E 113 81

RÂJAŚEKHARA:

HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS.

BY

VAMAN SHIVRAM APTE, M. A.

PRINCIPAL, FERGUSSON COLLEGE, POONA.

POONA:

Printed at the "Arya-Bhushana" Press.

1886.

PREFACE.

—— : o : ——

The following pages are chiefly intended for the University student. An attempt has been made to put together all available information about Rajasekhara and to determine his place in Sanskrit Literature. The volumes of the *Indian Antiquary* are a mine of useful information on antiquarian subjects, but I have been unable to go through them, and so it is likely that I should have, in Section I., repeated or advanced as a new theory what has already appeared in them. In noticing the geographical names occurring in the poet's works I have derived much help from Mr. Borooah's essay on 'The Ancient Geography of India' prefixed to the third volume of his English-Sanskrit Dictionary.

POONA,
SEPTEMBER 24, 1886. } V. S. A.

CONTENTS.

Section I.

Section II.

Personal History.

Section III.

Writings and their value.

PAGE.

RÂJAŚEKHARA:

HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS.

The Syndicate of the University of Bombay, having prescribed two of Rajaśekhara's works, the Viddhaśalabhanjikâ and the Bâlaramâyana, for the University examinations of this year, have brought the poet into considerable prominence. To determine his date and to bring together all that is known about him or his works, becomes therefore necessary, not only in the interests of the University student, but of the general Sanskrit-reading public also. I propose in this Paper 1st, to ascertain his date; 2ndly, to give some account of him gathered from his writings, and 3rdly, to take brief notices of his works and form an estimate of his characteristics as a writer.

Section I.

2. Owing to the indefatigable exertions of several Indian and European oriental scholars, who have interested themselves in antiquarian researches, Indian chronology is not now as unsettled as it was 40 or 50 years ago. A writer on a subject like the present has not now to depend merely on vague surmises or ingenious suggestions. A few important landmarks have been discovered from unimpeachable materials, which have greatly facilitated further researches. Nevertheless, if we have to fix the date of a writer, all that we can generally do is to settle the limits between which he may be supposed to have flourished, or sometimes, as in the case of Kalidasa, the limit beyond which his date cannot go. Early Sanskrit writers do not give us the dates of their compositions, nor do many give even the name of the patron or ruler in whose time they flourished. Fortunately, Rajaśekhara has, in his works, given us some materials which, taken in conjunction with what we know of him from other sources, may lead us to ascertain, if not his exact date, at least the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem*, the two limits between which his date may be supposed to fall.

3. Different scholars have proposed different dates for Rajasekhara. H. H. Wilson places him at the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century *; Professor Bhandarkar places him about the 10th century †; Mr. J. F. Fleet assigns his pupil to the middle of the 8th century ‡; Dr. Peterson and Pandit Durgaprasada have accepted the same date¶; Mr. A. Borooah consigns him to the 7th century, § while Prof. Max Muller relegates him to the 14th$. Let us see which of these dates may be accepted.

4. In the Prastavana or Introduction to his Balaramayana, Rajasekhara gives a verse in which he mentions, among other poets, the name of Bhavabhuti. On being asked by the assistant Manager 'why do you not describe the poet,' the Manager says: ‖

"Why, has not the fortune-teller described him?—He who, in former times, was Valmiki, who afterwards assumed on earth

---

* Hindu Theatre Vol. II., P. 362.

† Report on Sanskrit Mss. for 1882-83, P. 44.

‡ See the article in the April number of the Indian Antiquary, on Mahendrapala's grant.

¶ The Subhashitavali of Vallabhadeva (1886), P. 101 of the Introduction.

§ Bhavabhuti and his place in Sanskrit Literature P. 17.

$ India: What can it teach us, P. 328.

‖ सूत्रधार:—ननु वर्णितमेव दैवज्ञेन।
बभूव वल्मीकभव: कवि: पुरा
ततः प्रपेदे भुवि भर्तृमेंठताम्।
स्थित: पुनर्यो भवभूतिरेखया
स वर्तते संप्रति राजशेखर:॥ Benares Edition P. 9.

This verse occurs in the same form in the Introduction to the *Bâlabhârata*—a drama by the same author. It is otherwise called *Prachanda-Pándava*. I have got a copy of this play through the kindness of Dr. Peterson, but it is evidently imperfect. It makes a dignified beginning, but breaks off at the end of the second Act, quite in the middle of the story. From the portion available to us, it may be inferred that the drama must be as long perhaps as the Balaramayana. Bhima angrily vows the death of Dussasana and the other Kauravas, but Sakuni bids the Pandavas look to themselves. "निर्गच्छत वनवासाय। को हि द्यूतविधानमुद्दिशते मोक्षार्थम्." With this speech ends the second Act. There is not even the inevitable Bharata vakya!

the form of Bhartrimentha,* and who again appeared in the person of Bhavabhuti, is, at the present day, Rajasekhara."

Here the poet tells us that he ranks himself with Valmiki, Mentha, or Bhavabhuti, who, each in his own day, occupied a high rank in the literature of the country. This reference to Bhavabhuti furnishes us with the *terminus a quo*. Dr. Bhandarkar, in the Preface to his edition of the *Málati-Mádhava*, has shown that Bhavabhuti flourished in the last part of the 7th century.† Our poet, therefore, must have flourished after the end of the seventh century; but how long after remains to be seen.

5. It will be seen from the verse quoted above in what terms Rajasekhara speaks of Bhavabhuti. The poet regards himself, as it were, an *avatára* or incarnation of Bhavabhuti, and looking into his works it must be admitted that Rajasekhara has shown unmistakeable signs of having imitated his 'master.' It is true that he has not been able to copy his inimitable graces and excellences; nor has he shown anything like the sublime grandeur and deep pathos of the Malati-Madhava or the Uttararamacharita. Still in his works may be discovered many ideas and expressions

---

* It is a pity that we know so little of a poet who is here placed on a level with the immortal epic bard. The name of the poet is Bhartrimentha, or Mentha, as he is sometimes called, the reading of the Benares edition, भर्हमेंठ being a mistake. He is described as the author of a poem called "Hayagrivavadha." He flourished in the reign of Matrigupta who, for a time, occupied the throne of Kashmir about the middle of the 6th century. This is what we know of him from the Rajatarangini :—

हयग्रीववधं मेंठस्तदमेदर्शयन्नवम्।
आसमाप्ति ततो नापत् साध्वसाधिति वा वचः॥
अथ मंथयितुं तस्मिन् पुस्तके प्रस्तुते न्यधात्।
लावण्यनिर्वाणशिवा राजाधः स्वर्णभाजनम्॥
अंतरङ्गतया तस्य तादृग्वा कृतसत्कृतिः।
भर्हमेंठः कविर्मेने पुनरुक्तं शिवोर्पणम्॥ Taranga 3 (264—6).

† Mr. A Borooah in his essay on "Bhavabhuti and his place in Sanskrit Literature" has arrived at the conclusion that the poet "cannot be placed later than the fifth century A. D." (P. 22). This position is now scarcely tenable. To accept it as correct would require a wholesale re-adjustment of the dates that have been indisputably settled. He has misread and thus misconstrued the verse कविदाक्पतिराज &c., which gives the date of Bhavabhuti based on historical evidence.

which are clearly Bhavabhuti's, and the poet has imitated even the defiant tone adopted by him with the full consciousness of his inherent worth.*

Now it appears to me hardly probable that Rajasekhara should decently, or with any advantage to him, consider himself 'Bhavabhuti born again,' unless a considerable period had elapsed since his time and thus made his name entitled to that respect and admiration which his works richly deserve, and so confirmed his reputation as a first-class poet. It is well-known that Bhavabhuti was not appreciated in his own day. He had to rest, with well-grounded faith, on "boundless time" and "extensive earth" for the appreciation of his works, and it is, I think, quite reasonable to suppose that a period of at least 100 years (perhaps this is short) must have elapsed before the verdict of posterity was unmistakeably pronounced in his favour. At such a distance alone can Rajasekhara be reasonably supposed to mention Bhavabhuti in the manner above referred to. From this I conclude that our poet must not have flourished till at least one hundred years after Bhavabhuti; in other words, he could not have lived earlier than the end of the 8th century A. D.

6. We have now to determine the *terminus ad quem*—the other limit of his date. One of the means to fix such limits is the works on Rhetoric written at different times, which quote verses from previous writers in support of their rules. Of the four celebrated works on dramatic literature Dasarupa, Sarasvatikanthabharana, Kavyaprakasha and Sahityadarpana, the first is the oldest. The Sarasvatikanthabharan attributed to King Bhoja of Dhar who lived in the middle of the eleventh century, quotes several verses

---

* अहो मद्गणोद्गता सरस्वती बायावरस्य । यदाह
ब्रह्मभ्यः शिवमस्तु वस्तु विततं किंचिद्वयं मूमहे
हे संतः शृणुतावधत्त च धृतीर्दुर्मास्त सेवांजलिः ।
यद्वा किं विनयोक्तिनिर्मम गिरां यद्यस्ति सूक्तावृतं
नार्थेस्तत्स्वयमेव तत्सुमनसो वाञ्छन्ति परं वैखरीम् ॥ Balabharata, Act I.

See also the Balaramayana, Act I verses 10 & 17.

from the Viddhasalabhanjika alone.* The Dasarupa also has quotations from Balaramayana, Karpuramanjari and Viddhasalabhanjika. The age of this work is now pretty well determined, since the author, as he tells us in the last verse, was a protegé of the King Munja. This Munja was the uncle of the great Bhoja, and was defeated and at last put to an ignominious death by Tailapa I. of the later Chalukya dynasty, who reigned from 973-997 A. D.† The date of the production of the Dasarupa may, therefore, be taken to be the last part of the tenth century,‡ and thus our poet must have flourished *before* the end of the tenth century.

7. There is another point which may be taken to support the above conclusion. In his Report on the search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Circle for 1883-84, Dr. Peterson states that he has recently got a copy of a work by name *Yasastilaka* written by a Jain writer, Somadeva.§ The date of the work, as

* It is surprising to find that a learned scholar like Dr. Hall should remark that "Rajasekhara as author of Viddhasalabhanjika or otherwise is nowhere mentioned in the Sarasvatikanthabharana" (Vasavadatta P. 20, note), when no less than 15 verses from this play have been drawn upon for illustration. It is true the author is nowhere mentioned by name, but any body who has cared to go over his works will be able to identify the quotations.

† Dr. Bhandarkar's "Early History of the Dekkhan."

‡ *Anent* the subject of quotations which are found in this work, I have one remark to make. In this work numerous passages from King Sriharsha's dramatic works, but more especially, the *Ratnávali*, are cited by way of illustrations. If we are to believe Kalhana's Rajatarangini, Sriharsha, the poet or patron of poets, lived in the first quarter of the 12th century. Works composed by him or during his time cannot, therefore, be quoted in a work of the 10th century, unless we suppose that the commentator of the Dasarupa lived some two hundred years after the author. But it is now generally accepted that Dhananjaya and Dhanika were, if not the *same* persons, at least brothers. We must, therefore, seek for some other explanation of the occurrence of the passages from Ratnavali in Dasarupa. Is it that the play was a production, not of *Sriharsha*, but of the '*honored Harsha*'? I find that Dr. Hall (Preface to his edition of Dasarupa P. 4) "takes the Ratnavali to date from the 7th century, and not from the 12th century." I do not know how far this theory has been accepted by subsequent writers. If Hall's conjecture be right, the question is solved. If not, it deserves further investigation.

§ I am indebted to Dr. Bhandarkar for having drawn my attention to this fact.

given by the writer himself, is शकनृपकालवलितसंवत्सरशतेष्वष्टस्वेकाशीत्यधिकेषु गतेषु, अंकतः ८८१ *i. e.* Saka 881 or 959 A. D. This work, as Dr. Peterson tells us, is full of quotations from famous poets mentioned by name. In the third *Asvasa*, when a serious dialogue is going on between Yasodhara and the Queen on अहिंसा, various authors have been quoted: Bharavi, Bhavabhuti, Bhartrihari, Gunadhya, Kalidasa, Bana, Magha, Rajasekhara.* This fact shows that Rajasekhara flourished before 959, or before the middle of the 10th century.

8. We thus see that our poet flourished between the end of the 8th and the middle of the 10th century. There are one or two points which, though yet more or less disputed, may be expected to reward the future researches of scholars, and which, if definitely settled, will give the poet a more definite date. The first point is that Kshira-Swamin, the celebrated commentator on the Amara Kosha, cites a few verses from the *Viddhasâlabhanjiká* by way of illustrations. Thus on the word गोनस (Amara I. 8. 4) he quotes the line गोनसाय नियोजितामदरजा : सर्पाय यद्दौषधि : (v. 3 of the Bombay Edition), to show that the word गोनस is also used as गोनास. Narayan Dikshit, the commentator on Viddhasalabhanjika, adds his testimony to the correctness of this quotation and says : बह्वप्यमरे गोनस इत्येव पठितं तथापि क्षीरस्वामिनाऽमुमेव श्लोकमुदाहृत्य गोनास इत्यपि समाहितं (P. 4. Bombay Edition). Kshira-Swamin also quotes the line द्विस्त्रीर्व्योम्नि पुराणमौक्तिकमणिच्छायैः स्थितं तारकैः (Verse 11) to show that तारक is feminine or neuter.† Now if we could determine the date of Kshirasvamin, we should here get a pretty accurate date for Rajasekara. Kshirasvamin, the commentator on Amara, has hitherto been generally regarded as identical with the Kshira mentioned in Rajatarangini IV. 488, as the tutor of King Jayapida.‡

* Prof. Peterson's Report P. 44-5.

† I owe this and the former reference to Mr. A. Boroosh, in whose possession the Manuscript of the commentary is at present. I am sorry I am unable to have a look at it now, as otherwise I should have tried to see if there were more quotations. The two given above are, however, sufficient for my purpose, and may be regarded as genuine, unless indeed we adopt the bold theory that they may be later interpolations.

‡ Dr. Bhandarkar's Preface to Malati-Madhava p. 10; Max Muller's India p. 334. I now learn that Dr. Bhandarkar is not quite sure of the identity of the two Kshiras, and that he would like to suspend his judgment on the point.

