

On Bhâravi and Mâgha.

By

Hermann Jacobi.

Bhâravi and Mâgha shine forth as the Gemini in the bright stellar sphere of classical Sanskrit literature. For they seem linked together by a mutual likeness in their works which must strike every reader. As tradition is silent on the nature of the relation subsisting between these two great classical poets, we must try to find it out by an attentive study of their works, the Kirâtârjuniya and the Śisupâlavadha. With this object I shall undertake in the following pages a discussion of the whole problem, and lay before the reader the results of my researches. If the labour bestowed on the subject should be considered out of proportion to the results arrived at, it should be kept in mind that the Kirâtârjuniya and Śisupâlavadha, since more than a thousand years, have been declared by the unanimous verdict of the Hindus to rank among the very best works of Sanskrit literature. No trouble, however great will therefore be ill spent, if it extends our knowledge of their authors beyond their bare names.

II.

The Kirâtârjuniya and the Śisupâlavadha resemble each other in many points. The structure of either poem is of that kind, or the story is so chosen (in both cases from the Mahâbhârata), that inci-

dents of the same nature must occur in nearly the same order in the one as well as in the other. Thus we have the description of the enemy Kir. i, 1—25, Śís. i; a council Kir. i—iii, Śís. ii; a journey Kir. iv and vii, Śís. iii, together with the usual topics of Kāvyaś, to wit; mountain-scenery, Kir. v, Śís. iv; the erotic description of flower-gathering Kir. viii, 1—26, Śís. vii; of bathing Kir. viii, 27—57, Śís. viii; of evening and night Kir. ix, 1—50, Śís. ix; of revelry and love Kir. ix, 51—78, Śís. x. After this the individual facts of the story have to be told, where of course the agreement must break off. But then we have speeches and answers to them by the other party Kir. xiii and xiv, Śís. xv and xvi; preparation for the battle Kir. xiv, Śís. xvii, the account of the battle, Kir. xv and xvi, Śís. xviii and xix; and single combat Kir. xvii and xviii, Śís. xx. Such an agreement in the plan of the two poems naturally suggests the idea that the one was moulded on the form of the other.

Turning now from matter to form, I call attention to the fact that both poems contain one canto, Kir. iv, Śís. iv, in which the author exhibits his proficiency in various metres and *yamakas*. In both cases the subject is the description of mountain-scenery. And another canto, Kir. xv, Śís. xix, which gives the account of the battle, is nearly wholly devoted to mere verbal artifices, jingles of words and syllables, and the like puerilities which seem to have been mistaken for the highest proof of an author's command over the language. The order and distribution in the canto of the various artifices is very much the same in both poems, as will appear from the subjoined list.

Kirātârjuniya xv. 1, 3 *yamaka*; 5 *ekâksharapâda*; 7 *niraushṭhya*; 8, 10 *yamaka*; 12 *gomâtrikâ*; 14 *ekâkshara*; 16 *samudgaka*; 18 *pratilomânulomapâda*, 20 *pratilomânulomârdha*; 22, 23 *pratilomena śloka-dvayam*; 25 *sarvatabhadra*, 27 *ardhabhramaka*; 29 *niraushṭhya*; 31, 35, 37 *yamaka*; 38 *dvyakshara*; 42 *yamaka*; 45 *arthatrayavâchin*; 50 *ar-dhâvali*; 52 *mahâyamaka*.

Śisupâlavadha xix. 1 *yamaka*; 3 *ekâkshara*; 5, 7, 9 *yamaka*; 11 *niraushṭhya*; 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 *yamaka*; 27 *sarvatobhadra*; 29 *mura-jabandha*; 31 *yamaka*; 33, 34 *pratilomena śloka-dvayam*; 36, 38 *yamaka*;

40 *pratilomânulomapâda*; 42 *yamaka*; 44 *pratilomânulomârdha*, 46 *gomâtrikâ*; 48, 50, 52, 54, 56 *yamaka*; 58 *samudgaka*; 60, 62, 64 *yamaka*; 66 *dvyakshara*; 68 *asanyoga*; 70 *yamaka*; 72 *ardhabhramaka*; 74, 76, 78, 80, 82 *yamaka*; 84, 86 *dvyakshara*; 88 *gatapratyâgata*; 90 *pratilomenâyam evârthaḥ*; 92 *yamaka*; 94 *dvyakshara*; 96 *gûdhachaturtha*; 98, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108 *dvyakshara*; 110 *atâlavya*; 112 *yamaka*; 114 *ekâkshara*; 116 *arthatrayavâchin*; 118 *samudgaka*; 120 *chakrabandha*.

It will be seen from this list, that nearly every second verse of Bhâravi, and strictly every second verse of Mâgha contains some verbal artifice. The order of them, at the beginning of the canto, is the same in both poems: *yamaka*, *ekâksharapâda*, *nirauśṭhya*; and at the end the analogy again becomes apparent. To Bhâravi's *nirauśṭhya* corresponds Mâgha's *atâlavya*; to the former's *dvyakshara*, an *ekâkshara*, they coincide in the *arthatrayavâchin*, and then diverge from each other.

The last verse of each canto of the Kirâtârjuniya contains the word **बद्धी**, while in the Śisupâlavadhâ **श्री** appears instead. The use of such a *mark* is not peculiar to these two authors, for it seems to have been pretty common.¹ But it is scarcely a mere accident that one author should have selected a *synonym* for the mark chosen by the other. Lastly both poems begin with the word *śriyaḥ*; this fact unimportant in itself, becomes weighty if taken in connexion with those mentioned before.

III.

