

## A NOTE ON BHAVABHŪTI AND ON VĀKPATIRĀJA

By JOHANNES HERTEL

In a paper "On the Literature of the Shvetāmbaras of Gujarāt"<sup>1</sup>, p. 20, I said: "We do not, in the printed editions, read the works of Vālmīki, of Kālidāsa, of Bhavabhūti, and of most of the other celebrated Sanskrit authors, but only disfigurations of their works, in whose every passage the authenticity of the wording is more than doubtful."

In this passage, I intentionally quoted the greatest names of Indian literary history.

As to Kālidāsa, I need not expatiate here on the facts after what I have stated in my reviews of Cappeller's edition of Kālidāsa's Śākuntala, and of Hultsch's edition of the Meghadūta<sup>2</sup>.

The fact that the texts of the works of the greatest Indian classics are, to say the least, still unsettled, is not only discreditable for those who are intrusted with the care of Sanskrit literature, it is most disastrous for any research, whether literary, or linguistic, or historical, in connexion with the works of Sanskrit authors. Critical editions—I shall never tire of repeating this truth—are the very foundation stones on which the edifice of Indology has to be constructed. If these stones are rotten, the whole edifice must needs crumble to pieces.

After these preliminary remarks, may I be allowed to say a few words on the works of Bhavabhūti?

Bhavabhūti's is a very great name in Sanskrit literature. He is the Schiller of India, a Sanskrit classic if any. Let us consider what

<sup>1</sup> 1922, in Kommission bei Markert & Petters, Leipzig, Seeburgstraße 53.

<sup>2</sup> ZDMG. 64 (1910), p. 630 ff.; GGA. 1912, Nr. 7, p. 403 ff.

we know of what is universally and unanimously believed to be his first work, viz. the *Mahāvīracarita*.

The printed editions of this celebrated composition have been enumerated by Sten Konow, *Das indische Drama*, § 89. Most of these editions, I regret to say, are not available to me, and there is now no possibility for a German scholar to procure for his use the texts printed in India, if these editions have not been purchased before the mundane war. The only edition, however, which I am truly sorry not to be able to consult in addition to those which I possess, is that of Madras which contains the commentary of Lakshmana Sūri.

The following remarks, therefore, are based on the editions of Trithen (London 1848), of Borooh (Calcutta 1877), and of Aiyar, *Rangachariar*, and *Parab* (Bombay 1892).

In his § 89, Konow has the following remark: "Die indische Tradition berichtet, daß Bhavabhūti selbst bloß den ersten Teil, bis zur 46. Strophe des 5. Aktes geschrieben habe. Der Schluß soll das Werk des Subrahmaṇya Kavi sein"; i. e.: "According to Indian tradition, Bhavabhūti would have composed only the first part down to stanza 46 of the fifth act. The conclusion is said to be the work of Subrahmaṇya Kavi."

Professor Konow neither gives the source of this statement, nor does he tell us, what he understands by "Indian tradition." What are the facts?

The text of the first edition, by Trithen, is based on only 3 MSS. "One of them, dated Samvat 1665, is written with more than usual care and accuracy; but it is unfortunately imperfect, and does not extend beyond the fifth act. The other, bearing the year of Vikramāditya 1857, though complete, is the hasty work of an indifferent scribe, teeming with errors of all kinds; and it was found necessary in more than one instance, in the course of the last two acts, to receive in the Text the reading of Professor Wilson's copy, now deposited in the Bodleian Library at Oxford"<sup>1</sup>.

This edition contains the *vulgata*, reprinted several times in India. Even that excellent scholar who was Anundoram Borooh, tells us that he was not able to procure any MS., when he made his own edition in 1877. He as well as Trithen corrected their respective

<sup>1</sup> Trithen p. i.

texts with the aid of the readings given in *alamkāra* literature. Trithen does not state in what relation "Wilson's copy," which he occasionally compared, stands to his second MS., but it must be concluded from his words that in that portion which is missing in his oldest MS., Wilson's copy, in the main, agrees with his second MS.

This second MS. is recorded in Aufrecht's Oxford Catalogue Pars i, 1859, p. 136, first column, under Nr. 260. It contains all the seven acts of the play; but it is even more modern than Trithen's second MS., being written after 1820 A. D.

Trithen's first MS. is recorded in Eggeling's Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of the India Office, Part vii, B, London 1904, p. 1581, first column, under Nr. 4136 (114c). According to Eggeling, it contains the first five acts. But the copyist expressly states that the text of the play contained in it is complete. His colophon reads as follows:

महावीरचरित आरण्यकं नाम पंचमीकः ॥ ५ ॥ समाप्तं चेदं वीरचरितं  
नाम नाटकं कृतिः श्रीकण्ठापरनाम्नी भट्टभवभूतेः ॥ संवत् १६६५<sup>०</sup> लिखितं चतु-  
र्भुजपुस्तकं रामदाश कुरचेचि (sic!) ब्रह्मण वेदाति ॥

The last of these words are written in a mixture of Sanskrit and vernacular; their meaning appears to be that the copy was made by Rāmdās, a Brāhmaṇa of Kurukshetra who was a Vedāntin, either for a certain Caturbhuj, or else, from a MS. belonging to a certain Caturbhuj.

Under these circumstances we have to state the following facts:

1. We not only do not possess any truly critical edition of the Mahāvīracarita, but not even *any* edition giving even the scantiest various readings from *any* MS.
2. The *vulgata* of the Mahāvīracarita does not go back to any source other than Trithen's edition, which is mainly based on two MSS., an old and excellent one, dated Samvat 1665=1608/9 A. D., and a bad one, dated 1857=1800/1 A. D. Professor Wilson's MS., which Trithen occasionally used for the last two acts of the play, is even younger, being written after 1820 A. D.
3. The sixth and the seventh act of the play are exclusively contained in these two young MSS., and, hence, cannot be traced farther back than 1800 A. D. According to Trithen as well as to Eggeling, the oldest MS. gives the text of the play only to the end of Act v.

But in the colophon as printed by Eggeling, the copyist expressly states *that this text is complete*.