As yet no attempt has been made, at least to my knowledge, to show that there were two persons of the same name, except the opinion of Dr. Aufrecht who places the commentator between the 11th and 12th centuries (India: What can it teach us, P. 334, note). The date of Jayapida is taken to be 751-782 A. D., or, according to Dr. Peterson and Pandit Durgaprasad, 779-813 (Subhashitavali, Preface P. 40) that is to say, the last quarter of the 8th or the first quarter of the 9th century. If, then, we agree that Kshira, the commentator is the same as Kshira, the tutor of Jayapida, we must come to the conclusion that Rajasekhara who is quoted by Kshira must have flourished some years before him, and that he must have lived not later than the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century A. D.*

Another point that deserves to be considered is the mention by Rajasekhara of his pupil and patron, Mahendrapala of Mahodaya. If the date of this Mahendrapala could be definitely ascertained,

* It will be noticed that I base my conclusion on a distinct hypothesis. If further discoveries prove the hypothesis to be wrong, the conclusion will of course be wrong. In the present state of my antiquarian knowledge I pronounce my opinion with great diffidence. But if the identity of the two Kshiras be established I see only one alternative: to propose a slight alteration in the date of Jayapida, so as to allow the necessary distance between Rajasekhara and the commentator. I have already remarked that our poet must have lived at least one hundred years after Bhavabhuti, *i. e.* about the end of the 8th century. In order, therefore, that Kshira may be supposed to become acquainted with Rajasekhara's works so as to quote passages from them, we must allow an interval between the two of about 20 or 30 years. This would take Kshira to about the first quarter of the 9th century, and I am not aware that this supposition would seriously conflict with the accepted date of Jayapida. It is quite possible that Jayapida's date is not 751-782, but some 20 or 25 years later. For 20 years after all cannot count for much where the dates are roughly calculated. And as a matter of fact Dr. Peterson and Pandit Durgaprasad give 779—813 as Jayapida's date. Besides, is it not just probable that Kshira the tutor should have survived his pupil for a few years and written his commentary at the ripe age of 60 or 70—by no means a period of imbecility and incapacity to work for our old ancestors? I am, therefore, inclined to believe that Kshira must have written his commentary after Rajasekhara's works had been before the public for 20 or 30 years. So long as the identity of the commentator and the preceptor of Jayapida has not been disproved on trustworthy grounds, I can think of no other reasoning to account for the quotations from Rajasekhara in the commentary. I have put forth this view that those who have a right to speak with authority in such matters, may turn their attention to it.

it would give us the exact date of our poet. Mr. J. F. Fleet, in the April number of the *Indian Antiquary*, has attempted to decipher the date of a grant of land made by Mahendrapala, first discovered in 1864 and subsequently discussed at different times by several scholars, such as Dr. Mitra, Dr. Hall, General Cunningham. Mr. Fleet has summarised the results of previous discussions on the grant, which propose different versions of the date. He rejects all of them and says that the correct version is 155, and refers it to the era of Harshavardhana of Kanyakubja—thus giving the year 761-2 A. D. as the date of Mahendrapala's grant. He feels so sure on this point that the dates of Mahendrapala's and Vinayakapala's grants are, in his opinion, "now perfectly certain"; and he says that they establish a definite genealogy, and "definite dates" for the ancestors of Mahendrapala. Dr. Peterson and Pandit Durgaprasad have apparently accepted Mr. Fleet's conclusion as a settled thing and have therefrom fixed a definite date for Rajasekhara.* I wish I could share in this confident opinion of these scholars; but, as I shall presently show, apart from the doubtful nature of the date, there are material discrepancies between the description of Mahendrapala in the grant and that of Mahendrapala, the distinguished pupil of Rajasekhara.

In the first place the question is, whether the figures in the last line of the inscription, which purport to give the date of the grant, are to be regarded as numerical figures or numerical symbols. All the scholars who have noticed this inscription have regarded them as numerical figures, and, a tyro as I am in the art of deciphering, I think they look like figures. Mr. Fleet says they are numerical symbols, but he has not thought it necessary to give any grounds why he thinks so. Nor has he given any authority on which he interprets the first and last symbols of the date to be 100

* "The dramatist has been supposed to date from as late as the 14th century, but his real date is the middle of the 8th. This is established by the fact that Kshira Swamin who wrote a commentary on the Amarakosha and who was the teacher of Jayasimha of Kashmir (A. D. 750) quotes a verse from the Viddhasalabhanjika in his note on Amara I, 8, 4 and that King Mahendrapala, to whom Rajasekhara himself refers as a pupil of his own, was reigning in 761 A. D." (Subhashitavali Introduction P. 101.) The date here given for Jayasimha, who is intended for Jayapida, I believe, does not tally with that given in another part of the same introduction (779-813).

and 5 respectively; for he himself says in a note that "the remaining symbols for 5, 10, and 100 in their present forms, are still to be entered" in Bhagvanlal Indraji's Table of numerical symbols. Again, the era to which the date may be supposed to refer, is not specified in the inscription. Mr. Fleet and others suppose it to be the Harshavardhan era, but here, too, no grounds are given why it should be so. But a very serious objection is, in my opinion, the great discrepancy between the descriptions of the two Mahendrapalas. In the inscription Mahendrapala and his ancestors as far as Devasakti have simply the title "*Mahárája*", which would show that they were merely feudatory Princes owing their allegiance to some paramount lord. Besides, Mahendrapala is there described as 'परमभगवतीभक्तः,' "a most devout worshipper of the goddess Bhagavati"; and Mr. Fleet remarks that "Bhagavati seems to have been throughout the *kula-devatá* or tutelary goddess of the family." Now the pupil of Rajasekhara is different from this Prince. He is described as रघुकुलतिलकः (ornament of the race of Raghu), रघुग्रामणीः (the leading person of the Raghu dynasty), रघुकुलचूडामणिः &c. The introduction to the Balabharata gives a fuller account of him. The Sutradhara, after invoking blessings on the line of Raghu, proceeds as follows :—

"तत्र (रघोरन्वये) च
नमितमुरलमौलिः पाकलो मेकलानां
रणकलितकलिंगः केलितट् केरलेंदोः।
भजति जितकुलूतः कुंतलानां कुठारो
हठहृतरमठश्रीः श्रीमहीपालदेवः॥ *

तेन च रघुवंशमुक्तामणिना आर्यावर्तमहाराजाधिराजेन श्रीनिर्भयनरेंद्रनंदनेनाधिकृतः सभासदः सर्वानेव नो गुणाकरः सप्रश्रयं विज्ञापयति। &c.

---

* The question that is naturally raised by this quotation is, Who is this Mahipala? H. H. Wilson, in his notice of the Balabharata, says that he "may be the same with Mahendrapala, or is possibly his father or paramount lord." He cannot be the paramount lord of Mahendrapala. He is born in the family of Raghu, is declared to be the most eminent of that race and is besides the son of the King Nirbhaya—which description applies exactly to Mahendrapala. Rajasekhara calls himself निर्भयगुरुः or निर्भयराजस्य उपाध्यायः and it shows that he taught not only Nirbhaya, but even his son, having been a sort of family preceptor. If Nirbhaya be supposed to stand for Mahendrapala himself, his very son will become

This passage clearly tells us that Mahipa la or Mahendrapala was a descendant of the line of Raghu—which would probably indicate that Rama or the Sun was his *kuladevatâ*; that he was the son of the honored King Nirbhaya, that he was a *Mahârâjâdhirâja* or paramount sovereign of Aryavarta, who had subdued, and established his sway over, no less than seven important principalities. The Mahendrapala in the grant has none of these marks of distinction, and it would, in my opinion, ask no ordinary stretch of belief to consider the two Mahendrapalas of such different descriptions to be identical. I think much trustworthy evidence must be forthcoming to establish such an identity, and I for one have failed to find any in Mr. Fleet's analysis of the grant.

Again, Mahendrapala's grant is made from a camp "full of cows, elephants, horses, chariots and foot-soldiers, stationed at Mahodaya." The capital of Rajasekhara's Mahendrapala is the "great

---

his 'paramount lord'! Nor can he be Mahendrapala's father, for in that case Nirbhaya would be his grandfather, whereas the grandfather and father of the Mahendrapala in the inscription are named Ramabhadra and Bhoja I. Moreover, the father would differ materially in *rank* from his son; the former is 'Maharajadhiraja,' while the latter, simply 'Maharaja'; and in the words of Mr. Fleet, "if the kings of this family had ever held the paramount rank and titles, the fact would, as a matter of course, have been commemorated by connecting the titles with their names in the inscriptions of Mahendrapala and Vinayakapala, even if the latter had sunk again to the position of *Mahârâjas*." The only remaining possible supposition, that Mahipala may be the son, will not, for the same reasons, help Mr. Fleet, for this son will differ from Mahendrapala's son Vinayakapala not only in rank, but even in name.

Independently of Mr. Fleet's Mahendrapala the Mahipala in the Balabharata cannot be either the father or son of Mahendrapala. In the former case Rajasekhara would be the tutor not only of Mahendrapala, but of निर्भय his grandfather—which is quite improbable. The latter case would involve the supposition that a period of 10 or 15 years elapsed between the composition of Balaramayana and Balabharata—the former being represented before Mahendrapala and the latter before his son, after he had attained *supreme* power—a supposition more improbable than the first. Besides the poet's references to Mahendrapala in the same drama show that he was a living and ruling sovereign at the time of composing the drama. Under these circumstances I am inclined to hold that Mahipala is only another name for Mahendrapala.

town" Mahodaya,* or Kanyakubja, the modern Kanouj. And it is, I think, very unlikely that an epithet like 'camp' should be applied to so large and famous a capital as Kanouj. I can, therefore, only suppose that the Maharaja Mahendrapala made his grant when he (probably on a pilgrimage to Benares) had encamped with his retinue near Mahodaya.

And lastly, if we accept the identity of the two Mahendrapalas and admit 761 A. D., or the middle of the 8th century as Rajasekhara's date, he is separated from Bhavabhuti by about 50 years only, and this period is not, in my opinion, sufficient to justify our poet in speaking of himself as "Bhavabhuti born again."

Taking all this into account I am constrained to say that I feel considerable hesitation in accepting 761-2 as the date of Mahendrapala, at any rate, of that Mahendrapala who is referred to by our poet as his distinguished pupil. The grant may have been made by a king named Mahendrapala, some minor feudatory, in a year which may or may not be 761 A. D. What I have, therefore, to say on this point is that the mere fact of the discovery of an inscription, in which a Maharaja Mahendrapala is mentioned, and the era of the date of which is very doubtful and the date itself is expressed in still more doubtful symbols or figures, must not be accepted as certain and unimpeachable evidence to fix the date of Rajasekhara.

9. In connection with the date of the poet it wil not be out of place to consider what the traditional or popular belief is about it. Pandit Govind Deva Shastri of Benares, in the Preface to his Edition of the Balaramayana (1869) states, apparently on the authority of Madhava's Sankaravijaya, that "this poet named Rajasekhara was a contemporary

---

* The Manager, addressing the audience, says :—

"कथमेते महोदयमहानगरलीलावतंसा विद्वांसः सामाजिकाः" Balabharata Act I. The identity of Mahodaya with Kanyakubja or Kanouj is confirmed by a passage from the Balaramayana :—

लक्ष्मणः—इदं पुनस्ततोपि मंदाकिनीपरिक्षिप्तं महोदयं नाम नगरं दृश्यते.

राम :—इदं हृद्यं सर्वमहापवित्रं परस्परालंकरणैकहेतुः।
पुरं च हे जानकि कान्यकुब्जं सरिच्च गौरीपतिमौलिमाला ॥ Act X. v. 89.

of Sankaracharya, being a king of Kerala." Mr. A. Berriedale, in his essay on Bhavabhuti previously referred to, accepts this opinion and adds: "As Madhavacharya himself belonged to the Deccan it is not likely that he would make a mistake on this point." On reference to the original where Madhavacharya is supposed to allude to the contemporaneity of our poet with the great reformer, I find absolutely nothing to confirm the belief. Verses 10-30 of Canto 5 of Sankaravijaya are supposed to refer to Rajasekhara, King of Kerala, who, being desirous of seeing Sankaracharya, sent his ambassador to him to arrange for an interview, and having got his permission, waited upon him, presented him with 10,000 golden coins and read to him his three excellent dramas.* But there is not so much as even a bare mention of Rajasekhara's name in a single verse, nor of his "three dramas;" so that all that the verses may be taken to signify is that a certain king of Kerala waited upon, and read his three dramas to, Sankaracharya. This fact, taken by itself, may be quite true, but we are not concerned with it here. We know from Rajasekhara's works that he everywhere speaks of himself as उपाध्यायः, कविवृषः, महामित्रपुत्रः, कवीनां गुरुः, निर्भयगुरुः &c., but he nowhere gives us any the slightest indication that he was a King, much less of Kerala, or any other country, except his own name which is capable of being interpreted as राज्ञां शेखरः "the chaplet or best of kings." According to his own account, he was first 'a young poet, then the head of poets and

---

* I give below a few of these verses :—

एवंनेमतिमर्त्यचरित्रं सेवमानजनदैन्यविचित्रम् ।
केरलक्षितिपतिर्हि विदुषः प्राहिणोत्सचिवमावृतमिश्रः ॥
यस्य नैव सदृशो भुवि बोद्धा दृश्यते रणशिरःसु च योद्धा ।
तस्य केरलनृपस्य नियोगाद्दृश्यसे मम च सत्कृतियोगात् ॥

* * *

तेन पूजकुशलः क्षितिपालः स्वेन सृष्टमथ शाश्ववकालः ।
हाटकायुतसमर्पणपूर्वं नाटकत्रयमवोचदपूर्वम् ॥
तत्रसार्द्रगुणरीतिविशिष्टं भङ्गसंधिरुचिरं सुकवीष्टम् ।
संप्रहेण स निशम्य सुवाचं तं महाप वरमित्यमुवाच ॥

It will be seen that Madhava nowhere alludes to Rajasekhara. It is only the commentator who interprets the term केरलक्षितिपतिः by राजशेखरराजः; but there is no warrant whatever for it. Again, the adjectives to 'नाटकत्रयं' have nothing in them which can unmistakably point to the three *dramas proper* of our poet (if we include Karpuramanjari, the dramas will be four) and the commentator has not a word to say in favour of such an identification in his long commentary on the last verse.

afterwards the preceptor of King Nirbhaya : in this manner did he rise to distinction.'* And it would, indeed, be a unique phenomenon in the history of Kings, if Rajasekhara, King of Kerala, could be supposed to become tutor to another King reigning at Mahodaya. We must, therefore, at once reject the belief that our poet was a king of Kerala, and Madhavacharya, at any rate, ought not to be made a party to its propagation.

As regards the alleged contemporaneity of Sankaracharya with Rajasekhara, the evidence available is against it. The date of Sankaracharya is generally taken to be the last part of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century, his birth-date being supposed to be 788 A. D. (Max Muller's India P. 354). But Mr. Telang, in the Appendix to his Introduction of the *Mudrârâkshasa*, has tried to show that Sankaracharya belonged to the latter part of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century, and he states that Prof. Bhandarkar has arrived at pretty much the same date as he has put forward. Besides, if we are to believe Madhavacharya he states that Bana, Dandin, Mayura and Sankaracharya were all contemporaries.† So then Rajasekhara who flourished after Bhavabhuti, who in his turn lived after Sankaracharya's contemporaries, cannot be supposed to be a contemporary of Sankaracharya himself. Even if the correct birth-date of Sankaracharya be 788 A. D., it will not in the least affect our poet, for he was neither a king of Kerala,‡ nor has Madhava anywhere referred to him by name or otherwise.

