The digvijaya of Raghu and some connected problems

by
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The chief aim of the present article is to shed some light on the connection existing between the digvijaya of Rāghu¹) and that of Sāmurādgupta²). The idea is not new; it has been ventilated in the last decennium by various scholars most of whom agree in considering Mr. Manmohan Chakravarti's suggestions³) plausible but rather unconvincing. Now it would seem to me that we have two ways only to prove that Kālidāsa was really influenced by Hariśeṇa in his description of Rāghu's conquests viz. to show, first, that there exist some points of contact between the two digvijayas in question and, secondly, that there is no such resemblance between Rāghu's campaign as described by Kālidāsa and descriptions of other similar expeditions met with in Sanskrit literature. I will try to prove this in the following.

It may be noted first that as far as geographical nomenclature is concerned, it would be vain to look out for a well established set of coincidences between Kālidāsa, a poet who did not avoid historical allusions, and Hariśeṇa, an historian or rather chronicler who could not avoid using poetical language

¹) Rāghuvamśa IV.
but whose account is as much matter-of-fact as one might reasonably expect of an Indian chronicler. This fact is largely due to what Mr. Collins has called "the conventional geography" of Indian poets and I need not expati ate upon his arguments which on the whole seem to me quite convincing. But there

1) Mark Collins, The geographical data of the Raḥuvaṁśa and Daśakumāra-carita considered more especially in their bearing upon the date of these works, Leipzig 1907, pp. 9 ff. Mr. Collins draws moreover attention to the traditional element in early Indian geography. This peculiar cause of confusion has been pointed out already by Bühler in his well known study on Indian inscriptions in their relation to classical Sanskrit literature. Indische Dichter sind selbst bei der Schilderung der Siegeszüge historischer Könige, ihrer Herren und Gönner, häufig recht ungenau in ihren geographischen und ethnographischen Angaben und halten sich, statt an die Wirklichkeit, an die traditionellen Lehren der Epen, der Purāṇas und älterer Gedichte, welche Digvijayas schildern. (Bühler, Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstpoesie, Wien 1890, p. 82). Isolated instances of similar inclination for traditional denominations may be quoted from other literatures also. Thus Polish poets often call their compatriots Lechites, from Lech, the supposed patriarch of the Polish nation, or even Sarmatians. Italian poets speak of the noble Roman blood (nobil sangue Romano, Petrarch) meaning of course the Italian people. Cp. Erin, son of Erin (= Irishman), Albion etc.

2) Two more causes of the uncertainty and obscurity of the early geography of India may be added to those set forth by Mr. Collins in the first part of his valuable treatise viz. — (1) Lack of definite frontiers between different parts of India. Thus the fact that the Pundras, usually reckoned among eastern nations (Brhat Saṁhitā XIV. 6; MBh. II. 1996), are enumerated in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 41. 18, Gorr.) along with the Dravidas, Colas and Cēralas as a southern people (Collins, op. cit., p. 6) is simply due to the floating line of demarcation between the South and the East (but cp. also infra, (2)). The Pundra territory lay eastwards from Ujjayinī where Vārāhamihira wrote but it was situated rather southwards from Ayōdhya (Kōsala) where, as Prof. Jacobi suggests, the Rāmāyana was composed. — (2). Amazing carelessness of ancient, especially epical and puranic, writers Some striking instances of this feature of the Indian mind are afforded by the digvijaya of the Pūndavas in the Mahābhārata. Thus Arjuna defeats the Suhmaś and Colas in the North of India although
are other marks of actual parallelism between Hariśēṇa and Kālidāsa. We shall see below that heroes of other digvijayas in Sanskrit literature generally hold, as it were, a common principle in dealing with their adversaries: they attack one of them, defeat him (or else come to terms after a fierce struggle), exact tribute from him and pass on to the next. It is not quite so with Samudragupta. According to Hariśēṇa he "violently rooted up" only the rulers of Āryāvarta whose dominions lay next to his own. Others, especially the kings of the bordering countries on the Eastern and North-Western frontiers, were only defeated but their dominions do not seem to have been incorporated into Samudragupta's empire. The powerful ruler of Kāmarūpa or Assam and many a chieftain of the warlike tribes on the Panjāb frontier practically saved their independence which, by the way, they were able to guard during nearly the whole course of ancient Indian history. And with respect to the South we have all reason to believe that Samudragupta's campaign was no more than a brilliant raid. He certainly did not annex those territories although, as Mr. V. A. Smith supposes, "beyond doubt, he despoiled the rich treasuries of the south, and came back laden with golden booty". Now, it is very interesting to note that much the same statements are made by Kālidāsa with regard to Rāghu. Of course complete parallelism is impossible. If it existed then, in all probability, it would have been noted long ago and Kālidāsa's date would be, by this time, firmly established even in the eyes of the most

the two names never designated any other than an Eastern respectively a Southern people. But the poet just wanted some names to fill the line and he took the first that recurred to his memory. Bhīma contends with the Šakās in the vicinity of Vīdēha although this tribe never lived in the East. The whole half śloka runs: Ša-kāmś ca Barbarāmś cāna ajayac chadmapūrvakam, I. 31. 14. Now Šakās were barbarians. Barbarians infested as well the North-Western as the Eastern frontier of India. This association sufficed to place the Šakās in the East.

1) I. 21.
sceptical critics. I am convinced with Mr. Manmohan Chakravarti and other scholars that Kālidāsa wrote his epics with the intention to please his royal patrons and I think that in glorifying the exploits of Rāghu he has paid homage to the great Sāmudrāgupta, but I am equally convinced that his allusions could not but be most fugitive and almost impalpable. Thus he proved to possess fine poetical taste and a certain feeling of independence: he was a court-poet but no official court-eulogist and I am sure that his hidden hints were instantly caught by the ready-witted Indian courtiers and duly appreciated by the sovereign himself. Be it as it may, in this case the parallelism is slight but undeniable. It is true that Kālidāsa does not allude to the prasabhōddharaṇa of Sāmudrāgupta’s nearest neighbours whose territories roughly coincide with the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh of to-day, but I think the reason of his silence is obvious. These kings were independent when Sāmudrāgupta acceded to the throne but to state their independence in the time of Skaṇḍagupta (during whose reign, as has been supposed by Mr. Manmohan Chakravarti and as will be shown below, Kālidāsa lived) would be to acknowledge that the predecessor of the ruling emperor, separated from him by less than a century, was a successful upstart who inherited from his father a rather petty kingdom in the East. This allusion Kālidāsa cleverly avoided. It may also be supposed that he simply thought it unnecessary and, perhaps, rather unsuitable to let his hero, meant to play the part of Sāmudrāgupta, conquer territories which in the reign of Skaṇḍagupta seemed to form the very centre of the Gupta empire. Anyhow the parallelism between the treatment of the

1) The root *ud-dhyā* is used by Kālidāsa (in a future participle *de conatu*) when speaking of Rāghu’s treatment of the *udacyas* but I don’t lay any stress on this particular since *ud-dhyā* is a regular terminus technicus in such cases.

2) Sāmudrāgupta is supposed to have died about (approximately) 375 A. D. and Skaṇḍagupta acceded to the throne in 455 A. D. See V. A. Smith op. cit. p. 308, chronology of the Gupta period.
remaining kings by Rāghu and by Śamudragupta is striking. The net of poetical similes and metaphors cannot hide away the transparent confession that Rāghu too did not care for permanent annexation of the defeated king’s territories. He crushed some of his adversaries, exacted tribute from some others and returned triumphantly to his capital. One detail in the description of his expedition deserves special attention. Samudragupta is stated with regard to the Southern (read: South-Eastern) kings, among whom we find the chieftain of Mahēndragiri, to have “first seized them and then granted them the favour of release” (“sarvadaksināpātharājagrahanāmōkṣanugraha”, l. 20). Now the same statement is made by Kālidāsa with regard to the king of Mahēndra in whose case the same words are used and with regard to an Eastern nation, the Vaṅgas. Cp:

ghitapratimuktasya sa dharmavijayi nṛpaḥ |
śriyam Mahēndranāthasya jahāra na tu mēdināṁ ||

IV. 43.

āpadapadmapraṇatāḥ kalumā iva tē (= Vaṅgāḥ) Raghum |
phalāḥ samvardhayāmāsura utkhaṭapratirōpitāḥ ||

IV. 37.

This is hardly a fortuitous coincidence. In general, it seems to me that, apart from its poetical ornaments, the digvijaya of Rāghu looks much more historical than any other which we will have to analyse in the following. It certainly looks far less stereotyped. This is the chief fact which I beg the reader to bear in mind when he will pass with me to a more detailed analysis of one or two digvijayas described in works prior and posterior to the Rāghuvaṁśa. Other facts will be noted in due time.

We have now to establish points in which Kālidāsa (and, we may add, Harīśena) differs from both his predecessors and successors in describing his hero’s conquests. Of course it was not my intention to fish for every digvijaya in the vast bulk of Sanskrit literature. It will be enough to analyse one or two of them which may be considered, in a certain way, either
as typical or else specially important for our sake. I select the well-known digvijaya of Mahābhārata II which can be said, in the main at least for it is not free from later additions\(^1\), to precede Kalidāsa; I will also have regard to the digvijaya of Pāṇdu, Mahābhārata I, which seems to have been well known in later literature as may be gathered from an allusion to it in the Kathāsārītssāgara\(^2\). As for the description of a digvijaya later than Kalidāsa, I select that of king Vatsa Udayana in the nineteenth tarāṅga of the Kathāsārītssāgara. It will be good however, for convenience' sake, to invert order and to begin with the latter — and later — description.