As I have indicated above, the agreement between the Kirâtârjuniya and the Śisupâlavadhâ suggests the idea that one poem served as the model for the other. Still another theory might be made to account for the facts just stated, viz that both poets belonged to the same school of poets. School, rightly analysed, means a *śâstra*

¹ Thus we find **अणुराय** in the Setubandha, **रत्न** in the Haravijaya, **हरचरणसरोज** in the Damayantîkathâ. See also Kâvyâdarśa i. 30.

and a *guru* or a succession of *gurus*. Now the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* provides no rules by which the mutual likeness of the two poems could be accounted for.

The part of the *guru* in the education of a poet would consist in his teaching those things which can be learnt only by practice, and in his modelling the style of the pupil. But in such points both poets can be proved to differ from each other. For as I have shown in the *Abhandlungen des v. Orientalisten-Congress*, p. 136 ff. and in *Indische Studien*, vol. 17, p. 444 ff. Māgha makes a frequent use of such metrical licences as are allowed, or connived at, by the authorities of the Śāstra, while Bhāravi strives to do without them. Metrical practice, certainly, would be characteristic of a school. As Māgha and Bhāravi differ in this regard, they cannot be considered to belong to the same school. Again Māgha's style differs from that of Bhāravi; the former is copious and sweet, the latter is concise and serene. Judging from the style alone, I should say that both poets did not come from the same part of India.

As the assumption, that Māgha and Bhāravi belonged to the same school, has proved untenable, we shall now examine our first explanation. If the one poem has served as the model for the other, we must be able to show which was the model, and which the copy. As both works, however, are equally excellent, the imitation is certainly not marked, as usual, by inferiority to the original. We must therefore assume, that the second poet whom for the reason just stated it would be unfair to call a mere imitator, tried to beat his predecessor on his own ground, and to eclipse him by equal or even greater achievements. Accordingly it will be now our task to show which of the two poets came first to the front, and who was the rival.

If we glance at the list of artificial verses given above, we see at once that Māgha beats Bhāravi; their number in the Śisupālavadha is double that in the Kirātārjuniya. Besides, Māgha strictly adheres to the rule that every second verse should contain a verbal artifice. Bhāravi on the other hand has attempted to impose upon himself the same restraint, but more than once he breaks from it. Lastly

Mâgha has a number of artifices which Bhâravi has not tried, see e. g. Śis. xix, 29. 68. 88. 90. 96. 110. 120.

The same superiority of Mâgha over Bhâravi in this kind of achievement again appears if we compare the corresponding cantos Kir. v and Śis. iv. Mâgha marks every third verse in that canto by a *yamaka*, while Bhâravi binds himself to no rule in inserting such verses, the number of which is only half that of Mâgha's. Another object of our poets in the cantos we are speaking of, is to show their proficiency in a variety of metres. Mâgha employs 23 different metres and distributes them so that every third verse from verse 19 down to the end of the canto is in the *Vasantatilakâ*, while Bhâravi employs only 14 different metres and distributes them without any rule in the corresponding canto. In another respect also Mâgha takes pains to prove his superior metrical skill by composing not only one whole canto in every metre which Bhâravi employed for the same purpose, but also five whole cantos respectively in the *Vasanlatilakâ*, *Mâlinî*, *Mañjubhâshiṇî*, *Ruchirâ* and *Rathoddhatâ* metres, which Bhâravi only occasionally uses for single verses.

We now turn to the treatment of those subjects or topics which should be contained in every *Mahākāvya* (*Kāvya-darśa* i, 14—19). They take up principally Sargas iv—ix of the *Kirâtârjuniya*, and Sargas iii—xii of the *Śisupâlavadha*. In the *Kirâtârjuniya* the erotic descriptions are at least adroitly made to subserve the general plan; for they impart to the reader a high opinion of the seductive charms of the nymphs. In remaining unmoved by these seducers, Arjuna's steadiness of purpose and his final triumph appear in a more forcible light. But in the *Śisupâlavadha* the erotic and some other descriptions contribute little to the design and idea of the subject; the reader may skip ten cantos of the poem without losing anything material to the story. These parts are awkwardly introduced by Mâgha with the apparent intention of proving that he was able to do them as well as, or still better than, his predecessor. All the scenes which Bhâravi had described, Mâgha paints again, more minutely and in more glowing colours. On such topics to which Bhâravi devotes but few verses,

Mâgha dwells *con amore*, e. g. the march, cantos III and XII, camp-life cant. V sunrise and morning cant. XI; in these parts Mâgha appears more powerful, or decidedly luckier, than in others, probably because the ground has not been occupied by his predecessor. Those subjects however which Bhâravi had treated before, do not seem exhausted to a fertile mind like that of Mâgha. He does not seem forced to rack his brains in any unusual way for new conceits; they flow profusely from that ever eddying fancy which is so strong a characteristic of the Hindu poet. Of course we should look in vain for *nothing but nature* in such parts; but that is also the case with older poets. When Kâlidâsa who is generally natural in his descriptions, has to describe e. g. female beauty (like that of Pârvatî in Kum. 1), he has recourse to quaint similes and far-fetched rhetorical figures. For that theme, beyond question, had been already worn out by his predecessors whose works are lost to us. And Śrîharsha is not only the last, but also the most fantastical and unnatural of all Mahâkavis. We know that he did not appear in the field but after the harvest had been gathered in.

IV.

