nor is their moral tone very high. (iii) So Mr. Agashe tries to distinguish the two authors, calling one A'cha'rya-Dāṇḍin, as he is found styled in the colophon of the Kāvyā', and the other simply Dāṇḍin. The distinction is in our opinion unsound and futile, for the apparent disparity in the standard displayed by the two works can be very easily explained by supposing that the Das'ak. is the work of Dāṇḍin as a young man, naturally taking a spectator's interest in the follies of youth, and also not perfect in the art of immaculate composition; riper studies in the realm of literary criticism must have led him, at a later date, to compose the Kāvyā'. Mr. Agashe appears to have assumed that the Das'ak. must have been written after the Kāvyā'. and therefore he finds it difficult to believe that it proceeded from the pen of the accomplished critic who wrote that manual as a Mirror of Poetic Composition. Such an assumption, however,

9 Instances of Dāṇḍin's laxness in grammar and idiom will be found in a later Section. Mr. Agashe specifically notes only one rule of the Kāvyā', which is violated in the Das'ak., viz. अौत समासाः श्रवणे मयां गदायत सोऽजिनत् (I. 80). It is true that the Das'ak. does not abound in compounds to the same extent as, for instance, 'Ba'pa'a Kādambari' does; indeed, its use of compounds seems to be quite normal, and certainly not सूनत, if we are to interpret the canon literally.

10 Thus the voraś स्वामयमाल्लाजिति वास्तसम्भन्नमभयंभयं श्रीमति मयां सह सह सुरतस्वसिकारिकैत्रय भी सूलुप्रच (see p. 99)—is clearly against the principle enunciated in the Kāvyā'. in the words कोष्ठं सब्रह्मीलकान्तर समस्तं निषिद्धस्तं, तथाद्वाधिपतिवैदेभेन मां तथा सह सूलुप्रच (I. 62-63). The Kāvyā'. is down upon all vulgarity and indelicacy (cf. तथा तष्ठा प्राम्यवाच्यमणी स्वाम्याक्षं श्रीस्वाम्याक्षं निषिद्धस्तं (I. 65), while the Das'ak. is a frequent offender in this respect (see pp. 115, 167 &c.)
is entirely unwarranted, and need not be accepted in the absence of any definite evidence. Moreover, even if the *Ka'vya* were the earlier production of the two, we know how difficult it is to practise what one believes in and preaches; and Daṇḍin the theorist might be excused for his comparative failure as an author when he assumed the rôle of the romancist. So the three different names merge into one personality; and in this connexion it is interesting to note, as has been pointed out by Mr. Agashe himself, that the poetess Gaṅgādevī, in her *Madhurāvijaya* (I. 10), describes A'charya-Daṇḍin as a *poet of very high order* (आचार्यदांदिनों गान्धाराबाईतूर्दत्तपदाः || विकालो बृहस् पत्त्वा निलासमणिवर्णयम् ||); thus even Indian tradition is against the separation of the poet Daṇḍin from A'charya-Daṇḍin. Indeed, the case for the plurality of Daṇḍins is so weak, and the evidence adduced so slight and so controversial, that Mr. Agashe himself felt compelled to regard his theory as not quite well established; to quote his own words, he left it to "await further research." But no additional facts have been brought to light in support of his hypothesis, which still remains unproved.

(2) THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF DANDIN.

Like most Sanskrit writers, Daṇḍin has observed a complete silence about himself in his works, nor are any reliable biographical details of him available, contemporary or otherwise. Indian scholars do not appear to have attached much importance to the historical side of literature, and consequently there is usually an entire lack of information about the life of any poet whom one may wish to study. The only sources of direct information open to us are certain traditions, current among Pandits, which are interesting in themselves but are of no historical value whatever. Thus it is related in the *Kavi-charitra*, about our poet, that on one occasion Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning, manifested herself in the form of a beautiful damsel playing with a ball (*Kanduka*), when looking at her Daṇḍin said:—

एकाकारि चय हि भाति क्रमुरुधिथयः क्रान्तितः।
वृद्धी स्वार्थसमाययोऽस्बः स्वस्यवस्मरौष्णिकायः।

"It appears as if there are three balls, though there is really one; (when just in contact with her palm) it appears bright-red, being tinged with the redness of the palm of that beautiful
lady; when fallen on the ground, the same appears white by the
lustre of the rays of her nails; and when in air it looks charmingly
blue by the rays darting from her dark-blue eyes.”

Bhavabhūti described the incident in these lines—

विद्वितं नृम कन्दुके ते हरवं विबिधापरस्मातोभयम् हस्।
मोरिताकवितासमाभिषेत: पावति: पावति: दुनुरपतासि।

“Indeed, O ball, I know thy heart. Though repeatedly
beaten by the lotus-like hand of the lady and falling to the
ground, thou, as if covetous of the contact of (=wishing to
kiss) the lower lip of the damsel, reboundest again and again.”

While Kālidāsa composed the following—

पशोधरकारारणी हि कन्दुके: करेण रत्नार्किकायते द्व्रुवः।
सङ्गीय नेशाकपतिनिपत्तः स्थितः: मन्दावाक पपताकारः।

“The lotus ( from the braid of the hair ) fell at the feet of
the lady to implore her favour, being as it were terrified at its
resemblance to her eyes, when it saw that the ball was again
and again beaten with the hand, through anger caused by its
assuming the form of her breasts.”

This tradition represents the three poets as contempo-
raries, which of course is not possible. Its only value seems to
us to lie in those three s'lokas, in which the three peculiar
characteristics of the style of each poet are clearly indi-
cated, e.g., the jingling consonance of alliterative syllables
(of Daṇḍin), the ability to make the sound an echo to
the sense ( of Bhavabhūti ), and the cleverness in the handling
of the Utprekshā Figure ( of Kālidāsa ).

Another tradition is found in the Bhoja-prabandha,
which is a comparatively modern work of one Balla'la in
which almost all the well-known Sanskrit poets are described
as being contemporaries at the court of one king Bhoja of
Ma'īva'. It is a production which contains many curious
stories and interesting stanzas, but it has no historical value
whatever, since some of the poets whom it quotes ( e. g.
Ba'na, Bhavabhūti and Ka'lidāsa) have been shown, on
independent grounds, to have lived at different periods.
Even the commentator Mallinātha, who lived so late after
Ka'lidāsa, is described therein as a court-poet of king Bhoja!
The work is thus utterly unreliable in fixing the date of
Daṇḍin, though in the early days of Sanskrit scholarship

D. I. 2.
Prof. Wilson tried to prove, on its authority, that Dāṇḍin lived at the court of Bhoja in the tenth century A. D. It records an interesting case of what is known as *Samasyā*. *pārṇa*, in which the three poets Bhavabhūti, Dāṇḍin and Kālīdāsa composed respectively the first three lines of a *slokā* descriptive of early dawn, king Bhoja himself having first supplied the fourth—(रूपः) अक्रणकिरणज्ञकिर्मिक्षे गदांशे, (स्पष्टि) बल्लणि शिशिरंगते गद्यसर्वं प्रसाधि। (कलितः) नायकनिष्ठकर्म्यां नायक-दुर्गौषधियते, (नौरुची) चर्मगच्छिनित्तमें चन्द्रविश्वेष ललन्ते॥. But, beyond giving us a charming verse, this account adds nothing to our knowledge of the poet.

A third tradition narrates that on one occasion, when the rivalry between Dāṇḍin and Kālīdāsa rose to a high pitch, Sarasvatī appeared on the scene in person and gave her opinion in the words—"कृष्णदुर्गश्री, कविरंगश्री, कविरंगश्री न लंघाश्:." On this, Kālīdāsa, who fancied himself as her special protégé, grew wrathful and asked her who he was, when the goddess pacified him by declaring that he was her own self in another form—"कौई शुभ तदा शुभे"—"स्वयंस्वाधृत न लंघाश:." As we have noted above, such traditions cannot be relied upon in fixing the chronology of Sanskrit authors. On the contrary, they serve to deepen the mist, caused by the absence of history, that hangs over Sanskrit literature, and to make confusion worse confounded. The only purpose they may be said to serve is that they show in what great esteem our poet was held by ancient Pandits, who thought him a worthy rival of the illustrious Kālīdāsa.