It may be objected, a priori, that since the Kathāsārītssāgara is an abbreviated translation of the Brhatkathā, the description of the digvijaya of king Vatsa might have been part of the original poem of Guṇādhya and thus be older than the corresponding chapter of the Raghuvamsā or, in other words, that Kalidāsa might have been influenced by it. But this objection does not hold. It is true that an allusion to Vatsa's digvijaya (for it cannot be called a description of it) is found in another abbreviated translation of the Brhatkathā viz. the Brhatkathāmañjarī\(^3\), but the corresponding passage is totally wanting in the nepalese Brhatkathāsloka-samgraha\(^4\). Hence it follows that the digvijaya of Vatsa was alluded to or perhaps even described in the Kāsmīrīan Brhatkathā but not in the original poem of Guṇādhya. Now both M. Lacôte\(^5\) and Prof. Speyer\(^6\) whose views regarding the relation of the Kathāsārītssāgara to the Brhatkathā

---

\(^1\) As shown by its mentioning the Huṇas I. 35. 12.
\(^2\) cp. infra, p. 55.
\(^3\) A comparison of the respective chapters of the Kathāsārītssāgara and the Brhatkathā is given in the Appendix.
\(^6\) J. Speyer, Studies about the Kathāsārītssāgara, Amsterdam 1908.
of Guṇāḍhya are widely different, agree in admitting that
the Kaśmirian Brhatkatha cannot have been an old work.
M. Lacôte assigns its first draught to the VII—VIII cent. A. D.
and he does not think that it assumed its final form earlier than
the IX—X cent. A. D. 1) But on the whole M. Lacôte thinks
that the description of Vatsa’s digvijaya in the Kathasarit-
śāgara looks very suspicious. I will quote some of his argu-
ments since they partly support my own theory viz. that, as
will be shown below, Sōmadeva was strongly influenced by
Kālidāsa in his description of Vatsa’s campaign. „Quant au
bref récit des conquêtes d’Udayana, je le trouve fort suspect.
Sa très faible étendue n’est nullement en rapport avec l’impor-
tance de pareilles aventures dans la carrière d’Udayana; il n’oc-
cupe que la fin du tar. XIX. Si décidé à abréger qu’on suppose
l’auteur, il est inexplicable qu’il ait tant réduit une matière qui
aurait dû être abondante. Sauf en ce qui concerne Brahmadatta,
nul détail précis sur les pays conquis, ni sur les exploits du
vainqueur; ils sont célébrés en quelques phrases vagues, de la plus
banale rhétorique. Mais quels étranges ennemis on lui attribue!
Passe encore pour les Mlecchas: le nom est ancien et peut être
vague, quoique je le soupçonne de désigner ici, comme chez Tara-
nātha, les Mahométans! Mais que dire des autres? Un roi des temps
légendaires combat les Perses (le nom de Pārasīka est tardif), les
Turuškas et les Hūnas surtout, lesquels n’ont pas fait leur apparition
avant la seconde moitié du V° siècle! Si Guṇāḍhya avait prêté à son
Udayana des victoires sur des peuples envahisseurs, il l’eût
montré triomphant des Yavanas et des Čakas! Il y a ici super-
cherie! C’est un Cachemiriien qui parle et presque un contempo-
rain de Somadeva! Il a dans la mémoire les luttes des siècles
les plus proches sur les frontières Ouest et Nord-Ouest de
l’Inde. — — — il n’est plus jamais question de ces conquêtes.
Mieux encore, quand Udayana veut quitter ce monde (tar. CXI)
et qu’il lègue ses biens à Gopālaka, il n’a rien autre à lui laisser
que Kauçambi; Gopālaka, à son tour, cède le pouvoir à son
frère Pālaka, déjà roi d’Ujjayinī; le royaume est toujours stricte-

1) op. cit. p. 144.
ment borné aux pays des Vatsas; il n’est pas question de suzeraineté sur d’autres lieux (CXI, 74, 92) 1).

A comparison of Vatsa’s digvijaya in the Kathāsaritsāgāra and the Brhatkathāmañjarī shows that the Kaśmīrian Brhatkathā contained little more than an allusion to his victory over king Brahmadatta of Benares. This ruler is styled king Vatsa’s „constant enemy“ 2) which is well nigh a terminus technicus of the Nītiśāstra. It appears further that the Kaśmīrian Brhatkathā contained a stereotyped enumeration of stratagems as employing of spies, poisoning of wells etc. recurred to by both kings’ ministers and finally that it brought, by way of addition, a short statement that after having subdued his „constant enemy“ king Vatsa conquered into the bargain all the remaining kingdoms of the earth. Much the same matter is treated in the Pañcatantra, Hitopadēsa, Mudrārāksa-sa and similar works and I think the whole chapter was originally meant as an exemplification of the „war and peace“ section of the Nītiśāstra. The last portion of the text he translated viz. the digvijaya proper, Soma-deva enlarged by copying almost verbally a certain number of stanzas occurring in Rāghu’s digvijaya in the Raghuvamśa. This can be proved by the following consideration. The Kaśmīrian digvijaya seems to have been composed mainly in prose 3) but almost every single stanza of Soma-deva’s containing an idea, simile etc. imitated from Kālidāsa corresponds exactly to one stanza of the Raghuvamśa. Hence it follows that Soma-deva did not transfuse into verses the prose he copied but that he wrote directly under the influence of Kālidāsa. The following examples collected from both authors and arranged in parallel columns will, I trust, convince the reader of the truth of my statements:

1) op. cit. pp. 74—75.
2) nityain vātrī, Kathāsaritsāgāra XIX. 54.
3) M. Lacôte supposes that both the Kaśmīrian Brhatkathā and the original work of Guṇadhyā were mainly in prose. See op. cit. pp. 282—283.
Kathasaritsagaram XIX.

praśtoyā siddhidūtyevā
śaradā dattasamāmadah
darśayantyātisupamanāṃ
mārgam svālpāmbunimnagam

64

purāyaṇam bahunādābhir
vāhinābhir bhuvastalam
kurvan akāṇḍaniṁrīgha-
varṣāsamayasambhramam

65

cēlū ca hēmasanāna-
sambhrtārkaprabhā hayāh
stasya niraśjanapratī-
pavakāṅgata iva

67

namatātha palāyadhvam
ity ucī viduṣīm iva
pavanokṣiptavikṣiptātis
stasya sūnadhvajāṃsukāīh

72

Vatsarājō 'pi taṁ praṇaptam
pradattopāyanam nṛpam
prītyā samānaṣayamāna
śurā hi praṇatipriyāh

88

il thawam tasmīḥ jīte Prācīn
samayon namayon mṛdūn
unmūlayaṁ ca kathinān
nṛpān vayur iva drumān

89

Raghuvaṁśa IV.

sarītaḥ kuvatā gūdhāḥ
pathaś cāsyānakardamān
yātrāyaḥ cōdayāmāsa
taṁ śaktēḥ prathamam sarat

24

rajbhīḥ syandanaḍḍhūtāṁ
gaṇās ca ghanasannibhāḥ
bhuvas talam iva vyōma
kurvan vyōmēva bhūtalām

29

tasmāi samyagghuto vahnir
vājinārjanāvidhāu
pradakṣinārvarūyēna
hastēnēva jayaṁ dadāu

25

sa yayāu prathamam Prācīn
tulyāḥ Pracīnabharhīsā
ahūtēn anilōddhūtāīs
tarjayann iva kētubhīḥ

28

apanūtaśrastrāṇāḥ
śēṣas taṁ sarunām yayuḥ
pranipātapratikārāḥ
samrambhō hi mahātmanām

64

tyājitāḥ phalam utkhatāṁ
bhagnāś ca bahudhā nṛpāḥ
stasyātulāṅgā mārgoḥ
pādapāīr iva dantīnaḥ

33
pāra ca prabalaḥ prācyām
ca ladvicivighūrṇitam
Vāṅgāvaijāyavitrāsa-
vāpamōnām iṇāmbudhkim

paurastyaṇ evaṃ ukrāmaṃs
tāṁs tāṁ janapadaṅ jayi |
prāpa talivanasyānam
upakarṣthāṃ mahodadhēḥ

(The Vāṅgas are mentioned in vv. 36, 37).

tasya velatāntē ca
jayastambham cakāra saḥ |
pātālobhayayācārtham
nāgarājām iṇḍogatam

Vaṅgān utkhaya tarusā
nētā nāusthadanodyatan |
icakhāna jayastambhān
Gangāsrotōntoreṣu saḥ

Kalingār agragāis tataḥ |

Ukalaudārśitopathaḥ

ullaṅghyamanā Kāverī
tēna sammardakūriṇa |
Cōlakēvarakirtis ca
kālūṣyaṁ yayatuḥ samam

sa sānyoparibhōgena
gajadānasugandhīnā |
Kāverīṁ saritāṁ pātyuḥ
śāṅkanīyām iṇḍōkarōt

na poraiṁ Muralānāṃ sa
sēhē mūrddhashu nōnmatim |
kārīr āhanyamāneṣu
yāvatkāntākucēṣv api

bhayaśreyśāvibhūṣāṇāṁ
tēna Kēralāyōṣitām |
alakēṣu camūrēṇus
cūrṇapratīṇidhūkṛtaḥ

(The Muralas are named in the next verse).

yat tasyu saptadhā bhinnāṁ
papur Godūrhipaṭaḥ |
mūtongas tan mahavyajāt
saptadhūṃvāmucanu iva

prasavāḥ saptaparṇānāṁ
madagandhibhīv āhataḥ |
asīyayēva tannagāḥ
saptadhūvva prususruvāḥ

52
taddattair (tad refers to Kumārāpēśvarah, v. 113) anvitaḥ nāgāḥ
samrāḍ vivartē 'tha sah | aty Akhandalavikramam |
adhibhir janagamāḥ sālāḥh
karikyārpitār īva ||

114

anyān uparurōḍha yāḥ ||

It may be noted, finally, that the names of the vanquished peoples generally correspond in both poems. In the Rāghuvaṁśa they are more numerous.

It is most interesting to see how cleverly Sōmadēva utilised his model. Himself a perfect stylist, he was no slavish imitator. Hence the whole series of Kālidāsa’s original images has been adroitly turned by the later poet into another series of equally original stanzas. But each stanza of the Kathāsa-ritsāgara has something in common with the corresponding verse of the Rāghuvaṁśa. And then their sequence is nearly the same which alone would suffice to prove the correctness of my assertion. The influence is undeniable.