If we consider the limited range of ideas which furnish the materials for Kâvyas, we should expect to meet the same conceit over and again in different works; and I do not doubt that most readers of Sanskrit poetry are under this impression. But if one reads the works of great poets with the intention of detecting borrowed ideas or stolen conceits, one is astonished at the very small number of actual borrowings. The reason why the poet avoided reproducing the ideas of their predecessors, is the same in India as elsewhere. For every candidate for fame has to force his way through a crowd of rivals, an Indian poet perhaps more than a common Paṇḍit. If he borrowed his conceits from well known authors, he was sure to be denounced as a plagiarist. For little Envy is always barking at Success, or as Mankha puts it, "those dogs of obtrectators at least

are good for one thing: they bark at the pilferers of poems who enter the poetical storehouse of others only in order to steal".¹

Nevertheless even the greatest poets were occasionally forced to take over thoughts from other writers. But if they did so, they always modified them, improving or expanding them, so that such borrowings were not exposed to the charge of plagiarism.

The following verses from the two poems will prove that the relation between Mâgha and Bhâravi is that which I have just endeavoured to describe. The conceits of Bhâravi will easily be recognised as the originals; but it is interesting to observe how they were altered and improved on by Mâgha. Thus we read Kir. vii. 36

आकीर्णं बलरजसा घनारुणेन प्रक्षोभिः सपदि तरङ्गितं तटेषु ।

मातङ्गोन्मथितसरोजरेणुपिङ्गं माञ्जिष्ठं वसनमिवाम्बु निर्वभासे ॥

"Covered by the dark brown dust of the marching troops, wavy near the banks through being disturbed, coloured red by the pollen of the lotuses shaken by elephants, the water shone like a cloth dyed with madder."

Śiś. v. 39 we have the following analogous description:

संसर्पिभिः पयसि गैरिकरेणुरागे-

रम्भोजगर्भरजसाङ्गनिषङ्गिणा च ।

क्रीडोपभोगमनुभूय सरिन्महेभा-

वन्योन्यवस्त्रपरिवर्तमिव व्यधत्ताम् ॥

"It seemed as if the river and the elephant, having amorously dallied together, had exchanged their clothes; for the water was red by the dissolving minium-paint of the elephant, and the elephant was covered by the pollen of the lotus."

Mâgha has apparently borrowed the comparison of water to a red cloth from Bhâravi; but he adds a *viśeṣha* by coupling it with the conceit of two lovers exchanging clothes. The case stands similar in the following verses. Kir. vi. 11:

¹ Srikanṭhacharita II, 22 :

एकः पुनर्दुर्जनसारमेयैर्धृतो गुणोयं परसूक्तिक्षोषम् ।

विविचितां लुण्ठयितुं भवन्ति यदयतः काव्यमलिस्त्रुचानाम् ॥

बहु बहिचन्द्रकनिभं विदधे धृतिमस्य दानपयसां पटलम् ।
अवगाढमीक्षितुमिवेभपतिं विकसद्विलोचनशतं सरितः ॥

"It gave him great pleasure to observe (diffused on the surface of the water) hundreds of drops of oily ichor, in form and colour resembling the moon-like dots on the peacock's tail, as if they were as many eyes opened by the river to watch the huge elephant diving into the stream."

Śiś. v. 40:

यां चन्द्रकैर्मदजलस्य महानदीनां
नेत्रत्रियं विकसतो विदधुर्गेजेन्द्राः ।
तां प्रत्यवापुरविलम्बितमुत्तरन्तो
धीताङ्गलम्पनवनीलपयोजपत्रैः ॥

"The stately elephants lent to the large streams beautiful eyes in the form of the moonlike dots, formed by the spreading liquid ichor, and emerging (from the water) they received in exchange from them other eyes in the form of lotus petals clinging to their now clean bodies."

Here Māgha again makes use of the idea of an exchange in order to improve on the original conceit of Bhâravi. He has recourse to a similar trick, in appropriating the idea in Kir. viii. 19:

व्यपोहितुं लोचनतो मुखानिलैरपारयन्तं किल पुष्पजं रजः ।
पयोधरेणोरसि काचिदुन्मनाः प्रियं जघानोन्नतपीवरस्तनी ॥

"The passionate one smote with her swelling breasts the chest of her lover who tried in vain to blow off with the breath of his mouth the pollen from her eye."

Śiś. vii. 57:

विनयति सुदृशो दृशः परागं प्रणयिनि कौसुममाननानिलेन ।
तदहितयुवतेरभीक्ष्णमच्छोर्द्वयमपि रोषरजोभिरापुपूरे ॥

"The lover in removing by the breath of his mouth the pollen from one eye of the fair-eyed one, filled again and again with the dust of jealous rage both eyes of a rival beauty."

The following case is also instructive. Bhāraṇi says Kir. viii. 35—36:

सरोजपत्रे नु विलीनषट्पदे विलोलदृष्टेः खिदमू विलोचने ।
 शिरोरुहाः खिन्नतपक्षसंततिर्द्विरेफवृन्दं नु निशब्दनिश्चलम् ॥
 आगूढहासस्फुटदन्तकेसर मुखं खिदेतद्विकसन्तु पङ्कजम् ।
 इति प्रलीनां नलिनीवने सखीं विदांबभूवुः सुचिरेण योषितः ॥

“Are these two lotus petals with a bee sitting on each, or are they the eyes of the coquettishly glancing (fair one)? Is this the hair of the bent-browed maiden, or is it a mutely hovering swarm of bees? Is that her face in which the stamina-like teeth appear at every gay laugh, or is it an opening lotus-flower? Such were the doubts of the women, but at last they recognised their friend in the forest of lotus-flowers.”

Māgha condenses the substance of these two verses in Śiś. viii, 29, but adds point to it:

किं तावत्सरसि सरोजमेतदारादाहोस्विच्छुखमवभासते युवत्याः ।
 संशय्य क्षणमिति निश्चिकाय कश्चिद्विद्वोर्कैर्वकसहवासिनां परोक्षैः ॥

“Doubting for a moment whether farther off in the lake he saw a lotus-flower or the face of a maiden, the youth recognised her by her coquettish graces: for they dwell not in the company of the egret.”