4. On the other hand, there are MSS. in which the concluding part of our play, *i. e.* all the wording from the prose following after v, 46 to the end, contains a *wholly different text*. This is clear from the important edition of Aiyar, Rangacharyar, and Parab, which gives the text of the commentator Vīrarāghava, adding the vulgata on pp. 209--254 without any commentary.

On p. 209, after explaining the wording of v, 46, Vīrarāghava has the following remark:

एतावत्येव भवभूतेः सूक्तिः । इतः परं तु सुब्रह्मण्यनामः कस्यचित्कवेर्वच इति मूल एव स्फुटीभविष्यति । अवश्यं चेत्यादीनि सुब्रह्मण्यकवेर्वचांस्यपि प्रायशो व्याख्यास्यन्ते । *i. e.*: "To here only extends Bhavabhūti's text, and this one (v, 46) is its last stanza. That the following text has been composed by some poet whose name was Subrahmanya, this will be seen from the text itself. Though the words अवश्यं च and all the wording following after them are the composition of the poet Subrahmanya, they will be explained in full."

*Subrahmanya's text is absolutely different from that of the vulgata.* But though this text was printed as early as 1892 at Bombay, *not even one of our Histories of Indian Literature* (Macdonell 1900, Oldenberg 1903, Henry 1904, Pischel 1906, Winternitz 1922) *so much as mentions the existence of these two different conclusions of one of the most celebrated dramas of Sanskrit literature; nor does Sten Konow in his above quoted monography on the Indian drama.* Every reader must needs refer his remark on Subrahmanya to the vulgata text, and this inference, of course, is quite wrong.

Instead of concealing the existence of these two different conclusions of our play from their readers, it would, of course, have been the duty of the scholars just mentioned to explain it. Let us try to do so in their place.

The first question to be answered is this: How was it possible that Vīrarāghava, at v, 46, ceased to explain the genuine text of Bhavabhūti, and continued to explain that of *some* Subrahmanya?

The commentator's very wording shows that this Subrahmanya was by no means a celebrated poet, and that Vīrarāghava did not know anything about him. For proof of his statement, he refers the

reader to a later passage of the text which, I think, can only mean the colophon of one, or of all, of his MSS. For from the various readings which he occasionally gives in his commentary, it is clear that he used *several* MSS. of this play. He must even have had more than one MS. of Subrahmanya's text, as he gives and explains various readings of this text as well. His commentary amply proves that Vīrarāghava was a very accurate scholar. Would anybody, under these circumstances, go the length of assuming that, for a mere whim, he neglected the text of the celebrated poet he was commenting upon, in order to comment on the text of "some" poet whom he did not know, and who, consequently, was nothing to him? Vīrarāghava certainly would not have called him कश्चित्, if he had admired him. Moreover, who would have consulted his commentary, if he did not throughout comment on the genuine text? Would others have given preference to the text of this "somebody", if Vīrarāghava, without any reason, was guilty of such a folly?

There can be only one reason for Vīrarāghava's proceeding, *viz.*, *that no complete copy of the genuine text was available to him.*

No other explication, of course, can be found for the poet *Subrahmanya's* proceeding. For that he did not intend to commit any forgery, this is evident from the commentator's words, who refers the reader to a future passage of the text MS. He, therefore, must have found the poet's name in the colophon of at least one of his MSS., though it does not appear in the printed text.

Nobody, I think, will imagine that Subrahmanya did his work without a *cogent* reason. It is clear from the prologue that our drama was destined to be acted in a temple on the occasion of a *yâtrâ*. Its continuation is the Uttararâmacarita. Now, in the Bharatavākya, vii, 21, the poet Subrahmanya says: सो ज्यं ... संदर्भो विदुषाममन्दहृदयान्दाय संतायताम्, *i. e.*: "May this ... composition, to the great joy of the hearts of the learned, *be connected together*".

These words clearly give the reason from which Subrahmanya did his work. संदर्भो "composition" either means "the (dramatical) composition of the Râma Story," *i. e.*, the Mahâvīracarita *plus* the Uttararâmacarita, or else, the meaning of the quoted passage is:

<sup>1</sup> Evidently this second reading, given by the commentator, is the genuine one, as that given in the text and explained by the commentator in the first place, *viz.* संदायतां = सम्यक्शोधितो भवतु, makes no good sense here.

"May this composition (the Mahāvīracarita) (now) be connected (with the other, *i. e.*, the Uttarārāmacarita)."

Whether our first or our second explanation is correct, at all events the poet tells us that *he filled in a gap between the two plays of Bhavabhūti*. That he did not do so for his *personal* purposes, this is clear from his wording itself. As in vedic and in our own times, Indian poets, during the whole period of Sanskrit poetry, composed their works *in order to earn their livelihood* by them. It follows that Subrahmanya wrote by order of some patron, whether some prince or some religious community, and that in his time, and at the place he dwelt in, the genuine text of the concluding part of the play, *i. e.*, of acts vi and vii, was not available.

We, thus, have two *independent* witnesses to prove that, in two different places and at two times—since, as we saw above, Subrahmanya was known to Virarāghava only from his text MSS.—the genuine text of the Mahāvīracarita did not "extend beyond the fifth act."

For a third, and a very important, witness of the same fact is the oldest of the MSS. used by Trithen, which, as we saw, ends with act v, though the text of this MS. is complete in itself.

The facts just stated are very astonishing, for they cannot possibly be explained by the supposition that the missing text had been lost in the course of time. Such an explication will do for, say, Aśvaghōṣa's Buddhacarita. Buddhism, and with it the works of Bauddha writers, disappeared from the Indian soil, and the Buddhacarita has been handed down to us in a Bauddha country, in Nepal, where there has been preserved a single copy which now is incomplete.

