

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRA>

Additional services for *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Art. VI.—Pāini, Poet and Grammarian: With some Remarks on the Age of Sanskrit Classical Poetry

Peterson

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society / Volume 23 / Issue 02 / April 1891,
pp 311 - 336

DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00156916, Published online: 15 March 2011

Link to this article: [http://journals.cambridge.org/
abstract_S0035869X00156916](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0035869X00156916)

How to cite this article:

Peterson (1891). Art. VI.—Pāini, Poet and Grammarian: With some Remarks on the Age of Sanskrit Classical Poetry. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 23, pp 311-336 doi:10.1017/S0035869X00156916

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ART. VI.—*Pāṇini, Poet and Grammarian : With some Remarks on the Age of Sanskrit Classical Poetry.* By Prof. PETERSON.

IN the course of a first reading of Vallabhadeva's *Subhāshitāvalī* I came upon the following verses ascribed by Vallabhadeva to "Pāṇini."

I.

अथासमादास्तमनिन्द्यतेजा
जनस्य दूरोज्झितमृत्युभीतेः ।
उत्पत्तिमदस्तु विनाश्वथं
यथाहमित्येवमिवोपदेष्टुम् ॥

"Now he has reached his setting, at whose glory none could cavil: to thee, O man, that hast put far from thee the fear of death, he seems to say, Everything that is born must die as I am dying."¹

¹ "Behold the sun, that seemed but now
Enthronéd overhead,
Beginneth to decline below
The globe whereon we tread:
And he, whom now we look upon
With comfort and delight,
Will quite depart from us anon,
And leave us to the night.
Thus day by day doth Nature take
The life that Nature gave;
Thus are our bodies every day
Declining to the grave:
Thus from us all our pleasures fly
Whereon we set our heart,
And when the night of death draws nigh,
Thus will they all depart."—*G. Wither.*

II.

सरोरुहाक्षीणि निमीलयन्था
 रवौ गते साधु कृतं नलिन्या ।
 अक्ष्णां हि दृष्ट्वापि जगत्समग्रं
 फलं प्रियालोकनमात्रमेव ॥

“Well done of the lake to shut its lotus eyes now that the sun is gone. What profit is there in eyes that see the whole world, if they see not the loved one?”

III.

विलोक्य संगमे रागं पश्चिमाया विवस्वतः ।
 कृतं कृष्णं मुखं प्राच्या नहि नार्यो विनेर्षया ॥

“The East sees the West redden as the Sun draws near, and her own face darkens; for there is no such thing as a woman that is not jealous.”

IV.

निरीक्ष्य विद्युन्नयनैः पयोदो
 मुखं निशायामभिसारिकायाः ।
 धारानिपातैः सह किं नु वान्त-
 स्रन्दोयमित्यार्ततरं ररास ॥

“The cloud sees with his lightning eyes her face, as she goes by night to meet her lover, and, saying to himself, ‘What, have I with my showers let fall the moon?’ thunders his loud lament.”

So far back as 1860 Aufrecht had called attention to the fact that the Paddhati of Śārṅgadharma contains two verses attributed to “Pāṇini.”

V.

उपोढरागेण विलोलतारकं
तथा गृहीतं शशिना निशामुखम् ।
यथा समस्तं तिमिरांशुकं तथा
पुरोपि रागाङ्गलितं न लक्षितम् ॥

“The Moon, red with love’s passion, caught to his breast the face of his lady the Night, with all her quivering starry eyes, in such manner that, though before her the darkness covering her breast fell in answering passion to her feet, she saw it not.”¹

VI.

The Rainy Season.

क्षपाः क्षामीकृत्य प्रसभमपहृत्यासु सरितां
प्रतापोर्वीं कृत्स्नां तरुगहनमुच्छोष्य सकलम् ।
क्व संप्रत्युष्णांशुर्गत इति तदन्वेषणपरा-
स्तडिद्दीपालीका दिशि दिशि चरन्तीव जलदाः ॥

“Methinks the clouds roam over heaven, seeking out the sun with their torch of the lightning, and saying, Where is he now

¹ I took this differently before, following Aufrecht, as I understand his translation. “On came the flushed Moon: Night fixed her quivering eyes, the stars, upon him, and was so taken with the sight that she noticed not how her whole mantle of darkness had slipped to her feet.” My First Report, p. 39, note. But that गृहीतं must be taken literally, as in the translation now offered, is shown I think by a comparison with No. X. below, as also from the terms पुरोपि and अंशुकं (bodice). How Böhtlingk takes the verse (Indische Sprüche, 1311) is not quite clear to me. “Der vor Leidenschaft roth gewordene Mond griff nach dem Antlitz der Nacht (nach der beginnenden Nacht) mit ihren beweglichen Augensternen der Art, dass diese, obgleich es vor ihren Augen geschah, nicht gewahr wird, dass ihr ganzes Gewand, die Finsterniss, ob der Leidenschaft (Röthe) entsunken war.”

gone, who smote the nights with languor, tore from the rivers their waters, burnt up the whole earth and sent his heat into the deepest forest glade?"

From the *Saduktikarṇāmṛita* of Śrīdharadāsa, Aufrecht gave later seven additional verses ascribed in that anthology to the poet Pāṇini.

VII.