The mentioning of the Hūnas by Kālidāsa and by Sōmadēva deserves perhaps a special remark. I confess that I cannot agree with Mr. Mannmohan Chakravarti’s 1) suggestion that Kālidāsa went so far in the description of Rāghu’s (= Samudrāgupta’s) conquests as to reproduce faithfully the

1) G. Huth was the first to lay stress on the reference to the Huns in the Rāghuvaṁśa but his treatise (Die Zeit des Kālidāsa, Berlin 1890) has remained unknown to Mr. Mannmohan Chakravarti. Bühlér’s criticism of Huth’s arguments (op. cit. p. 81 f.) goes too far. It is true that the names of all the tribes mentioned by Kālidāsa in the fourth Canto of the Rāghuvaṁśa may be found in the Purāṇas and other works but this is quite natural since the Purāṇas give detailed lists of all Indian tribes. Likewise it can be granted that Indian poets did not care for historical conditions of their time but they could not help undergoing their influence. To deny the possibility of this without further ceremony (as Bühlér seems to do) would be just as bad as to accept it without any restriction.
actual grouping of foreign tribes on the North-Western and Northern frontiers 1). Of course he could not have alluded to the Hūnas as a people settled somewhere in the North, perhaps in Gândhāra or in Kaśmīr, before he had heard of their having overrun those countries which event happened about the year 455 A. D. 2). But that is all. Other tribes defeated by Rāghu viz. the Pārasīkas and the Yavanās 3) are mere names denoting troops of fierce horse-men who had infested the North-Western frontier of India during the whole course of its history 4). Just the same holds good for Somaḍēva. The only difference is that instead of speaking of Pārasīkas and Yavanās 5) he mentions the Pārasīkas and Hūnas 6) and that he adds the Turuṣkas or Turks who, in his time, played much the same part as the Hūnas in the second half of the fifth century A. D.

The result of our investigation is very important. We have seen that Somaḍēva made liberal use of the fourth Canto of the Rāghuvaṃśa. He followed Kālidāsa even in such minute particulars as those described in vv. 67, 72, 97, 114. Moreover the whole plan of both digvijayas is nearly identical. And yet the Kaśmīrian poet never mentions one point viz. that the South-Eastern kings were defeated but pardoned by the conqueror 7). Hence we must infer that this detail appeared un-

1) In the time of Saumudragupta the Huns did not yet make their appearance, but the poet cannot be blamed for an anachronism which is quite in the line of the antihistorical bias of the Hindu mind.

2) That the Huns supply us also with the terminus ad quem for the Rāghuvaṃśa, will be demonstrated later on.

3) pāscatītyāt vasaśādhanāḥ IV. 62 b is glossed as Yavanāḥ by Mallinātha.

4) Of course there was a time when Yavanas were real Greeks.

5) Which name had lost all actuality in the eleventh century.

6) Whose name had now acquired, to a certain degree, much the same meaning as that of Yavanās in Kālidāsa’s time.

7) Thus the Vārgas were utkhātapratī أبيṭaḥ in the Rāghuvaṃśa (IV. 37) but Somaḍēva speaks only of their аваjaya (XIX. 90, quoted above, p. 52). It is true that the Kathāsaritsagāra has the words namayan mgydun unmālayanā ca kahiṇān nypān, v. 89, but this vague phrase corresponds to v. 33 of the Rāghu-
important in the eyes of an Indian poet describing his hero's conquests. But since Kalidāsa states this fact expressly it is evident that there existed some special reason for his doing so. This reason cannot be doubtful: Kalidāsa was influenced by Hariśena's panegyric. And this assertion can be corroborated by collateral evidence. We will show below that several other phrases employed by Hariśena with reference to Samudragupta have been used by Kalidāsa when speaking of Rāghu.

We now pass to the Mahābhārata 1). In verse 55 of the nineteenth taraṇa of the Kathāsaritsāgara, analysed above, Yāungandharāyaṇa exhorts king Vatsa as follows:

tasmiṁ (i.e. Brahmadatte) jite jaya Prācīpratromenākhitū disah uceāḥ kurusva vai Pāṇḍor yaśas ca 2) kumudājvalam 3)

Yet, as we shall see presently, Sōmadēva was in no way influenced by Pāṇḍu's digvijaya described in the Mahābhārata L. 122. 21 ff. I think the only reason which might have induced the Kāśmīri poet to make this allusion was that Vatsa like Pāṇḍu started on his conquest of the world after having become married to two wives. Every coincidence between the two digvijayas ends here. Still less resemblance, if possible, is there between the digvijaya of Pāṇḍu and that of Rāghu. After having crushed the Dāsārṇas Pāṇḍu turns to the East. He

vāṁśa (as shown above, p. 51) and has nothing to do with the precise statement contained in the words grhitapratimuktaśya -- Mahēndranāthasya jahāra na tu médinīm.


2) There are in the Mahābhārata two similar phrases which I may quote par acquit de conscience viz. svabāhulaviryaṇa Kurunām akarōd yasaḥ, v. 29 and Sōntanō rājasvinhasya Bhāratasya ca dhīmataḥ | pranastāḥ kirtvijah sabdah Pāṇḍunā punar aṁṭāḥ | v. 37.

3) This verse seems to have been the source of an erroneous remark of M. Lacôte viz. Udayana ---- commencera par l'Orient, comme les Pāṇḍavas. (op. cit. p. 73). But the Pāṇḍavas did not begin their digvijaya by the conquest of the East. They conquered the earth yāungapodyēna (II. 27. 4). The description begins with the North.
subjugates the ruler of Magadha, then the Vīdēhas, Kaśīs 1), Suhmas, Puṇḍras — and here his conquests practically end. But apart from their being rather curtailed and too one-sided to be entitled to the name of digvijaya, there is absolutely nothing in the whole adhyāya which would remind us of the poetical yes, but unusually precise description of Kālidāsa’s. It may be added that the description of Paṇḍu’s conquests is in the common epical style i.e. very plain. Yet we meet with one elaborate image 2) which deserved being utilised by Somaḍēva if he really meant to imitate Paṇḍu’s digvijaya. But he did not. His model was the fourth Canto of the Rāghuvaṁśa.

As to the digvijaya of the four Paṇḍava brothers occupying ten chapters in the second book of the Mahābhārata (II. 26—35), it cannot be my task to analyse it in detail. Besides it is well known to every reader of the Mahābhārata. It will be enough to state the following points which will wholly suffice for our need: — (1) The digvijaya of the Mahābhārata, unlike that of Rāghu (and, of course, that of Samudra-gupta), is no political campaign. Its only aim is to fill the treasury of Yudhiṣṭhira as stated by Arjuna in the following verse:

\[ \text{tasya}^3) \text{ kṛtyam aham manye kōsasya parivardhanam karam āhārayiṣyāmi rāj̥aḥ sarvān nyāpottama} \]

% 26. 5.

Hence the standing phrase: tāṁ (or tāṁ, as the case may be) jītvā --- kare ca viniveśya ca --- āhṛtya tatra dhanāṁ or dhanāṁy ādāya and so forth 4). — (2) We find no poetical orna-

1) Mark the order!
2) tāṁ sarāughmāhājvālaiṁ śastrārciṣam arindam | Paṇḍupāvakam āsādyā nyādahyanta narādhīpah || v. 30.
3) This refers to dhanam ostrain sarā viryam pakṣo bhūmir yaśo balam enumerated in v. 4.
4) I seize this opportunity to correct an oversight of Mr. Collins. He enumerates among other curious tribes mentioned in the digvijaya of the Mahābhārata *mayūrasadṛṣāḥ*, peafowl-like people (II. 1036); *tittirakalmūṣāḥ*, people spotted like the partridge,
ments which could have been utilised by Kalidāsa thus furnishing us with a proof of his having written under some influence of the epical digvijaya. Once or twice the very common comparison: sānyēna — kampayann iva medinēm occurs. One image which may be called original viz.

\[\text{tad bhagvān pārthivān kṣatram Pārthēnākliśṭakarmanā |}\\ \text{vāyunēva dhanānikān tūlihūtān yayān diśah ||}\\
\]

has not been utilised by Kalidāsa. — (3) The whole is an awfully monotonous catalogue of kings and peoples defeated. Nearly the same terms are applied to and the same words are used of an Eastern or a Western, a Southern or a Northern ruler. One feels the description is purely mechanical: I don’t hesitate to call it simply dull. There is no shadow of historical probability in all the ten chapters. Compared with this conventional bungling, Kalidāsa’s description is, despite of its poetical ornaments, sober history. No trace of epical monotony here. Raghu defeats the South-Eastern kings but restores them to his royal favour — just like Samudragupta; he is content with spoiling the South without annexing it — just like Samudragupta; he fights battles with the daring Northern nomads casting terror into their ranks — once more, like Samudragupta.

Well, I cannot help thinking that a careful comparison of Raghu’s digvijaya with a typical digvijaya of the Mahābhārata on the one hand and with that of Soma-deva on the other hand cannot fail to show that in this case Harīśeṇa actually served as model to Kalidāsa. This I hold as a proved fact. But of course this fact alone, taken in itself, is

and manḍūkāḥ, the Frogs (II. 1043) (op. cit. p. 13, note 5), but these are epithets, not proper names, and do not refer to men but to horses (maṣūrasadṛśān — hayān; tittirákalmaśān manḍūkā- khyān hayāṭūramāṇaḥ; hayān’s tittírakalmaśān — maṣūrasadṛśān) won by Arjuna from Northern tribes by way of tribute. The best horses were bred, as is well known, in the North of India, especially on the banks of Indus; hence sāṅdhava means also horse.
nothing more than an isolated case of literary influence furnishing us with the terminus a quo for Kālidāsa. It cannot suffice to prove that Rāghu is an allegorical representative of Sāmudrāgupta. To prove this we shall have to show, first, that other details applying to Sāmudrāgupta in Hariśena’s panegyric apply also to Rāghu in Kālidāsa’s poem, and, secondly, that the same holds good of some at least among Sāmudrāgupta’s successors mentioned in the early Gupta monuments and Rāghu’s successors in the Rāghuvamśa.