The case is entirely different with Bhavabhūti who, as we know from Vākpati's Gauḍavaha 799, was a celebrated poet in his lifetime, *i. e.*, about 733 A. D.<sup>1</sup> He was equally famous about 900 A. D., when Rājaśekhara, alluding to Bhavabhūti's Rāma plays, calls him an incarnation of Vālmiki.<sup>2</sup> And he never ceased to be famous; for later poets imitated him, the authors on *alaṅkāra* as well as the anthologies abundantly quoted him, and down to our own days he is considered among Indian scholars to be only second, or even equal,

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Belvalkar, HOS. 21, p. xlii, § 10.

to Kālidāsa himself. Especially the Mahāvīracarita has been abundantly used as a source by other dramatists.<sup>1</sup>

For these reasons it is clear that at all times many MSS. of this play must have existed in the centres of Sanskrit learning throughout India, *whence it follows that the loss of part of the genuine text of the Mahāvīracarita was an impossibility.*<sup>2</sup>

The correctness of our view is borne out by the fact that Aufrecht, in his Catalogus Catalogorum i, p. 443, and ii, p. 102, enumerates no less than 34 copies of this play. What multitudes must exist in the *private* libraries of the paṇḍits!

If, notwithstanding, the oldest known MS. does not contain the last two acts, and if neither the poet Subrahmanya and his patron or patrons, nor the commentator Virarāghava, knew anything of a genuine text of this portion of the play, the conclusion seems to be unavoidable that *the vulgata text as given by Trithen and reprinted in India is as spurious as the text of Subrahmanya. Up to the present, we have no testimony of this text going back farther than 1800 A. D.*

In this connexion, a remark of Belvalkar, l. c. p. xvii, § 31, last alinea, is interesting. He says: "The poet may also be charged with some inconsistencies of statement: cp. vii. 16<sup>c</sup> with v. 38<sup>a</sup>." It will be seen that the *only* inconsistency quoted by Belvalkar is between a passage of the *genuine text*, and one of the *vulgata text of act vii*. This is another corroboration of our view that this text as well as Subrahmanya's is a continuation of the Mahāvīracarita written by some other poet for the same reason as that which caused Subrahmanya to write his own supplement.

A further corroboration of the correctness of our view will be found in the following fact. As Borooah, l. c. § 4, has shown, Bhavabhūti, like other Sanskrit classics, quotes or imitates himself in different passages of his works. I give here, from Borooah's list, the parallel passages of the Mahāvīracarita, not altering the numbering of the stanzas as given by Borooah, though editions other than those used by him show some slight deviations in this respect.

<sup>1</sup> See Borooah, Bhavabhūti and his place in Sanskrit Literature, § 38.

<sup>2</sup> Partly for the same reasons, it is an impossibility that e. g. Daṅḍin's Daśakumāracarita was ever completed. The note of Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Literatur iii, p. 649, addendum to p. 358, does not duly take into consideration what has been said in my "Indische Erzähler" (Leipzig Haessel, 1922) vol. iii, p. 46.

i, 14cd = U. iv, 9cd.	ii, 45 ab = Mā. v, 9ab.	v, 13 = U. ii, 15
i, 18 = U. iv, 19.	ii, 46 ab = U. vi, 21 ab.	v, 40 = U. ii, 20.
i, 19cd = U. i, 16cd.	iii, 29 = U. iv, 28.	v, 41 = U. ii, 21 = Mā. ix, 6.
i, 42 = U. i, 15; vi, 15.	iv, 27 ab = U. i, 13 ab.	v, 42c = Mā. ix, 23c.
i, 57 abc = U. i, 17 abc.	iv, 33 = U. i, 8.	v, 42d = U. i, 33b = Mā. ix, 23d
ii, 41 = U. vi, 9	iv, 52 abd = U. i, 22 abd.	v, 54b = Mā. ix, 3b

It will be seen that there is *not a single quotation from the sixth and from the seventh act*, though all the other acts are quoted. This goes far to prove that the last two acts, as given in the vulgata, are not Bhavabhūti's work.

On the other hand, we have a quotation of v, 54b. This circumstance together with the testimony of the oldest MS. shows that Subrahmanya altered even the genuine text after v, 46, whereas *in the vulgata Bhavabhūti's own text has been preserved to the end of act v.*

We shall not now be astonished at another inconsistency of the vulgata text. It will be seen from Trithen's edition, pp. 20, 38, 51, 72, 94, 117, and 137 (cp. ed. Aiyar, p. 215, p. 236, and p. 254) that every one of the first five acts bears an individual title. The first act is called **कौमारः**, the second **परशुरामसंवादः**, the third **संसृष्टः**, the fourth **चारित्र्यम्**, the fifth **आरण्यकम्**, whereas no such title has been given to the sixth and to the seventh act.

The results we have arrived at in the foregoing lines would only be invalidated by the *proof* that the text of the vulgata in the two last acts contains Bhavabhūti's genuine wording. Such a proof, however, could only be given by a truly critical edition, the text of which must be based *on the pedigree* of all the available MSS. If in such an edition the history of the text *evidently* shows that indeed, at one time, there was left, in some part of India, a single incomplete MS. to which all the copies represented by Trithen's oldest MS., by Subrahmanya's text, and by the MSS. commented upon by Virarāghava, go back, whereas in some other part of India a complete MS. survived, to which Trithen's copy of 1800/1 and Wilson's even younger copy go back, then, indeed, we have been wrong in our conclusions. But as it is utterly improbable that such a proof can ever

be given, we may draw further conclusions from what has been said above.

If the vulgata text of acts vi and vii is as spurious as that of Subrahmanya, then *the very foundation of the hitherto unanimously accepted chronology of Bhavabhūti's works must needs collapse.* For in that case, Bhavabhūti, like so many other Indian authors, would have left his Mahāvīracarita unfinished; cp. my "Indische Erzähler", vol. iii, p. 46 ff. Then, however, it is not at all likely that the Mahāvīracarita was the first of Bhavabhūti's plays: on the contrary, *it must have been the last of his Rāma plays, and very probably it was the last of all his dramas.*

To this view the remark, of course, would be no objection that the purport of the Uttararāmacarita is a continuation of that of the Mahāvīracarita. The public before which Bhavabhūti's plays were acted, was thoroughly versed in Rāma's history, in which the events represented in the Uttararāmacarita form a unit. We know, moreover, that Bhāsa, too, treated in plays which are independent of one another, the subjects contained in the epics.

That the author of the Mahāvīracarita was not a mere beginner, this is evident from stanza 4 of the *prastāvanā*, in which he calls himself **वज्रवाच**. Such boasting would scarcely have been ventured by a young and unknown poet. But the strongest proof of the Mahāvīracarita being the work of an already renowned poet lies in the following prose section, in which he is told to bear the title of Śrīkaṇṭha. Borooh, l. c. § 54, calls this "a title, so far as I know, not shared by anybody else."