10. The conclusion that may be drawn from the foregoing observations on the date of Rajasekhara is that he flourished between

---

* बालकविः कविराजो निर्भयराजस्य तथा उपाध्यायः ।
इति यस्य परंपरया श्रूयते माहिष्मतीनाथः ॥ (Kar. Manjari P. 3)

† Preface to Mudrarakshasa, P. 50

‡ In the South of India the prevalent belief is that Rajasekhara was a king of Malabar (Kerala) and that his name was Kulasekhara Perumal, (Perumal being equal to Maharaja). The southernmost part of India is claimed as the birth-place of his dramas. A friend from Tellicherry sends me extracts from a work called *Keralotpatti* and *Kerala-Viseska-Mahatmya*, showing that Kulasekhara lived in 332 A. D. I need hardly discuss these points. There is nothing whatever to show that Kulasekhara is the same as Rajasekhara, and the date 332 A. D, if accepted, will make our poet earlier by at least 4 or 5 centuries !

the end of the seventh and the middle of the tenth century; and that he must probably have lived about the end of the 8th century, if the evidence furnished by Kshirasvamin's references to his works be accepted as quite satisfactory. The earliest date, which is put forward by Mr. Borooah, is based upon a wrong date assigned to Bhavabhuti, and, as has been already shown, cannot be accepted at least in the present state of Indian chronology. The latest is the 14th century proposed by Dr. Max Muller. It can not, of course, be correct. That learned scholar appears to me to have confounded the two Rajasekharas ; the author of the four dramas, and the author of the *Prabandhakosha*, who was a Jain and wrote his work in 1347. Dr. Peterson's date, which is based upon Mr Fleet's date of Mahendrapala's grant, cannot be accepted until more satisfactory evidence be adduced, while the other dates fall more or less within the two *termini* stated above.

11. Before closing this Section it may be worth while to examine what is known about the poets referred to by Rajasekhara in verses indisputably his, or which are ascribed to him in the existing anthologies. In the Introduction to the Balaramayana the poet gives a verse in wich he describes his family.* There he tells us that Akalajalada, Surananda,† Tarala and Kaviraja were among his ancestors. Of Surananda we know absolutely nothing. Akalajalada was, as the poet tells us, the great-grand-father of Rajasekhara, but beyond this nothing more important is known about him. The Editors of the *Subhâshitâvali*, however, point out that in two verses ‡ ascribed in the *Sùktimuktávali* to Rajasekhara, references are made to Akalajalada as a poet of great repute. A verse beginning with

---

* स मूर्ती यस्यासीद्गुणगण इवाकालजलदः
सुरानंदः सोपि श्रवणपुटपेयेन वचसा ।
न चान्ये गण्यंते तरलकविराजप्रभृतयो
महाभागस्तस्मिन्नयमजनि यायावरकुले ॥

† It may perhaps be thought possible to take *Surananda* as an adjective. But the construction can hardly, in my opinion, admit of it. सः=प्रसिद्धः and the instrumental is उपलक्षणे तृतीया.

‡ अकालजलदेंदोः सा हृद्या वचनचंद्रिका ।
नित्यं कविचकोरैर्या पीयते न च हीयते ॥
अकालजलदश्लोकैश्चित्रमात्मकुलैरिव ।
जातः काश्मीरामो नाटके प्रवरः कविः ॥

भेकैः कोटरशायिभिः* &c., which is quoted as that of a दाक्षिणात्य, is supposed to be his, and may be said to give the origin of his name.

12. But the names of the other two poets, Tarala and Kaviraja, are not quite unfamiliar to us. The first question, however, that arises is, Who is this Kaviraja? Is he the same with the well-known author of the Raghava-Pandaviyam, who refers to himself in the following couplet:

सुबंधुर्बाणभट्टश्च कविराज इति त्रयः ।
वक्रोक्तिमार्गनिपुणाश्चतुर्थो विद्यते न वा ॥

Or is he some other 'Prince of Poets'? The general belief is that Kaviraja, who is regarded as the author of the 'crooked' poem, lived later than the tenth century.† But is it not very likely that he should be the same as the Kaviraja mentioned as one of our poet's ancestors? At the present moment I am not aware if any evidence exist to show that there were two poets of that name. We know that in the verses quoted in the *Sârangdhara-paddhati* as belonging to Rajasekhara, he refers to Tarala as one of his ancestors, and that in the *Hari-Hârâvali* in the विशिष्टकविप्रशंसा, Rajasekhara is said to refer to Tarala in these terms :—

यायावरकुलश्रेणेर्हारयष्टेश्च मंडनम् ।
सुवर्णबंधरुचिरस्तरलस्तरलो यथा ॥ ‡

This verse clearly shows that Tarala belonged to the Yayavara family, and, looking at the verse from the Balaramayana quoted above, it appears to me that Kaviraja, the author of the Raghava-pandaviyam§ who is mentioned in such close connection with Tarala, belonged to the same family and that he was one of Rajasekhara's ancestors.

---

* भेकैः कोटरशायिभिर्भृतमिव क्ष्मान्तर्गतं कच्छपैः
पाठीनैः पृथुपंककूटलुठितैर्यस्मिन्मुहुर्मूर्छितम् ।
तस्मिञ्शुष्कसरस्यकालजलदेनागत्य तच्चेष्टितं
येनाकंठनिमग्नवन्यकरिणां यूथैः पयः पीयते ॥

† Max Müller's India, P. 339. It is due to this scholar to remark that he has in the same place expressed his belief that 'Kaviraja may after all be not so late as he is generally supposed.'

‡ Prof. Peterson's Report for 1883-84, P. 59.

§ I regret I have not got a copy of the book with me, and so cannot say how far internal evidence will corroborate this supposition.

If this view be correct, we have here a means of roughly estimating the dates of these two poets. It has been before stated that our poet was the fourth in descent from Akalajalada,* his father being Durduka and his grand-father perhaps Surananda. Tarala and Kaviraja must, therefore, along with the others that are indicated by the word 'प्रभृतयः', be considered as his remote ancestors, separated from him by at least 6 or 7 generations, or by 150-200 years. Accepting the *terminus ad quem* of Rajasekhara's date, we may infer that Tarala and Kaviraja must have lived about the beginning of the 8th century at the latest. Subandhu and Banabhatta lived in the beginning of the 7th century, and this poet, who is always represented as belonging to the "matchless trio skilled in crooked sayings," may, in all likelihood, have lived some 50 or 60 years after them.

13. To turn to other writers alluded to by Rajasekhara. Aparajita is mentioned in the introduction to the *Karpuramanjari*, as the author of a work called मृगाङ्कलेखाकथा. But we know as much of the author as of his work. The other writers mentioned are:—Bhasa, Ramila, Somila, Vararuchi, Srisahasanka, Mentha, Bharavi, Kalidasa, Tarala, Skandha, Subandhu, Dandin, Bana, Divakara, Kanta, Ratnakara, and Matanga-divakara. Many of these are at present no more than mere names to us. Bhasa is known to be a predecessor of Kalidasa; but as the precise date of Kalidasa himself is undetermined, all that we can say is that he flourished before the year 637 A. D., for in an inscription of this date both Kalidasa and Bharavi are referred to as reputed poets. Ramila and Somila appear to have been the Beaumont and Fletcher of their day; they are always mentioned by Rajasekhara as joint authors of a work called शूद्रककथा. But nothing more definite is known about them. The same may be said of Vararuchi, Srisahasanka, Skandha, Divakara, Kanta, and Matanga-divakara. Mentha has been noticed on Page 3; the date of Bana, Dandin and Subandhu is the 7th century and their works are too well-known, and there now remains Ratnakara. As Dr. Buhler has pointed out, he is the author of a Mahakavya called 'Haravijaya' and is mentioned by the author of

---

* अकालजलदस्य प्रणप्तुः किमिति गुणगणो न वर्ण्यते (V. Bhanj. I.)
अकालजलदस्य चतुर्थः (Bal. Ram. I.)

the *Rajatarangini* (V. 24) among the authors who obtained fame under Avantivarman. But the author calls himself बालबृहस्पत्यनुजीविन् 'servant of the young Brihaspati,' which, according to Kalhana, was an honorific epithet of a king who reigned from 832-844 A. D. Ratnakara may have, therefore, begun his career about the beginning of the 9th or the end of the 8th century.*

Section II.

14. Having tried to roughly ascertain the date of Rajasekhara, I shall now turn to his personal history. Some points bearing on this subject have already been touched upon in the preceding pages, but I shall here collect for ready reference all the items of personal information that we find in his works.

15. Rajasekhara is more particular than most other poets in giving some account of himself and his patron. Kalidasa, the Prince of Indian Poets, has nowhere given us so much as a distant

---

* Buhler's Kashmir Report, quoted in the Subhashitavali (p. 97). The Editors seem to be at a loss to reconcile this date of Ratnakara with the mention of him by Rajasekhara, whom they regard, on the strength of Mr. Fleet's inscription, as a poet of the 8th century. They say :—'The discovery of the dramatist's real date has rendered it obvious that we have to do with at least two Rajasekharas, to the younger of whom are to be ascribed in all probability all the memorial verses dealing with famous poets which are ascribed to a Rajasekhara in the anthologies, and which have hitherto been supposed to belong to the dramatist.' They need not, however, in my opinion, resort to this desperate shift, as the very discovery of the real date is open to question. If the position I have taken up, that Rajasekhara lived between the 8th and the 10th centuries, be correct, Ratnakara's mention by him can be satisfactorily explained by supposing our poet to have lived about the end of the 9th century. And if the hypothetical date proposed on the assumption of the Kshira of Jayapida being the same as the commentator on the Amarakosha, be found to be correct, even then we need not call into being a second Rajasekhara. Ratnakara's patron lived, according to Dr. Buhler, from 832 to 844, but Ratnakara may as well have commenced his career some 30 years earlier, which would mean that he was a contemporary of Rajasekhara, if not his predecessor. Rajasekhara is said to refer to Ratnakara in this verse :—

मा स्म संतु हि चत्वारः प्रायो रत्नाकरा इमे ।
इतीव स कृती धात्रा कविरत्नाकरीपरः ॥

And I cannot see in this reference anything which is incompatible with a feeling of respect and admiration such as one poet may show for his contemporary.

allusion to his patron, his nativity or his family. But Rajasekhara satisfies the curiosity of the reader in this respect to a considerable extent. From the introductions to his works we learn that he was the great-grandson of, or fourth in descent from, Akalajalada, "the crest-jewel of Maharashtra," belonging to the Yayavara* family; that he was the son of Durduka (or as some copies read it, of Duhika, he being called दौहिकी) and Silavati, and that he was the preceptor of Mahendrapaladeva, the ornament of the race of Raghu, and the paramount lord of Aryavarta. He invariably styles himself उपाध्याय or गुरु either of Mahendrapala or the King Nirbhaya (निर्भयगुरुः Bal. p. 5), निर्भयराजस्य तथा उपाध्यायः Karpuramanjari p. 3). He also tells us that he was the "son of a great minister" (महामंत्रिपुत्रः Balabharata). Two of his dramas are represented before audiences called by the mandate of Mahendrapala or Mahipala; Karpuramanjari is performed at the desire of the poet's wife Avantisundari, while Viddhasalabhanjika at the command of the audience of the 'honored Yuvaraja.'†

16. As regards his caste the poet is not definite in his information. It is to be *presumed* that he was a Brahmana, because he regards himself as an incarnation of the Brahman Bhavabhuti, but chiefly because he is an उपाध्याय or गुरु to a Kshatriya Prince. His surname *Yáyávara* would also show that he was a Brahmana.‡

---

* यायावर etymologically means 'one who frequently moves about from place to place': (भृशं or पौनःपुन्येन यातीति); hence it means a vagrant mendicant. Here it is used as a surname.

† Nothing is known about this Prince. He is supposed to belong to the Chedi dynasty.

‡ There are one or two circumstances which would seem to show that the question of his caste cannot be said to be decided. The first is the verse in which he tells us the family of his wife:—

चाहाणकुलमौलिमालिका
राजशेखरकवीन्द्रगेहिनी।
भर्तुः कृतिमवंतिसुंदरी
सा प्रबोधविधुमेतदिच्छति॥ (Kar. Manj. p. 3).

This means that his wife Avantisundari was "the chaplet of the Chavhan family" and would lead us to infer that Rajasekhara, since he married a Chavhan's daughter, was himself some Mahratta. Another circumstance that apparently lends support to this belief is that Rama is supposed to be the 'jewel of his own race' (स्वस्त्वेस्मिन्निजवंशमौक्तिकमणौ रामे विराने हिषा Bala Ram. Act. I. v. 15), and on this authority Pandit Govind Deva Shastri calls him सूर्यवंशीयचाचावरकुलजन्मा. I must confess this is a rather

His theological opinions seem to be *Saiva* ; for he devoutly invokes *Siva* and *Parvati* in his Viddhas*a*labhanjik*a*, the B*a*labh*a*rata and the Karp*u*ramanjar*i*. In the last work he puts in the mouth of Bhairav*a*nanda two or three verses* which are laudatory of "Kaula-Dharma," the "eat-drink-and-be-merry" principle, so to say—a type of the worst Epicureanism. He probably introduces them to ridicule those 'vicious tenets,' which to this day are said to be current among some sections of the people called *Sâktas*. His character may be thus briefly stated. He was benevolent, always striving to relieve the distress of the afflicted, very brave and courageous, the very embodiment of goodness of disposition, liberal, a lover of truth, and foremost among poets, and, above all, the preceptor of the most distinguished King Mahendrap*a*la. Indeed, as observed in the Viddhas*a*labhanjik*a*† he did not regard any of his personal qualities of so much importance as the fact that he had for his pupil so well-known a sovereign as Mahendrap*a*la. He rose to this distinguished position by the excellence of his writings. He was first known as a young poet,

---

dubious point. The second circumstance may be accounted for by referring the word निज to *Rama* 'the jewel of his own race.' But the first cannot in my opinion be so lightly explained away. 'चउहाण' in the Prakrit is not capable of being translated in any other way, nor am I aware of any Brahman family bearing the surname चव्हाण. On the other hand, the poet calls himself उपाध्यायश्रीराजशेखर. The word *Upádhyàya* has a sacred character attaching to it, and it has invariably been supposed to belong to none but a Brahmana, and I know of no instance of a person such as would wed a Chavhan's daughter, being made the *Guru* of a King. Which of these two positions then are we to regard as correct? Is it to be understood that Rajasekhara, though a Brahmana, married a Mahratta girl as allowed by Dharmas*a*stra, which says that a person may marry a woman of any of the inferior castes? Perhaps it would be prudent to wait till we get more satisfactory evidence on the point.

* मंत्रो न तंत्रं न च किमपि ज्ञानं ध्यानं च न कोपि गुरुप्रसादः ।
मद्यं पिबामो महिलां रमामो मोक्षं च यामः कुलमार्गलग्नाः ॥
रंडाचंडा दीक्षिता धर्मदारा मद्यं मांसं पीयते खाद्यते च ।
भिक्षा भोज्यं चर्मखंडं च शय्या कौलो धर्मः कस्य नो भाति रम्यः ॥
मुक्तिं भणंति हरिब्रह्ममुखा हि देवा ध्यानेन वेदपठनेन क्रतुक्रियाभिः ।
एकेन केवलमुमाशपितेन दृष्टो मोक्षः सयं सुरतकेलिसुदारसाभ्याम् ॥

† किमपरमपरैः परोपकारव्यसनविधेर्गणितैर्गुणैरमुष्य ।
रघुकुलतिलको महेंद्रपालः सकलकलानिलयः स यस्य शिष्यः ॥

then he got the title of "Prince of poets," and when he attained to such eminent fame, he became tutor to King Nirbhaya.