असौ गिरेः शीतलकन्दरस्यः
पारावतो ममथचाटुदक्षः ।
घर्मालसाङ्गीं मधुराणि कूज-
संवीजते पक्षपुटेन कान्ताम् ॥

"See how yon dove in a cool cleft of the hill, well skilled in love's caresses, fans with his wings his dear mate exhausted as she is by the heat, and cooes sweet things in her ear."

VIII.

The burning ground.

उद्ध्वेभ्यः सुदूरं घनजनिततमः पूरितेषु द्रुमेषु
प्रोद्धोवं पथ पादद्वयनमितभुवः श्रेणयः फेरवाणाम् ।
उल्कालोकैः स्फुरद्भिर्निजवदनदरीमर्पिभिर्वोक्षितेभ-
स्योतत्सान्द्रं वसाम्भः कुथितशववपुर्मण्डलेभ्यः पिबन्ति ॥

"See how those troops of jackals plant their hind legs on the ground, and, with outstretched necks, drink the fat that drips from the rows of putrid corpses hung too high for them in the trees that are enveloped in deeper and deeper darkness, so that the

bodies of the malefactors are revealed to them only by the flickering flames that issue from their own mouths.”¹

IX.

चञ्चत्यचाभिघातज्वलितज्जतवहप्रौढधान्निश्चितायाः

क्रोडव्याकृष्टमूर्तेरहमहमिकया चण्डचञ्चुग्रहेण ।

सद्यस्तप्तं श्वस्य ज्वलदिव पिशितं भूरि जग्ध्वार्धदग्धं

पथ्यान्तःसुखमाणः प्रविशति सलिलं सत्वरं वृध्रवृद्धः ॥

“See how that old vulture, with a fierce blow from his beak, gulps down in a moment a great lump of half-burnt flesh from the corpse, hot, and seeming to be itself on fire, (taken) from the pyre, the blaze of which is heightened as its fire is fanned by the beating of his wings, while its symmetry is spoiled by the impact of his breast,—and then, burning within, plunges eagerly into water.”²

¹ Compare Aufrecht's translation, Z.D.M.G., 36, 366, and Böhlingk's note on the same, *ibid.* p. 659. उद्धृष्टैः for Aufrecht's उद्धृष्टैः is Böhlingk's conjecture. Both Aufrecht and Böhlingk take घन in the sense of “cloud.” It is the light from the funeral pyres, or the flames issuing from the mouths of the jackals, that deepens the darkness of the trees. The time is of course night. उक्तामुख is a name for jackal in Mālatīmādhava, 78, 4. Compare also the following verse from Govardhana's Saptasati :

तमसि घने (cf. our घनजनिततमः) विषमे पथि जम्बुकमुक्तामुखं प्रपन्नाः
स्मः ।

किं कुर्मः सोपि सखे स्थितो मुखं मुद्रयित्व ॥

I do not know what natural phenomenon is referred to. Aufrecht takes उक्ता to mean meteors, Böhlingk the burning brands (of the pyres). Both refer निजवदन to the corpses, not to the jackals. These plant their hind legs on the ground: their fore legs are on the trees. Aufrecht and Böhlingk take पादद्वय of the fore legs.

² क्रोडव्याकृष्टमूर्तेः is Böhlingk's conjecture for Aufrecht's क्रोडाद्याकृष्टमूर्तेः. Aufrecht notes that the second syllable in व्याकृष्ट is not distinct in the MSS.

X.

कह्लारस्य शर्गर्भैः शिशिरपरिचयात्कान्तिमद्भिः कराग्रै-
 स्यन्द्रे खालिङ्गितायास्तिमिरवसने शंसमाने रजन्याः ।
 अन्योन्यालोकिनीभिः परिचयजनितप्रेमनिख्यन्दिनीभि-
 र्दूरारूढे प्रमोदे हसितमिव परिसृष्टमाशमस्वीभिः ॥

“ When the Moon took his lady the Night in his fair arms (rays), cold as the touch of white lilies, and Night's garment of darkness fell, methinks her friends, the East, the West, the South and the North, looking at each other, and raining down the love begotten of old acquaintance, smiled brightly in their great delight.”

XI.

पाणौः¹ पद्मधिया मधूककुसुमभ्रान्त्या गण्डयो-
 नीलेन्दीवरशङ्कया नयनयोर्बन्धूकबुद्ध्याधरे ।
 लोयन्ते कवरीभरे निजकुलव्यामोहजातसृहा
 दुर्वारा मधुपाः कियन्ति करुणि स्थानानि रक्षिष्यसि ॥

“ They settle on your hand taking it to be a lotus, on your cheeks which they mistake for madhūka flowers, on your eyes deeming these to be full-blown indīvara flowers, on your lip because they think that a bandhūka flower, in your dark hair which they take to be a swarm of their companions: truly the bees are hard to get rid of, how many parts of your body, my girl, will you be able to guard ? ”

There may be some mistake in the word. In the Introduction to the Subhāshitāvalī I wrote चञ्चत्पचाभिघातं and क्रोडात् with Aufrecht. But the v.l. चञ्चत्पचाभिघात° seems distinctly preferable, and there is an apparent parallel between the action on the pyre of the wings and the breast of the vulture. Böhtlingk takes सद्यः with तप्तं.