Efforts have been made to deduce some imaginary facts concerning the poet’s life from his name ‘Dāṇḍin,’ which signifies a *Samnyāsin*; thus it is suggested that the poet, whose real name has been lost to us, was endowed with this *sobriquet*, when, after having tasted the bitter-sweet cup of youthful pleasures, he turned a recluse and put on the garb of an ascetic. 11 Prof. Wilson also hazards a similar, though not exactly the same, conjecture. He

11 Such fanciful explanations of proper names are not uncommon. Thus the commentator Vītarāghrava narrates how the poet Bhavabhūti got his name as a result of his having composed a verse in which the word अवशूलिः occurred. Vide p. 15 of our Introduction to the Uttara.
says—"The very name of the author suggests an uncertainty. Daṇḍin properly designates a 'staff-bearer,' but is commonly applied to a sect of religious mendicants...who are so termed because they carry a slender gāda or wand. Many of the order have been literary characters; and it is not impossible that one of them may have amused his leisure with inventing the stories in question, however inconsistent with his religious meditations. The work would thus be of a Daṇḍi, not of Daṇḍi; but it is not generally so considered, Daṇḍi being ordinarily regarded, in this instance at least, as a proper name, and associated with the usual honorary prefix, as Śrī-Daṇḍin." Such suggestions, however, lack corroborative evidence, and are obviously attempts to twist the name of the poet so as to make it yield some meaning and then to invent a network of plausible circumstances around that meaning. Under these conditions we are finally left to gather what information we can from a study of the poet's own works; they contain no autobiographical matter, but still we may glean here and there a few facts, and draw some legitimate inferences therefrom, which are after all more reliable than a host of fanciful dāntrikathā.

Reading the Daśāk and the Kāvyā, in this light, we can guess with some certainty that Daṇḍin was a Dākshinātya, probably a native of the Vidarbha country, as he speaks proudly of the Māhārāṣṭrī language and praises the Vaidarbhi style of writing (see Kāvyā. I. 34, 41-42). Cockfights, as has been pointed out by Mr. Agashe, were a common diversion in South India; the very vivid description of one in the Daśāk. (pp. 143-144) seems to lend certainty to his being a southerner, a conclusion which is also supported by such definite expressions as काण्वीलिपिन (p. 159), and by his references to Kāliṅga and A'nđhra. Further, the story of Gomini in the sixth Uchchh. is so realistic in all its details and gives such a minute description of economic housekeeping in Southern India—which is found unchanged even in our own times—that it could only have been written by one thoroughly at home with the habits of the people of South India. It appears that our author must have lived in affluent circumstances and had drunk deep at the fountain of worldly pleasures, as is evident from his life-like
and intimate descriptions of royal palaces and wealthy court
tesans. His descriptions of gambling bouts and cockfights, of
journeys through forests, and of adventures among thieves and
marauders, show that he had seen life in all its shades of
grave and gay. We do not know anything of his religious
beliefs, as he never discusses such topics; the introductory
stanza to the Das'ak. is in praise of Vishnu; but this alone
cannot prove him to have been a worshipper of that deity,
since there is reason to believe that the stanza is not from the
pen of Danandin (as the student will find later on). From the
clear vein of eroticism that runs throughout the Das'ak., it
seems that our author was well-read in the Kama-Sutra of
Vatsyayana; while his detailed references to the science of
politics in Uchchh. VIII. show that he had closely studied
the Artha-Sstra of Kautilya, the standard text-book on
ancient Hindu Polity.

Quite recently (in 1924) there has been published in South
India a fragment of a Sanskrit prose romance entitled the
Avantisundari-kath, which is ascribed to Danandin. Its learned
editor, Mr. M. R. Kavi, M. A., to whom credit is due for
having brought to light such an important work, accepts
its authorship of Danandin, whom he considers identical with
the author of the Das'ak. The romance Avantisundari-kath has
been discovered in fragmentary and worm-eaten MSS.; it is
full of lacunae, and the fragment extends to only about 25
printed pages. We shall refer to it again later on, but we
may say here that there appears to be no objection to accept
Mr. Kavi’s identification tentatively, although corroborative
evidence on this topic is certainly needed. The Kath, is accom-
ppanied by a metrical Katha-sran, probably by Danandin himself;
here we find several entirely new items of information about
our poet and his genealogy, and also about a number of other
poets who were his predecessors. According to this account, a
family of Brahmaṇas of the Kaushika gotra, originally residing
at Anandapura (in Gujarat), migrated later to Achalapura

12 There is a tradition current that Danandin composed the Kavya.
as a manual for the use of a prince to whom he was a tutor. There
is nothing improbable in such a tradition, but we are afraid we
must class it among those which are not supported by any direct
evidence. The only argument advanced is the use of the word qvb
twice in the Kavya. (I. 5, II. 172); but not much can be made out
of such a casual reference.
There one Nārāyana-Śvāmī had a son called Dāmodara aśīs Bhāravi (the author of the Kārtājūnīya). Bhāravi was a friend of king Durvinita, a Western Gaṅga prince in exile whose date is given as about 570 A. D.; he was later a court-poet of the Pallava king Simhavishṇu of Kāṇchi (Conjeeveram). Bhāravi’s son was Manoratha, who had a son named Viradatta; the last married Gaurī, and to them was born Dāṇḍin, who is thus the great-grandson of Bhāravi. Dāṇḍin lost both his parents when he was quite young; afterwards, when the Chālukyas invaded Kāṇchi, he had to flee from home and become an exile. He travelled extensively over the whole of India, and after the Pallavas had re-established themselves at Kāṇchi he came back, after a period of twelve years, and maintained the “literary prestige of his ancestors” at the court of the Pallavas. Here he composed the Acantisundari Kathā, which was revealed to him, as is related, by divine favour. This account, if true, opens up for the first time several new avenues of inquiry which strictly lie within the province of the antiquary. At present it stands alone; probably there may be fresh discoveries of hitherto lost works, which may strengthen these facts. Until such come to light, however, we may note down the above details as tentatively true, especially as they do not contradict any known particulars about Dāṇḍin; on the contrary, they lend support to the inference about Dāṇḍin being a native of South India and a person in affluent circumstances, while the date they ascribe to Dāṇḍin (about 650 A. D.) is not far removed from that arrived at by other means.

(3) The Date of Dāṇḍin.

The determination of Dāṇḍin’s date is a problem which is still enveloped in the mist of controversy. The late Prof. Wilson, who was the first scholar who gave attention to this subject, was of opinion that the author of the Das’ak. flourished in the latter part of the eleventh century, or the first part of the twelfth. He based his conclusion on two points of internal evidence. He laid great stress first on the allusions to the Yāvanas in the body of the work, and secondly on the mention of the race of Bhoja in the beginning of the eighth Uchhdbāṣa. As the Yāvanas are mentioned only as merchants or navigators or pirates, in which capacity the
Arabs were likely to have been known to the Hindus before the Mahomedan conquest, Prof. Wilson considered the fact as suggesting that the work was composed before the advent of the Mahomedans. Further, since in the last Uchchhavisa a king of the race of Bhoja is introduced wherein his grandfather Purnavarman is spoken of in terms of high praise, it implied, in Prof. Wilson's opinion, the previous existence of king Bhoja; and as the special mention of the race is intended to be complimentary to the scions of the same, he inferred that Dandin flourished at the court of one of the immediate descendants of king Bhoja who, as he held, ruled in the latter part of the tenth century. Now, these arguments have become antiquated, as they have been shown to be thoroughly unsound. The evidence afforded by the term Yasana is purely negative, and only shows that the work was composed some time before the Mahomedan conquest; how long, one cannot say. The meaning attached to the word Yasana may also be disputed, since in ancient Sanskrit works it is found applied to many different tribes of non-Hindu foreigners or Mlechchhas, and to the Ionians or Greeks. Regarding the inference drawn from the mention of king Bhoja, it may be pointed out that Bhoja is a familiar name; kings of the race of Bhoja are referred to by Kallidasa and also in the Mahabharata, and it is impossible to say with certainty which particular king the author of the Dasakam had in his mind. Prof. Wilson seems to have been misled by that tradition which made king Bhoja the patron of Dandin; the tradition is taken from the Bhoja-prabandha, which, as we have shown above, has no historical value, the work being a hotch-potch of miscellaneous literary anecdotes quite unreliable in character. It is evident, therefore, that we must seek elsewhere for the data concerning Dandin's date.

It is generally admitted that of the two older writers on Alamkara, Dandin and Vamana, Vamana came later and Dandin was his predecessor. Vamana has been placed in the latter

13. We need not go here into the question of examining in detail the arguments by which this conclusion has been arrived at, as it more strictly falls within the province of the historian of Alamkara literature. Similarly, we need not discuss the relationship of the writings of the rhetorician Bhambha with our author's Kavya, since the date of Bhambha himself is yet unsettled, and nothing can be profitably adduced in support of Dandin's time, even if we succeeded in showing that Bhambha preceded him.
half of the eighth century; Dāṇḍin, therefore, must be placed earlier than that. This fixes the latest date that can be assigned to our author, and finally disposes of the attempt of Wilson to place him two centuries later. The earliest limit is established by the fact that his Kāvyā refers by name (सबरान्त्रायाम नाखर्प महुर्न पार्वर्त बिजुः। सागर: मृत्स्मृतायार सेतुशण्ठाकि यन्तययस् ॥ I. 34) to the Prākrit poem Setubandha of king Pravarasena, who lived in the fifth century. But between these two limits of 500 A. D. and 800 A. D., it has not yet been possible to fix an absolutely definite date for our author, for lack of sufficient evidence. Attempts have been made to draw some tangible conclusions from the state of Hindu society depicted in the Das'ak., but they fail to prove anything definite. The social manners, customs and conditions depicted by Dāṇḍin, in which gamesters and courtesans play such an important part, seem to resemble those we find portrayed in the Mṛich. They do not, therefore, assist us in placing the composition of the Das'ak in any particular century, since it is a patent fact that Hindu society remained unchanged in its outward aspects, both grave and gay, during the first thousand years or so of the Christian era. Similarly, nothing can be argued from the political and geographical divisions of India referred to by Dāṇḍin, since all that can be said of them is that they belong to a period prior to the Mahomedan conquest; but how much prior, we cannot say.