Kir. ix. 67:

रुन्धती नयनवाक्वविकाशं सादितोभयकरा परिरम्भे ।
 व्रीडितस्य ललितं युवतीनां क्षीबता बहुगुणैरनुजह्रे ॥

“Intoxication, hindering the free use of the girls’ eyes and speech, making both their hands to hang down in the embrace, thus imitated the effect of Modesty by many of its outward signs.”

Śiś. x. 30:

कुर्वती मुकुलिताक्षियुगानामङ्गसादमवसादितवाचाम् ।
 ईर्ष्येव हरता द्वियमासां तद्गुणः स्वयमकारि मदेन ॥

“Intoxication, rendering stiff the limbs of the girls whose eyes were closed, and whose words became indistinct, removed their Modesty, as if jealous of it, and put on Modesty’s appearance.”

Kir. ix. 35:

न स्रजो रत्नचिरे रमणीभ्यश्चन्दनानि विरहे मदिरा वा ।
साधनेषु हि रतेरुपधत्ते रम्यतां प्रियसमागम एव ॥

"The young women took no delight in wreaths nor in sandal nor in wine while their lovers were absent; for it is the meeting with them which makes pleasant the implements of pleasure."

Mâgha gives a different turn to this idea Śis. ix. 50:

न मनोरमास्त्रपि विशेषविदां निरचेष्ट योग्यमिदमेतदिति ।
गृहमेष्टति प्रियतमे सुदृशां वसनाङ्गरागसुमनःसु मनः ॥

"While expecting the visits of their lovers, the fair-eyed ones were unable to decide which of all their beautiful things, the clothes, the unguents, and the flowers, would suit them best, though they were fine judges of such things."

Here Mâgha has decidedly improved on the original. But he is not always equally happy in the changes which he introduces.

Kir. viii. 45:

परिस्फुरन्मीनविघट्टितोरवः सुराङ्गनास्त्रासविलोलदृष्टयः ।
उपाययुः कम्पितपाणिपल्लवाः सखीजनस्यापि विलोकनीयताम् ॥

"The (bathing) nymphs whose thighs were touched by the nimble fish, looked aghast and moved their slender hands: (thus) they offered a sight attractive even to their female companions."

Śis. viii. 24:

चञ्चलन्ती चलश्फरीविघट्टितोरुर्वामोरु रतिशयमाप विभ्रमस्य ।
बुभुधन्ति प्रसभमहो विनापि हेतोर्लीलाभिः किमु सति कारणे रमण्यः ॥

"Trembling when her thigh was touched by a nimble fish, the handsome-thighed maiden discovered extraordinary graces: without any ground, by mere coquetry, girls affect great fright indeed; and greater still is their fright, if there be a cause for it."

The reader will have remarked that Mâgha has taken over the phrase विघट्टितोरु from the original, as he has done with single words in some of the verses quoted above. But he tries to make up for

this loan by introducing a *śabdālamkāra*, the *Lātānuprāsa*, in *vāmora* at the same time showing his attention to niceties of grammar; for the latter word has a long *ū* according to Pāṇ iv, 1, 70, while the vowel in *vighaṭṭitoru* is short.¹

Māgha betrays the same ambition of dignifying his imitations from Bhāravi by verbal ornaments in some of the verses quoted above. Thus we find in the second pāda of the verse x. 30 the *Chhekānuprāsa*; the verse vii. 57 is remarkable for its *chheka*- and *vṛtti-anuprāsa*s; and the last pāda of the verse ix. 50 contains a *yamaka*.

However Māgha's imitations are sometimes of a different kind; he combines in one verse suggestions from two or more verses of Bhāravi, or amplifies and expands one conceit of his predecessor in two or more couplets of his own. Take for instance Kir. vii. 32 and 34:

आयस्तः सुरसरिदोघरुद्धवर्त्मा संप्राप्तं वनगजदानगन्धि रोधः ।

मूर्धानं निहितशिताङ्कुशं विधुन्वन्त्यन्तारं न विगण्यांचकार नागः ॥ ३२ ॥

"The elephant striving to get across the stream of heavenly Gangā, the opposite shore of which was fragrant with the ichor of wild elephants, shook his head under the sharp hook of the driver, and did not heed him."

अग्राय क्षणमतितृष्यतापि रोषादुत्तीरं निहितविवृत्तलोचनेन ।

संपृक्तं वनकरिणां मदाम्बुसेकैर्नाचेमे हिममपि वारि वारणेन ॥ ३४ ॥

"Smelling an instant at the water impregnated by the ichor of wild elephants, and glancing furiously with dilated eyes at the opposite bank, the elephant did not drink the cool liquid, thirsty as he was."

Māgha condenses the description of these scenes in one verse Śis. v. 33:

¹ The Calcutta edition samvat 1925, and the new Bombay edition (1888) have the long *u* also in the first compound. But this is a mistake (probably of the *editio princeps*). Mallinātha however must have found the first word spelt with a short *u* for he comments expressly on the long *u* of the *second* word only. Māgha was too well versed in grammar to commit such a blunder, and besides Bhāravi would have taught him how to spell the word.

नादातुमन्यकरिमुक्तमदाम्बुतित्तं
 धूताङ्कुशेन न विहातुमपीच्छताम्भः ।
 रुद्धे गजेन सरितः सरूषावतारे
 रिक्तोदपाचकरमास्य चिरं जनौघः ॥

"The furious elephant, who would not drink the water flavoured by the ichor of other elephants, nor leave it, shaking off the driver's hook, blocked up the passage to the river so that the people had to wait there with empty vessels in their hands."

