

## P R E F A C E.

IN the following pages I have endeavoured to furnish the Oriental Student with a correct edition of the most celebrated drama of India's greatest dramatist. Strange to say, no edition of the text of the "Śakuntalā" has ever before been published in England. Yet no composition of Kālidāsa displays more the richness of his poetical genius, the exuberance of his imagination, the warmth and play of his fancy, his profound knowledge of the human heart, his delicate appreciation of its most refined and tender emotions, his familiarity with the workings and counterworkings of its conflicting feelings,—in short, more entitles him to rank as "the Shakespeare of India." Nor, in comparing him with our own great Dramatist, should we fail to remark the command of language exhibited by the present play. In this respect the singular flexibility and copiousness of Sanskrit may have even given him the advantage. On the Continent, the "Śakuntalā" has been studied and admired, not only by oriental scholars who possess a correct edition of the text, but by the general public, who enjoy the advantage of good translations; insomuch that Goethe, Schlegel, and Humboldt have all expressed their admiration of this masterpiece of the Hindú Poet. Goethe's four beautiful lines, which appeared in 1792, are—

"Willst du die Blüthe des frühen, die Früchte des späteren Jahres,  
Willst du was reizt und entzückt, willst du was sättigt und nährt,  
Willst du den Himmel, die Erde, mit einem Namen begreifen:  
Nenn' ich Sakuntalā, Dich, und so ist Alles gesagt."\*

\* Thus translated for me by Professor Eastwick:—

"Wouldst thou the young year's blossoms and the fruits of its decline,  
And all by which the soul is charmed, enraptured, feasted, fed,  
Wouldst thou the earth and heaven itself in one sole name combine?  
I name thee, O Sakuntalā! and all at once is said."

Augustus William von Schlegel, in his first Lecture on Dramatic Literature

In England, on the contrary, we have depended for our knowledge of the "Śakuntalā" solely on Sir William Jones' translation, which does not truly represent the original. The other great dramatic work of the same Poet, the "Urvaśī" or "Vikramorvaśī," is indeed known to the public by the admirable translation of Professor H. H. Wilson; but, with the exception of my own edition of this play, published at Hertford, and intended merely to meet the wants of the lecture-room until I should have leisure to perfect it on the same plan as the present volume, no edition of the text of either play has ever been printed in this country. Nor have other Sanskrit dramas, in spite of the interest excited by Professor Wilson's translations, received more attention at the hands of English editors of Oriental works. Only one other play, the "Vīra-charitra," edited by Dr. Trithen, can be reckoned among the many important publications that have issued from the presses of our Oriental printers. Possibly our backwardness in editing the text of these compositions, may be attributed to our accidental preference for other productions in a language, which has surprized the world by the variety of its literary treasures, and by the new direction it has given to philological study; or, perhaps, to our acquiescence in the 'Calcutta

(translated by Black), says:—"Among the Indians, the people from whom perhaps all the cultivation of the human race has been derived, plays were known long before they could have experienced any foreign influence. It has lately been made known to Europe, that they have a rich dramatic literature, which ascends back for more than two thousand years. The only specimen of their plays (nataks) hitherto known to us is the delightful Sakuntala, which, notwithstanding the colouring of a foreign climate, bears in its general structure such a striking resemblance to our romantic drama, that we might be inclined to suspect we owe this resemblance to the predilection for Shakspeare entertained by Jones, the English translator, if his fidelity were not confirmed by other learned orientalisists. In the golden times of India, the representation of this natak served to delight the splendid imperial court of Delhi."

Alexander von Humboldt, in treating of Indian poetry (Kosmos, translated by Prichard, vol. ii., p. 38), observes: "The name of Kalidasa has been frequently and early celebrated among the western nations. This great poet flourished at the splendid court of Vikramaditya, and was, therefore, cotemporary with Virgil and Horace. The English and German translations of the Sakuntala have excited the feeling of admiration which has been so amply bestowed upon Kalidasa. Tenderness in the expression of feelings, and richness of creative fancy, have assigned to him his lofty place amongst the poets of all nations." In a note (p. 114), he says: "Kalidasa, the celebrated Author of the Sakuntala, is a masterly describer of the influence which Nature exercises upon the minds of lovers. The scene in the forest, which he introduced in the drama of Vikrama and Urvasi, is one of the most beautiful and poetical productions which have appeared in any time."

editions (now out of print), published under the authority of the Committee of Public Instruction, and printed at the Education press.