If, however, we judge from the internal evidence of style, we think there will be found good grounds for placing him towards the end of the sixth century, before the time of Bāṇa, or at the most in the first half of the seventh century, as a contemporary of Bāṇa. The comparative ease and simplicity of the diction of the Das'ak. precludes the possibility of its belonging to the school of Bāṇa, as it shows no traces of the influence of the extravagant puns, immoderate conceits, and interminable compounds of that author. In its absence of artificiality, and directness of expression, the Das'ak. resembles the works of Kālidāsa or Bhāravi much more than those of Bāṇa or the later writers, to whom ślesiha, ṣakrokti and such-like figures were the very life and soul of ornate prose. To Dāṇḍin the life and soul of good prose was a profusion of compounds, and nothing more (cf. त्योऽः स्तवाच्यः-
He appears to have been one of the pioneers who introduced the new style of writing. Of the three romantic prose compositions, the Daśāk, the Kādambarī and the Vāsavadattā, the Daśāk seems to be the earliest production. The style of Subandhu and Bāṇa is more artificial and elaborate; that of Daṇḍin is not often of a high poetical elevation, as he does not aim to produce a work purely poetical but to offer an example of classical prose composition written in a language simple, elegant and intelligible. Our author belonged to that period of Sanskrit literature when style was in a transitional state, being developed from the simple to the complex and the elaborate. Had Daṇḍin lived after Bāṇa, his work could not but have received some tinge from the writings of his predecessor. His description of Rājaḥmaṇa, of the Hero and Heroine, of the education of Prince Rājavāhana &c., could not have been so tame, terse and unornamental as it is. Hence we consider that there are reasonable grounds for placing our author before Bāṇa and Subandhu. It is not possible to judge, however, as to exactly what period separated Daṇḍin from Bāṇa; perhaps they might even have been contemporaries, one writing in the south and the other in the north. Thus approximately Daṇḍin’s date may be held to lie somewhere between 550 A. D. and 650 A. D.

Recently Mr. Agashe, the editor of the Daśāk, who tries to distinguish the author of the Kāvyā, from the author of the Daśāk, has endeavoured to show that the latter wrote in the eleventh or the twelfth century of the Christian era. His principal argument is that the Daśāk is not quoted or referred to by any Sanskrit writer earlier than the tenth century. To quote his own words14: “What is more pertinent to our present inquiry is the question whether any trace of the Daśāk is found in Nṛipatūṅga’s work. Prof. Pathak refers to Nṛipatūṅga’s extolling Bāṇa’s two works, Harshacharita and Kādambarī, as masterpieces of Sanskrit prose. But there is absolutely no mention of the prose work of a Sanskrit author [viz. Daṇḍin] from whom he has borrowed so much in his own work... Is it possible that Nṛipatūṅga knew not the Daśāk, or if he did, did he deliberately ignore it? Neither of the two

14 See his Introduction, p. xxxvi. Nṛipatūṅga was a Kanarese writer who composed the Kavi-rāja-mārga, which is a work on Alāṅkāra, and to which Mr. Agashe refers.
inferences is, we think, justified. To us it appears more likely that the Das'ak. was simply non-existent. This absence of any mention in Nṛipatuvāga’s work should also suffice to dispose of the argument that this work was perhaps an earlier production.” But Mr. Agashe is here arguing by relying on merely negative evidence, which is an unsound principle in the conduct of controversies, unless it is supported by collateral circumstances. Writers on rhetorics or other critics are not bound to quote each and every book they are acquainted with, but only a selection of such as they find particularly helpful or suggestive, or otherwise deserving of mention. If anything is to be insisted upon, we can at the most say that the absence of any mention of the Das'ak. before the tenth century shows that the Das'ak. may not have become so very popular till then, and not that it “did not exist.” Scholars are well aware of the fallacy underlying such an argumentum ex silentio, who will venture to urge, for instance, that because Bāna in the introductory verses of his Harsha-Charita has not mentioned the Rāmāyaṇa, therefore the latter did not exist in his time? Mr. Agashe has placed the Kāvyādāsa in the latter half of the seventh century, and we have shown previously that there are no reasons for rejecting the common authorship of the Kāvyā and the Das'ak. Mr. Agashe’s date is based on two assumptions:—(i) that Dandin in Kāvyā. III. 114 (नालिकयमध्या परितष्ठत्वादविष्णुविना) असि काविकुत्री परस्परनिधानयुः पुष्पः is referring to the town of Kāincl or Conjeeveram and its kings of the Pallava Dynasty; (ii) and that the King Rājavarman (or Rātavarman) mentioned in Kāvyā. II. 279 (द्वितीय साकात् त्रैं राज्य यद्दश्रयनः.) is identical with a certain Pallava prince who ruled over Kāincl in South India in the latter half of the seventh century. Unfortunately, however, the existence of a king of that name has not at all been proved; it is the result of mere conjecture. Another attempt of Mr. Agashe to support this date (viz. 650 A.D.) is also equally based on mere conjectural speculation and guess-work. Thus, the S’ārūgadharapaddhāti quotes the verse “नालिकयमध्या परितष्ठत्वादविष्णुविना।” असि काविकुत्री परस्परनिधानयुः पुष्पः as composed by the poetess Vijjākā, with reference to the introductory sloka of the Kāvyādāsa. Mr. Agashe has tried to identify this Vijjākā with a certain queen Vijayā of the Karnāṭaka, whose date is given at about 650 A.D.; but it is an attempt based on conjecture. As it is, both the
lines of inquiry pursued by Mr. Agashe converge to the same date (650 A. D.), which is not far removed from the date we ourselves have tentatively offered above. Very recently new light has been shed on this discussion by the discovery of the *Avantisundarikathā* (see supra, p. xvi), which seems to strengthen the conclusions of Mr. Agashe. According to that work, Bhāravi flourished at about 570 A. D.; so Daṅdin, who was Bhāravi’s great-grandson, and was a court-poet of the Pallava kings of Kāśchat, will have to be placed at about 650 A. D. This date, if established by further incontestable testimony, will remove once for all the veil of uncertainty hanging over the time when our author lived and composed his works; but for that we must await further research.


There is abundant evidence to show that in the case of many ancient Sanskrit writers known to literary fame, only a few of their productions have survived the lapse of time; the rest have disappeared for ever, except in those rare instances where the ceaseless efforts of scholars have brought to light MSS. of works supposed to have been no longer extant. Something similar has happened in the case of our author, too. Daṅdin has long been recognized as the author of two works, the Kāvyā and the Daśak.; but to the question whether he wrote any more, no answer could definitely be made. The question is one of particular importance, for in the *Śārūgdhara-paddhati* we have a verse ascribed to Rājas’ekhara which declares that Daṅdin wrote *three* works, all of them of surpassing literary merit (त्रिपदाक्षणे देवान्तर्गीतिः राजायुक्त विष्णु: || श्रीमः. पृ. 174). Rājas’ekhara’s explicit statement is not one to be easily set aside, and it has called forth a display of considerable ingenuity on the part of scholars who have sought to attribute this or that work to Daṅdin, as a complement of the triad of which the Kāvyā and the Daśak. are two. Thus, it was pointed out by some that perhaps the third work was either छन्दोविषिष्ठिति or कलापरिष्कर्ष्य, since in the Kāvyā, Daṅdin apparently refers,15 by

15 Cf. छन्दोविषिष्ठिति स्कन्दसत्तमादेशं निरालितः || सा विषा नैरित-स्तीर्थदुः सर्वभीरः कायासारस || I. 12; and हर्मय कलाशस्वतिरीति: सार्व वीरशायुः. तत्यसः: कलापरिष्कर्ष्यः क्लमविषिष्ठिति || III. 171.
these titles, to some other compositions. These references, however, read somewhat ambiguous, and do not convince us as to whether Daṇḍin has referred to them as his own works, or as some treatises well known to his readers by those names. *Chhandowichiti*, for instance, is a common name for the subject of prosody or any text-book thereon, and might as well apply to the *Chhandāhūtra* of Piṅgala or some similar work. The title *Kalāparichchheda* is still more obscure; perhaps Daṇḍin might have intended to write a fourth chapter of his *Kāvyā*, bearing that title, in which case it could not count as an independent work, being a part of the *Kāvyā* itself. Then the late Prof. Pischel had advanced the somewhat bold theory that the *Mṛichchhakāvī* was to be regarded as the missing work of Daṇḍin. His main reasons were two:—(1) that the verse लिंगगतिः समोकाशि etc., which occurs in the *Kāvyā* (II. 226), occurs also in the *Mṛich*. (I. 34), pointing to the probability of both the works being by the same author; and (ii) that the state of society described in the *Mṛich* closely resembles that described in the *Das'ak*. But the discovery of the works of Bhāsa, in which the verse लिंगपूर्वि etc. occurs twice, nullified the former argument; and as regards the latter, it is easy to see how very preposterous it would be to ascribe any two different works to the same writer simply because of the similarity of the society portrayed therein.