But he works out the suggestions from Bhâravi's first stanza in two other verses v. 36, 41:

गण्डूषमुज्झितवता पयसः सरोषं
 नागेन लब्धपरवारणमारुतेन ।
 अम्भोधिरोधसि पृथुप्रतिमानभाग-
 रुद्धोरुदन्तमुसलप्रसरं निपेते ॥ ३६ ॥

"The elephant who, scenting a rival, squirted out the water he was drinking, fell down on the shore of the lake, cleaving the ground with his massive teeth up to their root."

प्रत्यन्यदन्ति निशिताङ्कुशदूरभिन्न-
 निर्याणनिर्यदसृजं चलितं निषादी ।
 रोहु महेभमपरिव्रट्टिमानमागा-
 दाक्रान्तितो न वशमेति महान्परस्य ॥ ४१ ॥

"The driver was unable to keep back the elephant turning on his rival, though he deeply pricked with his sharp hook the corner of the beast's eye so that the blood trickled down; for the mighty ones are not subdued by violence."

In such cases it may sometimes be doubtful whether Mâgha copied from Bhâravi or from nature. For we must always keep in mind that Mâgha is a poet of the very first order, who combines a vivid imagination with an acute observation of life. It would be to little purpose to give at length all passages in composing which Mâgha may be assumed to have had before his mind — in some cases I should

say before his eyes — the work of Bhâravi. I therefore conclude this paragraph with a list of parallel passages from those parts of both poems which treat of the same subjects — premising however that my list lays no claim to be considered complete. K. II, 59, Ś. II, 2, XIII, 61; K. VII, 36, Ś. V, 39; K. VI, 11, Ś. V, 40; K. VII, 31, Ś. V, 46; K. X, 20, Ś. VI, 33; K. X, 3, Ś. VII, 6; K. VIII, 16, Ś. VII, 40; K. VIII, 7, Ś. VII, 41; K. VIII, 19, Ś. VII, 57; K. VIII, 14, Ś. VII, 58; K. XIV, 32, Ś. VIII, 2; K. VIII, 29, Ś. VIII, 7, 8; K. VIII, 57, Ś. VIII, 9; K. VIII, 31, Ś. VIII, 12; K. VIII, 27, Ś. VIII, 14. K. VIII, 44, Ś. VIII, 16; K. VIII, 56, Ś. VIII, 18; K. VIII, 46, Ś. VIII, 20; K. VIII, 33, Ś. VIII, 22; K. VIII, 45, Ś. VIII, 24; K. VII, 37, Ś. VIII, 25; K. VIII, 33, Ś. VIII, 26; K. VIII, 35, 36, Ś. VIII, 29; K. VIII, 50, Ś. VIII, 36—38; K. VIII, 41, Ś. VIII, 41; K. VIII, 54, Ś. VIII, 43; K. VIII, 32, Ś. VIII, 47; K. VIII, 38, Ś. VIII, 50, 58; K. VIII, 39, Ś. VIII, 54; K. VIII, 52, Ś. VIII, 55; K. IX, 6, Ś. IX, 2, 5; K. IX, 2, Ś. IX, 8; K. IX, 16, Ś. IX, 16; K. IX, 11, Ś. IX, 19; K. IX, 15, Ś. IX, 19, 20; K. IX, 33, Ś. IX, 40; K. IX, 35, Ś. IX, 50; K. IX, 37, Ś. IX, 78; K. IX, 55, Ś. X, 7; K. IX, 57, Ś. X, 9; K. IX, 56, Ś. X, 11; K. IX, 68, Ś. X, 18, 29, 35; K. IX, 36, Ś. X, 20; K. IX, 70, Ś. X, 21, 28; K. IX, 60, Ś. X, 24; K. IX, 67, Ś. X, 30; K. IX, 52, 53, Ś. X, 34; K. IX, 52, Ś. X, 44; K. IX, 72, Ś. X, 72; K. IX, 48, Ś. X, 73.

V.

The facts we have been examining, permit us to consider Mâgha as the rival of Bhâravi, at least of Bhâravi's fame as the then most admired poet. I have reserved one argument for this proposition, an argument which at first sight will appear startling, but which will now, that the relation between the two poets has been made out, be admitted as rather probable. It is derived from the names of the poets themselves. Whatever may have been the original etymology of *Bhâravi*, that word naturally suggests some such meaning as 'the sun (*ravi*) of brilliancy' (*bhâs*). And *Mâgha*, which word does not occur again as a proper name and may therefore be a *nom de plume*, looks as if chosen by the rival of Bhâravi in order to proclaim his superiority

to him. For Mâgha, the month of January, certainly does deprive the sun of his rays.¹

Though it may be regarded as the principal ambition of Mâgha to prove himself the equal of Bhâravi he occasionally emulates also Kâlidâsa. The ninth canto of the Raghuvamśa contains 54 stanzas in the Drutavilambita metre, the last line of each stanza contains a *yamaka* (e. g. verse 1 *yamavatâmapavatâm cha dhuri sthitah*). Similarly the sixth canto of the Śisupâlavadha contains 66 stanzas, each adorned by the same kind of *yamaka*. This canto is devoted to the description of the seasons, and likewise the corresponding one of Kâlidâsa contains a long description of spring (24—48). The correspondence between these cantos can be traced farther; for in Ragh. v. 9 after those 54 stanzas in Drutavilambita follow 28 in 12 different metres, and in Śis. vi, thirteen stanzas in eight different metres; a greater variety of metres than usually exhibited at the end of cantos in both poems. As regards similarity of subjects (except those also contained in the Kir.) the end of Ragh. V. v compares with Śis. xii, and the latter part of Ragh. V. 13 with Śis. xiii.