In order to satisfy with the first part of our present task, I want to call the reader’s attention to the following three points:

— (1) One of the preserved stanzas of Hariśena’s panegyric viz. that describing Sāmudrāgupta’s designation to yuvarūja by his father and a stanza of the Rāghuvamśa dealing with the same subject with regard to Rāghu, clearly correspond to each other. Compare:

\[ \text{āryō hīty upaguhya bhavapiśumāir utkarnītā rōmabhīh} \\
\text{sabh jesūcchvasitēsu tulyakulajamānamānanādvikṣitāh} | \\
\text{snēhavyāduśītēna bāspaguruṇā tattvekṣīnā cakṣusā} \\
\text{yaḥ pitrābhhihitā nirīkṣya nikhilaṁ pāhy ēvaṁ urvēm iti} \]

v. 4.

and:

\[ \text{tataḥ praśānāṁ ciram ātmanā dhyātin} \\
\text{nīśanta-guruṁ laghayāsiyāṁ dhuram} | \\
\text{nisargasaṁskāravinīta ity asān} \\
\text{nṛpēṇa ca kāre yuvarūjasabdadhāk} \]

Rāghuvamśa, III. 35.

One might perhaps object that the two stanzas differ very considerably. Why, yes. They do differ with regard to language and style but the situation they describe is nearly identical 1). The only difference is that the stanza of Hariśena (whom, by the way, Kālidāsa did not attain this time) is more vivid, more picturesque. One feels Hariśena must have witnessed

1) Cp. my remarks on Sōma-deva’s relation to Kālidāsa, above p. 53.
himself the momentous scene, whereas to Kālidāsa it was an historical fact like many other facts on which his master's hand had to set its unmistakeable stamp before filing it on the endless pearl-string of perfectly polished verses. It cannot be denied that more distinct traces of foreign influence may be found in Kālidāsa's writings. He was no doubt greatly indebted to Aśvaghoṣa not so much for situations as quite especially for expressions and phrases. But in this case things lie differently. Aśvaghoṣa was an ancient writer (by the way, little known in Brahminic circles as shown by the fate of his works) whom Kālidāsa studied and from whom he had to learn. But Hariṣeṇa was a modern poet, almost a contemporary since he composed his panegyric on Samudragupta about A.D. 345 ¹), almost a rival since he was the court-eulogist of the same Gupta dynasty whose protégé Kālidāsa was. I think it was almost a point d'honneur with Kālidāsa not to borrow anything directly from Hariṣeṇa. And yet the great poet himself could not help undergoing — rather unconsciously. I suppose — his predecessor's influence. Hence it comes that the traces of Hariṣeṇa's literary influence on Kālidāsa are, singly taken, almost impalpable and yet they have great cumulative force. —

(2) One of the most favourite subjects for similes, images etc. is with the Indian poets the royal fame, kirtih or kirtayah. Of course Kālidāsa speaks of the fame of many a descendant of Dīlīpa. He makes liberal use of the current similes (fame white as snow etc.) and images (fame filling the earth etc.). But anyhow it is striking that when Sunandā (Canto VI) begins to praise Aja's father, Rāghu, she recurses, speaking of his fame, to much the same simile which has been used by Hariṣeṇa in his composition. The latter states that Samudragupta's fame has filled the whole earth and then penetrated to heaven ("vyāptani lāvanītalam kirtim itas trīdasapati bhava- nagamanavāptalājitasukhavicaraṇūm. II. 29, 30) and, further, that

¹) This I have tried to show in a short article on "The date of the Allahabad stone pillar inscription of Samudragupta," just published as a contribution to the Windisch Festschrift (pp. 170—172).
it "purifies the three worlds" like Ganges\(^1\) (punāti bhuvanatrayam, v. 9\(c\)), and Kālidāsa says of Rāghu’s fame

\[
\text{ārūdham adrīn udadhīn viśīrṇāni} \\
\text{bhujangamāṇānī vasatiṁ praviśtam} \\
\text{ūrdhvam\(^2\) gataṁ yasya na cūmbandhi} \\
\text{yaśāḥ parīcchettum iyattayilam} ||
\]

VI. 77.

I willingly admit that this case alone would be entirely devoid of convincing force but it seems to me so much corroborated by collateral evidence that I don’t hesitate to quote it here. I repeat once more: it is quite natural that Hariśena and Kālidāsa have several images in common but it is most striking that there exists a strong parallelism between Sauḍragupta and Rāghu. — (3) One more particular, finally, deserves attention in this connection. I mean the great liberality of Rāghu and Sauḍragupta. Nearly the half of Canto V (vv. 1—35) is devoted to the praise of Rāghu’s liberality. He gave away goods and chattels — all the immeasurable booty brought home from his victorious expedition — on the occasion of the viśva-jīt sacrifice. He spared to a poor brahmin all the rich treasures Kūbeṇa sent him in the form of a golden rain. He was praised by the inhabitants of his capital as a king who granted the petitioners more than they dared to ask (nypō’rthikīṁad adhikopradāsaḥ, V. 31d). Similarly Sauḍragupta. Already Hariśena speaks of his liberality in highly commendatory terms. Cp.

\(^1\) Hariśena calls Sauḍragupta’s fame: Pūṣupater jataṭantarguhānirodhāparimokṣasūghram iva pāṇḍu gāṇghān pavaḥ, v. 9, and Kālidāsa says of Rāghu:

\[
\text{sa seniṁ mahaṁ karṣan pūrvasaṣāraṁ} \\
\text{abhaṅ Harajaṭābraṣṭāṁ Gāṇghām iva Bhagirathaḥ} ||
\]

IV. 32.

Of course I don’t intend to lay any stress on this partial coincidence but, if we consider the indubitable connection between both works, it appears not quite improbable that the former image might have been the purely mechanical cause of the latter.

\(^2\) ūrdhvam svargađikāṁ gataṁ vyāptam, Mallinātha.
the following expressions of his panegyric: anukampavatō, anēka-gōsatasahasrapradāyinaḥ, kpavanadinānathatvarajanoddharanasaṃtradiksābhyyupagatamanasaḥ. Later inscriptions confirm this statement. Cp. the standing epithet of Samuḍraguṭa: nyāyagata-tēnēkagōhīranyakōṭipradasya1) and one or two expressions like the following one: --- suvānadāṇē nyakkāritā2) nyapatayāh PythuRagharāṇḍyāh. This again might be called a common characteristic of Indian monarchs (at least, in theory). Ancient writings are never loth to enjoin liberality and to praise it above all other virtues. And yet it is a curious and scarcely fortuitous coincidence that, on the one hand, of all the Imperial Guptas Samuḍraguṭa alone bears the official title of liberal, and that, on the other hand, in the long series of kings from Dīlīpā down to Agnivaṇa, Raghu alone is praised above all others for his unwonted liberality 3).

I think, the cumulative force of all the minute details analysed thus far, renders evident my supposition that Raghu is meant to represent allegorically Samuḍraguṭa 4).

1) See e. g. Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. III, No. 4, No. 10, No. 13 and others.

2) The two first syllables of this word are broken away; nyakkā is my conjecture. In the beginning yena should be supplied.

3) One might perhaps object that in case Raghu really represented Samuḍraguṭa we should expect him to be praised for his literary and musical tastes, since the latter king is told by Harīṣeṇa to have studied poetry (v. 8) and put to shame the celestial musicians (l. 27). But to this I will answer that the fame of Samuḍraguṭa's liberal education must have soon faded away since it is never alluded to in later inscriptions. He survived in the nation's memory as a great warrior and a generous monarch.

4) It has been supposed by Talboys Wheeler (History of India) that Rāmāyana too was an allegorical poem directed against the Ceylonese Buddhism. Prof. Jacobi says with reference to this theory: »Indische Dichter spielen nicht so Verstecken mit ihren Absichten, und wenn sie allegorisch dichten, so sorgen sie dafür, dass man sie verstehe. Man denke sich; Vālmiki, der grösste Dichter der vorklassischen Zeit, dichtete eine Allegorie, die Niemand verstanden hat, bis ein Europäer des 19. Jahrhunderts das wohl vergorene Geheimniss gekommen ist!« (Das Rāmāyana, Bonn 1893, p. 90). This
It remains to show that the immediate successors of Rāghu have their counterparts in the early or Imperial Guptas. This suggestion has been already put forward by Mr. Collins in his careful comparison of "The geographical data of the Rāghuvaṁśa and Daśakumāracarita" 1). His words are: "I am not sure that a rough parallel could not be drawn between the first five rulers of the Rāghuvaṁśa 2) (upon each of whom Kālidāsa dwells at length) and the first five Gupta emperors beginning with Candragupta I, the practical founder of the dynasty. It is at least curious that in each case the second in the list (Rāghu, Samudragupta) makes wide conquests over almost identical areas. The fifth emperor was Skandagupta (who contended with the fierce Hūnas of the north as Rāma with the fierce Rākṣasas of the south), and such a parallel would therefore be quite in keeping with the view put forward by M. Chakravarti and supported by Prof. Liebich 3), that Kālidāsa wrote his epic during the reign of this sovereign 4).

1) As it may render this suggestion more plausible, I will add that it presented itself to me on my first perusal of the Rāghuvaṁśa i.e. before Mr. Collins' treatise was published and, of course, quite independently of it.

2) Dilīpa, Rāghu, Aja, Daśaratha, Rāma. The list is different in the Purāṇas, as also in the Rāmāyana (Viṣ. Pur., tr. Wilson, vol. III, p. 314): the number and the names may therefore have been specially chosen. (Mr. Collins' note 5).