¹ In the Śārṅgaddharapaddhati this verse is ascribed to Achala. Its given in the Subhāshitāvalī anonymously. The reading पाण्योः in the edition seems now wrong. The girl is using one hand in the attempt to protect herself from the bees.

XII.

पाणौ शोणतले तनूदरि दरचामा कपोलखली
 विन्यस्ताञ्जनदिग्धलोचनजलैः किं स्नानिमानोयते ॥
 मुग्धे चुम्बतु नाम चञ्चलतया भृङ्गः क्वचित्कन्दली-
 मुञ्जीलन्नवमालतीपरिमलः किं तेन विस्मर्यते ॥

“Why, lady, do you let your tears, stained with the eyesalve they wash off, spoil all the beauty of your cheek, already somewhat wasted, as it rests on that red palm of yours: foolish one, the bee in fickleness may kiss the kandali flower, but think you that on that account he forgets the fragrance of the opening mālati?”¹

XIII.

मुखानि चारुणि घनाः पयोधरा
 नितम्बपृथ्वो जघनोत्तमश्रियः ।
 तनूनि मध्यानि च यस्य सोभ्यगा-
 त्कथं नृपाणां द्रविडीजनो हृदः ॥

This verse must for the present be left untranslated. हृदः does not, so far as I can see, yield any sense. Aufrecht notes that it would be easy but risky to substitute गुहान्. Böhtlingk suggests that the MS. reading is हृदः not हृदः and corrects to हृदम्. He compares Indische Sprüche, 345, a verse in which a king's palace is said to be वार्धिवत् like the ocean.

It remains to add to this collection of Pāṇini verses three more from the Subhāshitāvali of Vallabhadeva, and one which is quoted by Namisādhū in his commentary on Rudraṭa's Kāvyaḷamkāra. I give the text of these only.

¹ Böhtlingk's idea that the second half of this verse is the answer, put in the mouth of the deserted fair one, does not seem right.

XIV.

ऐन्द्रं धनुः पाण्डुपयोधरेण
 शरद्धानार्द्रनखचताभम् ।
 प्रसादयन्ती सकलङ्गमिन्दुं
 तापं रवेरभ्यधिकं चकार ॥

XV.

प्रकाश्य लोकान्भगवान्स्वतेजसा
 प्रभादरिद्रः सवितापि जायते ।
 अहो चला श्रीर्बलमानदामहो
 स्पृशन्ति सर्वं हि दशाविपर्यये ॥

XVI.

शुद्धस्वभावान्यपि संहतानि
 निनाय भेदं कुमुदानि चन्द्रः ।
 अवाप्य वृद्धिं मलिनान्तरात्मा
 जडो भवेत्कस्य गुणाय वक्रः ॥

In illustration of the remark that even great poets permit themselves the use of forms which grammar condemns, Namisādhu cites the fragment (XVII.) संध्यावधूं गृह्य करेण from "Pāṇini's Pātālaviṇaya," and adds the following verse "of the same poet."

XVII.

गतेर्धरात्रे परिमन्दमन्दं
 गर्जन्ति यत्प्रावृषि कालमेघाः ।
 अपश्यती वत्समिवेन्दुबिम्बं
 तच्छर्वरी गौरि जङ्करोति ॥

Another fragment from Pāṇini's Jāmbuvatīvijaya, is preserved to us by Rāyamukūṭa in his commentary on Amarakosha I. 2, 3, 6.¹

XVIII.

पयःपृषन्तिभिः स्पृष्टा
 वान्ति वाताः शनैः शनैः ।

Who is this Pāṇini, author of verses which would do no discredit to Kālidāsa himself, and which in all respects resemble the well-marked type of poetry of which that great writer is for us the best known representative? His countrymen have forgotten his name and fame; and one well entitled to speak for them, I mean Professor Bhandarkar, has rejected the suggestion that he cannot well be any other than the grammarian with something not far removed from scorn. "In my opinion the style and manner of a work written by Pāṇini the grammarian must resemble those of the Nirukta: but in the few verses attributed to Pāṇini there is no such resemblance whatever. Should the entire work be discovered and found as a whole to be written in an archaic style, there will be time enough to consider its claim to be the work of Pāṇini; but at present we must reject that advanced on behalf of those artificial verses."

¹ Aufrecht, Z. d. M. G. 14, 582.

“The great grammarian may have been a poet, and may have written a work called *Jāmbuvatijaya*. But if the verses brought to light are from that work, and consequently the work is of the nature of those belonging to the period of the Renaissance, then at once the tradition which represents the author of that work to be the same as the author of the *Āshtādhyāyī* must be rejected as conflicting with the clearest evidence, internal as well as external.”¹ In his ‘Second Reply’² Bhandarkar would dismiss the anthologies, and the whole body of the literature which has revealed the poet Pāṇini to us, as “mere trash in comparison with that *Ārshagrantha* or Book of Light, the *Mahābhāshyā*.”