We can well understand that after the Uttararāmacarita Bhavabhūti's patron Yaśovarman ordered him to execute the by far more difficult task of dramatizing the whole of the Rāmāyaṇa. But it would be incomprehensible that, instead of finishing the Mahāvīracarita, the poet should have written the Uttararāmacarita, if, indeed, the former was his first play. To me, at least, this seems to be an impossibility.

We know from Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī iv, 144, that Vākpatorāja and Bhavabhūti lived at the court of Kanauj in the service of King Yaśovarman, when the latter was subdued by Lalitāditya of Kashmere. This statement is corroborated by a well-known stanza of Vākpatorāja's Gauḍavaha. Stanzas 799f. of this poem run as follows:

भवभूजलहिण्णियकञ्जामयरसकणा इव फुरन्ति ।  
जस विसेसा अज्जवि वियडेसु कहाणियेसेसु ॥ ७९९ ॥  
भासम्मि जलणामित्ते कन्तीदेवे अ जस रज्जुआरे ।  
सोबन्धवे अ बन्धम्मि हारियन्दे अ आणन्दो ॥ ८०० ॥

I translate these stanzas as follows:

799. "(Vākpati) in the vast palaces (pun: copies) of whose narratives (*i. e.* epics) even now excellences (*i. e.* beauties) are sparkling, like drops of the amṛta liquid (pun: enlivening sentiments) of the poetry (= poetical art, *and* inspiration) which have come out of the Ocean (called) Bhavabhūti,

800. and who delights in Bhāsa, the friend of Fire, and in Kāntideva, and in the author of the Raghuvamśa, and in the works of Subandhu, and of Haricandra."

Vākpati's poems here are compared to large palaces, as they are inhabited by many persons and contain many matters, and the word निवेश evidently is meant as a pun implying at the same time the sense of *copies*<sup>1</sup>. As palaces situated on the sea-shore are sprinkled by the water of the Ocean, the drops on their walls glittering in the sun, so the copies of Vākpati's poems are sprinkled by the amṛta drops of the poetical art or inspiration, which comes from the Ocean Bhavabhūti. (The poet evidently does not think here of the churning of the ocean, but compares Bhavabhūti himself to an ocean of amṛta.) And this takes place *even now*, whereas the poet can only delight *in the works* of the authors enumerated in stanza 800, since these authors belong to the past.<sup>2</sup>

If the word अज्जवि "even now" has *any* meaning here, it can only be understood as marking a difference between Bhavabhūti and the poets whose names are given in stanza 800. It follows that *Bhavabhūti was still living and advising Vākpati when the latter was composing his Gaiṇḍavaha, and Kullhana's statement is corroborated by that of Vākpati himself.*

<sup>1</sup> Traces of these copies, evidently the rough draughts of the *body* of Vākpati's epic, are to be found in quotations by Prakrit grammarians. Cp. Grierson in Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, (extract) p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> It will be seen that my own explanation of these two stanzas widely differs from S. P. Paṇḍit's in his edition of the Gaiṇḍavaha, p. lxiv ff. and from Belvalkar's, HOS. 21, p. xlv f., § 13.

Professor Winternitz thinks that Bhavabhūti's plays are mere "book-plays", *i. e.* dramas which were not intended to be acted on the stage, but only to be read. In his "Geschichte der indischen Litteratur", vol. iii, p. 232, he says: "Daß seine Dichtungen mehr Lesedramen als Bühnenwerke sind, beweisen schon die langen Komposita in den Prosareden"; and *ibidem*, p. 237: "So dramatisch aber auch viele Szenen des Mālatīmādhava sind, so ist doch auch dieses Werk des Bhavabhūti nur ein Buchdrama. Denn es ist kaum denkbar, daß ein Publikum, das nicht aus lauter hervorragenden Kennern des Sanskrit bestanden hat, jemals hätte das Werk beim bloßen Hören verstehen können."

The mere idea that such "book-dramas" ever existed in ancient India, seems to me quite inadmissible. For in India, even epics and romances were not composed to be studied with the *eye*, but to be enjoyed with the *ear*. We do not know anything about a book-trade in ancient India. Sanskrit, as I have shown elsewhere, was a living language down to even recent times, and the anecdotes contained in books like the Prabandhacintāmaṇi and the Bhojaprabandha, if we had no other evidence, would suffice to show that the society at the courts of the Hindu rulers, which were the centres of classical Sanskrit and of its literature, was learned enough to understand and to compose instantaneously the most artificial and the most intricate stanzas. These poets and their public possessed a command of the Sanskrit language which, indeed, was marvellous. So artificial a romance as Soddhala's Udayasundarikathā (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. xi, Baroda 1920) was composed within a few days, and read *before*, not *by*, Mummurāja (first half of the 11th century). Still the style of this romance is by far more artificial than that of the Mālatīmādhava, and its text abounds in long sentences, and the sentences are crowded with long compounds.

Yaśovarman's courtiers, then, were sure to understand Bhavabhūti's works when the latter were represented on the stage. But we may even assume that these dramas were acted before a public of which only a part fully understood their wording. "Crowds of all classes, from ignorant cultivators to princes, attend the performance of Sanskrit plays to-day, but they do not go with the primary object of hearing what the characters say. They go, as our opera audiences go, to see a story with which they are familiar reproduced on the

stage, and to hear the music and the singing. The actual spoken words are of minor importance. Even in modern plays in which the songs are written in the vernacular, as is sometimes the case, the audience cannot follow the words of the singer unless they know them beforehand. I can vouch this from personal experience." (G. A. Grierson, JRAS 1904, p. 473.) "I can myself vouch for the absorbed attention with which uneducated villagers will listen to recitals of the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, and to the representations of Sanskrit plays, — pleased by the sonorousness of the language, and satisfied with only the vague idea of what it all means which is supplied by their general acquaintance with the outlines of the topics." (Fleet, *ib.*, p. 482.)