17. As regards his native place also the poet does not tell us much that is definite. He appears, however, to have been a native of Mahārashtra, or the country now known as Berars. His great-grandfather is called the "jewel of Mahārashtra" and the colophon of the printed edition of Karpuramanjari stands thus :—

इति श्रीमन्महाराष्ट्रचूडामणिना महेंद्रपालोपाध्यायेन राजशेखरेण बालकविना कविराजेन विरचिते नाटकविशेषे कर्पूरमंजरीनामके सट्टके चतुर्थ जवनिकांतरं समाप्तम्.

It is, therefore, quite likely that he was a native of Maharashtra. This term had, in ancient times as even at the present day, a wide application. But Rajasekhara states what tract of the country he understands by it. In the tenth Act of the Balaramayana, while Rama, Lakshmana and Sita are pursuing their homeward journey in the aerial car, Sugriva says :—

सु.—भरताग्रज अयमग्रे महाराष्ट्रविषयः ।
रामः—यत्क्षेमं त्रिदिवाय वर्त्म निगमस्यांगं च यत्सप्तमं
स्वादिष्टं च यदैक्षवादपि रसाच्चक्षुश्च यद्वाङ्मयम् ।
तथस्मिन् मधुरं प्रसादि रसवत्कांतं च काव्यामृतं
सोयं सुभ्रु पुरो विदर्भविषयः सारस्वतीजन्मभूः ॥
रतविद्याविदग्धानां विभ्रमोल्लेखलंपटः ।
नित्यं कुंतलकांतानां किंकरो मकरध्वजः ॥

The poet here considers Maharashtra, Vidarbha and Kuntala to be identical. Vidarbha or Maharashtra was in old days much celebrated for its scholars and deep learning. It was this country from which Bhavabhuti poured forth the exquisite melody and manly elegance of his song. Besides this prominent and eulogistic reference to Vidarbha the poet praises in equally high terms the *Vaidarbhi* style of composition. We may thus conclude that Rajasekhara was a native of Maharashtra, or that part of it now called Berars.

It will be found that the poet shows an intimate acquaintance with the manners, local peculiarities and excellences of the people in the south as well as the west of India. The minute description he gives of the people and products of the territories watered by the Kaveri, Tamraparni, and Narmada, his mention of the 'black

cheeks,' 'the pure smile,' and teeth rubbed white with the rind of the Betel-nut tree, of the Dravida women ; the curling ringlets of the Karnatic maidens and their fat hips raising the level of the water of the Kaveri, the pleasure-seeking propensities of the people of Lata—the modern Ahmedabad and Broach ; his detailed notice of towns like Mathura, Kanyakubja, Tripura—all this would seem to show that Rajasekhara, though a native of Maharashtra, had travelled over the greater portion of the South of India and most of the tracts about the Narmada, and acquired his information about the people and their manners &c., from personal observation, and that when he was known to be a great poet, he was called as tutor by King Nirbhaya, and he fixed his abode at the Court of the sovereign ruler of Mahodaya. Akalajalada, as before observed, is said to be a दाक्षिणात्य, 'a southerner ;' and his great-grandson was, no doubt, a southerner too. दाक्षिणात्य means 'to the South of the Narmada' and not 'in the South of India,' for, as Rajasekhara says, the Narmada is आर्यावर्तदक्षिणापथयोर्विभागरेखा (Bal. Ram. Act 6), the boundary line separating the North of India from the Dakshinapatha or South of India.

Section III.

18. Having in the first two Sections attempted to acquaint the reader with the age and personal history of Rajasekhara, I shall now proceed to his works, examine their contents and estimate their worth. Rajasekhara is known as the author of four dramatic works, three of which are printed: *Karpùramanjarí*, *Viddhasâlabhanjikâ*, *Bâlarâmâyana* and *Bâlabhârata* otherwise called *Prachanda-Pàndava*. The first and third have been published in the *Pandit* issued at Benares ; the second was printed some years ago by Pandit Jibananda at Calcutta, but at the beginning of this year we had an edition of the play, better in many respects than Jibanand's, edited and annotated by Messrs. Arte & Godbole. The Balabharata exists in a manuscript form and that too in an incomplete state Besides these four works Rajasekhara is credited with having written several memorial verses that we find scattered in the existing anthologies dealing with famous poets, and I have no doubt that they must be ascribed to him. In a verse in the Balaramayana he distinctly speaks of his "six Prabandhas" or compositions, and if we leave the four recognized works, there remain two that have probably yet to be recovered from the

wrecks of Time. It is, therefore, quite likely that the same Rajasekhara also wrote the memorial verses—probably in a connected form—which were afterwards severally distributed in subsequent arrangements. I have noticed some of these verses in the preceding Sections, and shall now review the four works in the order of their mention.

19. The *Karpûramanjarî* appears to have been one of the poet's juvenile productions. In ideas, style, and plot it generally resembles the *Viddhasâlabhanjikâ*. It belongs to a class of dramatic compositions called *sattaka*—which is entirely in Prakrita, without the Praveshaka and Vishkambhaka, the usual interludes, has the *adbhuta* or marvellous sentiment predominant in it, and its acts are named Javanikas. In other respects it resembles the Natika. This Sattaka has four acts or javanikas and its arrangement is much the same as that of the author's Natika. In the Prastavana, after the usual benediction in praise of famous poets like Vyasa, the several Rîtis or styles of composition, the loves of Cupid and Rati and Siva and Parvati, we are told that Rajasekhara of 'moon-white reputation' wrote this species of composition to show his masterly proficiency in all languages. On being asked why the poet attempted a Prakrita composition in preference to Sanskrit, the Sutradhara repeats the poet's opinion that 'there is as much difference between the two as between man and woman : the words though in a different form and their sense remain the same in both ; and that excellence of thoughts and sentiments constitutes a Kavya, no matter in what garb they are clothed.* We are then told that in this Sattaka, 'flowing with Rasas,' a King named Chandrapala will, for the attainment of the station of paramount sovereign, marry the daughter of the lord of the Kuntalas. The plot—if indeed it may be so called—is briefly this.

The King and Queen with their retinue enter and congratulate each other upon the advent of the lovely Spring, which is described in six or seven verses. The Vidushaka and Vichakshana, an attendant of the Queen, then fall out, dealing in smart

* अर्थनिवेशास्त एव सङ्घास्त एव परिणमंतोपि ।
उक्तिविशेषः काव्यं भाषा वा भवति सा भवतु ॥
पुरुषाः संस्कृतबंधाः प्राकृतबंधेषि इतोपि सुकुमाराः ।
पुरुषमहिलायोरिवविशेषंतरं तावदेव ॥

and often vulgar retorts, and making clever sallies of wit. While the two are occupied with this agreeable task of recrimination, Bhairavananda, a magician, enters, repeating ideas which smack of rank Epicureanism and dissoluteness. He engages to show to the King a 'marvel' and immediately a beauteous maiden appears on the scene. The eyes of the King and the maiden meet and the flame of Love is kindled. The girl tells her history, which shows that she is the daughter of the Queen's sister. The Queen proposes to take her with herself and, evening being announced, the parties retire.

The second Act shows the lovers in the usual state of love-lorn persons—the apparatus of cool, refrigerant substances, heaving of sighs, the eagerness to see more of each other. The Vidushaka joins in describing the heroine's beauty, and after a time they see her enjoying herself on a swing and the Vidushaka gives us a bit of his poetic powers in describing the 'swinging of the moon-faced lady.' Vichakshana then comes and takes them to the pleasure-garden, where the heroine at the command of the Queen is fulfilling the desires of the Kurabaka, Tilaka and Asoka trees. The lovers again see each other and their passion is more inflamed. Just then the evening time is proclaimed by bards and their interview is cut short.

At the beginning of the third Act the King tells his friend that he has seen his beloved in his dream, and the witty friend rallies him by narrating to him a romantic dream of his own. The conversation then turns on the characteristics of *love*, to which task the Vidushaka shows that he is quite equal. Karpuramanjari attended by a friend then enters and gives vent to her excitement of passion. The King approaches her and holding her by the hand leads her to the pleasure-garden by a subterranean passage, where the moon has spread her bright effulgence. While the King is gallantly dallying with her, a loud noise is heard behind the scenes, which only ushers the arrival of the Queen to see the garden. They, of course, hurriedly take leave of each other and Karpuramanjari proposes to go by the same subterranean passage to avoid detection.

The last Act opens with Summer, which has far advanced.

It is then found that the Queen has ordered the door of the passage to be closed up, and that Karpuramanjari is immured. A maid-servant then enters and announces to the King that at Bhairavanand's request the Queen is going to marry him to a lady called *Ghanasâra-Manjari*, the daughter of the King of Latas, and that he should be pleased to accept the proposal. In the meantime the magician has managed to deliver Karpuramanjari from her prison and he puts her in place of Ghanasara-Manjari. The wedding is then duly performed, and the Queen learns with mortification that the new addition to the harem is no other than her own sister Karpuramanjari. The Queen angrily departs and the usual Bharatavakya winds up the Act and the play.

20. It will be thus seen that the work has nothing interesting in it. The plot is very poor. The ideas are commonplace and are often repeated, and the story is unnecessarily lengthened by descriptions which are seldom impressive. We must not, perhaps, judge of the work as a dramatic production. Probably the poet himself never intended it to serve any other purpose than showing what a great command he, 'proficient in all languages' as he was, had over Prakrita; and viewed in this light, it must be pronounced to be a very successful performance. The poet is quite at home in his new sphere. He uses long metres like Sragdhara and Sardulavikridita with wonderful ease, and he does not feel himself to be under any disadvantage although he is making Prakrita the vehicle of his thoughts. If the Sanskrit tongue follows the Brahman Bhavabhuti like an obedient wife (वश्या), Prakrita may be considered to follow Rajasekhara with equal obedience. Considered as a drama the *Karpûramanjari* is a worthless production: viewed simply as a Prakrita composition, it will remain as a monument of the great command of Rajasekhara over Prakrita and has the same importance as the *Setubandha* ascribed to Kalidasa.

21. The *Viddhasâlabhanjikâ* or "carved wooden statue"* appears to be the poet's next production. It is in some respects superior to the one noticed above. He has at least tried to give the

* The piece derives its name from a statue of the heroine placed on a column in the King's pleasure abode. The statue, however, does not play an important part in the development of the plot; *cf.* the title Mrichchakatika.

piece an appearance of a drama by the introduction of more varied characters. The play opens with three benedictory stanzas, two of which are dedicated to Cupid and the tender sex, and the third to *Parvati*. After a short Prastavana we are introduced to Haradasa, a pupil of Bhagurayana, minister of King Vidyadharamalla. He tells us that this minister, having learnt from his spies that Chandravarman, King of the Latas, and a feudatory of Vidyadharamalla, had passed his daughter off as his son and heir, has brought her to his master as a hostage for the tribute due from her father, with an important object in view. One morning the King sees a fancied vision, which he relates to his confidant, Charayana. It appears that he saw in his dream a beauteous maiden, who gently approached him and threw round his neck a necklace of resplendent pearls. The Vidushaka treats the whole as merely a dream, reproaches him for his fickleness, as he has just before fallen in love with Kuvalayamala, Princess of Kuntala, and advises him to be content with his Queen, remembering the wise adage that 'a partridge secured at the moment is better than a pea-hen to be got after a day.' The King and his friend then go into the garden where, over the edge of the rampart, they behold a number of fair females, amusing themselves with swinging, among whom the King recognizes the countenance of the lady seen by him in his vision. But she soon disappears. The King and his friend then enter a pleasure-abode, built of crystal and adorned with several paintings and statues. In that chamber they behold, in several places, the portraits of the lady really seen by the King in his supposed dream. There is also a statue of her 'rich in excellences.' Afterwards they behold the maiden herself through the transparent walls of the apartment, but she runs away on being observed. The bards just at that time proclaim the hour of noon and they hurry to the Queen's apartments to perform the mid-day ceremonies.

The second Act opens with a dialogue between two attendants of the Queen, in which we are told that Kuvalayamala, the daughter of the king of Kuntala, is intended by the Queen to be given in marriage to Mrigankavarman, the supposed son of her maternal uncle (whom, by the bye, the Queen out of curiosity dressed in a woman's garb). Then follows a frolic practised by Mekhala, the foster-sister of the Queen, upon the Vidushaka. He is promised a new bride

Ambaramala (Sky-Garland), the daughter of Mirage and Hare-horn, which he honestly believes. But when the ceremony is about to take place, the bride proves to be merely a male slave of the Queen. The Vidushaka is highly incensed at this dirty trick and goes off breathing revenge. The King follows and pacifies him and they go into the garden, where they see the damsel Mrigankavali playing with a ball. But she disappears. Presently they overhear a conversation between her and one of her companions, in which it appears that she, in spite of her coy reserve, is equally enamoured of the King and is pining away for him. Evening is now proclaimed and they retire to the Queen's apartments.

A dialogue at the beginning of the third Act tells us that Bhagurayana, relying on the prediction of a seer that he who would espouse Mrigankavali would be the paramount lord of the Earth, took one of the Queen's attendants into his confidence, and telling her that Mrigankavarman was not a boy, but a girl, induced her to introduce Mrigankavali into the King's chamber furnished with hollow posts, and made her show herself in his presence on various occasions. We thus learn that the dream of the King is only a contrivance of the minister. We are next told how the Vidushaka has planned his scheme of revenge. Mekhala was told by a female, as if by a heavenly voice, from behind a tree that she would die on the next full-moon day, but that if she crawled between the legs of some learned Brahman, she might be saved. The scheme succeeded and the Queen requested the Vidushaka to graciously preserve the life of the poor maid. The scene then takes place; he proclaims the trick and triumphs in the humiliation to which he has subjected Mekhala. The Queen suspects that her husband is at the bottom of the plot and goes off in a pet. The King and his friend then repair to the garden, where the moon shines brightly upon the deep blue vault gemmed with myriads of stars, and the air is filled with a flood of pure argentine lustre. While he is describing his passion, Mrigankavali and her friend also enter the garden, the former expressing the tormenting pangs caused by her love for the King. The lovers then meet, but they abruptly separate, on hearing the cry that the Queen is coming to see the garden.

The fourth Act opens with the dawn, when Charayana and his wife are introduced, the latter asleep. In her sleep, however,

she is very talkative and repeats a supposed dialogue between the Queen and the King, in which she urges her husband to marry Mrig*a*nkaval*i*, the sister of the boy Mrig*a*nkavarman, who, she pretends, has come to pay a visit to her brother, and whose hand will give her husband paramount sovereignty, and satisfies him about the purity of her intentions by reminding him that she has already given him half a dozen wives. The object of this is simply to entrap the King into a marriage with one she supposes to be a boy, and thus to punish the 'master' for the faults of his 'pupil.' The Vid*u*shaka suspects the trick, and waking his wife sends her to the Queen, and himself joins his friend. At this time the King is suffering from the sultriness of summer aggravated by the intensity of his flame, and while the amatory emotions of the King and his beloved are being described, they are interrupted by the Queen's maidens who come with the nuptial materials. On the entrance of the Queen, accompanied by Mrig*a*nkaval*i* and Kuvalayam*a*la (who is already married by the Queen to her supposed brother), the ceremony of marriage takes place. But just as the fire is perambulated and the King has taken his seat, a messenger arrives from the Queen's maternal uncle. He announces that his master has got a son and consequently the supposed Mrig*a*nkavarman, who is really Mrig*a*nkaval*i*, should be given away by the Queen to some worthy consort. The Queen finds that in trying to overreach her husband, she has overreached herself, and only added one more rival wife to the seraglio. But as the thing is irrecovably done, she assumes a majestic nobility of mind and ratifies the marriage with good grace and gives Kuvalayam*a*la to the King into the bargain. To crown the King's happiness, a messenger arrives from his Commander-in-chief *S*rivatsa, with the news that the forces of the Karnatic Princes have been vanquished, and that V*i*rap*a*la, King of Kuntala and friend of the King, who was expelled from his throne by his kinsmen with the aid of these troops, has been reinstated on the throne. The Northern, Eastern and Western princes having been already subdued, Vidy*a*dharamalla's authority now extends from the milk-ocean on the North to the sea filled with the waters of the T*a*mraparni on the South, and from the ocean in which falls the moon's daughter Narmad*a*, on the West, to the Bay of Bengal sanctified by the fall of the Ganges, on the East.