It appears to me to be certain that the tradition which identifies Pāṇini the poet with Pāṇini the grammarian, and which attributes to the one writer the verses at the head of this paper, cannot be disposed of in this fashion. It has gained immensely in strength from the discredit into which the Renaissance theory, referred to by Bhandarkar, has fallen. In his recent paper “Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie” Bühler has shown that the gap between, say, for example, the supposed date of the *Mahābhāshya* and the fifth or sixth century of our era, is an imaginary one; and that, scanty as the stone records are, enough remains to render it certain that the art of “poetry” (*kāvya*) as expounded by writers like Daṇḍin and Vāmana, and practised by poets like Bāṇa and Bhavabhūti, was already an old art in the first century of our era. This is a point to which I shall recur immediately. I use it here to press home the consideration that in view of it, it has become ten times more probable than it was before, that writers like Rājasekhara, Kshemendra, Namiśādhu, and, *pace* Bhandarkar, I will add the compilers of the despised anthologies, inheritors of an unbroken tradition, could not possibly have been mistaken in a matter like this. The fact is, that the gap is between these writers and us,

¹ The Date of Patañjali. A Reply to Professor Peterson, pp. 4 and 6.

² P. 20.

not between them and Pāṇini. Until evidence to the contrary is adduced, we are bound, I contend, to accept Rājasekhara's explicit statement that "by Rudra's grace Pāṇini wrote first his grammar, and then his poem the Jāmbuvatījaya."¹

A side light, it may be noticed in passing, is thrown upon this controversy when we notice that Pāṇini's is not the only name which is connected by Indian tradition with the two muses of Grammar and Poetry. What is true of Pāṇini is true of his two commentators, Kātyayāna or Vararuchi, and Patanjali. Patanjali refers to Vararuchi's poem, and the Subhāshitāvali contains seventeen verses ascribed to him. They are of the same character as the Pāṇini verses, as will be seen from two examples for which room may be found. In the first Vararuchi is breaking a lance with his master.

प्रत्यययौवनां श्यामामपेततिमिरांशुकाम् ।

विलोक्य जातहासोभून्मुदेव कुमुदाकरः ॥

"The bank of night lotuses laughed as it were for joy (*i.e.* the white petals unfolded) to see his swarthy lady the Night, in her fresh youth, and with her covering of darkness laid aside."

योन्नि नीलाम्बुदच्छन्ने गुरुवृष्टिभयादिव ।

जयाह ग्रीष्मसंतापो हृदयानि वियोगिनाम् ॥

"The sky is covered over with dark clouds, and the heat of summer, in fear as it were of the heavy rain, has taken up its abode in the hearts of lovers away from their mistresses."²

This last verse resembles a verse by Kumāradāsa, which Aufrecht quotes, and compares to the Anacreontic *μεσονυκτίοις ποτ' ὄραις*.

¹ The references to Pāṇini as a poet occurring in treatises on rhetoric, commentaries, and the anthologies, have been put together in the article Pāṇini, in the Introduction to the edition of Vallabhadeva's Subhāshitāvali. Compare also Pischel's paper in the Z.d.D. M G. 39, 75.

² With the approach of the rains travellers ought to be able to make for home.

शिशिरसीकरवाहिनि मारुते

चरति शीतभयादिव सत्वरः ।

मनसिजः प्रविवेश वियोगिनी-

हृदयमाहितशोकज्जताशनम् ॥

“The wind was laden with drops of icy spray : Love, as it were in fear of the cold, entered the hearts of forsaken girls in which the fire of sorrow burned.”

The resemblance cannot be accidental. For, as I was able to show in the paper already referred to, Patanjali quotes Kumāradāsa, and the resemblance between these two verses therefore goes to show that the Vararuchi of the anthologies is the Vararuchi of the Vārttikas, and that the type of poetry of which they are fine examples is as old as Patanjali. I know of no verses ascribed in the anthologies to Patanjali himself *eo nomine*. But I have little hesitation in ascribing to Patanjali, the great commentator on Pāṇini, the fine verse by the “Commentator” (Bhāṣhyakāra), which Aufrecht cites from the Saduktikarṇāmṛita, and to which a peculiar interest perhaps attaches.

यद्यपि स्वच्छभावेन दर्शयत्यम्बुधिर्मणीन् ।

तथापि जानुदग्नोयेमिति चेतसि मा कृथाः ॥

“Though the sea be so clear that it shows the jewels lying at the bottom, think not on that account that it is but knee-deep.”

If the “Bhāṣhyakāra” of this verse is the “Bhāṣhyakāra” of the Mahābhāṣya, Bharṭṛihari had it in mind when he described the Mahābhāṣya as अलम्बगाधि गाम्भीर्यादुत्तान इव सौष्टवात् “so deep that its soundings cannot be taken, so clear that it seems shallow.”

Bharṭṛihari himself is a third example of the grammarian poet. A fourth is Vyāḍi, author of the "Sangraha," to take the place of which the Mahābhāṣya was written. All that is left of Vyāḍi (for his Sangraha, according to Bharṭṛihari, had perished before the Mahābhāṣya was written) is one verse which Aufrecht cites from the Saduktikarnāmṛita. It is noticeable as a conspicuous example of the metaphorical use of expressions, intolerable in their literal sense, which Daṇḍin (Kāvyaḍarṣa, i. 95-97) tells us had the sanction of good poets.

कवलयति न चेतस्तस्य दारिद्र्यदुःखं
 न च पिशुनजनोक्तिः कर्णकण्डूं करोति ।
 वरकविकृतगोष्ठीबन्धगन्धोपभोगे
 य इह मधु वमन्तीं काव्यचिन्तां करोति ॥

"The pains of poverty do not swallow up his heart, the talk of bad men does not make his ear itch, who, in the enjoyment of the soul-ravishing conversation of good poets, gives all his mind to poetry, that vomiteth honey."