Especially in the case of Bhavabhūti's plays there cannot be the least doubt that they were composed in order to be represented on the stage. For the *prastāvanās* of the *Mālatīmādhava*, of the *Uttararāmacarita*, and of the *Mahāvīracarita* do contain, all of them, the explicit statement that the respective dramas were to be performed before an audience of pilgrims in the temple of *Kālapriyanātha*.

Cp. *Mālatīmādhava*: मारिष सुविहितानि रङ्गमङ्गलानि सनिपतितश्च भगवतः कालप्रियनाथस्य यात्राप्रसङ्गेन नानादिगन्तवास्तव्यो जनः ॥ *Uttararāmacarita*: अथ खलु भगवतः कालप्रियनाथस्य यात्रायामार्यमिश्रान्विज्ञापयामि ॥ *Mahāvīracarita*: अथ खलु भगवतः कालप्रियनाथस्य यात्रायामार्यमिश्राः समादिशन्ति.

Thus the theory of Professor Winternitz is utterly untenable. All of Bhavabhūti's plays were written to be represented in one and the same temple.

It follows that all of them must have been composed in Kanauj. Under these circumstances, it can scarcely be due to a mere chance that two works of the two most celebrated court poets of Yaśovarman were not finished.

If S. P. Paṇḍit's assumption is correct who thinks that Vākpati did not finish his huge poem because his patron was deprived of his throne—and I cannot see any objection to the probability of this opinion—, then the same will be true in the case of Bhavabhūti. No doubt the title of *Śrikanṭha* had been conferred on the poet by his patron, and no doubt but that he wrote in the pay and by order of Yaśovarman. After the ruin of this king, Bhavabhūti will have had no occasion to complete his *Mahāvīracarita*, as this work was destined

for a *special* festival in a *special* temple. Who knows if the temple of *Kālapriyanātha*, who evidently was Yaśovarman's family deity, was not destroyed when Kanauj was taken by the enemy?

The date of the *Mahāvīracarita*, then, would be some years after 733 A. D., whereas the two other plays of Bhavabhūti which we still possess must have been composed before this drama.

Objections based on the poet's technic and on his style might perhaps be made. But such objections would not prove anything. The purports of the *Mālatīmādhava* and of the two *Rāma* plays are too different not to influence the technic. The poet, no doubt, had to face the *greatest* difficulties in composing the *Mahāvīracarita*, and he was not at liberty to alter any incident of the *Rāma* story which he would have liked to alter from merely literary reasons. Let us not forget that in his *Rāma* plays the poet had to deal with a *religious* topic.

The style, of course, is also influenced by the subject treated by the poet. It must needs be different in a *mysterium* and in a *comedy*. But the time of treating of Bhavabhūti's style will have come, when all his plays will lie before us in truly critical editions. As matters stand, we do not even know what is Bhavabhūti's property in the *Mālatīmādhava*; see Belvalkar, l. c. p. xli f., § 9. The same scholar, according to Winternitz, *Geschichte der Ind. Litt.* iii, p. 646, Addendum to p. 232, has shown in *JAOS.* 34, 1915, p. 428 ff., that there are two recensions of the *Uttararāmacarita*. The volume quoted is not available to me, but I may add that the *Mālatīmādhava* texts, as represented by the commentaries of *Tripurārī* and of *Jagaddhara*, show very remarkable differences from one another. The hitherto published texts of Bhavabhūti's plays, then, are no materials on which an inquiry into the poet's style can possibly be based.

From *HOS.*, vol. 21, it appears that Mr. Shripad Krishna Belvalkar is an accurate and learned critic. Let us hope that he will give us, in due time, the truly critical editions of Bhavabhūti's plays which will settle the questions treated in this paper.

The results we hope we have arrived at in the foregoing lines would partly be invalidated, if Hermann Jacobi were right in his criticisms, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1888, Nr. 2, p. 61 ff. Against the view expressed by Shankar Paṇḍurang Paṇḍit in the Introduction to his edition of the *Gauḍavaha* Jacobi maintains that the poem, as

we have it, *is only an abstract of the poet's original production*; and Winternitz, op. laud. p. 84, vol. iii, subscribes to this eminent scholar's opinion.

As the topic under discussion is of a considerable importance, we may be allowed to examine the facts, and to draw our own conclusions from this examination.

The purport of the *Gauḍavaha* has been given by its editor on pp. xiv ff. of his "Introduction."

The poem opens with 61 stanzas containig "a long series of invocations in honour of various deities or ideas... Then follow thirty-six couplets about poets generally, their excellences, defects, aspirations and disappointments," about critics, and about the Prākṛit language (down to st. 98).

Then the narrative sets in with an eulogy of King Yaśovarman. Various subjects are treated in this connexion, *e. g.*, the story of Indra defeating the mountains, which is even twice inserted (113 ff. and 212 ff.), that of the *pralayas* (167 ff.), that of the immolation of the serpents by Janamejaya (472 ff.), that of the churning of the Milk Ocean (1016 ff.), and some others. But these mythological stories are mere episodes; the main purport of the narrative is a survey of Yaśovarman's warlike expeditions and a picture of his private life. The *jalakriḍā* of Yaśovarman's courtiers in the ponds of his vanquished enemies is described (161 ff.), the state of the widows of the latter is depicted, and after this a description of his campaigns is given, which forms the subject of stanzas 192 to 796. The flight of the king of Magadha, *i. e.* of the Gauḍa, is mentioned at 354, the battle in which he and his vassals were vanquished, is very shortly described in stanzas 414—416, one of which, viz. 416, is devoted to the statement that the drums of the gods were heard, and that a rain of flowers poured down on the victorious army. Yaśovarman "devoured" (कवचिज्जल) the flying king of Magadha.

Then we are told how Yaśovarman conquered the king of the Vāṅgas, how he accepted the submission of the king of the Deccan, and how he subdued the Pārasīkas. He levied tribute "in those regions also which were made inaccessible by the western mountains (the Ghauts)". Thereupon Yaśovarman marched to the banks of the Narmadā, to Mārvād, to Thānesar, to Ayodhyā, received the submission

of the people living on the Mandara mountains, and turned to the north, marching towards the Himālaya.

Yaśovarman returned to his capital and dismissed his vassals. His bards sang his praise, he made love to the inmates of his serail and to other young women, and retired to a summer retreat outside the city (down to st. 796).