22. From the foregoing analysis it will be clear that the plot of the play, though complicated, is quite uninteresting. According to the definition of a Natika, the story ' is invented, consists of four Acts and is full of female characters,' but the author has shown very little skill in putting together incidents and producing a dramatic effect. It has neither 'the elegance of the Ratnavali'* or even the Priyadarsika, nor the 'spirit of the Malavikagnimitra.' The whole is a very tame, insipid affair. The story turns upon the Queen's continued ignorance of the real character of the youth committed to her care, which under the circumstances mentioned is a wild improbability. The Queen does not merely *believe* him to be a boy : she acts on that belief, and with a desire to do her maternal uncle a service, gets him married to a lovely girl ! Besides, the poet, in keeping the Queen ignorant of the real sex of her charge, has completely marred the beauty of a Natika. If we examine the *Ratnâvali* or the *Mâlavikâgnimitra*—which is a Natika in essence, though not in form—we shall find how the Queen is jealous of the maiden whom her husband intends to add to the seraglio, how the fond pair is

* It would seem that many hands have not tried this branch of the drama. I know of only three Natikas: this play and the two ascribed to King Sriharsha. There are a few coincidences between Sriharsha's and Rajasekhara's works, some minor, some important. *Priyadarsikâ*, the heroine of the second Natika ascribed to Sriharsha, is the daughter of the Queen's sister ; so is *Karpûramanjari*, heroine of the *Sattaka* noticed above. *Ratnâvali* is the daughter of Vasavadatta's maternal uncle ; so is Mrigankavali, The King's Minister Yaugandharayana acts in the interests of his master in the former; so does Bhaguravana in V. Bhanjika ; the names Kanchanamala and Kuvalayamala, Ratnavali and Mrigankavali are of similar formation. The dignity of universal monarch was prophesied to accompany the hand of Ratnavali ; the same is the case with Mrigankavali's. A magician helps the fulfilment of the plot in the *Ratnavali* ; so does Bhairavananda in the Karpuramanjari. These are some of the coincidences that struck me as I compared the four works together. Besides, it would appear as if Rajasekhara had before his mind the two heroines *Ratnavali* and *Priyadarsika* when he wrote :—परिणायित एवार्यपुत्रो मया मगधाधिपस्य सुतां अनंगलेखां मालवनरेंद्रस्य दुहितरं रत्नावली प्रियदर्शनां च &c (V. Bhanj. act 4). May it not be inferred from this that Rajasekhara knew of the existence of the two Natikas ! If the latter belong, as they are supposed, to the 7th century, it is quite likely that our poet should have had in view some of the characteristic features of the two plays, though he had his own way of arranging the several incidents. To me the coincidence in so many respects does not appear quite fortuitous, and I am inclined to believe that it affords a proof that *Ratnâvali* existed before the tenth century.

caught several times 'in the act,' which makes her pour the phials of her wrath on the devoted head of the poor girl, and of the King's pleasure-minister, to boot, and indignantly spurn all her husband's attempts at propitiation, and how in the end, when the Queen comes to know the relationship between the girl and herself, she with a true majestic dignity gives the girl away to her royal husband. But all this is deplorably wanting in the Viddhaśalabhañjika. The Queen is not angry with the King even once, except for the trick played on Mekhalā, and the Vidūshaka's references to her angry frowns and his fear that they 'would be cooped up, like pigeons, in a cage', appear simply ludicrous. The hero, according to dramaturgic canons, is an illustrious person, but it is questionable whether he is 'gay and thoughtless and yet firm.' He is not a gallant like Vatsa or Agnimitra; he is not afraid of the Queen, and not having been caught in the fact gives us no opportunity to pity him in his humiliating yet gallant prostration at the feet of his wife. The heroine is a simple-minded, lovely girl, like all the heroines of Nāṭikās. She is coy and confiding. Usually the heroine is over afraid of the Queen, but here she is safe in that quarter, for the Queen herself often attired her in a female garb and was therefore least likely to suspect any intrigue between her and her husband. The Queen who ought to be 'a bold woman, indignant at every step,' has been shown to be a mild lady, concocting mock marriages, first to outwit the jester and then the King, with the only result of making a fool of herself And Kuvalayamālā—what shall we say of the poor girl? She is first wedded to a supposed boy, and then transferred, according to the advice of the Vidūshaka backed by legal authorities, to the husband of her *quondam* husband! What must have been her feelings on that occasion! Yet the wonder is that though the poet has introduced her for a specific purpose, she is not seen opening her lips even once in the whole play; no, not even when she is humorously congratulated by Mṛigāṅkavalī, her former husband, upon having shared with her the affection of the King! The Vidūshaka is the only character that saves the play from being altogether "damned," that rouses some interest with his remarks, now jocular, now serious, half sarcastic, half abusive; with his sound common-sense ridicule of his friend's unsteady love, his store of folk-lore and proverbial expressions, his fear of ghosts,

his cunning in outwitting Mekhalā, and yet simplicity enough to believe in the story of his marriage. He is not an intriguing, gluttonous fellow, like Vasantaka or Gautama; but a humorous companion, showing his नर्मसचिवत्व only by quoting law to give his friend another wife. You cannot but enjoy his mortification when he is married to a "lubberly boy," and participate in the supreme satisfaction felt by him at the success of his countertrick. It would thus seem that the essential requisites of a Natikā are in this play honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

23. Looking at the arrangement of incidents, I must say that some are put in, which are not calculated to further the development of the plot. The first Act is unnecessarily lengthened by a frequent repetition of similar ideas, and strangely enough the heroine is not introduced till towards the end of the third Act. She is indeed shown behind the stage, first on the swing and then playing with a ball, and letting the King know her mind in a verse which is completed in the fourth Act (another invention of the poet); but the position of the actors on the stage is rendered very awkward. The poet has introduced many speeches 'behind the scenes' instead of expressing them on the stage, at least in some cases. But Rajasekhara is nothing, if not original. He thought that he was not bound to slavishly follow the practice of his predecessors in the field, and has, therefore, invented not only ideas, but a peculiar method of arranging incidents, so as to impart novelty to his works. In trying to improve upon his predecessors he has given us several ideas which are quite extravagant and affected.* His constructions are often involved, far-fetched, loose and awkward, and are in a few places ungrammatical. Words are used in quite unusual senses: मूलं 'top' (in अस्ताचलमूलं), भ्रामरी 'going round the fire' (as I take it), प्रणयिनी 'lovely,' वक्रं 'jest,' सब्रह्मचारी 'like,' परिभ्रमः 'mistaking for,' संवाहनं 'striking against,' किं पुनः 'but' &c. The nuptial fire is perambulated twice on the stage, and the Jester's wife sleeps on the stage, both of which actions are against dramatic laws. And to crown the unfavourable impression produced by a perusal of the play, to the penury of the plot and its unskilful arrangement is added the dry, vapid, and often clumsy style of the poetical passages. There are,

* For instance see verses, 15, 45 (Act I.); v. 3, 9, 10, 22 (Act II.); v. 3, 6 (and the prose speech preceding it) 14, 25, (Act III.); v. 12,—14. (Act IV.)

indeed, about 10 verses in the whole play which may be regarded as capital productions; but, barring these, the majority of the verses are dull and unattractive. The descriptions of the play at ball and moon-light are vigorous, but scarcely impressive. On the whole, the *Viddhasâlabhanjikâ*, whether considered as a dramatic or literary production, must, I think, be considered a failure, and if *Rajasekhara*'s rank among poets were determined only on the merits of this play, he would, without doubt, stand almost at the bottom of the list.

24. Passing from the Viddhas*a*labhanjik*a*, we come to the *Bâlarâmâyana* ; and in doing so we feel an immense relief. It is undoubtedly his greatest and most important production. It is far superior to the N*a*tik*a* in every important respect, and its excellence is certainly due to the sublime and exalted nature of the subject itself. The life and adventures of R*a*ma, sung by the immortal V*a*lm*i*ki, have furnished a most fruitful subject for a succession of poets and dramatists. Bhavabh*u*ti was, it appears, the first to dramatize the life of R*a*ma, and may be said to be the pioneer of what Mr. Borooah calls the " Ramaic" plays. R*a*jasekhara, in writing this drama, drew for the most part upon the R*a*m*a*yana of V*a*lm*i*ki, reserving, of course, the right of a poet to make such additions and alterations as to him might seem proper. Before offering any criticism upon the merits and demerits of the play, it will be proper to give a brief outline of the story itself.

After a benedictory verse eulogistic of an abstract godhead—'वाणीनां गुरुः'—and a Prast*a*van*a* of considerable length, which is valuable in many ways, we are introduced to Sunass*e*pha and an evil spirit disguised as an ascetic. Their dialogue brings out the fact that at the Svayamvara ceremony of S*i*t*a*, which is to take place, R*a*vana will try to marry her by fulfilling the vow. The next scene shows us R*a*vana attended by his general Prahasta, Janaka and his family preceptor. R*a*vana orders the bow of *Siva* to be produced, and while all are filled with apprehension that this evil R*a*kshasa may become S*i*t*a*'s lord if he but bend the bow, R*a*vana contemptuously throws it down and thinks it humiliating to his prowess to win a wife by fulfilling the vow, like cowardly mortals. Janaka is angry at the contempt shown for the bow ; they determine to fight, but a voice from behind the scenes wards Janaka off from the imprudence. R*a*vana, being insulted by *Sat*ananda, makes the dreadful vow that he will be the inveterate

enemy of him who will marry *Sita*. The time of noon being announced, Ravana orders his followers to enjoy themselves for some days in the pleasant gardens of Mithila. This act is called प्रतिज्ञा-पौलस्त्य.

The second Act is called परशुरामरावणीय and treats of the violent altercation between Rama and Ravana. Narada—the 'lover of quarrels'—is going to excite, while an attendant of Siva is sent to appease, them. In the next scene Ravana is introduced, acting the part of a love-sick mortal, calling to mind the excellences of *Sita*'s form and chiding the 'Mind-born' for striking at *him*. Jamadagnya, the valiant, irascible Brahman hero, then enters and the conversation of the two, which is first gay, becomes gradually serious when they rake up each other's weak points, until it grows so warm that Ravana calls upon the bragging Brahman to bend his bow, and a fierce strife would surely have ensued, had not their revered parents come just at that time to separate the fiery combatants at the command of Siva.

In the third Act a pair of vultures is introduced at the beginning. In the dialogue the male vulture congratulates his mate upon the prospects of a rich repast of demons' meat, as the slaughter of Tadaka by the two young sons of Dasaratha is sure to fan the wrath of Ravana so as to make him wage a sanguinary war with them. We are further told that Rama and Lakshman are going to attend the Svayamvara ceremony and that a drama on that subject is to be represented before Ravana for his entertainment This appears to be a trick of the gods to deceive Ravana by bringing about the real marriage of Rama and *Sita*, and hence the Act is properly styled विलक्षलंकेश्वर. As the time of night approaches the actors are called upon to begin. Several Kings from eighteen different countries are assembled in a large splendid hall, and the herald proclaiming the stake of *Sita*'s hand calls upon each King to try his strength. But no one succeeds in so much as lifting the bow, and as often as the Kings make their trial, Ravana breaks out into exclamations reproaching them with their discomfiture. At last comes Rama, and when he breaks the bow and is crowned with the prize, the hand of *Sita*, Ravana springs up to oppose him, but is reminded by Prahasta that it is a *drama* and not a *reality*! Ravana is thus abashed at having become excited for nothing, and the play being over, the actors are dismissed.

In the fourth Act Bhargava is vanquished and it is, therefore, called भार्गवभंग. We are told in a Vishkambhaka that *Jamadagnya*, being irritated at *Rama's* breaking the bow of his master *Siva*, is going to attack him. Dasaratha and *Matali* are then seen descending the sky, and they describe with exultation the various feats formerly achieved by the brave Bhargava. Dasaratha reaches Janaka's capital Mithila and congratulates his son upon his good fortune. Just then the deep, thundering voice of the angry Bhargava is sent through the hall, and all at once they find themselves in close contact with him. The passionate Brahman relentlessly challenges the stripling to fight with him. The latter with respectful courtesy pretends that Bhargava is simply joking; but when it is found that he is serious and that he actually hands a bow to the youth, Lakshmana rushes forward to take it, and the warriors including *Rama*, go out in an open spot of ground 'fit for combat.'

In the next Act *Ravana* is shown maddened by his love for *Sita*, and his minister has cunningly devised for his entertainment a mechanical contrivance representing *Sita* and her friend. When *Ravana* asks for *Sita*, the mechanical *Sita* is presented to him, and like a mad lover, he talks endearing words to her, and is about to clasp her to his bosom, when the truth is out. He is, however, not at all angry, but only bids his maid-servant lead the way to the pleasure-garden to seek, if possible, comfort in its agreeable coolness. He first calls upon the seasons, then the gods, and then upon the rivers, one by one, to wait upon him and to allay the heat of his excitement, but his flame burns all the brighter for it. Finding no relief anywhere he next calls upon the swans, the deer, the elephant, the fleet antelope &c., and accuses them of having stolen away the gait, look &c of his beloved and threatens to punish them, but he is told by his attendant that there is nothing before him and that it is all the creation of his fancy. While he is thus trying to derive consolation and acting the part of the love sick *Madhava* of Bhavabhuti or the Pururavas of *Kalidasa*, his sister *Surpanakha*, her body mutilated and disfigured, comes wailing to him, and this incident serves to stir him up and make him leave the part of a mad lover. He is deeply excited and vows terrible revenge for this outrage upon his sister.

The sixth Act is intended to clear Dasaratha of the charge of having sent into exile his dearest son at the wicked desire of Kaikeyi, and it is called निर्दोषदशरथ. *Mal*yavat, in conjunction with *Mayamaya* and *Sur*panakha, has devised a plan to carry out the scheme of revenge proposed by his master. The two latter were to assume the forms of Dasaratha and Kaikeyi and repair to Ayodhya (the real D. with K. having gone up to the heavens to aid Indra in his battle) and then Kaikeyi was to ask the king for the two boons —the banishment of Rama for 14 years and the installation of Bharata on the throne. This they have effected, so that when the real Dasaratha and Kaikeyi come down, they are plunged into the deepest grief. Rama, *Sita* and Lakshmana have already left Ayodhya, and Sumantra and *Vama*deva describe to the bewailing family the state of the lovely and delicate *Sita*, her touching remarks at the time of leaving her home and during the toilsome journey, and the course of their march as far as the Narmada, in the most affecting verses. Ratna-Sikhanda, a relation of Jatayu, comes and relates the further progress of their journey and the death of Jatayu in the attempt to rescue *Sita* from being ravished by Ravana. Dasaratha's grief is doubled at hearing it and he prepares to throw himself into the sacred river.