So far as I can collect, the actual extent of our knowledge of the Hindú Theatre—whether acquired through English translations, or the printed editions of foreign countries—may be thus stated. Seventy years have elapsed since Sir W. Jones discovered that there existed in India a number of Nátakas, or Sanskrit dramas, many of them of great antiquity; some abounding in poetry of such undoubted merit, and in pictures of Hindú life and manners so charming and faithful, as to render them prizes of the greatest value to all classes of literary men. Eager to apply the means thus gained of filling what was before an empty niche in the Temple of Sanskrit Literature, Sir W. Jones addressed himself at once to translate into English the “Śakuntalá,” which he was told was the most popular among the natives. Unfortunately the Pandits omitted to inform him that the multiplication of manuscripts of this play, consequent upon its popularity, had led to a curious and perplexing result,—not, however, unexampled, as has since been proved by the two-fold version of the “Rámáyana,”—namely, that the various manuscripts separated themselves into two groups or classes: the one class embracing all those in Devanágari writing, which, without perfect uniformity, had still a community of character; the other, all those in Bengálí.

German scholars distinguish these two classes of manuscripts by the names “Devanágari recension” and “Bengálí recension,” which terms may conveniently be adopted. The Devanágari recension is the older and purer: the Bengálí, however, must have existed at least 400 years, since it is followed by the “Sáhitya-darpana,” one MS. of which bears the date 1504 of our era. The MSS. of the Devanágari class are chiefly found in the Upper Provinces of India, where the great demand has produced copyists without scholarship, who have faithfully transcribed what they did not understand, and, therefore, would not designedly alter. On the other hand, the copyists in Bengal have been Pandits, whose *cacoëthes* for emending, amplifying, and interpolating, has led to the most mischievous results. The bold and nervous phraseology of Kálidása has been either emasculated or weakened, his delicate expressions of refined love clothed in a meretricious dress, and his

ideas, grand in their simplicity, diluted by repetition or amplification. Many examples might be here adduced; but I will only refer the student to the third Act of the Bengálí recension, where the love-scene between the King and Śakuntalá has been expanded to five times the length it occupies in the MSS. of the Devanágari recension, and the additions are just what an indelicate imagination might be expected to supply. Even the names of the dramatis-personæ have been tampered with: the King Dushyanta is changed into Dushmanta; Anasúyá into Anusúyá; Vátáyana into Párvatáyana; Sánumatí into Mísrakeśí; Taraliká into Pingaliká; Dhanamitra into Dhanavṛiddhi; Márkaṇḍeya into Sankochana.

Unfortunately, it was a MS. of this recension, and not a very good specimen of its class, that Sir W. Jones used for his translation. From him, therefore, was gained about sixty-five years since, the first incorrect knowledge of this, the first Sanskrit play known to Europeans. No edition of the text appeared till about forty years afterwards, when one was produced, after immense labour, at Paris, in the year 1830, by M. Chézy. He deserves great credit for the difficulties he surmounted; but his edition was also from a MS. of the Bengálí recension, and has no more value than Sir W. Jones' translation. It abounds also in typographical and other more serious errors. An edition of the "Śakuntalá" was subsequently printed in Calcutta, also from Bengálí MSS., and in the Bengálí character, by Prema-chandra, dated Śáka 1761, or A.D. 1839.

It was reserved for Dr. Otto Boehtlingk to be the first to edit the Devanágari recension of this play at Bonn in the year 1842. No other edition of the text of this recension has been published until the present time; and in England even the Bengálí text has never yet appeared.

The translations of this play which have been published since that of Sir W. Jones and the German version of his translation by Forster, in 1791, are,—first, the French of M. Chézy; subsequently, the German of Hirzel, Rückert, and Boehtlingk; a Danish translation by Hammerich; and, very recently, another German translation in prose and verse, by Meier: not to speak of Danish and Italian versions of Sir W. Jones' English.

I propose myself very shortly to offer to the public a free

English translation, in prose and verse, of the Devanágari recension of this drama.