3) Das Datum des Candragomin und Kālidāsa's, Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur 1903. Abt. IV, p. 28. (Mr. Collins' note 4).

4) M. Chakravarti (JRAS., 1904, p. 160) restricts the composition of the fourth canto to the period 480—490 A. D. (Mr. Collins' note 5).
(op. cit. p. 48). That Rāghu has his counterpart in Samudragupta has been shown above. That there exists a parallel between Rāma and Skandagupta is no less probable. Moreover it can be directly proved that the idea of such a parallel appeared quite natural to an Indian poet. This is shown by the following ślokā of the Kathāsaritsāgara:

Śindhurajaṁ vaśikṛtya harisūnyāir amudrutah |
kṣapayamasa sa Mlecchān Rāghavō Rākṣasān ēva ||

XIX. 108.

(A curious coincidence: the verse quoted refers to barbarians occupying much the same territory where Rāghu contended with the Huns!) Thus two members of the Gupta dynasty have found their counterparts in two kings of the Rāghu family. But the whole early Gupta dynasty numbers no more than five rulers. Hence I think that a third coincidence would be more than enough to ascertain the close correspondence of both dynasties beyond all doubt. And this coincidence actually exists. The Mihrauli iron pillar inscription 1) which must be referred to Candragupta II, son and immediate successor of Samudragupta, says of this monarch "that 'when warring in the Vāṅga countries, he breasted and destroyed the enemies confederate against him'; and the language of the poet may refer to the suppression of a rebellion rather than to a war of aggression" 2). The Sanskrit original runs: yasyōdvaratayataḥ pratipam urasā śatūṇ samētāyayatān Vāṅgese ṣāhavavartinī etc. (the rest does not concern us). Now there is an incident in Aja’s career described by Kālidāsa, which bears a strong resemblance to the event alluded to in the inscription just quoted: Aja, when returning home 3) with his young wife, had to repel a treacherous

1) Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. III, No. 32.
2) V. A. Smith, op. cit. p. 275.
3) Aja’s home was Ayōdhya but Candragupta’s capital seems to have been still Pāṭaliputra and it may be noted that the way from Vīdarbhā to Pāṭaliputra might have easily led through the Vāṅga countries. But of course this is a pure contingency which ought not to be taken seriously. „Allzu scharf macht scharzig“.
attack made from ambush by enemies united against him. Here too the poet's language clearly points to a rebellion. Personal hatred towards the lucky rival seems to be no more than a poetical pretext as may be gathered from the stanzas referring to this incident:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pramanyavana} & \text{ praś api Kōsalendre} \\
\text{pratyekam aṭtasvato yā babhuvah} & \\
\text{atō nṛpaś caśamire samētāh} \\
\text{strāvatusalūbhah na tadātmajasya} & \text{ VII. 34} \\
\text{tam udvahantam pathi Bhōjakanyōm} \\
\text{rurodha rājonyaṣaṇah sa dṛptah} & \\
\text{Balipradiṣṭam Śriyam ōdadāman} \\
\text{trāvīvikramaṁ padam ivendraśatrūḥ} & \text{ 35} \\
\end{align*}
\]

To the phrase \textit{udvartayataḥ pratipam urasā} corresponds the next stanza:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tasyāḥ sa rakṣārtham analpayodham} \\
\text{ādiśya pitṛyaṁ sacivaṁ kumūraḥ} & \\
\text{pratyagrahit pārthivavāhinīṁ tāṁ} \\
\text{Bhāgirathēṁ Śoṇa ivottaraṅgah} & \text{ 37} \\
\end{align*}
\]

If one should persist in calling this too a fortuitous coincidence then I will answer that these fortuitous coincidences have grown too numerous and precise. In fact their number and surprising correspondence are simply striking. To me they clearly prove that Kālidāsa wrote \textit{Raghuvaṁśa} in order to flatter his new patron, Skandagupta, just as he wrote the \textit{Kumārasaṁbhava} in order to flatter his former patron, Kumāragupta.

The result of our investigations is further borne out by some general considerations:

(1) In the genealogical list of the Gupta dynasty Samudragupta alone is distinguished by a whole set of commendatory epithets. He was the most powerful, the most generous, the invincible king. The glory of the whole family is focussed in his person. Next to him stands Skandagupta whose victory over the Huns is greatly extolled. Much the same position is held by Rāghu in the \textit{Raghuvaṁśa}. This is shown already

¹) This has been already noted by Mr. Collins. See p. 62, footnote 2.

²) I select Rāmāyaṇa and not the Purāṇas because there can be no doubt that Kālidāsa has known the poem of Vālmīki, whereas we cannot have the same certainty regarding the latter writings. The Purāṇic lists partly agree better with the Raghuvamśa though not so as to modify the general line of our argumentation.

³) The Vākāṭaka king Rudrasēna II, who according to Mr. Collins (op. cit. p. 60) acceded to the throne about 485 A. D., married Prabhāvatiguptā, daughter of a mahārajaṇīdhiraḥ Āśrī Devagupta. No Gupta emperor of this name is known to have existed. Mr. Collins therefore suggests three explanations of this discrepancy one of which is that this prince may have been a younger brother of the ruling sovereign. (op. cit. p. 36) i.e. of Skanda-gupta. This younger brother would thus seem to have played some political part and it is not quite improbable that this circumstance has been one cause more which prompted Kālidāsa to identify
it is most interesting to see how Kalidāsa modified and abbreviated this long list in order to make it fit his purpose. First of all he wanted Rāghu i.e. Samudragupta who was the practical founder of the Gupta empire if not of the Gupta dynasty; next to him Rāma i.e. Skandagupta whose Hun wars together with some other circumstances were the immediate cause of the Raghuvamśa. Therefore he was obliged to discard the first twenty-five or twenty-four (if he meant to introduce Rāghu’s father into his poem) names although more than one of their bearers was an highly adapted hero for an epic poem. In fact, a rich growth of poetical legends had clustered about names like Manu, Ikṣvakū (the first king of Ayodhyā), Prthu, Triśaṅkū, Māndhātar, Bhagīratha, Kakusthā and others 1). But Kalidāsa had to reject them all, because the founder of the Gupta dynasty, Chandragupta I, could not boast of twenty-four ancestors. His pedigree scarcely comprised more than one or two insignificant names 2). But the difficulties end not here. Rāghu’s father could be neither Kakusthā nor Bhagīratha 3), heroes of poetical legends, who would occupy too prominent a place in the poem. Kālidāsa’s choice fell on Dilipa, a rather pale personage, just as Samudragupta’s father, Chandragupta I, who laid but the first foundations of the future empire and about whom the inscriptions are silent 4). Between Rāghu an Rāma eleven kings

Skandagupta with Rāma whose brother was Lakṣmana. It should always be borne in mind that our historical material is very scanty. Hence we are obliged to make profit of every allusion, be it ever so slight and seemingly insignificant.

1) Elsewhere Kālidāsa often alludes to these legends.

2) The inscriptions name only his father Ghaṭotkaca and his grandfather Guptā.

3) Bhagīratha is passed over in silence. Allusions to his legend occur in Kālidāsa’s works (Raghuvamśa, IV. 32) but his connection with Rāghu is not hinted at. Kakusthā has been relegated into Rāghu’s remote ancestors, cp. VI. 71.

4) He is styled mahārājādhirāja but does not yet bear the title paramabhāṭṭāraka. The account of his failure in performing the āśvamedha sacrifice may preserve an actual historical fact.
appear in the epical list. Some of them — Ambaraśa, Nahuśa, Yayāti — were closely associated with legends which could not suit Kālidāsa's purpose. He was obliged to discard all but two of them. And so he did. He retained the name of Rāma's father, Daśaratha, which could not be dropped, and that of his grandfather, Aja. It is worth noting how steadily the poet pursued his aim which was to make the legend suit historical reality.

(2) Of course Kālidāsa did not aim at furnishing the legendary Ikṣvākus with all features of the historical Guptas. After all his poem was not called Guptavaṁśa (or Samudraguptavāṁśa) but Raghuvaṁśa. He cleverly interwove legend with history and was content with some transparent allusions to the ruling dynasty in addition to a general parallelism between both families). He was further obliged to make some concessions to the legend: thus Kuṁragupta certainly did not kill a young hermit of the sūdra caste. Anyhow it is interesting to see how exactly both series of kings correspond to each other:

1. Dilipa, a rather pale personage, no conqueror. The chief interest rests rather on the person of his wife, Sudakṣina, Raghu's mother.

1. Candragupta I, a local raja of Paṭaliputra whose fortune it has been to marry a daughter of the famous Licchavi clan. He probably extended his dominion as far as Allahabad) but he is not styled officially a conqueror.

1) Some of these allusions are lost to us because of our scanty knowledge of the Gupta history.

2) In the Purāṇas the Guptas (i. e. practically Candragupta I) are said to have reigned (early in the fourth century) along the Ganges, over Prayāga, Śāketa and Magadha. This statement looks very trustworthy. Cp. The Purāṇa text of the dynasties of the Kali age with introduction and notes edited by F. E. Pargiter, M. A., Oxford 1913, p. 55.
2. Rāghu, the great conqueror, famous for his liberality 1).

3. Aja. He too was a gallant knight.


2. Samudragupta, the greatest of all Guptas. A military genius. Praised for his unwonted liberality.

3. Candra-gupta II. Styled officially "prthivyām apratisrathasya Samudraguptosya putraḥ---svayam apratisrathah" 2).

4. Kumāragupta. Rather pale. We meet once or twice with an allusion to his "abhivardhamanavijayan rājyam" but this seems to be a wholly conventional phrase since no campaign of his is described or even hinted at 5). The inscriptions never fail to praise the conquests of other

---

1) It is perhaps worth noting that a brahmin of the Kauṭsa family is named in connection with both Rāghu (V. 1 ff.) and Samudragupta (Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. III, No 6.), for although he calls himself minister of Candra-gupta II, yet he was anvayaprāprapta-sacivyah i.e. he or his father must have been minister of Samudragupta.