The seventh and eighth Acts are devoted to describing the southward march of Rama and Lakshmana, with their monkey allies, to punish Ravana. When they come to the Sea, they find an insuperable difficulty in crossing it. The idea of a bridge is proposed, but the Lord of Waters at first stoutly opposes such a humiliation being inflicted upon him. At last when Rama is ready to shoot arrows at him, he gives way and the vast numbers of monkeys are engaged in throwing in stones upon stones and at length a bridge is constructed. When this news reaches the armies of Ravana, they send several of their number to crush down these puny mortals. The powerful warrior, Simhanada, then approaches, and after an angry conversation he and Rama engage in a deadly fight. The eighth Act just takes up the story. The destruction of the Rakshasa forces and their valiant generals, the slaying of Meghanada by Lakshmana and the fall of the redoubtable Kumbhakarna, spread a gloom over Lanka, and Ravana who is observing from above a turret the frightful carnage going on below, is overcome with deep sorrow at the death of his valiant brother and two sons, and runs

hastily to see Mandodari. These two acts describe heroic deeds of a marvellous nature and hence they are styled असमपराक्रम and वीरविलास respectively.

The ninth Act witnesses the death of the lord of Lanka. While the battle is raging fierce and hot near the gates of Lanka, Purandara, Dasaratha, and a pair of choristers appear in a balloon in the heavens above, and view the awful scene. The various remedies used by Ravana and Rama to counteract each other's missiles are described in minute detail, and the whole scene is simply horrid to contemplate. But of the ten heads of Ravana, only one now remains, and even that is adroitly lopped by Rama with a sharp arrow. At this great feat the gods begin to shower down flowers as an indication of their great joy, and the victor is greeted with hearty congratulations from all quarters.

The last and tenth Act brings Rama and others triumphantly home to Ayodhya. The Act opens with the entrance of Lanka who is grieved to find every one belonging to her slain by the cruel mortals. But she is consoled by her sister Alaka. The purification of Sita in the fire is then announced from behind the scenes, and the 'Earth-born' lady is seen issuing out of the dread ordeal quite unscathed. Rama, Lakshmana, Sita, Trijata, Bibhishana and Sugriva are then introduced seated in the Pushpaka balloon, prepared to wend their way back to Ayodhya. The party, as they move on, pass over several places and peoples. The sea, the Himalaya, Kailasa, the Manasa lake, the hermitages of celestial sages, the Meru mountain, the world of the moon, (these being seen in a higher flight of the balloon), the Rohana and Malyavat mountains, the Malaya range of hills, the Tamraparni, the hermitage of Agastya, the country of the Dravidas, the Andhras, the Kaveri, the Maharashtra, the Narmada, the Latas, the country of Malva, the Panchalas, Kanyakubja, Prayaga, Benares, and lastly Ayodhya, are successively passed under view and very gorgeously described. Hanuman then comes with the glad tidings that the preparations for Rama's coronation have been completed by the venerable Vasishtha. The preceptor accompanied by Bharata and Satrughna then enters, and after the first greetings and blessings are over, Vasishtha formally installs Rama on the throne of his ancestors,

and the play closes with joy and happiness printed on the face of every one.

25. The preceding analysis, brief as it is, will suffice to show the great length of the drama. It is a *Mahānāṭaka*, not only in a technical sense, but also in its bulk. It is, as its name indicates, a 'Bala Ramayana,' or a little or abridged Ramayana, as contrasted with the big Ramayana of Valmiki, and thus every part of it is on a grand scale. The Prastavana is quite as long as a small act; an act will nearly make up a drama like *Ratnāvali*, while the whole play will furnish matter for two works like *Uttararamacharita* or *Sakuntala*. Malatimadhava and Mrichchakatika are considered *Mahānāṭakas*, but they sink into insignificance when compared with *Balaramayana*. The verses in each Act average 74, the total number being as large as seven hundred and forty-one, one act alone having no less than one hundred and five! About fifty per cent of the whole number are in the long metres स्रग्धरा and शार्दूलविक्रीडित. The same subject-matter has been traversed by Bhavabhuti's *Mahāviracharita* in about half the space. The great bulk of the book is, therefore, one of its chief demerits and completely unfits it for the stage. The poet's original imagination and wide descriptive powers have led him to expand incidents to unnatural lengths, and what might be dismissed in three or four verses is described in about 15 or 20! Such parts appear very tedious and mar to a great extent the interest of the story and spoil the dramatic effect. Of this nature are the descriptions of Parasurama's exploits by Dasaratha and Matali, Ravana's description of the seasons, the morning panegyrics repeated by two bards, one awake and on the stage and the other asleep behind the scenes, which extend over 15 verses of the most uninteresting stuff, the construction of the bridge, and parts of the battle-scenes near the gates of Lanka. These are the principal weak points of the drama, and if the reader is not gifted with that rare human qualification-Patience, he is sure to throw it away in a fit of despondency at its interminable length, and is likely to form an unfavourable estimate of its worth.

26. But if we once admit that the work is not adapted for the stage, and examine it merely as a literary attempt, it will be found that there is a good deal to be said in its favour. Most of the defects pointed out in the Viddhasalabhanjika are here con-

spicuous by their absence. There is little awkwardness of construction, or affectation of ideas. Here there is no stiffness in the verses, but a gentle, graceful, and vigorous flow. Rajaśekhara, probably conscious of the dignified nature of the subject, has tried his best to pour out upon this work all the wealth of his great learning and imaginative faculty. He shows considerable confidence in his literary abilities, as is clearly seen from the whole tone of the Prastavana. He is at this time a poet whose 'fame has spread in all directions'; and he is ready to boldly take his stand upon the inherent merits of his composition.* The predominant *Rasa* being the heroic sentiment now and then blended with *love* and *tenderness*, many of his lines and dialogues are very effective, and written in a striking, vigorous style. The bragging of Ravana, the violent, angry altercation between him and Bhargava, the description of the Kings in the Marriage-hall, the advice given by Janaka to Sita, Rama's respectful yet valiant attitude towards Parasurama, the wailings of Dasaratha's family at the exile of Rama, the awful and grand picture of the raging conflict between the monkey warriors and the evil spirits, and lastly the homeward journey of Rama in the celestial balloon: these are described with such masterly skill that one cannot but admire the vast resources of the poet's mind, and the full play of his descriptive faculty.

27. In the incidents and personages of the drama and the conduct and development of the plot, the poet has deviated from the Ramayana to a considerable extent. The incidents in the six Kandas of the great epic have had to be necessarily condensed or omitted, and though in most cases the main facts are closely followed, there are several scenes and acts which are purely the creation of the dramatist. In this he clearly imitated Bhavabhuti, and there are unmistakable signs that he had the *Mahaviracharita* before him at the time of writing this play. But he has not simply copied him. The Ramayana describes Sita's Svayamvara at Mithila where Ravana tries to bend the bow, but is discomfited, and Rama

---

* श्रुते यः कोपि दोषं महदिति सुमतिर्बालरामायणेऽस्मिन्
प्रेष्टव्योसौ पटीयानिह भणितिगुणो विद्यते वा न वेति ।
यद्यस्ति स्वस्ति युभ्यं भव पठनरुचिर्विद्धि नः षट्प्रबंधान्
नैवं चेद्धीर्धमास्तां नटबटुवदने जर्जरा काव्यकंथा ॥
Cf. also verse 10.

alone succeeds in fulfilling the vow. Here Ravana is shown disdainfully scorning the idea of staking the strength of his arms on such a paltry thing, and the real Svayamvara is exhibited before him in the shape of a dramatic representation. This is, no doubt, a very great liberty taken by the author, but I cannot say that it is altogether uninteresting. The first three Acts are the creation of the poet, and though the story of Jamadagnya's meeting Rama is told in the Ramayana, the incidents in the fourth Act are invented by Rajasekhara after the style of Bhavabhuti. The next two Acts are also the creation of the poet. The fifth appears to be chiefly intended to show that he can describe the state of a lover smit with the pangs of love. But I think he is not happy in this respect. His main object in the whole Act appears to be to show his powers of description and produce scenes like the fourth act of the Vikramorvasi or the ninth of the Malatimadhava; and though the attempt by itself may not be a failure, it appears to be an unnecessary appendage, and the propriety of it in that place may be greatly questioned. In the plan of the sixth Act Rajasekhara follows Bhavabhuti in exculpating, Dasaratha's wife from the ignominy attaching to her name, but he goes one step further. Bhavabhuti makes Surpanakha assume the form of Manthara and go to Rama with a lettter from Kaikeyi urging him to ask for her the two boons; Rajasekhara makes Mayamaya and Surpanakha disguise themselves as Dasaratha and Kaikeyi and perpetrate the wicked deed, and thus exculpates both the king and his queen. The incidents of the next three Acts are drawn more or less from the Ramayana, but they are related in a different order and manner. The scene of Lanka and Alaka is a clear imitation of Bhavabhuti.* In the description of the journey to Ayodhya from Lanka he has, however, improved upon him, bringing his greater knowledge of the geography of the country to bear upon his descriptions. Valmiki takes his hero to Ayodhya over the sea, the Kishkindha forest, the Rishyamuka mountain, the lake Pampa, the Godavari, the hermitage of Agastya, Chitrakuta, the

* Rajasekhara who is shown to have imitated Bhavabhuti in several respects, has derived from him two of his characteristics. The first is the style of putting in extravagantly long prose speeches that we occasionally find in the Balaramayana after the model of Lavangika's bewilderingly long compounds. And the second is the repetition of passages of one play in another, sometimes parts of them, and sometimes whole verses. There are

Yamuna, Prayaga, the Ganges, and Sringaverapura. Rajasekhara has made numerous additions, which, by his lively and gorgeous descriptions of the places, considerably enhance the interest of the journey. In the development of the plot, the poet has thus shown considerable originality, although it cannot be said that it produces a good impression in every instance.

28. In painting his characters he has not been so successful. Bhargava or Jamadagnya is represented as the type of heroism and true Brahmanic spirit—haughty, irascible, self-confident, and vindictive. The passages between him and Ravana and Rama are illustrative of his heroic pride and dignified self-sufficiency. But Ravana has not been well drawn. He appears to advantage in his vaunting remarks at the time of bending the bow, and better still, in his interview with Bhargava in the second Act, where his sarcastic and cutting remarks are well worthy of a skilled satirist. But the poet has erred in making him act like a weeping, whining lover in attempting to get at Sita. Valmiki's Ravana, thoroughly devilish as he is, is determined upon securing Sita, and tries every foul means to accomplish his object The abduction of Sita does take place even here, but we do not see that he has taken any part in it. Besides we do not feel that he is the lord of *diabolical* fiends, that he has much of the *devil* in him, for his fiendish cruelty and vindictiveness give place to sentimental wails and maudlin utterances, worthy of a helpless and maddened mortal. Rama, though an important personage, is reduced to a secondary part in the drama, and though he slays his mighty foe, we see less of him than of Ravana in the play; he is, in fact, thrown in the background by Ravana, who, like Satan in the Paradise Lost, becomes the principal character to engage our attention. His calm and intrepid valour in facing Bhargava and his wonderful sense of filial duty in adhering to his resolution of going into exile, even when the trick was found out, are, however, very strikingly shown.

29. The last work that we have to consider is the *Bâlabhârata* or *Prachanda-Pândava*. We have it, as I have before observed, in an incomplete form at present, but from the little that is available it would seem that it was projected by the author on the same plan as the *Bâlarâmâyana*. The name is similarly formed. It is a 'little Bharata,' as opposed to the Mahabharata. The play opens

with an invocation of Śiva and has a short, but very important, introduction. It gives us an account of the poet's pupil Mahendrapala, and some items of personal information. The Prastavana is followed by the entrance of Vyasa and Valmiki, when the former acknowledges the superior abilities of the latter and calls him his उपाध्याय. Valmiki, however, justly praises him for his abilities as the author of the eighteen Puranas, and asks him how far his new history-the Bharata-has progressed. He replies that he has completed it, having by his penance secured Ganapati for his scribe. But as the evening time approaches, they propose to go to perform their evening devotions, Vyasa promising that as Valmiki has already heard from him the story as far as the coming of the Pandavas to attend the Svayamvara of Draupadi, he will be glad to relate the remaining portion at a more seasonable time.

The five Pandavas are then introduced, musing who indeed will be the fortunate victor of the day. Draupadi, Dhrishtadyumna, a herald, and a female servant are then introduced, and the eyes of all the Kings are at once riveted upon Draupadi. The Pandavas describe her in five different verses. When her brother finds the Kings vying with one another to fulfil the vow, he calls them to order and asks the herald to do his duty. He successively calls upon Santanava, Drona, Karna, Dussasana, Śakuni, Jayadratha, Duryodhana, Balabhadra, Kamapala, Padmanabha, Satyaki, Śisupala, Jarasandha, but none of them is able to hit the '*Radha*.' Suddenly a cry is heard among the crowd of sages and Brahmans, and Arjuna is seen gently coming forward. He draws near the bow of Krishna, strings it and shoots the *Rádhá* through, when the herald tells him that 'Draupadi cannot be claimed by him, as his *Kula-Sila* was not declared.' Arjuna replies that Draupadi is to be claimed by any one who fulfils the vow, but other kings break in upon him with cries that *he* has not hit the mark, but the force of the wind. Arjuna however, minds them not, and headed by Bhima tries to take his bride away and challenges them to prevent him if they can.

The second Act shows Vidura and his servant entering with gambling materials, and in the course of their dialogue it transpires that at the desire of Dhritarashtra, Yudhishthira has consented to

play at dice with Duryodhana, it being very well known that Duryodhana envied the *Pa*ndavas their great wealth and was also smarting under the insults received at the hands of Draupad*i*. After the entrance of Dharma and Bh*i*ma, and Duryodhana and *Sa*kuni, the play commences, and Yudhishthira first stakes his garland of flowers, his opponent betting his whole treasure against it. The dice are rolled on the ground, and Yudhishthira loses the game. He then successively bets his courtezans, elephants, horses, and the kingdom, but he unfortunately loses every thing. He then stakes himself, then his four brothers in succession; and when it is found that he has no other person to stake, the infatuated monarch becomes ready to bet Draupad*i* herself, but she meets the same fate as her husbands, and Duryodhana then orders the 'slave Draupad*i*' to be brought into the court. Accordingly Dus*sa*sana drags her by the hair and hauls her about. He, moreover, insults her with being the wife of *five* husbands, and strips her of her garments; but as soon as one is removed, she is invested with another! Vikar*na* shudders at this revolting scene and becomes ready to leave the infamous band of the hundred and one Kauravas. Draupad*i* pronounces a curse and vows that she will be avenged—terribly avenged, by her husbands. The anger of Bh*i*ma knows no bounds, and he indignantly vows in the presence of the assembly that he will not rest till he has smashed all the Kauravas to pieces, and that he will tie up the tresses of Draupad*i* with his hands stained with Dus*sa*sana's blood. *Sa*kuni, however, scornfully tells them to go to the forest according to the terms of the game, and with his speech closes the Act.