Prof. Pischel's theory received in fact very little support from scholars, and is now happily consigned to oblivion.16 Some Pandits have tried to ascribe the drama *Mallikā-mārūta* 17 to our poet; but the drama has been shown to be the work of one Uddanḍa Raṅganātha, who wrote in Malabar in the fifteenth century A.D. This Raṅganātha must have been an admirer of our author, as is seen from his having copied several incidents of the *Das'ak* in his play; but his date, which has been proved beyond any doubt, shows the utter impossibility of Daṇḍin having been its author.

Which, then, are we to consider as the third work of Daṇḍin? We have already referred to the recent discovery in south India of a fragmentary prose romance, styled the अभिदिष्टवन्द्रीका, which is ascribed to our author by its editor.

---

16 See pp. xvi.—xvii of our Introduction to the *Mṛich*. for a further discussion of this point.

17 Edited and published by Pandit Jibanand Vidyasagar of Calcutta in 1878.
The fragment is really too short to enable us to give any decided opinion; but from the portion that is now available, its claim to be treated as the third work of Dandin does not appear to be quite groundless. The _Avantisundarīkathā_ is in fact the same story that we find in the _Das'ak_, with this difference that the Avanti is written in a distinctly elaborate and highly polished style, by the side of which the _Das'ak_ pales into comparative mediocrity. It may be that the _Das'ak_ was the earliest production of our author, who in his riper and maturer years re-wrote and elaborated the same into the _Avantisundarīkathā_. The style of the latter work bears the impress of a master-hand and presents a picture not unworthy of a great poet. We close here a few passages from which the student may judge for himself:—

(4) शरदिव सरसा कामहुस्यहुस्य्य हेमन्त्यालुइरियः वाल्लिकां दारमानां।
शिखरमयिर नवन्नर्तिक कस्तचतुर्वचनामुखिः तन्तुलातुल समस्पृंदित्यः
किमातर्तिर्तियेय नदलस्वभावस्य सर्वार्त्तिर्तियेयं रतितियं
दुर्कास्य शाळस्य स्तम्भस्य रूपलोक विद्वेष्टिर् तद्भावित्य युक्तकेशस्य
ढारिर्क धनाभिन्यः देवसेनेव सेनायेः। राहिनि युक्तभावनाय असुम्योताप
रहित भा देभी वनमस्ति नाम। p. 13

(5) पत्तिमुलस्यस्तुकुलस्यकौटिकाविविष्ठतिनामानि भालिनार्मयः क्रमानि।
चक्रोवलो नन्दकृष्णारीकः सर्वस्वप्निचलिङ्गसीर्यतिकरः
जल्ववनक्षरस्वाचकस्तु। रुचिल्प निरुपेनि ज्ञान वारियेऽं श्रीदातागर्भस्तत्र।
न हि विवेकः कृष्णतस्य। जलमधे मेंमात्रांस्तू हेलकलाङः। स्थान दृष्टः
युगांश्च समार्थयाश्चु। etc.। p. 16

(6) ताँ च भ्रात्माप्राणारामालिकाद्विभाविनिश्चातामास्तु। वर्णसंख्या
कुरुक्षेत्रलक्ष्मीनाथिमी। लक्ष्मीनाथस्य कीर्तिच्याति: केतकहीर्वलस्यगुणितः
वर्णपाराभिम:। ग्रहितामलकायिष्ठतालाहिकः। आदिनेत्रभरमजरमल्या
पाणिनि:। कुरुक्षेत्रिनाथिनीविविष्ठिन्तिमयिमानि।
रक्तपुणेशु नदवचचलिहस्य रक्तचित्रेशु रक्तलिहस्य चर्चावशास्त्रात्सरस्वतोत्तरलोकेऽ
कीर्तिपार्थित्विविष्ठाः। pp. 18-19.

(7) कुमुदशरादराकृतिविविद्विन्धुस्यवितारिणीवलकविविविष्ठिनामां धोमनतः।
पत्तिनाथाः इसमालाः वर्णाभिन्नममाहिंसात्सरस्तं सभिभिन्नमनस्चातारालिनहुस्य
सन्यासी। वारिये तीर्थींचलोप्रवेशी। मनोगृहो दृष्टः। वाहिनीस्तु
समाप्तिच्याति: श्रवणिना चक्रवर्तानुन्तकमुकुस्यामितिए
शास्त्रावितालित्वपरमकिंचिनिमयिमानि। कल्याणिकास्य सकल्पाकृतिकौ-कृतिकारिणी।
कर्तवीतारात्मस्य क्रियावलितम: शास्त्रावित्तमयोभिने। द्विगुणसेनीयोऽ
शास्त्रावितानि। सरासारचं प्रतापकार्यी। सामान्तियतपरित्युत्नि। नेपतालानि
विद्वानः दुर्लभ्यत नमोकृतविवेकानमने। द्वर्तवायुः कुमुदिनातू विवेकाः। शरदी
esto.esto।p.20.
All thanks are due to Mr. M. R. Kavi, M. A., the learned editor of the Avanti, for bringing to light this hitherto unknown work, which is obviously the production of a highly gifted writer. There appears to be no reason for denying Mr. Kavi's ascription of it to Dandin, and we may, therefore, tentatively accept that romance as the missing third work of the author of the Dasakumâracharita.

III. THE DASAKUMÂRACHARITA.

(1) THE PLOT.

The student, who has to study this book for examination purposes, will be required to keep in mind the bare thread of the narrative of the Das'ak, in order to understand the sequence of the whole. We, therefore, give below, for ready reference, a very brief summary of the entire plot as presented in the various Uchchhvîsas:

(The Pu' rvapîthika')

Uch. I. Râjadhamas, a benevolent and accomplished monarch, ruled in Pashpapurî, the capital of the kingdom of Magadha. His queen, a peerless beauty, was named Vasumatî. He had three ministers, Dharmapâla, Padmodbhava and Sitavarman by name, who held their offices by hereditary succession. Of these Dharmapâla had three sons, Sumantra, Sumitra and Kâmapâla; Padmodbhava had two, Sus'ruta and Ratnodbhava; and Sitavarman two, Sumati and Satyavarman. Kâmapâla turned out a vagabond and led a life of dissolute profligacy. Ratnodbhava, engaged in foreign trade, constantly performed distant voyages; while Satyavarman, disgusted with the world, went on a pilgrimage to foreign parts. The remaining four brothers succeeded to the ministerial offices held by their fathers.

War once broke out between Râjadhamas and Mûnasûra, king of Mâlwa. Râjadhamas was, in the first instance, victorious, but was finally defeated and obliged to take shelter in a forest of the Vindhyâ mountains. There he approached a sage, Vâmadeva by name, for the recovery of his lost kingdom. The sage advised him to live there for a few years, which he did accordingly. His four ministers followed him in his retreat, and here his wife gave birth to a son, Râjavîhana. About the same time the four ministers also got sons—that
of Sumati was named Praúti, of Sumantra Mitragupta, of Sumittra Mantragupta, and of Susrúta Viśruta. While Rájahamsa was residing in the forest, there were brought to him, on different occasions, five other young boys, making, with the sons of the ministers and Rájavahana, the "Ten Kumaras" of the story. Thus:—(1) Prabháravarman, the king of Mithilá, was a friend and ally of Rájahamsa. On the defeat of the latter, Prabhára, beat a hasty retreat towards his own country. But on his way he was attacked by the foresters (Sábaras) and lost his baggage and attendants. His two sons were separated from him in this skirmish. One of them was rescued from the Sábaras by a Brahmana, who took him to Rájahamsa. The latter called him Upaháravarman, and brought him up along with the other princes. (2) On another occasion the King came across the second son of Pránára, whom he took under his protection, naming him Apaháravarman. (3) Ratnadbbhava was shipwrecked when voyaging with his wife. The latter was delivered of a son, but owing to an accident the boy was separated from his mother. A Brahmana saved him and brought him to the King, who bestowed on him the name of Pushpadbhava. (4) Kámapála had married Tárávali, the daughter of a Yaksha-chief. Tárávali brought her son to the queen of Rájahamsa; this boy was called Arthaúla. (5) The son of Satyavarman was rescued from a river into which he had been thrown by his step-mother in jealousy. This boy was brought to Rájahamsa who had him named Somadatta. These ten boys, thus assembled, were educated together, and became adepts in all the necessary arts and sciences.