It seemed at the time to me and to others¹ that the discovery that Pāṇini wrote poetry of the same kind as that of Kālidāsa, and that his commentator Patanjali quoted a writer who is by Rājasekhara placed after Kālidāsa, afforded reason for throwing doubt on the high antiquity claimed very generally for the two grammarians. A readjustment of some kind seemed necessary. But I was tempted to look on Kālidāsa as the fixed point, and on Pāṇini as the movable one, in any attempt to reduce the interval of some nine centuries which in common opinion then divided them. Before this Society I need not dwell at any length on the reasons for this. It was to you that the late James Fergusson unfolded his theory of the

¹ Compare especially Pischel's paper already referred to.

Vikramāditya era, a theory which was adopted and developed by Professor Max Müller, and on which that scholar built his own theory of an interregnum, and a renaissance of, Sanskrit literature. According to Fergusson the Brahmins who, in or about 1000 A.D., invented the Vikramāditya era—through hatred of a current Buddhist mode of reckoning—chose as the eponymous hero of the new era a sovereign who defeated the barbarians in 544 A.D., but, for convenience of reckoning, put him in the year 601, instead of the year 1 of his own era. By and by this odd detail dropped out of memory, and the consequence was that a whole body of literary tradition which centred round Vikramāditya was shifted back 600 years, to the utter confusion of the whole subject.

To this theory Max Müller gave his provisional assent. But that distinguished scholar did not omit to lay due stress on the consideration that the whole weight of Fergusson's scheme rested on the fact that it was at that time impossible to produce a document, written or engraved, in which the Vikramāditya era was used and which was itself prior to the year 600 of that era, or 544 A.D. "The era of Vikrama Mr. Fergusson holds was not invented before the sixth century A.D. It cannot therefore occur on any historical document before that date: and the whole theory would collapse if one single coin or stone could be produced dated contemporaneously 543 [read 599] of the Samvat of Vikrama."¹

It was my good fortune to be the first to produce the missing stone.

In the early part of 1885 I was at Kotah, engaged in one of the too few tours through Rajputana in search of MSS. which brighten the lot of a Sanskrit professor in Bombay. Bhagvanlal Indraji was with me. We visited the hermitage of Kanva outside the city, and took a fresh rubbing of the inscription there, which was first described by Colonel Tod.² That inscription is dated in the 796th year "of the Lords

¹ India : What can it teach us ? p. 284.

² Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, p. 795.

of Malwa," an era which had not previous to my visit to Kotah, been identified with any of the well-known Indian eras, though, as I have learned since,¹ General Cunningham had already expressed the opinion that it must be identical with the era of Vikramāditya. Passing south to Jhalra Pathan, Bhagvanlal and I learned from the Brahmins of that place that they traced their lineage to a band of immigrants from the west, who had settled for the most part at Daṣapura, now called Mandasor. Bhagvanlal's eyes brightened. He knew from Mr. Fleet that the place referred to contained at least one old inscription, and the account of the Jhalra Pathan Brahmins convinced him that it probably contained more than one. He was already suffering from the disease which was to bring his life to an untimely end. Yet nothing would satisfy him but to start off, in a country *ekka*, with no provision for his comfort, across a roadless country, on his pilgrimage of seventy miles to the place where the larger body of this immigration from the West had settled. He had his reward. For when we met again in Bombay he placed in my hands his transcript of an inscription, before which, if I may borrow in this room the language of politics, the combinations of Fergusson, and his reckless charges of mendacity, crumble to dust and ashes. In my paper on the Kotah inscription² I showed that Bhagvanlal's Mandasor inscription does contain what was wanted, a date in the Vikramāditya era prior to the year 600 of that era. I may recapitulate the argument briefly here. The Mandasor inscription is dated "in the 494th year of the reckoning of the Mālavas,³ while Kumāragupta was ruling the earth." Kumāragupta's dates were known. He was reigning in the year 463 of the Vikramāditya era, and in the year 508 of the same. An era in the 494th year of which he was on the throne, and which was so firmly

¹ Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, Introduction.

² The Auchiṭyālamkāra of Kṣhemendra, etc., p. 45.

³ We owe the correct explanation of the term गणसिद्ध्या to Kielhorn.

established that it is found three centuries later in the Kotah inscription, can only be the Vikramāditya era itself under another name. This view of the significance of the Mandasor inscription was generally accepted, and has now received the support of Mr. Fleet.¹ It is accordingly, I believe, no longer doubted by any competent authority that Fergusson's theory with regard to the Vikramāditya era must be abandoned, and that Max Müller's view of an interregnum in, and a renaissance of, Sanskrit literature has lost all the support afforded to it by a theory out of which it avowedly in great measure sprung.