It may be supposed that Mâgha vied also with other poets whose works are lost to us. I will mention only that Śis. xvi. 21—35 contains what is usually called a *durjananindâ*. This is a favourite topic with later poets, and is sometimes introduced at the beginning of some kâvyas e. g. of the Gauḍavaha, the Dharmasarmâbhyudaya, the Śrikanṭhacharita, the Vikramâūkacharita. From the quaintness of Mâgha's remarks on this head it is likely that many former poets had tried their ability on this inexhaustible subject.

¹ Compare the following couplet by Râja-ekkhara:

कृत्स्नप्रबोधकृद्वाणी भा रवेरिव भारवेः ।
माघेनेव च माघेन कम्पः कस्य न जायते ॥

and another couplet I dont know by whom:

माघेन विघ्नितोत्साहा नोत्सहन्ते पदक्रमे ।
स्मरन्तो भारवेरेव कवयः कपयो यथा ॥

I read स्मरन्तो instead of स्मरतो which the Subhâshitaratnabhândâgâra gives.

The construction we can put on the results of the foregoing discussion, would be the following. Mâgha endeavoured to force his claim to be acknowledged the greatest poet of his age, by contending with his most famous predecessors. His most arduous task which he seems to have had most at heart, was to outdo Bhâravi, who as may inferred, was at that time looked upon as the greatest poet lately risen to universal fame.

However it is obvious that Mâgha had still another end in view viz that of celebrating by his poem the glory of Vishṇu in the form of Kṛishṇa, while Bhâravi had sung the praises of Śiva. The religious, or rather sectarian tendency of the Kirâtâṛjuniya probably made this poem notwithstanding all its beauties and excellencies less acceptable to all those sects that did not acknowledge Śiva as the supreme deity. The Vishṇuites certainly must have felt jealous of the support which even poetry gave to the rival sect, and hence a zealous follower of their own sect, who was a favourite of Sarasvati, must have had a strong inducement to set up as a rival of Bhâravi.

Keeping in mind all that has been said before, we are now in a position fully to understand the meaning of the last verse in the Śisupâlavadha which runs thus:

श्रीशब्दरम्यकृतसर्गसमाप्तिस्तत्त्व

लक्ष्मीपतेश्चरितकीर्तनमात्रचार¹ ।

तस्यात्मजः सुकविकीर्तिदुराशयाद्:

काव्यं व्यधत्त शिशुपालवधाभिधानम् ॥

“(Dattaka’s) son, *ambitious to obtain the fame of an excellent poet*, composed this poem called Śisupâlavadha, embellished by the word Śrî at the end of every canto, which poem is solely commendable for its celebrating the deeds of the Lord of Lakshmi.”

¹ This is the reading of Vallabhadeva; the Calcutta edition has instead of मात्रचार the words चार माघः. The name of Mâgha need however not been expressly mentioned, as the poet has taken care to preserve it by the Chakrabandha at the end of canto 19.

VI.

The religious motive which actuated Mâgha, is such that it may have induced a poet of another sect to follow in the steps of Mâgha. If an imitator of Mâgha was not generally acknowledged as a Mahâkavi, he was pretty sure to be considered one by his own sect. Such an imitation of the Śiśupâlavadha has been produced by the Jainas. This is Harichandra's Dharmaśarmâbhyudaya, published in the Kâvyamâlâ. That Harichandra imitated Mâgha is evident from his slavishly copying part of the plan of his work. I here give the arguments of the parallel cantos in both works with such details as make the agreement appear still closer.

Śiś. iv and Dharm. x description of mountain scenery. Various metres, beginning with Upajâti. Every third verse contains a *yamaka*.

Śiś. v and Dharm. xi description of the seasons. Metre, Drutavilambita. Each verse contains a *yamaka*.

Śiś. vii and Dharm. xii. Gathering flowers.

Śiś. viii and Dharm. xiii. Bathing.

Śiś. ix and Dharm. xiv. Description of evening and night, moon-rise, the toilet of the ladies etc.

Śiś. x and Dharm. xv. Drinking and love making. Metre, Svâgata.

Śiś. xi and Dharm. xvi, 1—37. Description of morning.

Śiś. xii and Dharm. xvi rest. Arrival at the end of the journey.

Śiś. xix and Dharm. xix. Fighting. Metre, Anushtubh-śloka. Every second verse contains a verbal artifice most of which are common to both works. Mâgha gives his name and the title of his work in a Chakrabandha verse 120; Harichandra has produced three similar artificial verses for the same purpose.

Before I show in what way Harichandra borrowed from his model, it must be mentioned that he does not restrict his imitation to Mâgha. H. E. DR. VON BÖHLINGK has drawn my attention to Dharma. x. 42 as an imitation of Kirât. v. 7. In Dharma. iv, 59 a whole pâda from Kumâras. i. 31 is inserted; but this is rather a witty appropriation, or a travesty, of a passage supposed to be known to all, than

broad borrowing. But he chiefly draws his ideas from Māgha so that in reading the Dharm. one is constantly reminded of some passage in the Śiś. I shall give only a few instances from Dharm. xv subjoining to every verse of Harichandra's the original from the Śiś., so that the reader may easily form an opinion on the nature of the relation between the original and the imitation.