UCA. II. As the princes had now all grown up, the King, in accordance with the advice of the sage Vamadeva, sent them on a campaign 'to conquer the world' (digvijaya). They departed accordingly, and for a time journeyed together; but when in the Vindhyá forest, Prince Rájavahana was induced by a stranger Bráhmaúa to leave his companions secretly and to assist him in obtaining the sovereignty, of the Pátála, which was foretold for him by god Śiva in a vision. Accordingly the two left secretly for Pátála through a chasm in the earth. The enterprise succeeded; but when the prince returned to the spot where he had left his companions, he found them all gone. Alarmed by his inexplicable disappearance they had left in various directions in quest of him. [The adventures
they met with before their re-union with Rājavāhana are narrated subsequently, and lend its title to our romance.] Roaming in search of his friends, Rājavāhana came to Ujjayini where in a garden he encountered Somadatta, accompanied by a splendid retinue and a beautiful damsel. Upon being asked by Rājavāhana, Somadatta began to narrate his adventures.

UCH. III. King Mattakāla of the Lātā country had invaded the territory of king Viraketu of Ujjayini with a view to compel the latter to give his daughter, Vāmalochanā, in marriage to him (Matta.). Somadatta ranged himself on the side of Viraketu, defeated the forces of Mattakāla, and succeeded in killing him in single combat. Overwhelmed by gratitude, Viraketu gave his daughter to Somadatta, and also adopted him as his Yuvarāja (heir-apparent.) While Soma with his bride was going to the temple of Mahākāla, in accordance with the instructions of an astrologer, he was met by Rājavāhana.—When Somadatta had finished his narrative, there arrived on the scene Pushpodbhava, who, being requested, next proceeded to unfold his tale.

UCH. IV. After wandering for several days, Pushpodbhava once saw a man falling from a precipice in front of him; this proved to be Ratnodbhava, who had been shipwrecked sixteen years ago and was separated from his wife on that occasion. Being unable to bear his grief any longer, he tried to commit suicide, when his son found him. Shortly after that, as good luck would have it, Pushpodbhava prevented a woman from immolating herself in fire; she proved to be his mother. After being thus re-united with his parents, Pushpodbhava journeyed on to Ujjayini, where he made friends with a rich merchant called Bandhupāla. There he fell in love with his daughter Bālachandrikā, who returned his affection. She was, however, sought in marriage by Prince Dāruvarman, whom she detested for his violence. So, under Pushpodbhava’s advice, she gave out that her person was possessed by a Yaksha and that she would marry that brave man who would free her from the evil spirit. Dāruvarman tried to defy the Yaksha and to win Bālachandrikā, when Pushp., disguised as her female attendant, killed him, and rushed out of the chamber exclaiming that the Yaksha had killed Dāruvarman. In the tumult which followed, he slipped out with Bāla., and they
were married a few days later. The arrival of Rājavāhana was made known to Pushp by Bandhupūla who was an expert in foretelling events by the observation of omens.—At the end of his narrative, Rājavāhana along with Somadatta and Pushp. repaired to Ujjiyañī, where he disguised himself as the son of a Brāhmaṇa, and soon earned distinction by his high attainments.

UCH. V. Dwelling in Ujjiyañī, Rājavāhana once beheld Avantisundarī, the lovely daughter of king Mānasāra, the foe of his father Rājahamsa. The prince and the princess were equally smitten with love at the sight of each other. Now, Mānasāra had abdicated the kingdom in favour of his son Darpaśāra, who too had retired to practise penance after appointing his cousins Dāruvarman and Chaṇḍavarman as joint regents; of these the former was killed by Pushpodhava, so that Chaṇḍavarman was left the sole ruler. Rājavāhana and Avantisundarī were legally married in the presence of the fire through the contrivance of a friendly conjuror, who made Chaṇḍi. believe at that time that the marriage was a delusion, being part of a magic show. Thereafter Rāja. and Avan-retired into the inner apartments for sport.

(The Das'akuma'rahārita)

UCH. I. The two lovers were discovered by the attendants and reported to Chaṇḍavarmanā, who got furious when he recognized Rāja. as the friend of Pushpodhava, the husband of the wicked Bālachandrikā on whose account his brother was killed. Chaṇḍavarmanā wanted to execute Rāja. immediately; but the old king Mānasāra intervened, and so Rāja. was temporarily kept imprisoned in a wooden cage, pending the final orders of king Darpaśāra. In the meanwhile, Chaṇḍavarmanā marched against Simhavarmanā, the king of the Aṅgas; whose daughter he wanted to wed; Rājavāhana had to accompany the invading army in his wooden cage. Chaṃpā, the capital city of the Aṅgas, was besieged, and Simhavarmanā was vanquished and taken captive along with his daughter. Just then the orders of Darpaśāra were received, sanctioning the execution of Rājavāhana. Accordingly, the prince was taken out for being trampled to death under the feet of an elephant but just at the moment the chain tied round his feet fell off and assumed the form of a nymph who had been cursed into
that form by a sage. While Rāja, thus became free, a cry arose that Chandavarmā was killed in a mêlée by a thief; this thief turned out to be Rāja's friend and companion Apahāravarmā. In the meanwhile, several allies of king Simhavarmā, that were invited by him for help, arrived on the scene with their forces, so that the safety of him and his daughter was assured. Among these allies, Rājavāhana found all the rest of his missing companions, and by his desire they severally narrated to him their adventures; of these Apahāravarmā was the first to recount his tale, with which the next chapter begins.

Uch. II. In the course of his wanderings Apahāra came across the sage Marichi, from whom he sought to obtain the tidings of his master Rājavāhana. The sage promised him help and asked him to abide in the city of Champa; at the same time he related to Apahāra, his own adventures: how he was beguiled into her love by a courtesan named Kāmamāñjari who won a wager by succeeding in enticing him into the meshes of her charms and thereafter repudiated him and made him a laughing-stock of the people. After spending a night at Marichi's hermitage, Apahāra proceeded to Champa; on his way there he made friends with Vimardaka, a gentleman who was one of the victims of Kāmamāñjari who had stripped him of all his possessions and made him a beggar. Apahāra promised help to Vimardaka in redeeming his lost fortune, and himself took to the profession of a gamester and a burglar. On one of his nightly sallies he met a beautiful maiden, Kulapālikā by name, the daughter of one Kuberadatta. Her father had first promised her in marriage to Dhanamitra, who, however, became poor afterwards through his princely charities. Kulapālikā loved Dhanamitra, but her father cancelled the old arrangement and wanted to bestow her upon one Arthapatī; and she was then going to Dhanamitra's house from her home to avoid that marriage. Apahāravarmā met her in the dark of the night. He promised to help her, and took her to her lover; the two then went back with her to her father's house, which they plundered, they left her at home, but on their way burgled Arthapatī's house. In consequence of these troubles the marriage was postponed for one month. Apahāra, enriched Dhanamitra with the proceeds of his robberies; a story was
then got up and circulated to the effect that Dhanamitra was in possession of a magic purse or leather-bag which daily produced immense gold. On hearing of this KuberaDatta gave his daughter to Dhanamitra.

Apaharavarma fell in love with Ragamanañjari, the younger sister of Kamamañjari, whose consent for the union he obtained by promising to procure for her that magic purse, provided she fulfilled one condition necessary for its being fruitful, viz. that she restored their wealth to all those persons whom she had reduced to poverty. She agreed, and thus Vimardaka got back what he had lost. The purse came to Kamamañjari; but Dhanamitra having reported its theft to the king, she had to return it to him; and, to save herself from punishment, she gave out, under Apahara's instructions, that the purse was given to her by Arthapati. Arthapati was in consequence expelled the country and his property confiscated.

On one night, in a fit of foolhardiness, Apahara attacked the patrolling police and was made a prisoner; his jailer Kantaka, who was enamoured of the princess Ambalika, utilized the services of this expert burglar to dig a subterranean passage from the prison to the palace. Apahara excavated the passage, but managed to kill Kantaka, and himself visited the apartment of the princess Ambalika, with whom he fell in love; but, as she was asleep, he returned without awakening her. Afterwards, when Chañdavarma besieged Champa and took her captive along with her father, Apahara came to the rescue and killed Chañdavarma in a fight. Later on he was met by Rajavahana, as was foretold to him by the sage Marichi.