The question, however, has rested here. Attention was drawn to the fact that Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya contains a quotation from a poet who must have lived after Kālidāsa, and Kielhorn followed this up with a list of similar quotations occurring in Patanjali's work. Kielhorn has also very recently shown good reason for believing that the author of this Mandasor inscription was familiar with one of Kālidāsa's works. In Bühler's essay an immense stride forward is taken. He reviews the whole question with the aid of eighteen of Mr. Fleet's inscriptions, and some earlier ones. The results arrived at are briefly such as to make the "renaissance of Sanskrit literature" theory no longer tenable. The existence of Sanskrit poetry of the classical type, and of well-known and opposing schools of that poetry, is by Bühler traced step by step from the fifth, through the fourth and third, back to the second century of our era. The paper is one which must arrest the attention of every student of Sanskrit literature, and I am glad to be able to state that an English edition of it will shortly appear in our Bombay Society's Journal. In the remarks which follow I propose to confine myself to a consideration of the new light which has been thrown on Kālidāsa's date, and to certain illustrations which I think the anthologies can be made to furnish in support of Bühler's main result, that it is to the centuries before our era, and not to the fifth

¹ Gupta Inscriptions, Introduction, *passim*.

or sixth century A.D., that we must look for the beginnings of Sanskrit classical poetry.

Vatsabhaṭṭi, the author of the Mandasor inscription, was far from being himself an original poet of the first, or any rank. He speaks of the pains of composition (*prayatnena rachitā*), and an examination of his work shows that what he means is that he has been at great trouble to follow the best models, and to observe all the rules of the art. Bühler has shown that he does not always succeed in keeping clear of inelegancies and even positive mistakes. In thirteen places throughout his brief poem he uses the weak pause at the end of a half verse, a license which the best poets never permit themselves. He ekes out his verses with expletives, which add nothing to the sense, and tautologies which repeat it. And in one passage he saves himself from a false quantity only by using a false gender. These considerations would be important in any case as showing that at the time when Vatsabhaṭṭi set himself this task, 472 A.D., there was a rich poetical literature for him to copy. They derive extraordinary interest from the fact that, as Bühler and Kielhorn have joined to show, we can identify one of Vatsabhaṭṭi's models, and that his model is no other than Kālidāsa himself. The proof of this is as follows. In verse 10 Vatsabhaṭṭi begins his description of the city Daṣapura (Mandasor) with the words :

चलत्पतकान्यबलासनायान्यत्यर्थशुक्लान्यधिकोन्नतानि ।

तीडल्लताचित्रसिताभकूटतुल्योपमानानि गृहाणि यत्र ॥

“Where the white, high houses, with their waving flags, and the women in them, are like the edges of white clouds, when these are streaked with the lightning-creeper.”

This is taken from a verse in the Meghadūta :—

विद्युत्तन्तं ललितवनिताः सेन्द्रचापं सचित्राः
संगीताय प्रहतमुरजाः स्निग्धगम्भीरघोषम् ।
अन्तस्तोयं मणिमयभुवस्तुङ्गमभ्रंलिहाग्राः
प्रासादास्त्वां तुलयितुमलं यत्र तैस्तैर्विशेषैः ॥

“The palaces there rival you thus and thus: you have your lightning, they have fair women; you have the rainbow, they have their paintings; you have your sweet, low roar, they have the drums that are beaten for music; you have water within you, they have their crystal pavements; you are high, they touch the clouds.”

It is spoiled in the taking. For Kālidāsa would not have complicated the comparison of the lightning playing along the edge of the lofty cloud to women appearing on the terrace of the high house by throwing in the additional comparison of the waving flags. And तुलयितुमलम् is good Sanskrit: तुल्योपमानानि is not.

In his next verse, Bühler goes on to show, Vatsabhaṭṭi returns to his model here, and fills up a few *lacunae* in his first copy. He finds he has said nothing of the music for which Kālidāsa finds a parallel in the murmur of the thunder. And he has been led to drop all mention of the pictures. Accordingly he writes a supplementary verse referring to “other” houses!

कैलासस्तुङ्गशिखरप्रतिमानि चान्या-
न्याभान्ति दीर्घवलभीनि सवेदिकानि ।
गान्धर्वशब्दमुखराणि निविष्टचित्र-
कर्माणि लोलकदलीवनशोभितानि ॥

“And others shine like peaks of the Kailāsa hill, having long upper rooms and terraces, resounding with the noise of musicians, full of pictures, adorned with rows of waving plantain trees.”

Kielhorn has shown that in another passage we can actually restore Vatsabhaṭṭi's text, as that has been edited by Fleet, by a reference to the passage in the *Ritusamhāra* of Kālidāsa on which it is modelled. Kālidāsa is describing the cold season, and writes :

निरुद्धवातायनमन्दिरोदरं
 ऊताशनो भानुमतो गभस्तयः ।
 गुरुणि वामांस्त्वबला सद्योवनाः
 प्रयान्ति काले च जनस्य सेव्यताम् ॥
 न चन्दनं चन्द्रमरीचिशीतलं
 न हर्म्यपृष्ठं शरदिन्दुनिर्मलम् ।
 न वायवः सान्द्रतुषारशीतला
 जनस्य चित्तं रमयन्ति सांप्रतम् ॥

"The inner room of a house all the windows of which are shut, a fire, the rays of the sun, warm clothing, young and tender women—these be the things that people seek after at this season.

"Sandal wood powder cold as the moon's rays, the palace-roof, white as autumn's moon, winds cold with moist icy spray—these things now bring no delight to men."