After this description of the hero and of his *digvijaya*, the poet gives a personal account of himself. He tells us that the connoisseurs wished him to give them a *full* account of how the king of Magadha was slain by Yaśovarman (इय उक्षण इमिणा जह सिद्धुविञ्चो पुरा मगहणाहो । तह सीसन्त ए तुमाञ्चो शीसिसिच्छन्ति), and the rest of the poem, 365 stanzas out of a total number of 1209, is devoted to the vilest flatteries addressed to the ruler, to the poet's promise, and to his preparations for singing his lord's praise. Even the gods assemble, and the whole of Nature prepares to listen to the narrative celebrating the ruler's exploits.

From this rapid survey it is evident that the topics treated in the *Gauḍavaha* have been well arranged by the poet. In that part which treats of Yaśovarman's *digvijaya*, the order of the facts related is strictly chronological. This part itself is inserted between two other parts, the first of which contains the usual invocations, whereas the second contains the author's account of himself; and after this, there follows a fourth part describing the preparations of the author to tell, and those of the men, and of the gods, and of the whole of Nature, to listen to the *detailed* description of the defeat inflicted upon the Gauḍa king by Yaśovarman, and of the former's death.

*In the whole of the Gauḍavaha, as we have it, there is, as far as I can see, no gap anywhere.* The topics treated in this poem not only are well arranged, they are also well connected with one another.

On the other hand, there are some points which strike the reader.

First of all, it is a remarkable fact that, in contradiction to the title of the work, the defeat inflicted on the Gauḍa, and his death, are just mentioned, but not described at any length, or with any particulars. We do not even learn his name from the poet's composition. The accounts of the other historical facts mentioned in the poem are equally scanty. By far the greater part of the description of the *digvijaya* contains pictures of scenery and mythological stories, destined to show that the monster Yaśovarman—for such he was—is an



incarnation of the gods. Flattery of the vilest and grossest kind, most repulsive to the modern European mind, is the main subject of the poem. The statement of the Yaśastilaka, viz. that the poet was "thrown into prison by Yaśovarman and there . . . . composed his poem" (see Peterson's edition of Vallabhadeva's *Subhāṣitāvalī*, p. 115), possibly, is well founded. As Peterson shows, "Vākpatirāja was a prince as well as a poet," and evidently was forced to sing the tyrant's praise, and Yaśovarman who, also, was a poet (see Peterson, l. c. p. 95f., Thomas, *Kavīndravacanasaṃuccaya*, p. 75f.), was later reduced to the same condition at the court of his victorious enemy Lalitāditya of Kashmere, as we learn from *Kalhaṇa iv*, 144.

The second point which strikes the reader of the *Gauḍavaha* is the great length of the invocations at the beginning, and the enormous extent of the poet's account of his preparations for singing *in detail* the "destruction of the Gauḍa king." This, as well as the pompous manner in which the treatment of the main topic is announced, clearly shows that Vākpati intended to compose an epic work of quite an enormous bulk. Any possible doubts concerning this fact are destroyed by the poet's authentic words, in his stanza 799, quoted above, p. 10.

I am under the impression that Vākpati was ordered to compose, for Yaśovarman's glorification, a *second Brhatakathā*. Hence the choice of a *Prākṛit* language for its composition, and hence the title of *Kathapīṭha* which, as we shall see hereafter, is the proper title of the poem as we have it.

From these and similar considerations I only can conclude with Shaṅkar Pāṇḍurang Paṇḍit that *the Gauḍavaha*, as we have it, is *only the introduction to the poem itself, and that this poem was never completed*.

Against such a conclusion, *Jacobi* raises the following objections:

1. If Mr. Paṇḍit were right, the *Gauḍavaha* would be quite a unique work in the whole of Indian literature. The Introduction is usually an integrant part of a work, sharing its divisions into *sargas*, *āśvāsas*, &c. The *Gauḍavaha*, as we have it, however, is too bulky to form a single *āśvāsa*.
2. Why did the poet incorporate those parts of his work which, according to Indian notions, are the most valuable and most poetical ones, in his Introduction, instead of introducing them into the body of his work?

3. These difficulties would disappear under the assumption that the *Gauḍavaha*, as it has been handed down to us, is a *mere abstract of the original poem*, "from which all those parts were omitted which were only connected with the *historical* events, and, hence, could not be of any general, or permanent, interest. Only thus it seemed possible to save at least the pearls of Vākpati's poetry."
4. "As an abstract of the original poem, the *Gauḍavaha*, of course, lost its external divisions into *āśvāsas*, but retained the internal arrangement of its matters ('die innere Gliederung des Stoffs'). The single parts of the original work are perfectly recognisable, viz. (1) the Introduction, consisting of *maṅgala* and praise of poetry; (2) the story promised in the title of the poem. Of this story mainly the pictures of scenery, &c. have been preserved, but besides them features enough to show the general course of events. (In this second part, the internal arrangement of the matters, too, is distinctly recognisable; viz. (a) Praise of Yaśovarman, (b) his campaigns (c) his amusements after his victory.); (3) the poet's personal history forms the conclusion of the poem.

The same arrangement of matters is to be observed in *Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, and appears to have been the usual one in historical poetry."

5. These assumptions would account for the fact that the number of stanzas, in the different MSS., widely differs. The commentator's recension and MS. J, which represents it, contains 1102 stanzas, whereas the sum of all the additional stanzas contained in the other MSS. is 133, *i. e.*, more than 1/9 of the total sum. The single MSS. differ in the number and in the arrangement of these additional stanzas. Hence, *Jacobi* concludes that several copyists of the abstract inserted into it such stanzas of the original work which they were pleased with, or such which for some other reason, they wished to preserve. Such an enlarged edition was the archetype of MSS. K, P, Dc.
6. All these assumptions are corroborated by the title of the commentary, which reads thus: *Haripāla-viracita-Gauḍavaha-sāra-ṭīkā. Cp. Paṇḍit, p. vii.*
7. Shaṅkar Pāṇḍurang Paṇḍit argues that the concluding stanza 1207 clearly shows that the body of Vākpati's poem was to come after it. This stanza runs as follows:

तस्स इमं पावणं अहिणवं च चित्तं च विम्हयकरं च ।

सीसइ चरिअं अचरमं शाराहिवइणो णिसामेह ॥

To this argument, Jacobi rightly objects that MSS. Dc and P contain the following additional stanza:

कइरायलंकास्स वप्पइरायस्स गउडवहं ।

नामेण कहावीढं रइयंचिय तह समत्तं च ॥

Correcting in the first line \*व to \*वि, and गउडवहं to गउडवहो, he translates this stanza as follows: "des Kavirāja betitelten Vākpatirāja's Gauḍavadha genannter Prolog wurde gemacht und so auch vollendet." As in this case the कथापीठं would be declared to be the poem itself, Jacobi thinks that this stanza has been contaminated from two half-stanzas in order to have a conclusion to the poem formed of words of the poet himself. "If this be true—he says—we need not correct the text of this stanza as it has been handed down to us. Gauḍavaḥam may have been, as an accusative case, the object of a verb which was contained in a preceding line which has been lost. At all events, it is certain that after stanza 1209 some other stanzas followed which concluded the poem. Hence it is by no means necessary that originally the proper story of Yaśovarman was narrated after stanza 1209."

I really do not think that Jacobi would to-day subscribe to all these arguments which he wrote in 1888. But as Winternitz does without discussing them, and as the conclusions drawn from these arguments are highly important for literary history, and especially for that part of it we are concerned with in this paper, I cannot forbear discussing them in connexion with what has been said above on Bhavabhūti.

*The essential point which, indeed, settles the whole question, is that treated under 7.* Let us begin with it our discussion.

First of all, it is a fact that in most Sanskrit MSS. the concluding stanzas of the poets are omitted by the copyists. If they are preserved in a MS., they at once point to the fact that this MS. deserves special attention.

Now I ask: If the Gauḍavaha be indeed what Jacobi thinks it to be, *i. e.* a mere abstract of the original work, an abstract from which the main portions were omitted, *viz.* the account of Yaśovarman's campaign against the Gauḍa king, which the author so pom-

pously promises to treat *in detail*, how could the person who made this abstract, which in reality destroyed the essential part of the poet's work, lay such a stress on concluding his abstract with the poet's *authentic* statement that it was concluded?

But if he did, *how was it possible that he did not simply copy the genuine concluding stanza, but replaced it by a contamination of a line of this stanza, and of a line of a stanza from the end of the Introduction, the result of this contamination being a stanza which was unintelligible?* Everybody, I trust, will see that such a proceeding on the part of the author of the supposed abstract is an *absolute impossibility*.

Hence the stanza discussed by Jacobi cannot, possibly, have been composed in the manner assumed by him; it must be taken, in the wording which we read in the MSS., as the authentic production of the poet himself. A correction of गउडवहं to गउडवहो is, of course, out of place. For such titles are properly adjectives, the substantives denoting the literary species of the poetical production, being mentally supplied. In our case, the substantive to be supplied is महाकाव्यम्, and the genuine title of the poem is not Gauḍavaho, as Sh. P. Paṇḍit wrongly prints on the title page, but Gauḍavaḥam. See the colophon of MS. P, ed., p. ii, and in general my remarks, ZDMG. lix, p. 1, note 1.

This is the reason why in MS. Dc (for in P only गउड has been preserved) the wrong reading \*vahaḥ has crept into the wording of the stanza. The genuine reading must, of course, be Gauḍavaḥe, and the correct translation of the couplet is this: "In the (mahākāvya) entitled Gauḍavaḥam, by Vākpatirāja, whose title is "King of the poets," this is the Introduction (कथापीठम्), composed and finished (by him)."

This absolutely necessary correction ceases to be a conjecture by the testimony of MS. K, the colophon of which Jacobi has overlooked. On p. iv, the editor gives the concluding words of this MS. Their beginning runs as follows: कइरायलंकास्स वप्पइरायस्स गउडवहं ॥ गाहावीढं समत्तं ॥

Here, the second line of the stanza has been sadly mangled and corrupted, no doubt because the last leaf of the original from which K was copied, had been injured, and with it the text of its last line. Cp. the state of the stanza in P. But, fortunately, the first line

of the stanza has been preserved in its authentic wording. Only **०वि** before **वप्यद्** has been dropped.

K is an excellent palm-leaf MS., dated Samvat 1289. Dc is not dated; but to judge from its general appearance, from the form of its script, and from its habit of expressing numerals by letters, it is even older than K. P is dated Samvat 1286.

*Hence it is absolutely, and beyond any shadow of a possible doubt, established by the poet's own authentic wording that the Gaiḍavaha, as we have it, is only the Introduction (कथापीठम्) to the poem which he intended to write.*

All of Jacobi's other objections to this view are now easily disposed of.

Ad 1. The text of the Gaiḍavaha forms the kathāpīṭha. How can we say that it is too bulky to form a single āśvāsa? The poet himself tells us, in the stanza quoted above, p. 10, that the MSS. (plural!) of his kathā were **विद्यद्** "huge," "immense." There cannot possibly be, I suppose, any doubt about the signification of **विद्यद्**. And if there were, it would be removed by the pompous and very long announcement of the body of Vākpati's work. See above, p. 15.

Ad 2. Whence do we know that the poet did *not* intend to insert similar descriptions in the body of his work?

Ad 3. Such an abstract as Jacobi supposes our Gaiḍavaha to be, would be, as far as I know, quite a unique production in Indian literature. If, indeed, later poets did not take any interest in historical events, why is it that works like the Harṣacarita and the Rājataran-giṇī with its supplements, and even such booklets as the Kṣītiśavaṃśāvalī, have been handed down to us? And why is it that this self-same man who, according to Jacobi, took so little interest in Yaśovarman's person that he omitted the whole account of his campaigns, nevertheless showed so much interest in the same ruler's person that he carefully preserved all the long, and tedious, and vile, and repulsive flatteries which the poet bestows on him throughout the whole of the text? Poetical skill, moreover, may be shown in the descriptions of battles as well as in those of sceneries, and as all the classical poets were *court* poets and had, *ex officio*, to celebrate their lords' warlike achievements, they had, methinks, reasons enough *not* to neglect the study of descriptions of campaigns and of battles which had been given by celebrated poets.