Uch. III. Upaharavarma next began his story. He had gone to his own country Videha in search of Rajavahana. There met his old nurse, who related to him how his father's kingdom had been seized by Vikaṭavarman and other sons of his elder brother and how his parents had been imprisoned by them. Upaharavarma resolved to effect their release, and through the medium of his nurse's daughter managed to win the affection of Vikaṭavarman's queen, who was offended by the dissolute habits of her husband. At the instance of Upahara, she persuaded Vikaṭavarman to undertake to perform a magical rite whereby he might exchange his body, which
was ugly and deformed, for a most beautiful one. He readily fell into the trap, and was killed by Upahāra, who then boldly usurped the throne, pretending to be the old king metamorphosed. He succeeded in deceiving all, including even his ministers, and reversed all the iniquitous deeds of the former occupant of the throne. He then released his parents, and made his father the king; and himself becoming the Yuvarāja, he led an army to the assistance of his ally Simhavaimā, when he met Rāja in Champā.

UCH. IV. Arthapāla next narrated his account. He had gone to Kāsi, where he met a certain man in great distress, who related to him the story of Kāmapāla who was the minister of the King of Kāsi and whom Arthapāla knew to be his father and the husband of that Tārāvalī (the Yaksha damsel) who had made him over to queen Vasumāti. Kāmapāla was appointed minister by the old king Chandrasimha of Kāsi; but the new king Simhagha, who was an evil-minded youth without judgement, had dismissed Kāmapāla and sentenced him to death. On hearing this, Arthapāla determined to effect the release of his father. He secured a poisonous snake, and when his father was being led to be put to death, he dropped it on his head, so that it bit him and he fell down senseless. Arthapāla knew anti-poison charms by means of which he counteracted the effect of the poison; and having removed the apparently dead body with the permission of the king, he restored Kāmapāla to life. They then concerted a plan for the overthrow of Simhagha. Arthapāla excavated a subterranean passage to the royal palace; this passage opened in an underground chamber where dwelt princess Maṇikarnikā, whose attendants requested Arthapāla to wed her. Arthapāla promised to do so, and entered the royal apartments, where he found the king asleep. He took him captive and carried him to Kāmapāla, who then administered the kingdom. Arthapāla married Maṇikarnikā, became installed Yuvarāja, and led an army to the assistance of the king of the Aṅgas, when he met Rāja in Champā.

UCH. V. Thereafter Pramati proceeded to describe his adventures. While on his journey he was benighted in a forest of the Vindhya mountains, where, commending himself to the guardian-deity of the place for protection, he lay down
for repose under a true. While asleep, he fancied himself transported to a palace where he beheld a lovely maiden with whom he immediately fell in love. On awakening he was wondering whether it was a dream or a delusion, when a nymph appeared and told him how it was all real, and how she had carried him asleep to the chamber of princess Navamālikā of Śrāvasti, who was the damsel seen by him. The nymph, who was none other than Tārāvalī, the wife of Kāmapāla, prophesied success for him in his suit and then took her departure. Pramati then proceeded to Śrāvasti. On his way he met a Brāhmaṇa at a cock-fight, and made friends with him. These two hatched a plan; the Brāhmaṇa took Pramati, dressed in female garb as his daughter, to the king, and left her under his protection, while he went off to find out the youth to whom he professed to have betrothed her. In the palace Pramati won the affection of Navamālikā; afterwards one day he disappeared and joined the Brāhmaṇa. The latter then went to the king with Pramati as his intended son-in-law, and demanded to see his daughter. The King was not of course able to produce her, whereupon the Brāhmaṇa threatened to immolate himself in the fire. The king was then forced to offer his own daughter to Pramati, in order to pacify the Brāhmaṇa. Pramati thus became the son-in-law of the king and soon won his confidence. While he was leading his troops to succour Simhavarmā, he met his friend Rājavāhana.

Uch. VI. Next it was the turn of Mitragupta to narrate his adventures. He had journeyed to the Suhma country and arrived at its capital Dāmalipta. The King of the Suhmas, by the favour of the goddess Dārgā, had obtained two children, one son (Bhīmādhanvā) and one daughter (Kandukāvatī), on condition that the former should be subordinate to the husband of the latter, and that the husband should be chosen by her at an annual festival where she was to play in public with a ball (kanduka). That being the time of the festival, Mitragupta went to behold it, and the princess happened to choose him; but this roused the ire of Bhīmādhanvā, who did not like to see himself subordinated to a stranger. So Mitragupta was seized by his orders, and cast into the sea. He was luckily picked up by a passing Yavana vessel; the Yavanas wanted to hold him as a slave, but their ship was
attacked by another, and Mitragupta fought valiantly on their behalf and routed the assailants; so he was treated by them with great respect and given his freedom. Bhimadhanvā turned out to be the captain of the attacking ship and was taken prisoner. The ship was driven by a contrary gale to an island, where they cast anchor and Mitragupta landed ashore. He there met a Rākshasa who threatened to devour him unless he answered his four questions. They were—What is naturally cruel? What contributes best to the happiness of a house-holder? What is love? And, What is the best means of achieving difficult things? His answers were, in order:—The heart of a woman; The virtues of the wife; The determination to possess; and Talent. He illustrated his answers by four stories, each having a woman for the heroine, viz.: Dhāmini, Gomini, Nimbavatī and Nitambavatī (see pp. 157-170). The Rākshasa was pleased with the replies. Just then another Rākshasa was found carrying along a struggling maiden by the aerial path; she was rescued, and proved to be Kandukāvatī, Mitragupta’s destined bride. Mitragupta then set sail and arrived at Dāmalīpta, where he was welcomed as his son-in-law by the old king. The latter was an ally of Simhavarmā; so Mitragupta was dispatched to his aid with an army, when he met Rājavahana in Champā.

Uch. VII. It was the turn of Mantragupta next to relate his story. He had gone to the country of Kaliṅga where in a cemetery he rescued the princess of Kaliṅga, Kanakalekhā by name, from the hands of a Siddha (a sorcerer) who had procured her presence through a goblin, and who was about to kill and sacrifice her for obtaining miraculous powers. Mantragupta fell in love with the princess, and accompanied her to the palace, where he lived in her apartment without being discovered. Now Kardana, the king of Kaliṅga, once went with his family to spend a few days by the sea-side. There he was attacked and taken captive by Jayaimha, the king of Aṇḍhra. Mantragupta wanted to rescue him, and soon found the necessary means. It happened that Jayaimha wished to wed Kanakalekhā, but a report had got abroad that she was possessed by an evil spirit (Yaksha) who had to be exorcized first. Mantragupta disguised himself as a great ascetic and offered his help to the King in driving away the Yaksha. It was planned that
the king should bathe in a lake, when, by virtue of Mantragupta's magical rites, he would emerge with his body metamorphosed, and would then be enabled to combat the Yaksha. Accordingly, Jayasimha entered the lake, when Mantragupta contrived to kill him, and himself issued forth as the metamorphosed King. Thereupon he found no difficulty in releasing Kardana and the princess; the former became the king of both the A'ndhras and the Kali'gas, and the latter was married to Mantragupta. Coming to the assistance of Simhavarmā, he met Rājavāhana. [The whole story is narrated without the use of any labial letters, which is a literary tour de force; a poetical reason for Mantragupta's avoidance of labials will be found given on p. 172, 1. 2].

UoN. VIII. Vis'ruta now narrated his adventures, being the last of the series. While wandering through the Vindhya forest he came upon a young boy attended by an old man. The boy was the young prince of Vidarbha. His father Anantavarma kept vicious company, and owing to his dissolute habits neglected the affairs of the state; he was thereupon attacked by Vasantabhānu, a neighbouring prince who killed him and usurped his throne. On the death of Anantavarmā, his queen Vasumādhara with her daughter Mañjuvādinī and son Bhāskaravarmā went to stay with Mitravarma, king of Māhishmati, who was the half-brother of her husband. Mitravarma, however, was discovered to be a treacherous ally, and the queen sent her son away with an attendant, with instructions to the latter to take the prince to a place of safety. Vis'ruta listened to their account, and discovering that the prince was distantly related to himself, promised him help in recovering his lost kingdom. Learning from a forester that a marriage was being arranged in Māhishmati by Mitravarma between Mañjuvādinī and Prachandavarmā, Vis'ruta sent the old servant back to queen Vasumādhara, asking her to spread a false report about her son's death; he also sent her a poisoned necklace with which she was to kill Mitravarma and then to await his (Vis'ruta's) arrival. Vis'ruta himself shortly afterwards arrived in the city, accompanied by the prince, and for a while took up the disguise of a mendicant. He soon found an opportunity to kill Prachandavarmā; he thereafter repaired to the temple of Durgā; entering, he hid himself underneath the pedestal of
the idol. The queen arrived there according to a preconcerted plan; she had already given out that owing to the favour of the goddess—as revealed in a vision—her dead son would return to her alive on that day in the temple. Vis'ruta issued forth with the prince from the interior of the temple, and announced to the assembled people that the prince was under the special protection of the goddess, who was pleased to send him back to them as their lawful ruler. Thus Bhāskaravarmā was recognized as the king of Māhishmatī; and Vis'ruta, marrying Māñjuvādini, became the king's chief adviser, and conducted the affairs of the kingdom for him.