Vatsabhaṭṭi drags in to his poem the same theme and the same words :

रामासनाथभवनोदरभास्करांशु-¹
 वक्त्रिप्रतापसुभगे जललीनमीने ।

¹ Fleet wrote रामासनाथ[र]चने. Bhandarkar reads चने for Fleet's चने, and suggests रामासनाथभवने. With रामासनाथ as an adjective qualifying भवन compare अबलासनाथानि गृहाणि in v. 10 of the inscription. Kielhorn's correction भवनोदरं, corresponding to Kālidāsa's मन्दिरोदर, seems certainly right.

चन्द्रांशुहर्म्यतलचन्दनतालवृन्त-

हारोपभोगरहिते हिमदग्धपद्मे ॥

“(In the season) that rejoices in the inner rooms of houses full of women, the rays of the sun, the heat of a fire, and in which the fish lie low in the water: in the season that knows nothing of the cooling pleasure caused by the rays of the moon, cold palace roofs, sandalwood powder, fans, necklaces of pearls, and in which the lotuses are wasted by the cold.”

Kālidāsa's sharp contrast between the things that delight men in the hot and cold seasons respectively derives no additional force from the touches about the fish and the lotuses, which are Vatsabhaṭṭi's clumsy additions.

The earliest date we had previously for Kālidāsa was 634 A.D., the date of the Aihole inscription, in which he is mentioned. The discovery that in 472 A.D. he was already a model for poetasters sends us back with fresh curiosity to the passage at the beginning of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* in which Kālidāsa speaks of himself modestly as a “poet of the day” whose works had to run the gauntlet of *laudatores temporis acti* who troubled him as critics of the same kind troubled Horace. “Nay, why should the audience pass over the words of world-renowned poets like Bhāsa, Saumilla and the Kaviputra, to pay this honour to Kālidāsa, a poet of the present day?”

“*The Manager*.—What a silly thing to say. Look you. A poem is not good because it is old, nor bad because it is new, etc.”

Can we use this reference to carry the argument a step further? Have we any fragments that will serve to show that they, who are referred to as “poets of the olden time” by an author, who was himself a classic in 472 A.D., wrote Indian classical poetry of the “renaissance” type centuries before the epoch at which that renaissance is fixed? We are thrown back on the anthologies here. For Kālidāsa has been amply revenged of the critics. Not one

of the plays which they preferred to his has survived. But the fragments in the anthologies are enough for our purpose, I give examples under the three names.

BHĀSA.

I.

कठिनहृदये मुञ्च क्रोधं सुखप्रतिघातकं
लिखति दिवसं यातं यातं यमः किल मानिनि ।
वयसि तरुणे नैतद्युक्तं चले च समागमे
भवति कलहो यावत्तावद्वरं सुभगे रतम् ॥

“O hard-hearted one! put away the anger that is spoiling our bliss. You are proud, but Death is writing “Past, past!” against each of our days. We are young, and short is our time together: were it not better done to love than to quarrel?”

II.

तीक्ष्णं रविस्तपति नीच इवाचिराद्यः
शृङ्गं रुरुत्यजति मित्रमिवाकृतज्ञः ।
तोयं प्रसीदति मुनेरिव चित्तमन्तः
कामी दरिद्र इव शोषमुपैति पङ्कः ॥

Autumn.

“The sun burns hot like a mean man lately exalted; the deer leaves his horn as an ingrate leaves his friend; the water grows clear within like the heart of a sage; the mud is dried up like an impecunious lover.”

III.

विरहिवनितावक्त्रौपम्यं विभर्ति निशापति-
 र्गलितविभवस्याज्ञेवाद्यु द्यतिर्मृष्टा रवेः ।
 अभिनववधूरोषस्वादुः करीषतनूनपा-
 दसरलजनाश्लेषक्रूरसुषारसमीरणः ॥

Winter.

“The moon grows pale like the face of a girl whose love has left her; the beams of the sun are as gentle as the orders of a man stripped of his power; the cowdung fire is charming as the anger of a young wife; the cold wind as harsh as a knave’s embrace.”

IV.

यदपि विबुधैः सिन्धोरन्तः कथंचिदुपाजितं
 तदपि सकलं चारुस्त्रीणां मुखेषु विलोक्यते ।
 सुरसुमनसः श्यासामोदे शशी च कपोलयो-
 रमृतमधरे तिर्यग्भूते विषं च विलोचने ॥

“All that the gods got with such pains within the ocean is to be seen in the faces of women, the flowers of heaven in the perfume of their breath, the moon in their cheeks, nectar on their lips, —and poison in their sidelong glances.”

SOMILA.

We know from Rājasekhara that Somila and Rāmila were joint authors of a “Śūdrakakathā.” They were the Beaumont and Fletcher of their day. But of plays that delayed the acceptance of Kālidāsa’s works one verse is all that remains. It was first quoted by Aufrecht from the Śārṅgaddhara-paddhati with the observation that it is one of the finest in that collection.

सव्याधेः कृशता चतस्र रुधिरं दष्टस्य लालास्रुतिः
 किञ्चिन्नैतदिहास्ति तत्कथमसौ पान्यस्तपस्वी मृतः ।
 आ ज्ञात मधुलम्पटैर्मधुकरैरारब्धकोलाहले
 नूनं साहसिकेन चूतमुकुले दृष्टिः समारोपिता ॥

The Dead Wayfarer.