3) IX. 10 is a conventional phrase. We know that Daśaratha did not conquer the whole earth ēkaraṭhēna. Still less Kumāragupta.

4) But this is probably a feature of the traditional Daśaratha, who had to kill a hermit boy on a hunting expedition. It does also point to Daśaratha's reign being rather peaceful which would be one point of agreement more with the reign of Kumāragupta.

5) It is true that he celebrated a horse-sacrifice but this he could have done just to ascertain his paramount power. Besides, the horse-sacrifice seems to have lost its significance in these later times. A petty mahārāja of the Bhāvasivas, Bhavanāga, is reported to have performed no less than ten (!) of them although he very probably lived under the suzerainty of the Gupta emperors about 400 A. D. (cp. Collins, op. cit. p. 60).
emperors who actually made any. Towards the close of his reign his kingdom "had been made to totter" 1) by the onrush of the Hūṇas.

5. Rāma. The exemplary hero. Conqueror of the fierce Rākṣasas.

5. Skandagupta. A great warrior 2). Waged war with the barbarous Huns.

I don't think this parallelism can be due to case.

(3) With Rāma all reflection of actual political conditions takes an end. The rest of the poem was added for convenience' sake. Rāma's later story, his repulsion of Sītā with all its consequences etc., all this corresponds pretty closely to the tradition. The persons of Rāma's sons and their successors are devoid of all interest. They are merae nominum umbrae. All this proves that Kālidāsa did not outlive Skandagupta 3). He did not even live to see the horrors of the second Hun war for it is unfortunately true that inter arma silent Musae. Rāghuvaṃśa is perhaps an unfinished poem. We will try to show below that it has been cut short by its author's death.

(4) One final remark. A śloka in the description of Indumati's svayamvara furnishes us with what seems to me an indubitable proof of Kālidāsa's having lived under the Gupta dynasty. The first 4) king whom Sunanda names is a certain Paramātapa, ruler of Māgadha. Of course he can have been

1) Bhitari stone inscription of Skandagupta, l. 14 (Corp. etc. No. 13).
2) Cp. Guptavamsaikavirah (Bhitari inscr., No. 13, l. 7), avanatariḥ (Junagadh rock inscription, No. 14, l. 4) and many other similar epithets.
3) Mr. Manmohan Chakravarti is at variance with himself when he says that Kālidāsa wrote the Rāghuvaṃśa in order to flatter Skandagupta (JRAS., 1903) but restricts the composition of the fourth Canto of this poem to the period 480—490 A. D. i. e. after Skandagupta's death (JRAS., 1904).
4) This too is not without interest.
only a vassal of Rāghu since the latter ruled over all Northern India. But the poet forgets this and says:

\[
\begin{aligned}
kāmāṁ vyāh santu sahasraśo 'nyē \\
rājāvatim āhur anēna bhūmin |
\end{aligned}
\]
\[\text{nakṣatratārāgraahasāṁkūtpi} \]
\[\text{jyotiśmati candramasaśiva rātriḥ ||} \]

VI. 22.

This statement can refer only to the Guptas. It does not correspond to the political situation created by Rāghu's conquests. But this fact is quite in keeping with a remark made by Prof. Jacobi with respect to Vālmīki, viz. „die epischen Dichter des Madhyadeva übertragen die politischen Verhältnisse und Stimmungen ihrer eigenen Zeit oder der jüngsten Vergangenheit auf die mythische Vorzeit“ 1).

I trust to have thus ascertained the following points: —

1) that Rāghuvamśa I—XIV is a pretty faithful reflection of the history of the Imperial Gupta dynasty from its founder Candragupta I (acc. 320 A.D.) to Skandagupta who reigned from 455 A. D. to about 480 A. D. — (2) that it was composed during the latter monarch's reign and not later.

It remains to corroborate this theory, based largely on internal evidence, by some more palpable facts. — It is well known that several passages in the inscriptive literature of the Gupta period have been traced back to similar verses in Kaśyapa's poems. These cases are mostly confined to the Mandasar prāsastī of Vatsabhaṭṭi, dated A.D. 472 2). Thus Bühler has noticed 3) that verse 26 of Vatsabhaṭṭi's composition viz.

\[
\begin{aligned}
tasyātmajah sthāryanayopaśānno \\
bhandupriyō bandhur ievra prajānām |
\end{aligned}
\]
\[\text{bandhvarthivartaḥ nyapaBandhvarma} \]
\[\text{dvigṛptapaksasāmanāikadakṣaḥ ||} \]

reminds us of similar verses in the XVIII-th Canto of the Rāghuvamśa e. g.

1) Jacobi, op. cit. p. 104.
3) op. cit. p. 13.
tēna deśipānām īva puṇḍarikō
rājāṇām ajayō 'jani Puṇḍarikāh |
sāntē pitāry āhātapuṇḍarikā
yāṁ puṇḍarikākāśam īva śrītā śrīḥ || 8 ||

Another coincidence of this kind noted by Bühler 2) is Vatsabhāṭṭi’s praśasti vv. 10, 11:

calatpatākānya abalāsanāthāny
atyarthaśukāny adhikōnatāni |
taḍillatācitrasītabhrakūṭa-
tulyopamānāni guhāṇi yatra ||
Kālīśatunghāśikharapratimāni cānyāny
ābhānti dirghavalabhāni swedikāni |
gāndharvasabdamukharāṇī nivīṣācitra-
kurūṇi lalakadalivanaśobhitāni ||

and Meughadūta v 64:
vidyutvantaṁ lalitavanimāh sēndracāpaṁ sacitrāh
saṅgītānya prohatanurajāh snigdhagambhūraghōśan |
antastōyaṁ maṃjīmyabhūvas tuṅgam abhranālaḥgārah
prasādās tvāṁ tulyāityum alam yatra tāis tāir viśēṣāṁ ||

From these facts the inference is reasonable, Bühler says, that Vatsabhāṭṭi was familiar with the works of Kālidāsa. As for me, I feel inclined to admit this possibility. But the fact is not quite sure. Mr. Manmohan Chakravarti objects that these verses “need not have been borrowed, as they refer to certain common similes which may have probably passed current in that age” 3).

1) Other verses are XVIII. 5. 7. 13. But such playing on proper names is frequent in Sanskrit literature. — Bühler draws also attention on the frequent use of subhaga by Kālidāsa and Vatsabhāṭṭi.

2) op. cit. p. 18.

3) JRAS., 1904 p. 161. — Kielhorn has pointed out that v. 39 of the Mandasor praśasti has been imitated from Rtuśamhāra V. 2—3. But this does only prove that Vatsabhāṭṭi knew the Rtuśamhāra. I cannot admit for a moment that the latter poem is a work of our Kālidāsa. It has a very peculiar character and
The first verse of the Udayagiri cave inscription of Candragupta II \(^1\) viz.

\[\text{yad antarjyótir arkábham urvyām} \quad * - - - - - \|\]
\[\text{* * * * - vyāpi Candraguptāśkyam adbhutam} \|\]

reminds us of Gañadāsa’s words in the Malavikāgnimitra

mahat khalu puruṣādhikāram idam jyōtiḥ. This coincidence too has been pointed out by Bühler\(^2\). All these quotations have, no doubt, some cumulative force. But one instance more may be added to them which, in my opinion, does prove conclusively that the Rāghuvamśa (or at least Canto IV of this poem) has been given to the publicity during Skandagupta’s reign. We read of Rāghu:

\[\text{ikṣvācayaniśadiniyasya tasya gōptur guṇōdayam} \|\]
\[\text{ākūmarakathādhūtam śālīgāpyō jagur yaśāḥ} \|\]

IV. 20.

This verse has been repeated almost verbally in the Bhitari stone inscription of Skandagupta:

\[\text{caritam amalakārter giyāte yasya śubhram} \|\]
\[\text{diśi diśi paritūśārīr ākūmaram manusyaśīḥ} \|\] \(^3\)

its style is wholly different from that of Kālidāsa. I am glad to agree this time with Dr Walter who has proved conclusively (partly utilising Pischel’s oral remarks) that the Rūsamhāra cannot have been written by Kālidāsa (see Indica, Heft 3. Übereinstimmungen etc., Leipzig 1905, pp. 6 – 9). I may only add that two of his statements lack accuracy viz. (1) v. II. 19 vahanti varśantī nadanti bhāntī dhyāyantī nṛtyantī samāśrayantī which Dr Walter cites as ganz verschieden vom Sprachgebrauch Kālidāsa’s is borrowed from the Rāmāyana, IV. 28. 27 (already Bohlen observed: versus haud dubio spurius quem codices omissunt; I cannot for the moment identify the other similar verse viz. VI. 26); (2) the avyayībhava beginning with ā- occurs not only in Kūmarasambhava I. 5 (āmekhalam) but twice more viz. Kūmarasambhava VII. 84 (ūlōcanāntam) and Rāghuvamśa XVIII. 28 (ubrahimasabham).

\(^1\) Corpus, No. 6. — The verse is greatly damaged.

\(^2\) op. cit. p. 30. — The words of Gañadāsa refer to king Agnimitra.

\(^3\) Corpus, No. 13, I. 12. The next verse of this inscription viz.
As far as I know, this idea does not recur elsewhere in Sanskrit literature. And it is not credible that Kālidāsa should have been the borrowing part. We have seen how difficult it has proved to discover traces of contemporary literary influence in his works. The Bhitari stone inscription is not dated but we shall not be very much mistaken in assigning it approximately to the middle of Skandagupta’s reign.