Ad 4. Jacobi himself lays special stress on the fact that the internal arrangement of the events related has been preserved in our text of the Gaiḍavaha. If this is granted, how is it possible that the very long announcement of the main story has been placed *at the end* of the poem instead of *at its beginning*? And how is it possible that *this* part of the poem has been preserved by a compiler who is supposed to have eliminated all those parts which were considered by the poet himself to be the most essential portion of his composition?

Ad 5. Spurious stanzas, as every scholar knows who has to deal with many MSS. of a single work, abound in the different copies. In Kālidāsa's Meghadūta, the difference between the shortest and the most comprehensive texts is 13 out of 125 stanzas. As to Jacobi's assumption that the scribes embodied genuine stanzas of the original text in the abstract they were copying, I cannot see anything more improbable. For such a proceeding on their part would presuppose, first, the existence of *many* copies of the full original work in their time, and secondly, a *very intense interest* they took in, and a *very accurate knowledge* they possessed of, this complete original. Such being the case, what probability is there that they did not copy this highly valued work, but in preference of it a scanty abstract from it?

Ad 6. The ṭīkā is contained in MS. J. only. The editor had at his disposal not the original, but only a very bad copy of it. Thus we have no guaranty that the colophon of the commentary is the same in the copy as in the original MS. But even if this be the case, I cannot find that the commentator's **सार** makes any difficulty. He, of course, was aware of the fact that he was not commenting on the *detailed* account of Yaśovarman's digvijaya. But as the kathāpīṭha gives a brief sketch of it, it is *substantially* an abstract (**सार**) of it.

To all these considerations, we may add that *nowhere in our text of the Gaiḍavaha does there seem to be any gap*. The historical events are mentioned in a very summary manner, in the way of a general survey of the facts which the poet intended to treat *in detail* (see his stanza 844 quoted above, p. 15) in the body of his work; but all the stanzas treating these facts are well connected with one another, and it is impossible for me to see how the huge portions of the narrative which Jacobi supposes to have been omitted could be inserted into the text as we have it.

Thus I do not doubt but that, in these exceptionally old MSS., the text of the Gaiṇḍavaha has been handed down to us, on the whole, as its author wrote it; that there are no gaps in the text; that this text, as its last stanza declares, is only the kathāpīṭha, or Introduction; and that its author never executed his intention of composing the huge work which was to be the real Gaiṇḍavaha.

Let us now consider the chronological inferences to be drawn from these facts.

On page 67, Jacobi quotes stanza 832 of the Gaiṇḍavaha which reads thus:

इय तदया खणनिव्वडियणिययपयमङ्गभङ्गरावङ्गे ।  
जाए इमम्मि मुयणिसु दाहणा आसि उप्पाया ॥

*i. e.*, "Such terrible portenta then arrived in the worlds, when the king, having by a side-look restrained in a moment his vassals' transgression of their rank, set out (on his digvijaya)."

The passage in which this stanza occurs is destined to show that Yaśovarman was an incarnation of Kṛṣṇa, and, hence, the lord of the worlds. The portenta enumerated in stanzas 827ff. did not occur in his territory, but in the territories of his enemies and of such of his vassals who were not at once willing to follow him in his expedition. This is the explanation which the commentary gives of the passage in question, and I am at a loss to see, how Jacobi's translation of शिययपयमङ्ग could possibly fit the context. Jacobi translates: "Solche schreckliche Zeichen geschahen damals, als der König, zeitweilig in seiner Stellung erschüttert, mit zuckenden Augenwinkeln (zum Kampfe) auszog." But भङ्गरावङ्गे does not mean "mit zuckenden Augenwinkeln," and निव्वडियणिययपयमङ्ग cannot signify "zeitweilig in seiner Stellung erschüttert." Even if this meaning could be forced upon the wording of the original, it would be impossible *here*. For firstly, such a mention of a heavy danger which the ruler had just escaped would make an *amaṅgalam*, *i. e.* a thing which Hindu poets are most careful to avoid; and secondly, how can a king set out on a digvijaya immediately after having experienced a serious menace to his royal position? Jacobi thinks that this transitory "Erschütterung" was the defeat inflicted upon him by Lalitāditya of Kashmere. This, at all events, seems quite impossible to me. For first, after such a defeat his *digvijaya* would simply have been an impossibility, and secondly,

the wording of Kalhaṇa's stanza quoted above, p. 9, shows that this defeat was not a transitory, but a definitive one. Through it Yaśovarman was reduced to the state of a panegyrist at his victorious enemy's court, *i. e.*, to the same position which his prisoner, prince Vākpati, had at his own court before Lalitāditya's victory.

If, therefore, the eclipses of the sun and of the moon mentioned in the passage under consideration really occurred, they must have done so before, or on, Yaśovarman's departure for his digvijaya as well as before his defeat at the hands of Lalitāditya. Jacobi thinks this interpretation of the passage to be impossible on the ground that, at *this* moment, according to stanzas 193—201, only auspicious omnia occurred. But it is clear from the whole context of stanzas 827ff., that the portenta mentioned there occurred merely as the consequences of Yaśovarman's side-looks, and were not directed against him, but against his enemies and those vassals of his, who, for a moment, hesitated to join his army.

If, therefore, Vākpati hint at the eclipses of the moon and of the sun which, according to Jacobi, took place on August 14<sup>th</sup>, 733 A. D., this would be *not the date of Lalitāditya's victory, but that of Yaśovarman's departure for his digvijaya.*

As this event must have occurred several years before Lalitāditya subdued Yaśovarman, the date of Bhavabhūti's Mahāvīracarita as well as that of Vākpatirāja's Gaiṇḍavaha will, probably, be some years later than 733 A. D. This approximate date is in accordance with the fact that "la défaite de Yaśovarman par Mukṭāpīḍa (*i. e.* Lalitāditya) se place donc entre l'an 736 et l'an 747, plus près de la première de ces deux dates vraisemblablement".<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lévi and Chavannes, JA. 1895, p. 353. Cp. Sir Aurel Stein's note on Kalhaṇa iv, 134.