(The UttaraPāṭhika)

Vis'ruta next directed his attention to the task of restoring Bhāskaravarmā to his paternal throne of Vidarbha, which had been seized by Vasantabhānu. He led an expedition against the latter, and killed him in single combat; thus the road was clear for Bhāskaravarmā's succession, and Vis'ruta's efforts were crowned with fruition. When coming to the help of Simhavarmā, he met Rājavāhana in Champā.

On the termination of these narratives, there arrived a messenger from the old King Rājahamsa, the father of Rājavāhana, with a letter. Rājahamsa was struck with grief when he had heard of the sudden disappearance of his son and the consequent dispersal of the band of the princes; but he had been comforted by the sage Vāmadeva prophesying that they would all return safe and sound after sixteen years. That period had now elapsed, and the sage having told him how they had all assembled at Champā, he desired them to start at once to see him. In obedience to this mandate the princes set out for Pushpapura. Coming to Ujjayini they defeated and killed Mānasāra and took possession of the kingdom of Mālwā. After that they repaired to Pushpapura. The old king was highly pleased to see them, and having distributed among them the various kingdoms they had won, he retired from public life. Then Rājavāhana became the king of the united kingdoms of Pushpapura and Ujjayini; the princes governed their respective principalities with justice, and all lived happily ever afterwards.
(2) The Three Parts of The Present Text.

The complete available text of the Daśak, a summary of which has been given above, presents one curious feature in that it consists of three separate fragments, known respectively as the Pārvapīṭhikā (in 5 Uchchhīvāsas), the Daś'akumāra-charita proper (in 8 Uch.), and the Uttarapīṭhikā (in 1 Uch., or rather, not divided into any Uch.). Of these three, only the middle portion is believed to have been from the pen of Daśdin himself. As the student will have noticed, it begins abruptly in the middle of the story of Ra'javāhana, and also ends abruptly, leaving Vis'ruta's narrative unfinished; the word das'a in the title of the work is proof enough to show that two more tales are lacking in the middle portion as it is extant at present. It is impossible to give any satisfactory explanation of how the original work of Daśdin came to be in such a fragmentary state. In the case of Bāna's Ka'ḍambari, which originally ended abruptly, we know that it was the author's death which left it incomplete, as we have been told by his son who composed its supplement or the Uttarabhāga. But concerning the Daśak, the writers who have provided the Supplements have offered no explanations, and we are left to surmise the probable cause best as we may. It is patent on the face of it, that the Daś'ak, once existed in a complete state; for, though an author may sometimes leave his work incomplete towards the end, he would scarcely begin it abruptly in the middle. Later, owing to some accident or other, a considerable portion in the beginning and in the end came to be lost; and either the disciples of Daśdin, or some other admirers of his work, who must have remembered how the missing portion read, supplied the deficiency to the best of their abilities. That the Pārvapīṭhikā and the Uttarapīṭhikā, as printed here, are not by the same hand that wrote the Daś'ak, will be clear when we carefully examine them. The Pārva, from its length, appears to be

18 Mr. M. R. Kavi, the editor of the Avantisundarikathā, has offered another explanation which is also possible. According to him, the original work of Daśdin was translated in Telugu by about 1250 A. D.; and, when the original could not be found complete, some skilful scholar must have re-translated the Pārva back-wards into Sanskrit from that translation.
an ambitious work, and its author has done his best to imitate the style of Daṇḍin; nevertheless it lacks the grace and felicity of the original part. The author seems to have acquired greater skill in composition as he proceeded with his narrative, for its earlier Úchchhvasas are cruder and less polished than the later ones. There are, moreover, discrepancies between the Pûrva. and the Daśak. proper, that stamp the former as being the work of a different writer. The following are the more important among these discrepancies:—(i) In the Pûrva. Arthapa'la is stated to be the son of Ka'mapa'la from his wife Ta'ra'vali; the Daśak. (Uch. IÍ') makes him the son of Ka'mapa'la from his wife Ka'ntimati. (ii) The Pûrva. makes Pramati the son of Sumati; the Daśak. shows him as the son of Ka'mapa'la. (iii) The account given of the nurse of Upaha'ravarman in the Pûrva. differs in several details from that found in Uch. III. of the Daśak. Similarly, there are variations between the Uttarapâthikâ and the preceding portion of the work, as for example the reference to Ma'nasâra on p. 215 is not in agreement with what has been stated before. Such details confirm us in our suspicion that the beginning and the end of the Daśak. have been supplied by later writers; even their names have remained unknown, and it is therefore natural that in MSS. the entire work should be frequently found ascribed to Daṇḍin.

Before concluding, it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that there have been many writers who have tried to compose similar supplements. Thus, Mr. Agashe has printed in his edition a small Pûrvapâthikâ, by one Bhaṭṭa-Nâra'yaṇa; he claims that it is a better piece of work than the current Pûrvapâthikâ. It seems to us, however, to be quite an inferior production, reading almost like a school-boy's summary; and it is far less fitted to stand as part of the well-finished, easy-flowing work of Daṇḍin. As regards the Uttarapâthikâ, the first ed. of the Daśak. issued by the Nîrî. press contained a version (called therein Daśakumâra-chaitas'eha) by Chakrapa'ṇi; this was the same version which was accessible to Prof. Wilson, and on which he commented adversely. It is of considerable length, and its style does not accord with Daṇḍin's in purity and vigour; it was therefore omitted in subsequent editions, and the
current Uttarapithika·, which is a more suitable and concise production, substituted in its place; the author of this Uttara.
is, however, unknown. There is a third Uttarapithikā by one Padmanābha, which is printed at Madras, and a fourth
one, ascribed to Pandit Gopinātha, exists in MS. It will thus be seen that criticism on Daṇḍin's work will only be
pertinent when it is made with reference to the main body of the text as it is available in its eight Uchchhvasas.

(3) General and Critical Remarks.

The Daśak. has long enjoyed a well deserved popularity in India both on account of its easy style and its attractive
subject-matter. Daṇḍin is a writer of great merit and considerable literary attainments; the high esteem in which
he is held by Indian scholars is shown by the number of current Sūhba'sliitas (cf. some quoted by us supra p. x) eulogizing
him for his pre-eminent position among Sanskrit poets. Like the great masters Kālidāsa, Bāṇa and Bhavabhūti, he has a
perfect command over language. As a lover of nature and a descriptive poet, he is inferior to the three great authors
just named, but inferior to them only. His descriptions of the first meeting between Rājavāhana and Avantisundari,
Pramati's account of the unknown princess, Kandukāvatī's play at the ball, &c., are very fair specimens of descriptive
composition. Of the whole collection the story of Apabhra- varman is the best, being richer in varied incidents, and that
of Mitragupta would rank next. Daṇḍin's mastery over the art of writing short stories is illustrated by the vividly
picturesque group of four stories narrated in response to the demand of the Rākshasa in Uch. VI.

The plot of the Daśak. seems to the whole to be of the poet's own invention, and does not appear to have been
borrowed from or based on any older accounts. It is, however, probable that in some minor particulars Daṇḍin
might have received hints from other sources, legendary or historical. The Brihatkathā of Gūṇādhya has long been
recognized in India as a veritable mine of fable-literature on which later authors have drawn repeatedly and copiously.
for the material of their works. If we examine the Bṛihat-kāthā (as summarized in the Kāthāsaritsāgara or the Bṛihat-kāthāmañjalī), we do not find any wholesale borrowing on the part of Daṇḍin anywhere. There are, however, certain similar incidents in both the Daśak. and the Bṛihat-kāthā, from which it may be argued that Daṇḍin’s writing is occasionally reminiscent of Guṇāḍhyā. Mr. Agashe has collected together several of these similarities, among which we may mention the prostitute’s mother remonstrating with her daughter (pp. 66–68), the snatching of an anklet off the foot of a woman (p. 169), and the visit of the prince to the nether regions (p. 64). But these are mere hints, not complete stories, and they do not detract from the originality of Daṇḍin’s plot. The accounts of Rājāhamsa’s kingdom being usurped by Mānasāra and the overthrow of Vasantabhānu (in Uch. VIII.) are understood by some to be based on certain contemporary historical events, though it is impossible to establish that Daṇḍin was referring to any particular historical personages. If there are any historical allusions in the Daśak., they are too slight, and made casually in passing; the groundwork of the Daśak is not historical, but fictitious; and in the evolution of his narratives Daṇḍin cannot be held to be indebted to any previous author or authors, though he may have here and there unconsciously borrowed a phrase or an incident from the Bṛihat-kāthā. He is fully entitled to the credit of having created an original romance of great interest and charm in which the life of the middle class as well as of the ruling caste is portrayed with discrimination and a due sense of proportion.

