

We thus see that *ādēśas* are confined to the last two classes of Prakrit roots. They cannot belong to the first or second.

All the above somewhat trite remarks are introductory to the consideration of one Prakrit root, which illustrates in a striking manner the difference between the grammatical schools of eastern and western India.

The eastern grammarians give *ā-hamm-* as an *ādēśa* for *ā-gam-* (RT. I, viii, 34; Mk. vii, 140). To them, therefore, as this is clearly put as a substitute, there is no Sanskrit root *hamm-(gatau)*. To the Easterners, *ā-hamm-* is a borrowed *dēśya* word.

Hēmacandra (iv, 162) recognizes this Prakrit root, but combats the statement of the Easterners, and denies that it is an *ādēśa* of *gam-*, or, indeed, any substitute at all. On the contrary, he puts it in the first class of the Prakrit roots given above, and equates it with a Sanskrit root *hamm-(gatau)*. As this root does appear in the Dhātupāṭha, Hēmacandra appears to be right, and the Easterners do not seem to have a leg to stand on. But Patañjali vindicates them. In his preface to the Mahābhāṣya, he treats of Sanskrit words which are used only locally. One of these is this very root *hamm-*,<sup>1</sup> which he says is used only in Surāṣṭra, i.e. in the very tract of country in which Hēmacandra lived and worked. It is evidently a *dēśya* word, introduced into Sanskrit in the West, but in the East still a *dēśya* word, and only a *dēśya* word, and there properly treated as an *ādēśa* for *gam-*.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.

21st June, 1921.

#### THE PLAYS OF BHĀSA

I am unable to concur with Dr. Barnett's appreciation (*supra*, pp. 587–9) of Mr. A. Banerji's article (pp. 367 sqq.) concerning Bhāsa. In 1920, when I had the pleasure of meeting the discoverer and editor of the plays, Mahāmahopādhyāya

<sup>1</sup> Kielhorn, p. 9, l. 26.

T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, I urged him to write an article summarizing the whole position, and discussing the doubts propounded by some scholars in India, and prominently by Dr. Barnett in Europe. Although the case for the ascription of the plays to Bhāsa is convincingly stated in the Mahāmahopādhyāya's prefaces to his editions of them, he agreed that it might be advisable to deal with the points which have been raised, and this, I trust, will in due course be done. Mr. Banerji's article, however, when it appeared, seemed to me so conclusive as almost to render any further argument on the main question superfluous. Having long been interested in the plays, I may, however, venture to state generally how the case presents itself to me :—

(1) The only known title of a play by Bhāsa is *Svapna-Vāsavadattā* ; but that there were others by the same author is indicated by the familiar references on the part of Kālidāsa and Bāṇa. That the plays existed in a group is apparent from Rājaśekhara's expression *Bhāsa-nāṭaka-cakra*.

(2) If the Trivandrum *Svapna-Vāsavadattā* is not the work of Bhāsa, the author has *plagiarized* the title.<sup>1</sup> This would be initially very unlikely, since Sanskrit dramas usually (and the old ones known to us invariably) have distinct titles, even when they deal with similar subjects (so the many plays relating to the story of Rāma), and even when they are plagiaristic, e.g. in the case of the *Mahānāṭaka* and in that of the *Cārudatta* and *Mr̥cchakaṭika*. Still more improbable would be the subsequent history. The Trivandrum *Vāsavadattā* was in the ninth century a famous play ; it is quoted by Vāmana in the *Kāvyaḷamkāra-sūtra-vṛtti*, and a work of this name is mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his *Bharata-nāṭya-veda-vivṛti* and in the *Dhvanyālokalocana*. Yet we are never told that there were two famous dramas of this name.

(3) Others of the Trivandrum plays were likewise famous.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Barnett's expression, "the pseudo-Bhāsa," if it does not imply any intention of falsification, seems rather hard upon an author who gives neither his own name nor another.

Bhāmaha in the seventh century, perhaps even before the date to which Dr. Barnett assigns the authorship, refers to the *Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa*; Abhinavagupta names the *Daridra-Cārudatta*; Vāmana quotes the *Svapna-Vāsavadattā*, *Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa* and *Cārudatta*. Yet, if the author of these works and of the others which we have is not Bhāsa, he is quite unknown. Supposing it was his intention to father his work upon Bhāsa, he has been at any rate phenomenally successful in suppressing his own name. And how did he impose upon the contemporary public, literary and otherwise, and upon his royal patron?

(4) The plays of Bhāsa were similar in structure, so far as our indications go, to those which we now have, a similarity which has been expounded in detail by the Editor and others. The published plays are in style and matter worthy of the fame which they have enjoyed and of Bhāsa's authorship. They impress us by their freshness and vigour; and we feel in them the inspiration of direct derivation from the great epics.