30. It is not possible to form any estimate of the worth of this play in its present imperfect state. But if we may judge of the whole from its parts, it may be said that the B*a*labh*a*rata is nearly on a level with the B*a*lar*a*m*a*yana. The story is not very interestingly told; there is neither much spirit nor action; but the verses are smooth and flowing. If a complete copy of the play were discovered, it would be possible to judge more accurately of its merits or demerits.

31. From this examination of R*a*jas*e*khara's works it will not be difficult to gather his principal characteristics as a writer. He is undoubtedly a poet of great learning and much information. But

he is not a dramatist.* None of his works displays any artistic skill—any dramatic genius. His talents appear to me to have been more fitted for writing a *Mahâkâvya* than a *Nâtaka*, where he could give loose to his invention and descriptive powers, untrammelled by any considerations of theatrical effect. His compositions are not adapted for the stage, and it is doubtful whether *all* will please in the closet. He has neither the tenderness in the expression of feelings and richness of creative fancy such as Kalidasa possesses, nor that mastery over nature and human passion and feeling generally which characterizes Bhavabhuti. He has neither the delicate appreciation of the workings and counterworkings of the human heart and that simple yet bewitching portraiture of the mild aspect of nature, which belong to the one, nor that perception of the awful beauty and grandeur of the outer world and the skill to bring out deep pathos and tenderness, which pertain to the other. His style is more prosaic than poetical : it is often vigorous, but seldom attractive or fascinating ; it is sometimes florid, but not classical. You cannot find in his works one elegant *Simile* or *Arthântaranyâsa* or *Drishtânta* such as we meet with in almost every page of Kalidasa, nor the remarkable felicity and richness of expression of Bhavabhuti. His style is almost devoid of any charm ; even the best portions of the Balaramayana owe their excellence more to the felicity of the ideas than to any linguistic merits. Kalidasa fascinates the mind and tickles the ear ; Bhavabhuti overpowers the heart and very often quite melts the soul ; Rajasekhara just touches the ear, but seldom finds the passes of the mind. Words are often used in their unusual senses, and sometimes obscure and abstruse words are employed, which is due chiefly to his remarkable fondness for the Sragdhara and Sardulavikridita metres. He is a very diffuse writer. Precision and conciseness of expression are usually absent. In the Viddhasalabhanjika especially, he has used in many places a serried phalanx of words and epithets, some of which are quite redundant, and do not add to the sense.

* Perhaps in Sanskrit a sharp line cannot always be drawn between a poet and a dramatist, as in English. One can never confound Milton and Shakespeare ; but Bhavabhuti and Bharavi, or Kalidasa and Bhartrihari have no peculiarly distinctive features. In fact a writer in Sanskrit has to be a good *poet* to be a good *dramatist*, and a playwright's merits are generally gauged more by the quality of his poetry than by his dramatic skill.

32. His chief merit, however, appears to be the powerful command he has over language—the varied vocabulary he can call to his aid. The *Vîrarasa* or heroic sentiment is undoubtedly his forte, as will be amply proved by the characters of Rávana and Jamadagnya, and in depicting it he has shown a remarkable skill—only second to Bhavabhuti's—in adapting his words to the sentiment, and in not a few places he shows how well he recognized the importance of Pope's well-known canon "The sound should seem an echo to the sense." He has also an inventive genius—a creative fancy, but his flights are never very high except in the invention of similes. Originality of conception and a little exaggeration are two of the essential requisites of poetical beauty, and where he has kept within reasonable bounds, as in the *Balaramayana*, their effect is agreeably perceived. He was probably tired of the trite, common-place similes and metaphors, used almost to satiety by his predecessors in the field, and he has, therefore, often evolved ideas exclusively out of his own brain, but in doing so, he has often bordered, as in the Viddhas*a*labhanjik*a*, on affectation and extravagance. His similitudes are very quaint. The moon is like a 'bee-hive from which honey has been taken out', or like 'a ball of silver'; moonlight nights are 'as bright as the teeth of Dravida women rubbed white with the bark of a betel nut', or 'as white as the curds made from a she-buffalo's milk'; a yellow frame of body become pale-white is like 'gold inlaid with mercury'; the setting sun is the 'soul of the departing day,' or 'being as red as the face of a monkey when provoked, is mistaken by sharks for a red piece of flesh', or is like 'a full-ripe orange'; the world enveloped in darkness resembles 'an old picture blackened by smoke'; the flood of tears is 'the canal flowing through the forest of the three folds of the belly', and the two eyes are 'the broad gutters'; the stars are like 'pearls six months old', or 'bubbles in the water', or 'Tagara flowers' or like 'Lajas' at the time of the marriage of Day and Evening Twilight, the Sun acting as nuptial fire; intimate affection is said to be as 'firm as a knot of hempen cord moistened with water'; not to mention the Vidushaka's amusing comparisons in the case of the Moon. Some of these ideas are striking more by their bathos than their attractive nature; and whatever their grace or propriety, credit is due to the poet for his fertile imagination. His descriptions of spring and summer

in Karpuramanjari and Viddhasalabhanjika, and of sunrise and sunset in the Balaramayana, are fair specimens of his description of natural scenery. He does not know how to paint and develop characters. As to passions, his range of emotion is very narrow. He knows how to describe the excitement caused by grief and despair, and with good and touching effect too, as in the sixth act of the Balaramayana. But to that real tenderness—that touching *Karuna-rasa*—which melts the soul, which, in the words of Bhavabhuti 'makes even stones weep, and hearts of adamant burst in twain', he must be considered to be a stranger, and there is not in all his works one scene which may approach the fourth act of *Sakuntala* or the third of Uttararamacharita. He, no doubt, claims for his poetry very high merits in that well-known stanza,* but I do not think that he has been able to establish his claim. On the whole, Rajasekhara may be regarded as a mediocre poet, shining in his element when he has the discretion not to go out of his depth.

33. A remarkable characteristic of Rajasekhara's style is the copious use of the Prakrita language, not merely in the usual prose speeches of the inferior characters of his plays, but in long verses repeated on and behind the stage. The greatest use made of Prakrita in dramas by his predecessors was to write an *anushtup* metre or two ; but our poet, who was proficient in that language, has given us about 40 verses in the *Sardulavikridita* metre in all the four plays together. And this is not to be wondered at, for he has written a whole play entirely in Prakrita. But one great peculiarity of his Prakrita is that we find in it several words which in many cases exactly resemble their vernacular equivalents. The poet has mostly used the Maharashtri dialect, and several words used by him are allied to the Marathi forms of the same words. Thus महल्ल and महाल ; खिडक्किआ and खिडकी, बइल्ल and बैल, थक्कसि and थकतोस, चुक्कति and चुकतो, भुल्ल and भुललेला, मरठी and मराठी, सोडिज्जंति and सोडतात, चंगं and चांगलें, बाहिरा and बाहेरले, ठेविअ and ठेवून, उद्दिअ and उठून, दिल्लं and दिलें, ठक्कुरः and ठाकूर (स्वामी), थोर for स्थूल, जुण्णं and जुनें, पोप्फुल and पोफळ, उल्लं and

* पातुं श्रोत्ररसायनं रचयितुं वाचः सतां संमता
स्रष्टुं चित्रमपि परामवाप्तुमवधिं लब्धुं रसस्रोतसः ।
भोक्तुं स्वादु फलं च जीविततरोर्यद्यस्ति ते कौतुकं
बप्प श्रौतः शृणु राजशेखरकवेः सूक्तीः सुधास्यंदिनीः ॥

ओलें, हक्कारीअदु and हाकामार, पावदु and पावो : these are some of the words that I have picked at random, and a careful reader will be able to discover many more. There are also several words which are put in as *Desi* words ; as तरट्टी=प्रगल्भा ; कंदोट्टः = नीलोत्पलं ; वरइतैं= अभिनववरः ; वोल्लेइ = अतिवाहयति, छइल्ला = विदग्धाः, वरिल्लं=वस्त्रं &c.

34. But the most important characteristic is the abundant use of proverbial forms of speech and the frequent employment of conversational or colloquial phrases in support of assertions, now and then mixed with several vulgar forms of abuse. This is a very peculiar feature of his style, which at once distinguishes him from all his predecessors. The following are some of the examples I have noticed :—वरं तत्कालोपनता तित्तिरी न पुनर्दिवसान्तरिता मयूरी ; तहिं मालतीकुसुमैः कुकूलं (दुकूलं) कल्पायिष्यामि, गंडस्योपरि पिंडकः संवृत्तः, नटे दृष्टे मंडिते उपविष्टः पतिर्मुंडितः, श्यालभार्या अर्धभार्या, किं गते सलिले सेतुबंधेन, किं गते विवाहे नक्षत्रपरीक्षया (V. Bhanj.) ; हस्तकंकणं किं दर्पणे प्रेक्ष्यते ; पायिता जीर्णमार्जारी दुग्धमिति तक्रं (कांजिकं) ; शीर्षे सर्पो देशांतरे वैद्यः, तटंगतायामपि नौकायां न विश्वसितव्यं; तुरंगमस्य शीघ्रत्वे किं साक्षिणः पृच्छ्यते (K. Manjari) ; त्वया दुर्यशोदायी सुष्ठु चतुर्थीचंद्रो दृष्टः ; विबोध्यते कुमारो यदि सलिले शिलाभिरुत्तीर्यते अलाबुभिर्वा निमज्ज्यते (B. Ram.) ; not to mention several opposite illustrations such as, किं मधुनि कुसुमयति; कथमिव सहकारयष्टयां कलकंठीकुंठितप्रणया ; प्रथमं सहकारमंजर्यां उद्विजते पश्चात्तच्चुंबिनी कलकंठी कंठमुद्रां शिथिलीकरोति; किं वा वर्णनं बकुलावल्याः सुरभिर्गंधोद्गार इति; अरिष्टयष्टिमाधिरूढा कांचनवल्ली वल्ली; कोन्यः चंद्रतः समुद्रवर्धने दृष्टः; मदिरा पंचगव्यं च एकस्मिन्भांडे क्रियते; काचो माणिक्यं च सममाभरणे प्रयुज्यते ; न सुवर्णं कषपट्टिकां विना शिलापट्टके कष्यते; लंबस्तन्या इव एकावली कांततकेशाया इव मालतीकुसुममाला काणाया इव कज्जलशलाका न सुष्ठुतरं भाति रमणीया &c. &c., which are found interspersed in the two earlier productions of the author. It will be seen that some of these phrases or proverbial expressions have gone out of use, while others have descended to us in more or less changed forms. Allusions to current practices or forms of dress are also not wanting ; *e. g.* नीलचोलकवती (कन्या) लिखितापि चित्रे (V. B.); त्वं लभस्व यत्फाल्गुनसमये शोभां जनो जनालभते (K. Manjari.).

35. We have before seen that the works of Rajasekhara are not of much literary value to the student of Sanskrit. But though not valuable for their language, they are very useful to the historian and geographer for the light they throw on questions connected with the ancient history of India. The Balaramayana is, by far, the most important in this respect, and the details of

countries and their descriptions there given are a great help in solving some of the difficult questions of Indian geography. The story in the Viddhasalabhanjika is invented, but it rests on a thin substratum of historical truth. In the fourth Act we are told that the hero Vidyadharamalla belonged to the Kalachuri dynasty and that he reigned at Tripuri. All the existing editions of the play read कारुलि and नृपुरि in place of कलचुरि and त्रिपुरी. But a manuscript from Tanjore which I have procured and which, in many places, proposes more eligible readings, reads खलचुरि and त्रिपुरी. The first must be the same as कलचुरि, and it can be got out of कारुलि by an interchange of र and ल which is, by no means, an uncommon thing in Sanskrit. And the correctness of this supposition is confirmed by independent historical evidence We know from Dr. Bhandarkar's " Early History of the Dekkan" (P. 37) that a family of Princes called Kalachuris or Kulachuris, who were also known as Haihayas, ruled over the country of Chedi, the capital of which was Tripuri, or Tevur near Jabalpur Vidyadharamalla is said to be उज्जयिनीभुजंग and त्रिलिंग विपात, which shows that he ruled over Malva and the eastern portion of Hyderabad, including the territory watered by the upper course of the Narmada. In the Balaramayana Act 3, we are told that the best king of the Chaidyas, who is also called दशार्णेश्वर, or दहालेश्वर, मेकलपति and नर्मदालंकृत-मंडलाधिपति, ruled over Tripuri.* The kingdom of the Chedis must, therefore, be considered to be the same as the country known as Dasarnas which, according to Kalidasa, is the eastern part of Malva, and from the expression नर्मदालंकृतमंडलाधिपति we must infer that their territories extended as far as the river Narmada. King Vidyadharamalla, therefore, who belonged to the Kalachuri dynasty, ruled over large tracts of land including the territory watered by the Narmada, and his capital must be Tripuri which is expressly said to be ' made noisy by the waves of the moon's daughter,' and he has seen the lady Kuvalayamala as she had plunged into the waters of the Narmada to bathe. These considerations would show that ' Tripuri' must be the correct reading, and the mistake is

---

* सीतास्वयंवरनिदानधनुर्विरेण दग्धाऽपुरत्रितयतो विधुना भवेन ।
खड निपत्य भुवि या नगरी बभूव तामेव चेद्यतिलकां त्रिपुरीं प्रशास्ति ।

This gives, as it were, the derivation of the name.

undoubtedly due to the transcriber's carelessness in writing श्रीमन्त्रपुरी for श्रीमत्त्रिपुरी.*

36. I shall now turn to the several names of places and peoples occurring in the poet's works. I shall first take up those that are mentioned in the course of *Rama*'s journey from *Lanka* to *Ayodhya*. The heavenly car after leaving *Lanka*, which is called नवविभीषणराजधानी, soars into higher celestial regions, and first the party see the *Himalaya* where *Siva* became अर्धमातीश्वर, and where *Madana* was burnt down by him. *Kailasa*, with *Alaka* 'the abode of festivities' and the *Manasa* lake are then described. This 'celestial lake' is said to be situated in *Hataka* in the *Bharata* (सरो मानसमासाद्य हाटकानभितः), and *Hataka* appears to be the same as *Ladaka*. After seeing *Mandara* and *Meru* mountains and the moon's world the balloon alights, and the party see the vast Indian ocean, 'in whose belly the mountains took shelter from Indra's thunderbolt'. The 'circular' island *Simhala* is then described. It is of course the same as Ceylon, as the *Rohana* mountain or the Adam's Peak and its 'sea rampart' determine its position unmistakably. The lord of *Simhala* is mentioned in Act 3 as ruling over 'Anurodhapura,' 'the receptacle of curiosities.' The mention of this town further confirms the identity of *Simhala* with Ceylon indisputably. Anurodhapura must be the same as Anuradhapura, which, as a writer in the Theosophist for August says, is a large town in the North of Ceylon, " with 1600 square granite pillars which supported the floor of an enormous monastery called 'The Great Brazen Palace' built by King

---

* In another part of Act 3 of the B. *Ramayan*, *Rajasekhara* makes *Mahishmati* the " hereditary capital of the *Kalachuris*". He says :—

चेदीश्वरा भवति मेकलशैलकन्या वीतंधनो वसति यत्र च चित्रभानुः।
तामेव पाति कृतवीर्यवधोद्यतासा माहिष्मती कलचुरेः कुलराजधानीम् ॥

The Chedis and Haihayas were in early times different dynasties and had different capitals situated on the banks of the *Narmada*. But we know from the Early History of the Dekkan that the Haihayas or Kalachuris at one time ruled over the country of Chedi, and probably at *Rajasekhara*'s time Tripuri had come to be regarded as the capital of the Haihayas or Kalachuris, instead of the old, hereditary capital *Mahishmati*.