Viewing the Daśak. as a masterpiece of constructive art, it reveals to us, as aptly remarked by Prof. Keith, “the graces of the Kāvyā style applied to the folk-tale, vivified by the genius of the writer.” High praise it undoubtedly deserves; but, as no human work is perfect, it suffers from defects which are indeed noticeable even on a cursory perusal of the whole. Fictly, as the work stands, it is faulty to a certain extent as regards its general dénouement; the events described seem to hang loosely together instead of leading to a definite end. (But we should hesitate to hold Daṇḍin responsible for this, for it is most likely due to the fragmentary condition of the available text, and not to
any constructive defect in the original). And secondly, the work does not teach a moral. Indeed, when one remembers how all Hindu fable-literature is distinctly didactic in tone, it is not a little surprising that Dandin should have contented himself with a realistic portrait only, without endeavouring to point to any distinct moral derived therefrom. He observes, but does not diagnose; he describes, but does not instruct. The evils he sees around him he knows to be evils, but he does not tell us how to steer clear of them or how to cure them; at any rate, if any moral is to be drawn, he leaves it to the reader, and does not concern himself with it. It would seem that rañjana, and not lūdha, was what he was chiefly aiming at; and in that no doubt he has succeeded to a very high degree.

One serious charge that has been brought against this highly popular romance of Dandin is its lack of good taste in the descriptions of the princes' adventures, and its occasional indelicacy of expression. Now, it is quite true that the poet has interspersed thieving, adultery and murders somewhat too freely in his narratives, and heinous crimes such as these have evoked from him expressions which are more palliative than condemnatory. But in this he appears to have yielded to the taste of certain sections of the society of the times when he wrote; it was his business to portray the occurrences in the royal harems and the intrigues at court, along with the irresponsible daily life of vagabonds, tramps and soldiers of fortune, on occasion arose. He pictured what he observed, and we know that he did not picture with any exaggeration; for history tells us but too frequently how succession in a royal family in India was shrouded in an atmosphere of crime and fraud. The charge of indelicacy of expression is one that cannot be seriously maintained against an established classic of repute, such as the Daśak, undoubtedly is; moreover, the standards of delicacy vary among different peoples and different civilizations; and what sounds indelicate to our modern ears might have been a common mode of expression in those less sophisticated days.

We have here, as Prof. Keith remarks, a confusion of morality and literature, and the ignoring of the diverse standards of taste of the west and pre-Mahomedan India.
Prof. Wilson has attached great importance to the geography of the Daśak. ; and lately Mr. Mark Collins has tried to discuss its geographical data in a separate pamphlet. We have already remarked above that the geographical references of Daśdin do not help us in fixing his age; and though he mentions a large number of countries and places in his narratives, very little definite can be inferred therefrom; nor does he make any new additions to our knowledge. Either the names are quite well known on the map of ancient India, or, when it is not so, the reference is so vague (e.g. वृक्षेञ्च on p. 201) as to be of little use in enabling us to fix its location properly. Similarly, the picture of Hindu society drawn by Daśdin does not present any extraordinary features calling for any special comment. We read therein of the prevalence of polygamy, idol-worship, belief in dreams, omens, ghosts and sorcery, gambling houses, courtesans, the doctrine of former birth and Karma. In these particulars Hindu society has remained almost stationary for many centuries past, although certain barbarous practices like human sacrifice have been put a stop to by law. Too much stress should not be laid on the profusion and superstition that we find in the Daśak.; these two features characterize more or less certain sections of every society even now, but nobody imagines thereby that the entire structure of that society is raised on them. The mercantile community of ancient India was enterprising; one reads of vast caravans journeying through the forests, and the account of Mitragupta shows that Indian merchants even traded by sea with far-off countries like Arabia; this maritime trade of India is now a thing of the past.

STYLE.

The style of the Daśak. is in general simple, easy-flowing, polished and idiomatic. There are in it occasional lapses from good grammar, solecisms and inaccuracies; we have noticed most of these in our Notes, such as the irregular use of the Perfect in अहं चक्षुः (p. 126) and त्र्यं सस्त्रेः (p. 202), or the defective syntax as in दस्तूरुपाध्य...तेनामात सिंहासीविनायेन (p. 101), or such unfamiliar use of words as in परिव्रत्त उज्जवलिनी (p. 167); but too much should not be made of such errors and irregularities, many of which occur in the Pūrva-pitikā, and not in the Daśak., and we know that Daśdin was not responsible for the Pūrva. Further, it
is quite probable that not a few of them may have been introduced owing to the ignorance and negligence of scribes. On the whole, the style of the Das'ak resembles more the easier narrative style of works like the Pañchatantra and the Hitopadesa; it stands on a different plane from the gorgeous splendour of Bāṇa’s Kādambarī, for instance. Bāṇa utilizes every kind of literary embellishment known to him, including innumerable puns, high-flown conceits, and extraordinarily long compounds, so that the thread of his narrative is often lost in these; he appears to be more concerned with displaying his skill in the use of words, rather than with the progress of his narrative. Daṇḍin avoids such temptations, and makes the narration of the story his principal aim; that he could have written like Bāṇa had he so chosen, it would be apparent on an examination of his Avantisundarkathā (for extracts from which work the student may turn to p. xxiv supra). The literary tour de force in the 7th Uoh., the whole of which is composed without the use of labial letters, finds no parallel in the works of Bāṇa. That he could accomplish this feat in writing विन क्राह्य without importing any obscurity of expression in his style, is a very high testimony to his command over language; it is done so cleverly and unostentatiously, and the narrative reads so very normal as usual, that had it not been for the author's own statement in the beginning, the reader would hardly have discovered the absence of labial letters even on reaching the end of the chapter. Daṇḍin is generally happy in his choice of words, and has a special facility in embodying common truths in homely and forceful language (Cf. लट्टेचसी अत्तात्माताति नेन गणना विवर्थक्ष्य वुष्कर्ष्य p. 80; अपमानास्थानां अवसाख्यहीर्जुः पति p. 82; न हृतप्रितिनिशत्रादिपं वुष्क्रिय निष्कितिचित्रासी वेषालितकमितुष्प p. 89; ईह जयति हि न निरीक्ष वेशेरिय विव: संदर्भते p. 181; जीविन्व हि नाम जन्मतः चदङ्गाप्र्यहाणि p. 194; &c.). There is one feature of style for which Daṇḍin was especially famed, according to an old Subhāṣīta already quoted above (p. x), viz. his selection of beautiful and alliterative words. Instances of this are strewn all over the work, from which we eull a few at random:—सार्वविभावनकुलेयुं विलुप्त- स्वत्तालिंहार्षि p. 71; अयुग्मस्यं शरणगायच्याति p. 84; अस्तेभपन्य नालम् संसर्गते p. 179; अनेकस्थानेक्ष आत्मत्तिर्चिनितकृतसंकारः संहृत: p. 179; न दुःखे: काञ्ज्ञित्वाच पाय: लुक्कालुक्क लुक्कालुक्कं प्रजानामगणणतांसंखु p. 188; etc.). The student can add many more.
CHARACTERIZATION.

The student will find at the end of this Section a list of the ten Kumāras, from which he can see at a glance their relationships. In describing their adventures, Dandin seems to have made narration of the incidents his chief concern, characterization being only secondary. This was necessitated by the framework of the romance, which was a series of tales in which no great scope could be found for the consistent development of any particular character; so our author has contented himself with delineating their personalities with a few deft and bold strokes, as there was no room for any very deep analysis of character. The hero is Rājavāhana, who is young, well-educated, and handsome in form. His readiness in going to the help of a Brāhmaṇa (Pārva. II.) shows the innate nobility of his heart. His union with Avantisundari leads to his arrest by Chandravarmā; although brave and not lacking in courage, he accepts it without resistance, as it had been pre-ordained by destiny (p. 57). The various remarks he makes at the conclusion of the narrative of each of the Kumāras show his courtesy and his generosity: he would only comment on the good points in the tale, ignoring any objectionable features of it, so as not to wound the feelings of his friend. His prompt departure to visit his father on receiving his letter (p. 215) shows him as a loving son conscious of his filial obligations. The student will remember how Bāna has made Chandrāpāda obey promptly a similar order of his father.

Among the remaining Kumāras, Somadatta is portrayed as a very brave warrior; Pushpodhava is a dutiful son; Apahāravarmā is a loyal and faithful friend, and withal a shrewd and successful plotter, a characteristic which evokes a compliment from Rājavāhana himself (p. 102). Upahāravarmā appears as a scheming gallant, though the author has taken pains to explain away his immoral intrigues (see pp. 111, 122). Arthapāla is a brave young man and a clever schemer. Pramati is depicted as a man of gentle temperament who gains his object by gentle means alone. Mitragupta meets with rather strange adventures; his encounter with the Yavanas shows his intrepid bravery, and that with the
Ra'khasa his ready wit. Mantragupta is a resourcefu
adventurer; and Viśruṭa appears to be a clever administrator'
especially learned in the principles of practical politics. On
the whole it may be said that Dandin has presented to us a
gallery of portraits of varied and interesting types.