Dharm. xv. 50:

सीत्कृतानि कलहंसकनादः पाणिकङ्कणरणकृतमुच्चैः ।
ओष्ठखण्डनमनोभवसूत्रे भाष्यतां ययुरमूनि वधूनाम् ॥

Śiś. x. 75:

सीत्कृतानि मणितं करुणोक्तिः स्निग्धमुक्तमलमर्थवचांसि ।
हासभूषणरवाश्च रमण्याः कामसूत्रपदतामुपजग्मुः ॥

Dharm. xv. 41:

कुन्तलाञ्जनविचक्षणपाणिः प्रोन्नमथ्य वदनं वनितायाः ।
कोपि लोलरसनाञ्जललीलालालनाचतुरमोष्ठमधासीत् ॥

Śiś. x. 52:

ह्रीभरादवनतं परिरम्भे रागवानवटुजेष्ववकृथ ।
अर्पितोष्ठदलमाननपद्मं योषितो मुकुलिताक्षमधासीत् ॥

Dharm. xv. 42:

पीवरोच्चकुचतुम्बकचुम्बिन्यापुपोष कमितुः करदण्डे ।
वल्लकीत्वमनुताडिततन्वीक्वाणकूजितगुणेन पुरन्ध्री ॥

Śiś. x. 42:

आशु लङ्घितवतीष्टकराये नीविमर्धमुकुलीकृतदृष्ट्या ।
रक्तवैणिकहताधरतन्वीमण्डलक्वाणितचारु चुकूजे ॥¹

From these quotations which might easily be multiplied, it will be clear to what extent Harichandra may be called an imitator of Māgha. He certainly varies the ideas which he borrows, but the alterations do not lend to his verses the appearance of novelty; they therefore invariably fall short of the original. Yet it is but just to

¹ The same conceit has been imitated by Ratnākara, Haravijaya i. 9.

state that Harichandra is not a bad imitator, and that his work will have given delight to his readers. His ambition apparently was to provide the sect to which he belonged with a Mahākāvya, the subject of which was furnished by Jaina history, so that a staunch professor of that religion need not go beyond the pale of his community in quest of refined poetry.

Harichandra's time has not been made out as yet. Professor PETERSON, who has discovered the Dharmaśarmābhyudaya, intimates as his opinion, that the author is not identical with the Harichandra who is praised by Bāṇa.¹

This opinion is certainly correct. Harichandra is younger than Bāṇa by at least a century. For he imitates, to say the least, very closely some verses of Vākpati's Gauḍavaha. As the subject is of some interest, I shall confront some of them with Harichandra's imitations.

Gauḍavaha 220:

भीयपरित्ताणमद् पदस्रमसिणो तुहाधिरूढस ।

मखे सङ्काविहुरे ण वेरिवग्गे वि अवयासो ॥

"As thy sword had vowed to protect the terrified, it could not, I should say, show its valour even against thy enemies, for they too were trembling with fear."

Here is Harichandra's imitation, Dharm. II. 28, which is not much more than a translation of the Prākṛit verse into Sanskrit:

भयातुरत्ताणमथीमनारतं महाप्रतिज्ञामधिरूढवानिव ।

न भूरिशङ्काविधुरे रिपावपि क्वचित्तदीयासिरचेष्टताहितम् ॥

Gauḍavaha 221 runs thus:

कोऊहखेण आहवपलोद्भया गारवोप्पियकरेण ।

पट्ठीओ परामुट्ठा तुमाइ पणयाण वेरीण ॥

"Out of curiosity you (Yaśovarman) touched with your majestically applied hand the prostrate enemies' backs, on which you had looked in battle."

¹ See his Report for 1883—84, p. 77.

In Harichandra's imitation in Dharma. II. 8 the idea is more quaintly, but not better expressed than in the original:

वितीर्णमस्त्रभ्यमनेन संयुगे पुनः कुतो लब्धमिति व कौतुकात् ।
स कस्त्रं पृष्ठं न नतारिभूभुजः कराग्रसंस्पर्शमिषाद्वलोकयत् ॥

"He (the king) inspected, as it were, by the touch of his fingers the back of every prostrate hostile king, as if he wondered how they had *recovered* (the back) which they had *given* (i. e. shown) him in battle."

Gauḍavaha 101:

चलियमि जमि वियणाविहुयफणामण्डलो वि णो मुयइ ।
महिवेढं बलभरखुत्तरयणसंदाणियं सेसो ॥

"When (Yaśovarman) went to war, Śeṣha could not, though he shook in anguish his expanded hood, remove from his head the disc of the earth which firmly adhered to his head-jewels into which it had been driven by the pressure of (the king's) army."

Harichandra's version of this couplet is little more than an expansion of the original. I give therefore the text only. Dharm. II. 6:

तदा तदुत्तुङ्गतुरङ्गमक्रमप्रहारमज्जन्निशङ्कुसंहताम् ।
न भूरिबाधाविधुरोष्यपोहितुं प्रगल्भतेद्यापि महीमहीश्वरः ॥

I conclude these quotations with Gauḍ. 771:

आसखपिययमाहरघडन्तफुडदसणकिरणभावेण ।
जा मुहरसासवं पिव पिवन्ति लीलामुणालेहिं ॥

"Who (the maidens) seemed to sip the wine from (their lovers') mouth by means of playfully applied white lotus-fibres in the shape of rays proceeding from the teeth through the opened lips of their lovers who were close by."

Dharm. xv. 19:

कान्तकान्तदशनच्छददेशे लपदन्तमणिदीधितिरेका ।
आवभावपुपजेनेपि मृणालीनालकैरिव रसं प्रपिबन्ती ॥

"Notwithstanding the company there present, the maiden appeared to drink the liquor (out of her lover's mouth) by means of

canules of white lotus-fibres, for the rays of her jewel-like teeth fastened on the beautiful lips of her lover."