Both these towns are situated on the *Narmada*, and as the two principalities are shown to be distinct, Mr. Boroosh considers that Tripuri may be somewhere about Hooshangabad, and not the modern Tevur near Jabalpur, which is very near *Mahishmati*. I should prefer to accept the general belief that the town is the same as Tevur 6 miles from Jabbalpur,

Dutugemunu in 161 B. C." In this island the people are 'the source of nectareous speeches, Rohana produces jewels and the Sea gives pearls.' We next see the Malyavat mountain. It is, I think, a part of the mountain range that we see running through Travancore as far as the sea; for the party first come to this place after crossing the ocean. It is said to be the ' chaplet of the whole earth' and has its ' slopes green like parrots, on account of the rows of bamboo thickets.' On this very mountain Rama passed his days of separation during the rains. We next come to Malaya and the Tamraparni, and their consideration leads us to the Pandyas and Dravidas. The Malaya mountain, which, with Dardura, is regarded by Kalidasa as forming the ' breasts of the Southern direction,' is the southern portion of the Western Ghauts running from the south of Mysore and forming the eastern boundary of Travancore. It ' teems with cardamoms and Kakkols, sandal, pepper and betel-nut trees.' The river Tamraparni, ' the lovely wife of the Ocean,' takes its rise in this chain. Both Kalidasa (Raghu. IV. 49-50) and Rajasekhara tell us that it flows through the kingdom of the Pandya Kings and serves to them as the ' matchless Kamadhenu to give pearls' (B. R. 3. 31) 'with its banks lined with sandal trees, the water sweeter than cocoa-nut water and being the source of jewels.' It is supposed by Mr. Borooah to be the same as the Tambaravari of the present day, which runs through the district of Tinnevelly and falls into the gulf of Manaar. Now the Pandya king is called द्रविडचूडामणिः and द्रविडपतिः (p. 66), and the country of the Dravidas themselves is said to be the same as Kerala (p. 301). Rajasekhara thus regards the three names as synonymous, but they are slightly different. Dravida appears to have included, in its larger sense, the whole of the Coromondal coast as far as the south of the Godavari. But strictly it did not much extend beyond the Kaveri. Dandin says that the town called Kanchi or Kanchipura, which is supposed to be the modern Conjiveram, is situated in the country of the Dravidas; but the Keralas or Dravidas and the Pandyas must have been near neighbours; the latter most probably inhabited the extreme south of India, their capital being, as Kalidasa says, 'the serpent town,' probably Negapattam 160 miles south of Madras, while the Keralas are evidently the people living a little higher up, for to the east of the Dravidas or Keralas is the सप्तगोदावरीतीरं (P. 301). Kerala is generally supposed to be the strip of land between the Ghauts and

the sea, corresponding to modern Canara. Probably it included Malabar also and extended beyond the Kaveri. Pulakesi I. is said to have conquered the Keralas, Pandyas and Cholas after crossing the Kaveri. The Cholas, mentioned in the Karpuramanjari, appear to have inhabited the territory lying on the banks of the Kaveri, probably the southern part of Mysore; for the Kathasaritsagara says that the water of the Kaveri, when crossed by the foe, became turbid along with the fame of the lord of the Cholas; and Rajasekhara, speaking of the Kaveri, says that 'it is like the braid of hair of the Goddess of Earth, has both its banks lined with cocoa-nut and betel-nut trees and its waters are agitated by the immersion of the Karnatic women.' The country of the Cholas fell, therefore, within the territory now known by the name Karnatic. All these countries were remarkable in ancient times for their bravery and war-like attitude, for the sovereigns of the Dekkan had to turn their arms for the very first time against the Pandyas, Keralas and Cholas.

The Andhras are the next people who attract our attention. The limits of their country were confined to the Ghauts on the west and the rivers Godavari and Krishna on the north and south. They are said to have occupied the tracts of land comprised in the seven streams of the Godavari (B. R. X. 70), and are said to be to the east of the Dravidas, and their country is close to Kalinga, as appears from the Dasakumara charita (7th story). The country of Vidarbha next meets our view. According to our poet it was a very large tract of land, probably extending from the mouths of the Krishna to the mouths of the Narmada and hence he calls it महाराष्ट्रविषय. In the third Act the lord of the Kratha-Kaishikas, who ruled at Kundina (v. 50) is called कुंतलेश्वर and महाराष्ट्रवरिष्ठ. According to the poet's idea all these names are nearly synonymous. Maharashtra, however, appears, to be the most comprehensive name and stands for the Deccan. Vidarbha represents the modern Berar, and Kuntala, the south-western portion of Hyderabad. The country of Maharashtra was famed for its learning, and Kundinapura, its capital, is said to be the 'seat of the Goddess of Speech and the abode of *rasas* and sports.' The Narmada is too well known to require any explanation. The country of the Latas is then presented to our view, and it is said to lie to the west of the Narmada. It probably included Broach, Baroda and Ahmedabad. Its ruler is

said to be 'expert in heroic and amorous sentiments'. The origin of the family is that while Brahma was performing the Sandhya adoration and holding a cavity-full of water in his hand, a sage was born who was called चुलुक्य and the family was called the Chulukya family. The country is praised as the 'land of Sanskrit learning, the abode of graceful speeches, love pastimes, and Prakrita.' Ujjayini is then shown to us, with its Avanti women 'skilled in sexual pleasures', and then the Malavas are presented to us. Malva is a large territory lying between the Narmada and the Chumbla. Its people are said to be the 'ocean of good disposition, abode of sports and the essence of Sringara.' The Kalindi or Yamuna, which is, as it were, 'the braid of hair of the Earth' is then seen. Tapi, wherein are found excellent touch-stones said to be a co-uterine sister of Yamuna, but its correctness is doubtful. The Panchalas 'lie between the streams of the Yamuna and the Ganges' (v. 86) and are called the 'ornament of the Antarvedi', or the Gangetic Doab. They give rise to a graceful style of composition called पांचाला. We then see Mohodaya or Kanyakubja, also called Gadhipura, situated on the Ganges. The women of this town are said to be 'very proficient in all the arts of fashionable toilet, graceful ways of talking, arranging braids of hair and the general art of putting on decorations.' We are then shown Prayaga and Benares, which are two well-known. Before reaching Ayodhya, the balloon goes to Mithila, the capital of Sita's father. It is regarded as the same as Janakapura in Nepala, and Janaka's country probably included the northern part of the old district of Tirhut and N. W. portion of Champaran. Mithila, according to the Ramayana, was three days' journey from Ayodhya.

37. There are other places which have not occurred in the preceding account and which are mentioned in Act 3 of the Balaramayna. Pragjyotisha was the capital of Kamarupa. It was a large territory, and its boundaries extended up to the Himalaya on the north and the borders of China on the east, including Assam, and Burmah. The country of the Avantis lies about the town of Ujjayini and is, no doubt, the western part of Malva. The King is said to rule over a town 'having the waters of Sipra for its moats. We have then the lord of Kusasthali, 'the abode of Kusa'. He is said by Rajasekhara to be मध्यदेशनरेंद्र. According to Manu Madhyadesa is 'that which is between the Vindhya and Himalaya, lies to

the east of Vinasana and to the west of Prayaga (2. 21). This would seem to show that Madhyadesa would fall about Bundelcund and कुशस्थली may be the modern Ramnuggur. Odra is the modern Orissa. The Kambojas must have inhabited the Hindu Koosh and the adjoining country, and may have extended to Thibet and Ladaka. Saurashtra, in which lay the town Valabhi, is the modern peninsula of Kattyawar. The Saka king was probably a Scythian ruler and there was also the King of Nepal. Magadha is the country to the east of Jabalpur, the old capital of which was Rajagriha, and afterwards Kusumapura. It represents the modern Behar.

There are still a few names mentioned in the Viddhasalabhanjika and the Balabharata which have not occurred in the previous sketch. The Muralas apppear to be the same as the Keralas, as the river Murala may be supposed to give their name The river rises in the western Ghauts and falls into the western ocean. The Bahlikas, 'having red lips' is a general name for the tribes that inhabited the Punjaub. The Payoshni is evidently the modern Purna, a feeder of the Tapi. It cannot be Tapi itself, for the river with Payoshni is mentioned in Vishnu Purana as arising in the Riksha mountain. The Konkan kings were rulers of the territory from Daman to Vingorla, the Conkan of the present day. The Mekalas, who with others were subjugated by Mahipala (see Page 9) were tribes inhabiting the range of mountains called Mekala, a part of the Vindhya, for the Narmada is said to be मेकलकन्यका in B. R. 3. The Kalingas belong to the modern Circars. Kulata is to the north-east of the Jalandar Doab, which is the territory between the rivers Beas and Sutlej. Balabharata also mentions Ramatha as a country subdued by Mahipala, but I have been unable to identify it with any existing country. Prof. Williams says it is in the west of India. Asafœtida was largely produced in this country, one of the synonyms for हिंगु being रामठ.

38 Before concluding this Section I must consider one question : that raised by some verses in the Balaramayana found to occur in Bhartrihari's Satakas. The first verse is उदन्वच्छत्रा भूः (Act I. v. 8), given in Miscellaneous stanzas of Nata and Vairagya ; the second is स्थिति. पुण्यारण्ये सह परिचयो हंत हरिणैः (Act III. v. 17) given as Miscellaneous stanza 42, and the third is वहति भुवनश्रेणीं शेषः फणाफलकस्थितां (Act VII, v. 40), which occurs as verse 35 of the

Nitiśataka, in Mr. Telang's edition of Bhartrihari. I have been unable to consult any other manuscript of the Bālarāmāyana to see if these verses occur there also, but I have little doubt that they must be in the place where they are, as the context will be spoilt without them. The first impresssion that may be produced on the mind at finding these verses in Rājaśekhara is that they may have been taken by him from Bhartrihari, as the latter was his predecessor by several centuries. But as I shall presently show, such is not the case. Rājaśekhara, whatever his merits as a poet, is *original*; he cannot be supposed to have borrowed the first stanza in question from Bhartrihari, for it cannot be conceived that, without the slightest twitch of conscience, he would solemnly try to pass off another's stanza as his own, with the prefatory words 'सूक्तमिदं नैनैव महामंत्रिपुत्रेण.' Nor can it be supposed to be one of those Subhāshitas, 'which are floating about in popular talk', so as to absolve our poet of the charge of plagiarism. We must, therefore, conclude that the stanza in question belonged in the first instance to Rājaśekhara, and that it was subsequently put in as Bhartrihari's by later copyists of the Śatakas. If we examine the miscellaneous stanzas, we find many of them occurring in other works extant (see Mr. Telang's edition, Preface). And this view is confirmed by independent considerations. The Stanza occurs only in five of the fifteen manuscripts of Nīti consulted by Mr. Telang and nearly in the same order, being either 16 or 17, and in Vairāgya, it occurs only in *one* Ms., that of Boblen, so that its authorship by Bhartrihari is open to grave doubts. Besides in Vallabhadeva's Subhāshitāvalī it is distinctly quoted as of Rājaśekhara (v. 322 in Dr. Peterson's edition) with two variants, छिन्ना for छन्ना and कथयति for कलयति. The same may be said of the second Stanza. It occurs in only four of the fourteen Mss. collated for Vairāgya. There are, however, two material differences. The third and fourth lines of Rājaśekhara stand thus:

इतीयं सामग्री भवति हि विरक्त्यै स्पृहयतां
वनं वा गेहं वा सदृशमुपशांतस्य मनसः ।

In the Śataka we have them as follows:—

इतीयं सामग्री भवति हरभक्तिं स्पृहयतां
वनं वा गेहं वा सदृशमुपशांत्येकमनसाम् ।

For the reasons before stated I hold that a later copyist took

the verse and made it fit in with Bhartrihari's theosophical tenets by substituting हरभक्ति for हि विरक्तये and changing the singular into plural in line 4. But the scribe was certainly not playing a safe game. For he has not only spoilt the connection between the last and the preceding lines, which is well preserved in *Rajasekhara*, but has actually given us a grammatical blunder, and thus 'marred the idea in stealing.' And this practice of changing words so as to suit the writer's fancy need not be regarded as purely imaginary. I know of a Jain commentary on Bhartrihari's *Nitisataka*, where the writer, with a view to show that there is not only a "Buddhistic flavour about his writings", but a positive declaration in favour of Buddha, actually reads भक्तिश्चार्हति for भक्तिः शूलिनि in v. 62! The first two stanzas are thus disposed of, but the third raises a difficulty. It is not a miscellaneous stanza It occurs in every one of the 17 Mss. consulted for *Niti Sataka*. Are we, then, to suppose that *Rajasekhara* borrowed at least this verse from Bhartrihari? Here, too, I would answer the question in the negative. For though I should not go so far as to say that the *Satakas* were a mere collection of elegant extracts culled from the works of previous writers, I have little doubt, as Mr Telang observes, that after the work was over, additions were made to it from time to time by later writers or by later editors of the *Satakas*. For a glance at the two Tabular Appendices prepared by Mr. Telang will at once show that most of the Mss. of the *Satakas* differ not only as to the *position* of the stanzas, but even their *number*. A parallel instance is afforded by the text of the Panchatantra, which, though a work of the 5th or 6th century, contains passages from writers of the 7th or 8th century. Moreover, if we may believe the evidence of the anthologies, it will be found that many verses now given as Bhartrihari's were formerly either not known to belong to him, or were considered to belong to different writers altogether. In Vallabhadeva's Subhashitavali—a work of the 14th or 15th century—stanzas like अङ्गः सुखमागाध्यः, दिक्कालादि, मृगमीनसज्जनानां, लभेत सिकतासु, प्रसह्य मणिं, हर्तुर्याति, यदाकिंचज्ञोहं &c are quoted as Bhartrihari's; others like निर्दंतु नातिनिपुणाः, प्रदानं प्रच्छन्नं, नम्रत्वेनोन्नमंतः, उल्लासिताखिलखलस्य, परिवर्तिनि संसारे, कुसुमस्तबकस्येव &c are said to belong to some one (कस्यापि, कयोरपि, केषामपि), while the stanzas पातितोपि कराघातैः, विपदि धैर्यं, प्रियप्राया वृत्तिः, क्षुत्क्षामोपि, इतः स्वपिति केशवः, ये संतोषसुख, are actually ascribed to Kshemendra, Menthaka, Jayaditya, Ratisena, Kalhana and Lulla's