Of the "Vikramorvasí," the twin play of the "Śakuntalá," two editions have appeared on the Continent; one at Bonn, by Lenz, and a more perfect one at St. Petersburg, by Bollensen: an edition of this play was also brought out in Calcutta, which is now out of print. Translations by Hoefler and Hirzel have been published in Germany. The "Málavikágnimitra," also attributed to Kálidása, has been edited at Bonn, by Tullberg, but the notes and translation which were promised, have not yet appeared. The "Mṛichchhakaṭi," supposed to be the oldest Sanskrit play extant, has been well edited in Germany by Stenzler, and in Calcutta. From the Education-press of Calcutta have also issued editions of the "Málatí-mádhava," "Uttara-ráma-charitra," "Mudrá-rákshasa," and "Ratnávali," all of which, as well as the "Vikramorvasí," have been translated into English prose and verse by Professor Wilson. The poetical merit of these translations must always secure for them a high degree of favour; and the Essay prefixed to them affords copious and valuable information on the Dramatic System of the Hindús. It should be mentioned that a literal English prose translation of the "Vikramorvasí" by Mr. Cowell, has recently issued from the press of Mr. Austin, of Hertford. The allegorical philosophical drama "Prabodha-chandrodaya" has been edited both in Calcutta and in Germany, and the "Mahá-náṭaka," or "Hanuman-náṭaka," (a dramatic history of Ráma-chandra, attributed to the monkey chief Hanumán) in Calcutta. Part of the "Dhúrta-samágama" will be found in Professor Lassen's "Sanskrit Anthology." Professor Wilson, in the appendix to his "Hindú Theatre," has given interesting abstracts of some unedited plays. Beyond this, as far as I can recollect, nothing very important has been effected either in England or abroad in relation to the Indian Drama.

I am bound to acknowledge that I have made free use of Dr. Boehlingk's edition of the text of the "Śakuntalá" in preparing the following pages for the press. The merit of his work can hardly be overrated; but I may, without presumption, say that I have discovered many better readings, corrected some errors, and introduced much original matter in the shape of annotations. In point

of fact, Dr. Bochtlingk's edition does not adapt itself to the exigences of an English student. The notes are in German; they are printed at the end of the volume—a practical obstacle to their utility; and they frequently contain perplexing corrections of the text. My experience has led me to prefer a system of synopsis, both in respect of the notes and metres, and to interlineate the Sanskrit interpretation of the Prákrít passages.

In the Hindú drama, as is well known, the women and inferior characters speak in Prákrít, which is a kind of provincial Sanskrit, that is to say, Sanskrit stripped of its artificial construction and softened, as Latin is softened into Italian. The Paṇḍits, with their usual subtilty, subdivide Prákrít into a great variety of different kinds, assigning particular dialects to particular characters: there is, however, but one Prákrít, properly so called, although specimens of the varieties occasionally occur, and two of them may be found in the interlude between the fifth and sixth Acts of this Play [see page 216, note 2]. Without discussing the question whether Prákrít was ever the spoken language of India, it is certain that many of the dialects at present spoken have been derived from Sanskrit through the Prákrít, and that the latter is often the key to the changes which Sanskrit words undergo in passing into the Hindú vernacular tongues. This, in my opinion, is of itself a sufficient reason for not displacing the Prákrít by the Sanskrit interpretation, even if it were not part of "the warp" (to borrow a German idea) of the composition. On the other hand, the same reason makes it desirable that the Sanskrit interpretation, instead of being removed to the foot of the page or to the end of the book, should rather be exhibited in such close juxtaposition with the Prákrít that both may be comprehended at a glance. I have therefore interlineated the Sanskrit, giving the Prákrít the upper line, and distinguishing it by red ink (though from the novel nature of the experiment the red is not always so distinct as could be wished), and accommodating the Prákrít words to their Sanskrit equivalents by relaxing the rules of Sandhi applicable to the latter.