One point still remains obscure. It has been supposed by Shankar Panḍit, to whom we are indebted for one of the best editions of the Rāghuvaṁśa, that there are six Cantos wanting at the end of the poem. On the other hand it seems certain that the eight Cantos of the Kumārasambhava known to us represent no more than the beginning of the poem which Kālidāsa intended to write. Prof. Jacobi 1) admits the former but rejects the latter possibility and throws out the suggestion that both poems lack but a small closing portion each. This cannot be ascribed to the poet’s death, says he, since it can be

\[
pitari dīcām upētē viplutāṁ vaṁśalakṣaṁśi
bhujabalavijitārīr yāḥ pratiṣṭhāpya bhūyaḥ \\
jitam iti paritōṣan mātaram sāsravetrān
hataripur iva Kṛṣṇō Dévakīṁ abhyupētaḥ
\]

reminds us of Rāghuvaṁśa XIV. 2 :

\[
ubhav ubhābhyaṁ praṇatāu hatārī \\
yathākramanī vibhavaśobhkīnāu tānu \\
vispaṣṭam asrāndhataya na dṛṣṭānu
jñātiṁ sutasparśasukhāpalambhāt
\]

Cp. further: yam (i.e. the sun) tōkō bahurūgavēgavivaśah saṁśrītya 

cetolabhaḥ (Indor copper plate inscription of Skandagupta, [dated A. D. 465/6], No. 16, l. 2, with Rāghuvaṁśa V. 4 cd :

\[
yatas tvayā jñānam aśeṣam āptam
lokēna cāitanyam ivāṣṇaraśmēh
\]

(cp. also V. 35cd :

\[
rājapi tebhē sutam āśu tasmād
ālokam arkād iva jīvalokāḥ
\]

where Mallinātha notices the various reading cāitanyam for ālokam).

1) Die Epen des Kālidāsa, Verhandlungen des Berliner Orientalisten-Conferences (Berlin 1881), II, 2.
proved from internal evidence that both poems have not been composed simultaneously. Prof. Jacobi therefore suggests that both poems were originally copied on birch-bark sheets, as is well known an easily damagable material, and he quotes a remark of Bühler’s according to which “the usual way of preserving the MSS. is to bind them in rough country leather and to place them on shelves upright, like our books. The friction of the leather invariably destroys the first and last leaves, and hence many Sanskrit works from Kaśmir have neither beginning nor end.” But this quotation speaks against Prof. Jacobi’s suggestion and shows that it lacks consistence: for not one syllable is wanting in the beginning of Kālidāsa’s epical poems. Nor are the poet’s remaining works, Mōghadūta and the dramas, mutilated. Of course there are works in Sanskrit literature with reference to which Prof. Jacobi’s suggestion holds good. Such is e. g. the Buddhacarita of Aśvaghōsa or Daśakumāracarita of Daṇḍin, works without beginning nor end. But things lie differently where the end alone is missing as e. g. in the case of the Ḥarṣacarita of Bāna. The latter writer was hindered by death from finishing his romance and Kālidāsa was in all probability hindered by death from finishing his second epic, the Raghuvamśa. But what about the Kumārasamābhava? First of all let us remark that the eight Cantos of the Kumārasamābhava cannot possibly represent a consistent whole as Prof. Jacobi assumes. His theory that the eighth Canto, the Umasuratavarnana, comprises the samābhava of Kumāra thus justifying the title of the poem, is frustrated by the simple fact that the true acceptance of the word samābhava is not conception (as would follow from Prof. Jacobi’s argumentation) but birth. Besides, we learn from the

1) The prologue of the Vikramārvaṇīya is a later addition made after its author’s death.

2) op. cit. — The future apākarīṣyatī, V. 14 is in Dr Walter’s eyes a proof that Kālidāsa did not intend to write more than eight Cantos. (See his German translation of this poem, München-Leipzig 1913, p. 42 footnote). More than improbable.
Rāmāyana, I. 36) that Uma did not conceive Kumāra because Śiva's sperm never reached her womb; it was poured out on the earth whereupon Agni, accompanied by Vāyu, penetrated into it. The next sarga, I. 37, tells us the story of Kumāra's birth. In the sargaviśayakrama prefixed to the Nṛṣāya Sāgara Press edition, this chapter bears the title Kārtīkēyotpatti which is a synonymous word for Kumārasaṁbhava 3). It is also clear that the Kumārasaṁbhava would not have been completed by a later poet if it were reputed to represent a finished whole. But if my argumentation is correct, as I am convinced it is, then we must ask: what is the reason of the poem having been left unfinished? The reason is obvious and very simple. It has been suggested by Mr. Mannmohan Chakravarti that Kālidāsa, 'selected Kumārasaṁbhava (the birth of Kārtīkēya) because this god was a kuladevata of the latter Gupta emperors (witness their names, Kumāragupta and Skanda-gupta, and their silver coins with peacocks on the reverse') 3). I will restrict this suggestion and say: the young Kālidāsa, newly attracted to the court of the Gupta emperors, selected for the subject of his poem the birth of Kumāra in order to flatter Kumāragupta by an implied comparison with the invincible leader of celestial hosts (the Huns menaced the empire, India demanded a leader!) but he dropped this subject in 455 A. D. when Kumāragupta died.

In conclusion, I agree with Mr. Mannmohan Chakravarti's remarks concerning the Mēghadūta 4) and recon-

1) I select on purpose this version of the legend as it must have been known to Kālidāsa.
2) Much in the same manner is the story of Kumāra's birth (and his victory over Tāraka) related in the Kathasaritsāgara, XX. 60—99 (Uma rāt, corresponding to the eighth Canto of Kālidāsa's poem, occupies vv. 72—73). The corresponding portion of the Bhādakathāmaṇjarī, III. 342—366 (Uma rāt 349—350; read Satya for Satī), contains three ślokas (344—346) which remind us vividly of Kumārasaṁbhava III.
3) JRAS, 1903 p. 185.
4) Mēghadūta is also silent about Gupta connections and central India, probably because Kālidāsa had not then been attracted to the Emperor's Court, thus having to leave his beloved Ujjayinī. JRAS, 1903 p. 186.
struct the chronology of Kālidāsa's descriptive poems as follows:

(1) Meghadūta was written at Ujjayinī some time before 455 A.D., say, about 450 A.D.

(2) The poet's next work was Kumārasambhava. It has been begun with the intention to win the good-graces of Kumāragupta at whose court the poet now lived but it has been cut short by the emperor's death in 455 A.D.

(3) From that date some time, say, ten or fifteen years elapsed. Kālidāsa's talent reached maturity. It may be that the fact of the later Imperial Guptas having transferred their capital to Ayodhya as also Skandagupta's fresh victory over the Huns, which reminded of that of Rāma over the Rākṣasas, inspired the poet with the subject of his Rāghuvamśa, a poem full of allusions to the ruling dynasty. The new work was nearly finished (perhaps altogether finished) when the poet died. This came to happen before 480 A.D. i.e. before the downfall of the Gupta empire.

The Mālavikāgnimitra probably preceded Meghadūta. It is clearly inferior to the latter poem and seems to have been the poet's first production. Śakuntalā marks the culminating point of Kālidāsa's genius. It must be placed between his epical poems or, say, about 460 A.D. The poet's third drama, Viṅkramōrvāśīya, has been represented after its author's death. It is therefore his last work written simultaneously with the later Cantos of the Rāghuvamśa.

Kālidāsa was born in or near Ujjayinī about 430

1) Cp. our quotation from the Indor copper plate inscription above, p. 73, footnote.
2) JRAS., 1903 p. 185.
4) See Prologue to this drama. — Mālavikāgnimitra has, alone among the poet's works, purely local interest relating as it does an amourette of a rājā of Vīdiśā. Now Vīdiśā lies very near Ujjayinī. In the Meghadūta the description of the latter city (27 ff.) follows immediately upon that of the former (24—25). Hence the selection of Mālavikāgnimitra would explain itself rather easily.
A. D. He started on his glorious career as a young man of, say, twenty and closed it about 475 A. D. (or a little earlier) at the age of forty or forty-five. He died as the court-poet of Skandagupta in this monarch’s capital i.e. probably in Ayodhya 1).

Appendix.

A comparison of king Vatsa’s digvijaya as described by Somasdeva and Kšemendra is not wholly devoid of interest. Both descriptions have a certain number of ślokas in common. It will be seen, however, that not one śloka for which, as shown above, Somadēva was indebted to Kalidasa is to be found in the Brhatkathāmañjari. This fact confirms my supposition that Vatsa’s digvijaya was lacking in the Kaśmīrean Brhatkathā. — Square brackets indicate verses which appear only in one of the two works under consideration. I am quoting in full only those stanzas which have been, in all probability, taken over from the common source of both poems.

Kathasaritsagara, tar. XIX.  
Brhatkathāmañjari, lamb. III.

[1—3]  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{atas tadarthoṁ tapasā} \\
\text{Śanibhum ārādhyāmy aham} & \text{ sa gṛḥitajayōdyōgas} \\
\text{vinā hi tatprasadēna} & \text{ tapasā Tripurāntakam} 2) \\
kutō vāuchitasiddhayāḥ & \text{ atō ’tha yad asādhyāṁ hi} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[4\]  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kim Śivasmaranān nṛṇām} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

276

---

1) The legend says that he has been murdered by a courtesan. There is a seed of truth in every legend and if this one be true then he could not have died an old man. Thus the legend confirms in a certain way my theory.