“If he had been ill his form would be wasted; if he had been wounded there would be blood; if a snake had bitten him there would be foaming at the mouth: none of these things is here: then how did this wretched wayfarer die? Ha! I see: it must be that he rashly let his eye rest on the mango bud round which the bees eager for honey are buzzing.”

Under Rāmilaka the Subhāshitāvali has one verse:

परपुरुषादिव सवितुः संप्रति भीताः कराग्रसंस्पर्शात् ।
 कुलवध इव सलज्जाः प्रविशन्ति गृहोदरं कायाः ॥

The Hot Weather.

“The shadows now retire into the inner rooms of the house like modest and chaste wives fearing the touch of the hands (rays) of another man than their husband—the sun.”

KAVIPUTRAU.

That “Kaviputra” in Kālidāsa’s sentence is a dual, and not a singular, we know from the Subhāshitāvali, which assigns this verse to the two “sons of the poet.”

भूचातुर्यं कुञ्चितान्ताः कटाक्षाः
 स्निग्धा हावा लज्जितान्ताश्च हासाः ।
 लीलामन्दं प्रस्थितं च स्थितं च
 स्त्रीणामेतद्भूषणं चायुधं च ॥

“To arch the brows, to dart side glances from half-closed eyes, to speak flattering words, to laugh bashfully, to move with graceful slowness, then stand still—all this is woman’s ornament and weapon of attack.”

The verse stands now in Bhartrihari.

Opinions will differ as to how far back these names, Bhāsa, Somila and Kaviputrau, serve to carry back the type of poetry of which all are representative. We stand on surer ground with a fourth name, that of Aṣvaghosha. This is the name of the twelfth Buddhist patriarch, who was a contemporary of Kanishka (A.D. 78). His “Life of Buddha” (Buddhacharita) was translated into Chinese in the year 420 A.D., and has now been translated from Chinese into English by Mr. Beal.¹ The Sanskrit original is extant, one copy being among the manuscripts got in Nepal for the University of Cambridge by Dr. Daniel Wright. The work calls itself a *Mahākāvya*, and it is sufficiently evident from the English translation that Daṇḍin and Vāmana would not have refused that title to it. The startling resemblance between Aṣvaghosha’s poetry and that of Kālidāsa cannot fail to attract the attention of the reader even of the English version of the Chinese translation. When Professor Cowell’s promised edition is in our hands, we shall have, it is clear, ample material for deciding which of the two writers it is that is using the other. Meanwhile the anthologies preserve some verses by Aṣvaghosha, three of which are given below as verses which probably date from the first century of our era.

AṢVAGHOSHA.

I.

नैवाकृतिः फलति नैव कुलं न शीलं
विद्या सहस्रगुणिता न च वाग्विशुद्धिः ।

¹ Sacred Books of the East, vol. xix.

कर्माणि पूर्वशुभसंचयसंचितानि
काले फलन्ति पुरुषस्य यथैव वृक्षाः ॥

“Beauty profits a man nothing, nor birth, nor goodness: nor does learning, though it be multiplied a thousandfold, nor purity of speech: the good deeds that have been heaped up in a previous birth, these come to their fruits to a man in this world as trees do.”

II.

व्यायस्यन्नपि कश्चिदर्थितफलप्राप्तेरभागी भवे-
त्सर्वारम्भनिरुद्यमोपि लभते कश्चिद्यद्येष्टं फलम् ।
हस्तात्कस्यचिदाशु नश्यति धनं तेनापरो युज्यते
बालोन्मन्तजडोपमस्य हि विधेर्नानाविधं चेष्टितम् ॥

“One tries hard but has to go without the thing he longed for, another lifts no hand yet gets his heart’s desire; out of one man’s hand the wealth that is in it quickly disappears, and another picks it up: thus Fortune, like a child, or a madman, or a fool, plays with our destinies.”

Lastly I will, at some risk doubtless, be “very bold,” and confess that the considerations I have here feebly set forth invest for me the verses in the anthologies which are written above the great name of Vikramāditya itself (Śrī Vikramādityasya) with a fresh and a great interest. If Aṣvaghosha wrote as we have seen him write in 78 A.D., if he was preceded in the art long before the Christian era by Pāṇini, Patanjali and many others, whose names as well as their poems have perished, who can the Vikramāditya of the following verses be but the great sovereign—poet and friend of poets—in whose honour the Vikramāditya era was established in the year 56 B.C. ?

VIKRAMĀDITYA.

I.

चेतोहरा युवतयः सुहृदोनुकूलाः
 सद्दान्धवाः प्रणयगर्भगिरश्च भृत्याः ।
 नानाविधोपकरणाः करिणस्तुरंगाः
 संमीलिते हि नयने न तदस्ति किञ्चित् ॥

“Girls that delight the heart, friends eager to please, good kinsmen, servants with words full of kindness, horses and elephants with all their trappings—in the twinkling of an eye all these things will have passed away.

II.

रुजासु नाथः परमं हि भेषजं
 तमःप्रदीपो विषमेषु संक्रमः ।
 भयेषु रक्षा व्यसनेषु बान्धवो
 भवत्यगाधे व्यसनान्धसि श्वः ॥

“In all my sicknesses God is my sovereign medicine; in darkness He is a light, and in rough places a path; in danger a protection, and in trouble a brother—He is the ship that shall bear me over sorrow’s soundless sea.”