In the method I have adopted of separating Sanskrit words by the free use of the *viráma*, I submit that I have taken a most reasonable license, for which all students will be grate-

ful. Dr. Boehtlingk considers the *viráma* a mark of punctuation, and does not approve of its use except at the end of a sentence. He holds that the *viráma* and the single perpendicular line generally used for punctuation originally only differed in one respect—that the former denoted a pause after a consonant, the latter, after a vowel. He therefore dispenses with the *viráma* almost entirely. Doubtless this system may be advantageously carried out in India, where it has always commended itself to the Paṇḍits, as tending to reduce the labour of writing, but I have constantly observed that the Hindú practice of joining every word operated on by the rules of combination is perplexing even to the readiest European apprehension. The student has already sufficient obstacles to surmount in the Devanágari character, and in the rules of Sandhi. Why should an unnecessary difficulty be superadded? and why should not Sanskrit avail itself of the improvements in punctuation which are now universally employed to facilitate the act of reading? By creating needless hindrances, colour is given to the prevalent exaggeration respecting the difficulty of this language. The Latin scholar, if acquainted with the laws of euphony, would not be embarrassed by the sentence *Uby ad Dianæ venerit itav at sinistrám* (euphonically changed from *Ubi ad Dianæ veneris ito ad sinistram*): but he would, I think, be unnecessarily hindered if this permuted sentence were linked together according to the Indian system followed by Dr. Boehtlingk—*Ubyaddianæ veneriritavatsinistrám*. Nor can I understand why the mere spaces left between the words in the first case should be deemed inconsistent with euphony. If these spaces are only to be effected in Sanskrit by extending the legitimate functions of the *viráma*, the invention of other marks of punctuation, and the facilities afforded by modern typography, ought to leave us free to do so. In other languages, where the rules of combination prevail partially, no such union of words euphonically affected is deemed necessary. Thus, in English, we do not write ‘aneagle’ because the euphonic *n* is affixed to *a*; nor ‘theagle’ because, in poetry, the final *e* of *the* has to be rejected. The only cases in which I have not ventured to separate distinct words operated on by Sandhi, are when two vowels blend into one, and when final *u* and *i* are changed into their corresponding semi-vowels *e* and *y*.

In regard to the text of the present drama, if I have succeeded in producing a more correct edition of the Devanágari recension than that of Dr. Bochtlingk, the merit is due to the more ample materials at my command. I have taken care to avail myself of Dr. Bochtlingk's corrections of himself, and his after-thoughts at the end of his work, as well as of such critical remarks as coincided with my own views. Often working independently of him, I have arrived at similar results, because I have had access to all the materials whence his *Apparatus Criticus* was composed. More than this: Dr. Bochtlingk tells us that his edition was not prepared from original MSS., but that Professors Brockhaus and Westergaard having more or less carefully collated certain MSS. in the East-India House Library, and in the Bodleian at Oxford, and made only partial extracts from three native commentaries, handed over the results of their labours to him. All these MSS. and Commentaries have been placed at my disposal, and most of them left in my possession until the completion of my work. Not a passage has been printed without a careful collation of all of them, and the three Commentaries have been consulted from beginning to end.

The MSS. which I have principally used, are:—

1. A MS. from the Colebrooke collection, and, therefore, from the Eastern side of India, numbered 1718.
2. A MS. from the Mackenzie collection, and therefore from Southern India, numbered 2696.
3. A MS. from the Taylor collection, and therefore from Western India, numbered 1858, dated Sáka, 1734.

All these belong to the East-India House Library, and represent the three Indian Presidencies respectively.

4. A copy of a very good MS. at Bombay, presented to me by Mr. Shaw, of the Bombay Civil Service.

5. An old Bengálí MS. belonging to the Library of the East India House, numbered 1060.

6. A very old Bengálí MS. from Professor Wilson's collection in the Bodleian.

I have from time to time consulted other Bengálí MSS., but have rarely admitted readings from them, unless supported by some one of the Devanágari. Thus, the verses which I have inserted at the be-



ginning of the third Act are supported throughout by my own and the Taylor MS., and partially by that of the MacKenzie collection.

The following are the three Indian Scholiasts:—

1. Kátavema, whose commentary, from the Mackenzie collection at the East-India House, is the only one in the Devanágari character. He was the son of Káta Bhúpa, minister of Vasanta (who was himself the author of a dramatic work called “Vasanta-rájíya”), King of Kumára-giri, a place on the frontiers of the Nizam’s dominions. He must have lived after the commencement of the sixteenth century, as he quotes Haláyudha, the author of the “Kavi-ráhasya” [see Westergaard’s preface to the “Radices Linguae Sanskritæ”]. This commentary is very corrupt; but where it is intelligible, is of great utility in throwing light on the more difficult passages of this play.