2) There is clearly a lacuna here. Let it be said at once that the printed text of Kšemendra’s Brhatkathāmañjari (edited by Messrs. Śivadatta & Parab in the Kāvyamālā) is characterised by utmost incorrectness.
[5]  
tatas taṁ saha devībhūyan  
sacīvaiś ca tapahśhitam  
trirātrōpōṣitam bhūpaṁ  
Śivaḥ svapne samādiśat ||  

\[\text{tuṣṭo } '\text{smi tē tad uttiṣṭha} \]
\[\text{nirvighnaṁ jayam āpsyasi} \]
\[\text{survavidyādharādhiśaṁ} \]
\[\text{putraṁ caivacirūd itī} \]  

vidyādharēśvarō bhāvī  
tanayō\(^1\) vijayaś ca tē |  
\[\text{iti Śravād varanī prāpa} \]
\[\text{trirātrōpōṣitō nypha} \]  

6. 7  

[8]  
aunandayace ca sacīvān  
praṭaḥ svapnena tena saḥ |  
vratāpavāsaaktānte ca  
dēvyāu dvē puspakōmalē ||  

tatsvapnavarṇanenāiva  
śrōtrāpēyena trītyaṁ |  
tayōś ca vibhavāyāśa  
jātah svādvāsaḫadhrakramaḥ ||  

\[\text{lēbhē sa rājā tapasā} \]
\[\text{prabhāvaṁ pūrvajāṁ sumām} \]
\[\text{punyāṁ pativratānāṁ ca} \]
\[\text{tatpatnyāu kirtim āpaṭuḥ} \]  

9. 10. 11  

nyapryttānuvṛttā ca  
dēvyāu dṛṣṭvā pativrāte  
[hrōśo Vasantaṭakaṁ prāha  
prasaṁsaṁs tadvicēṣṭitam]  

277  

[279. 280].  

utsavavyagrapānre ca  
vihite vratapāraṇē |  
Yāugandharāyaṇo 'nyēdyur  
itī rājanam abravit ||  

12  

anyēdyur atha bhūpāle  
jayōdyogakathāntare |  
pāuruṣāṁ dūivasaphalam  
prāha Yāugandharāyaṇaḥ ||  

281  

\(^1\) my correction for tanayād.
dhanyas tvam yasya caīvēthāṃ
prasaṃṇo bhogavān Ṣraḥ |
tad idānīṁ rīpūḥ jītvā
bhaja Lakṣmīṁ bhujārjītām ||
sā hi svadharmasāṃbhūtaḥ
bhūḥṛtām anvayē sthirāḥ |
nijadharmārjītām hi
vināśō nāsti saṃpadām || 13. 14

avaśyaṁ prthivīpāla
bhūbhujāṁ vijayaḥ Śrīyaḥ |
ḥavaty utsāhanityānāṁ
iḥāmutra ca siddhayē ||
avāpyatē śubhaphalaṁ
suṣṭāḥ pūrvasaṅcitaḥ |
282. 283 a b

(tathā ca ciraḥbhūmiṣṭho
vidhiḥ pūrvaśasanbhṛtaḥ |
pranāsīḥ bhavatā praṇaṁ āṣṭaḥ
kīṁcātraidām kathāṁ śṛṇu ||
15

pasyācitītām evāpyaṁ
ivayā yāudhiṣṭhirān dhanam || 283 e d

(16—50 Dēvadasākhyāvanijāḥ
kathā) 1)

(284—299 Dēvadasākhyāyikā) 2)

[51—55]

ity uktō mantrimukhyaṇa
thāthētu vijayōdyataḥ |
Vatsarājāḥ prakṛtiśu
prayānārāmbham aḍīṣat ||
56

srutvēti mantrivacanaṁ
rājā vijayālāsaḥ |
dideṣu digjayōdyoge
sēnāyam api tadddyutē || 3)
300

dadāu Vāidehadeśe ca
rājyaṁ Gōpalakāya saḥ |
satkārahētor nṛpatīḥ
svāšuryāyānugacchatē ||
57

Gōpalakaṁ ca Videha-
rājya 3) dhyātva jayōtsuṇaḥ |
302 a b

---

1) I omit this story as it does not concern us directly.
2) The last words seem corrupt.
3) Vīdēha° seems to be the correct reading for Vīdaśa° of the printed text.
kiṁ ca Padmāvatibhrātṛē
prāyacchat Śīnvaharvamanē |
saṁmānya Čēdivaṣayam
sāṁyāh samam upēyuse ||

58
tatō bhrātaram āhūya
Padmāvatyā narēsvaṇaḥ |
vidadhē Śīnvaharvamanēm Čēdirājye 1) balādhikam ||

301

[59. 60. 61]
tataḥ śubhe 'hāni prīto
nīmīttāi jayaśaṁśibhiḥ |
Brahmadattaṁ prati Prācyāṁ
pūrvam Vatsēkvarō yayaū ||

62

kṛtvā 2) mantrigrīrā dpūtāṁ
Vārāṇasyāṁ mahāpatim ||
Brahmadattāṁ sa saṁhṛṣṭa-
sarvasaṁantamaṇḍalam |
jētuṁ -- | yayaū -- ||

302 cd. 303 ab (cdef)
pāṇḍureṇatapātrēṇa
yātṛāyāṁ vibabhāu vibhuḥ |
kṣērakṣobhasambusthēṇa
saśāṅkenēva Mandarōha ||

304 3)

[64. 65] 4)
tadā ca sāṁyauṁyārghoṣa-
pratiśàbdakūlikktaḥ |
parasparam ivācakhyus
tadāgamabhayaṁ diṣaḥ ||

66

jētuṁ sajjagajānīka-
turagotkhaṭabhūtalāḥ |
yayaū subhaṭasambhārdha-
vyāloṭitadigantarāḥ ||

303 cdef

[67] 4)
virējur vānarāś cāṣya
siṭaśravansacāmarāḥ |
vigaladgaṇḍasindūra-
śoṇadānajalāḥ pathī ||

1) My correction for cēddhi rājye.
2) kṛtvā cannot be possibly good. Read perhaps tatō.
3) The original contained some allusion to the royal umbrella.
4) Taken over from the Rāghuvaṁśa.


\[\text{[70. 71. 72]}^{1}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{āvāṃ yāyāu sa digbhāgān} & \quad \text{tasya sūnyē bhaṭūḍhūtā}^{2} \\
\text{paśyan phullasātāṃbujān} & \quad \text{vibabhāu khaḍgamaṇḍali} \\
\text{mahīmardabhayōdbhrānta-} & \quad \text{pāṭalavāsāt}^{2} \quad \text{prītyēva} \\
\text{Ṣeṣōṭkṣiptaphaṇān iva} & \quad \text{samprāptā bhujaḍāvali} \\
\end{align*}

\[\text{73}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{atrāntārē ca tē cārā} & \quad \text{kāpāṭikapaṇadhibhīr}^{3} \\
\text{dhyātakāpūḍikvṛratāh} & \quad \text{daīvajñavayāñjanāīr}^{3} \quad \text{api} \\
\text{Yāgandharāyaṇānudīśtāh} & \quad \text{ācakāraśa ripōr mantrām} \\
\text{prāpur Vārāṇasim purīm} & \quad \text{gūḍham Yāgandharāyanaḥ} \\
\end{align*}

\[\text{74}\]

\[\text{[75. 76. 77. 78. 79]}^{1}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{athāśya Brahmātattassya} & \quad \text{Brahmadattasya sācivō} \\
\text{mantri Yōgaranḍākakāh} & \quad \text{dhīmān Yōgaranḍākakāh} \\
\text{cākāra Vatsarūḍasya} & \quad \text{vyadhāt Vatsēvarasyambhō} \\
\text{vyājān āgacchataḥ pathi} & \quad \text{ghāsām ca viṣadūṣitam} \\
\end{align*}

\[\text{70. 81. 82}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{uddhisāyat pratipatham} & \quad \text{Brahmadattasya sācivō} \\
\text{viṣūḍidravyaṃkiticbhiḥ} & \quad \text{dhīmān Yōgaranḍākakāh} \\
\text{vyēkṣān kusumavallīca} & \quad \text{vyadhāt Vatsēvarasyambhō} \\
\text{tōyāni ca tṛnāni ca} & \quad \text{ghāsām ca viṣadūṣitam} \\
\text{vidadvē viṣakānyāś ca} & \quad \text{Brahmadattasya sācivō} \\
\text{sūnyē panyavilāsinīḥ} & \quad \text{dhīmān Yōgaranḍākakāh} \\
\text{prāhinōt puruṣūmā caiva} & \quad \text{vyadhāt Vatsēvarasyambhō} \\
\text{nīśūs cchadmaḥūtināḥ} & \quad \text{ghāsām ca viṣadūṣitam} \\
\end{align*}

\[\text{80. 81. 82}\]

\[\text{307}\]

\[\text{308}\]

---

1) v. 72 borrowed from the Raghuvamśa.

2) My corrections for bhaṭā dhūtā and pāṭalavāsī.

3) My corrections for praṇaḍhībhīr and daīvaja."
tac ca vijñāya sa jñāni-
liṅgī cārō nyavedayat |
Yāugandharāyaṇāyaśu
svasahāyamukhāis tadā ||
Yāugandharāyaṇāḥ 'py ētad
buddhvā pratipadām pathi |
dūṣitam tyātōyādi
pratiyōgāir asōdhayat ||
apūrvastrīsamāyogam
kaṭakē niśiśedha ca |
avadhit vadhalāīnś tōṁś ca
labāhvā saha Rumaṇvata ||
83. 84. 85
ulkāsairāndariśanāṁ ghūraṁ
māyās tās ca suḍuḥśahāḥ ||
Yāugandharāyaṇas tasya
pratiyōgāir asōdhayat || ¹)
vyarthaṁ cakāra sakalam
māyāṁīrmaṇḍagambaram ||
309. 310 ab

tad buddhvā dvāhastāmāyaḥ san
śāṇyapūritadiṁmukham |
Vatsēśvaram Brahmadattō
mēṇē durjayam eva tam ||
saṁmantrya dattvā dūtam ca
śirōvīravitāṁjaliḥ |
tataḥ sa niḳatibhūtāṁ
Vatsēśam svayam abhyagāt ||
86. 87
tatō baddhāṇjalir dhīmān
rātrōpāyanasāṃgataḥ || ²)
310 cd

[88] ³)
ithām tasmāṁ jīte etc.
89a
Brahmadattam sa jītvāvā etc.
311 a.

From this point the two descriptions disagree.

¹) The printed text has the meaningless ivābhāvat and a varia
lectio pratikārparāyaṇah. Faute de mieux we may read asōdhayat.
²) Something is missing here.
³) Compare Rāghuvamśa.

Corrige. The Italian quotation on p. 44 ¹) should run:
latin sangue gentile.