(5) There are good evidences, adduced by the Editor, of borrowing, as between Kālidāsa, who mentions Bhāsa, and the Trivandrum plays. A dependence of the *Mrcchakatīka* of Śūdraka upon the *Cārudatta* has now been thoroughly worked out by Dr. Georg Morgenstierne (*Über das Verhältnis zwischen Cārudatta und Mrcchakatīkā*, Leipzig, 1921). In the latter case the idea of making the Trivandrum work the borrower is excluded. I have the impression that other evidences of influence exerted by the plays upon later literature are available; but, since a date later than the seventh century is not propounded, this point may be passed over.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I may note that in Pūrṇabhadra's *Pañcatantra* there occurs, in addition to the verse cited by Dr. Morgenstierne, p. 12, n. 2, also a well-known verse (*nityodita*) corresponding to the Bhāsa (*Avimāraka*) verse *yatne kṛte yadī na sidhyati*. As regards the verse *sañcitapakṣma-kapāṭam*, cited in the *Dhvanyālokalocana* (p. 102) as from the *Svapna-Vāsavadattā*, we find it with the obviously correct opening *svañcita* . . . in Hemacandra's *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, p. 21.

Nothing has been discovered in the plays which would conflict with a date prior to Kālidāsa.

(6) In regard to the Prākṛit much valuable work has been done by Dr. Lesný (*ZDMG.*, lxxii, pp. 203–8 and ref.), Dr. Sukthankar (*JAOS.* xl, 248 *seq.*, xli, 107 *seq.*), Dr. Georg Morgenstierne (op. cit.), and by Mr. Banerji in his article ; and now we have the elaborate dissertation on the subject by Dr. W. Printz (*Bhāsa's Prākṛit*, Frankfurt A.M., 1921). The evidences of antiquity are unmistakable ; but Dr. Barnett now proposes to put them aside on the ground that similar phenomena are adducible from other plays edited in Southern India. No doubt this contention will receive examination in detail. But shall we find anything to match the instances which Dr. Printz has elicited (pp. 26–7) of accusative plural masculine in *-āni*, a form which Professor Lüders first distinguished in the Edicts of Aśoka and the plays of Aśvaghoṣa ?

(7) That the few verses ascribed to Bhāsa in the anthologies are not discoverable in the plays is at first sight a difficulty. But the explanation given by the Editor and by Mr. Banerji seems to me adequate. The anthologies cite verses by Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, and the other eminent poets which are likewise untraceable ; and one of those ascribed to Bhāsa was identified by Gaṇapati Śāstri in his edition of the *Mattavilāsa*, which, as he showed, is similar in structure to Bhāsa works.

(8) The European scholars who accept the authorship of Bhāsa include practically all (excepting Dr. Barnett) who have written upon the subject, at least the following : Professor Jacobi (trans. of the *Vāsavadattā*), Professor Jolly (Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1916, p. 353), Professor Winternitz (*Festschrift Kuhn*, pp. 299–304), Professor Konow (*ibid.*, pp. 106 *seq.* and *Das indische Drama*, pp. 51 *sqq.*), M. Baston (trans. of the *Vāsavadattā*), Professor Suali (*Giornale della Soc. As. Italiana*, xxv, p. 95), Professor Pavolini (*ibid.*), Dr. Lesný (loc. cit.), Dr. Lindenau (*Bhāsaustudien*), Dr. Morgenstierne (op. cit.), M. Lacôte (*J.A.*, sér. xi, vol. xiii,

pp. 493 *seq.*), Dr. Printz (op. cit.). It would be difficult, I believe, to rebut the evidence adduced in these works.

F. W. THOMAS.

#### NOTE ON THE HATHIGUMPHA INSCRIPTION

We are still awaiting the definite edition of this important inscription, expected from Messrs. Jayaswal and Banerji, who have made valuable contributions to its readings. It is to be hoped that the plaster casts which have been taken may clear up some of the still doubtful points, and perhaps photography in its modern developments has not yet said its last word on the subject. But the difficulties of the inscription are by no means solely those of reading, and interpretation has still to play a part. *En attendant*, I should like to record the following :—

(1) l. 4. In place of—

Kaśapana[m] Khatiyaṃ ca sahāye vitopati Musika-nagaraṃ,  
I read—

kataṭhenāgatiya ca sahāyavatā pīṭhulasikaṃ nagaraṃ,  
where, however, I must admit that °vatā would possibly be °vitā and °lasikaṃ °lasiki. Taking the reading as proposed, the only possible Sanskrit equivalent would be—  
kṛtārthenāgatya ca sahāyavatā pṛthūllāsikaṃ nagaraṃ,  
“and, having returned with his purpose accomplished, he with his allies made gay the city.

The reading here is a matter of importance, since Mr. Jayaswal finds a reference to Kāśyapa Kṣatriyas and the Mūṣika capital. If the ally is the Sātakarṇi referred to in what precedes, then the reading *abhitāyitā* (= *abhitṛāyitvā*, or °tā, “going to the rescue of”) is preferable to *acimtayitā*.

(2) l. 6. For *rāja-seya-saṃdaṃsanato* I would read *rājasūya-saṃdaṃsanato*, the *rājasūya* ceremony following upon the [*punar*]-*abhiśeka*.

(3) l. 7. For *ca [ja ra gha]ra* read *vajira-ghara* = *vajragṛha*.

(4) l. 9. For *jaṭharaṃ bhi paraṃ* read *jaṭharābhipūraṃ*.