2. Śankara, whose commentary, from Professor Wilson’s collection in the Bodleian Library, is on the Bengálí recension, and written in the Bengálí character. In many places it agrees with the readings of the Devanágari recension, or at least notices them.

3. Chandra-śekhara, whose commentary, belonging to the East-India House, is also on the Bengálí recension, and seldom does much more than repeat the words of Śankara. If this Chandra-śekhara is the same person as the father of Viśwa-nátha, the author of the “Sáhitya-darpana,” he probably lived sometime in the fifteenth century.

I have never failed to consult the three commentaries before deciding on the reading of my text, and have made their interpretations the basis of the literal translation I have given of the metrical part of the play.

All that is known of Kálidása, the author of the “Śakuntalá,” may be stated in a few words. He lived in Ujjayiní or Oujein, the capital of King Vikramáditya, who flourished 56 years B.C., and whose reign is the starting-point of the Hindú Era called Samvat. He was one of the nine celebrated gems of that monarch’s court, the splendour of which is a favourite theme with Hindú writers in all languages. The other works attributed to him are the “Vikramorvasí,” and “Málavikágnimitra,” before noticed; the “Megha-dúta,” or Cloud-messenger, a short but beautiful poem, which has been edited by Professor Johnson in England and

by Mr. Gildemeister at Bonn, and translated into English verse by Professor Wilson; the "Raghu-vanśa," a heroic poem, edited and translated into Latin by Stenzler; the "Ṛitu-sanhāra," edited and translated by Bohlen, a short poem on the six Seasons, each verse of which is like a medallion, giving a complete picture of some Indian scene; the "Kumāra-sambhava," a poem on the Birth of Skanda, the god of war, of which part has been lost; the rest, edited by Stenzler, and recently translated into English verse by Mr. Griffiths. The "Śringāra-tilaka," "Prānottara-mālā, Hāsyārṇava," and "Śruta-bodha," are also ascribed to Kālidāsa. The "Nalodaya," attributed to him, is certainly the production of a later epoch.

I have to express my acknowledgements to Professor Johnson, who has assisted me in revising the proof-sheets of this volume, and has aided me by occasional suggestions. I have also to thank Dr. Max Müller for some information connected with the Vedas.

Every credit is due to Mr. Austin, of Hertford, for the spirited manner in which he has undertaken the printing and publication of this and other Oriental works, and spared neither trouble nor expense in carrying them through the press.

M. W.

EAST-INDIA COLLEGE,

*July, 1853.*

## CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

---

Page 12, line 1, for सूतः read सूत

Page 21, line 3 of the first note, after 'distanced,' add : 'in good qualities, [in beauties].'

Page 31, line 8 from bottom, for 'opposition' read 'apposition.'

Page 41, line 2, for मन्त्रयध्वं, read मन्त्रयेथे

Page 55, line 6 from top, carry back the one letter, from क to झ

Page 89, line 4 from top, the *e* of *Śakuntalā-darśane* has dropped in part of the impression.

Page 91, line 14 from bottom, for 'venerable hermit,' read 'venerable parent.'

Page 113, note 2. • With reference to this note, compare in Vikram., Act 1, *Chitrakṣhā-dvītiyām priya-sakhīm Urvaśīm grīhitvā viśakhā-sahita iva bhagavān soma upasthitā sa rājarshih.*

Page 115, line 7 from top of the note, for *anatilulita* read *atitilita*.

Page 126, line 12 from bottom; after Raghuvansa, vi., 83, add : 'This is confirmed by Bhatti-Kavya, iv., 17, where the epithet *dwirada-nasoruh* is applied to a female.

Page 179, line 18 from top, for 'Guhhyakas,' read 'Guhyakas.'

Page 228, line 2 from top, in a part of the impression the last syllable of *yama-sañānam* has dropped.

Page 249, note 1, add : Compare Vikram., Act 2, *anguli-svedena me lupyante 'kshardni.*

Page 249, transpose the lines of the metre.