Compare also Gaud. 106 with Dharm. II. 22; Gaud. 102 with Dharm. II. 23; Gaud. 803 with Dharm. V. 32. These instances could no doubt be multiplied by a careful examination of both works. For our purpose we need no farther proof to show that Harichandra largely copied from Vâkpati. As Vâkpati flourished about the middle of the eighth century, Harichandra must be younger.

We need not wonder that Vâkpati was imitated by a poet who was fascinated by Mâgha. For Vâkpati is a first-rate poet, and would have been generally acknowledged as such, but for the language in which he composed his works. He got the title *Kavirâja* presumed from Yaśovarman; and I make no doubt that this author is meant by the Kavirâja who is mentioned by Vâmana (*Kâvyâl.* IV. 1. 10).¹ There is still less cause for wonder that Harichandra, a Jaina, should have imitated Vâkpati. For we know that the Jainas were given to studying the Gaudavaho.

After this digression we return now to our principal object.

VII.

I must now enter on the most difficult part of our subject, the question about the age of Bhâravi and Mâgha. As Bhâravi is wholly silent about himself, we must rely on other proofs for fixing the time in which he flourished. The Aihole inscription dated Śaka 556 or AD 634 mentions Bhâravi together with Kâlidâsa as famous poets.² Accordingly Bhâravi must be older than that date. A quotation from the *Kirâtârjunîya* (a pāda of XIII. 14) occurs in the *Kâśikâ* on Pāṇ. I. 3. 23,³ as Professor KIELHORN has pointed out. However this fact does not help us to advance beyond the conclusion derived from the poet's mention in the Aihole inscription.

¹ Suggested by Hâla 2?

² See *Ind. Ant.* VIII, 239.

³ See *Ind. Ant.* XIV, 327.

Māgha has appended to the Śīsupālavadha five stanzas, in which he gives his peṭṭigree. His grandfather Suprabhadeva was prime minister of a king, whose name is variously spelt as Varmalākhyā, Varmalāta, Varmanāma, Nirmalānta, Dharmanābha, Dharmadeva, or Dharmanātha;¹ of what country he was, we do not know. His father was Dattaka and bore a second name Sarvāśraya. Unfortunately this information does not enable us to fix the time of Māgha. Nor are the legends,² told in Vallāla's Bhojaprabandha and in Merutunga's Prabandhachintāmaṇi, of any use for chronological purposes. For they would make us believe that Māgha was a contemporary of king Bhoja of Dhārā who lived in the eleventh century. This is however a palpable anachronism. For passages from the Śīsupālavadha are already quoted in the Kāvyaśālikāra Vṛitti of Vāmana³ who must be referred to the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century. Māgha therefore must have lived before the ninth century. But from internal evidence, which is alone available in our case, he can be shown to be anterior to the seventh century. For Bāṇa and Subandhu have borrowed from Māgha as I shall now prove. DR. CARTELLIERI has shown that Bāṇa borrowed from Subandhu; it is therefore not unlikely that he should also have borrowed from Māgha. In a description of the moonrise, Kādambari, ed. Peterson, p. 160, 17—20 we read शनैः शनैश्चन्द्रदर्शनात्सुन्दरमन्दस्मिताया दशनप्रभेव ज्योत्स्ना निष्पतन्ती निशाया मुखशोभामकरोत् । तदनु रसातलादवनीमवदर्योन्नच्छता शेषफणमण्डलेनेव रजनीकरबिम्बेनाराजत रजनी ।

Compare Śīś. ix. 25—26:

वसुधान्तनिःसृतमिवाहिपतेः पटलं फणामणिसहस्ररुचाम् ।
स्फुरदंशुजालमथ शीतरुचः ककुभं समस्फुरत् माघवनीम् ॥
विशदप्रभापरिगतं विबभावुद्याचलव्यवहितेन्दुवपुः ।
मुखमप्रकाशदशनं शनैः सविलासहासमिव शक्रदिशः ॥

¹ See preface p. 4 of the new Bombay edition of the Śīś. by Durgāprasāda and Śivadatta.

² They are given at length in the preface of the new Bombay edition of the Śīś.

³ Śīś. i. 12, 25. x. 21. xiv. 14 in Kāvyaś. v. 1, 10; v. 2, 10; v. 1, 13; iv. 3, 8, respectively.

Bâṇa's description reads like a reminiscence from the Śiśupâla-vadha. That these passages are intimately connected is moreover proved by the fact that the two conceits immediately follow each other in both works though in an inverted order. The slight alteration in Bâṇa's second sentence was, I suppose, caused by his recollecting a similar passage and combining it or mixing it up in his memory with the above quoted verse. That passage, Śiś. iv. 1 runs thus:

निश्वासधूमं सह रत्नभाभिर्भित्त्वोत्थितं भूमिमिवोरगाणाम् ।

The words भित्त्वोत्थितं भूमिम correspond to Bâṇa's अवनीमवदार्यो-
न्नच्छता. This circumstance proves beyond doubt, I should think, that Bâṇa has borrowed from Mâgha.

I now turn to Subandhu, the celebrated predecessor of Bâṇa. I have noted the following passages which seem to be imitations from Mâgha. Subandhu in a lengthy description of the morning has the following conceit (p. 252 Calcutta edition): मत्संगतिप्रवृद्धो वारुणीसमा-
गमाद्विजपतिरेष पतिष्यतीति हसन्त्यामिवाखण्डलककुभि "when the (guardian nymph of the) Eastern region seemed to wear a bright smile, because she watched the Moon (her lover) who had brightened in her embrace, now sinking low through keeping company with (her rival the nymph of) the Western region". — The last words have a double meaning which may be rendered: the illustrious lord of the Brahmans (*dvijapati*) becoming an outcast by being addicted to liquor (*vârunî*). Compare Śiś. xi, 12:

उदयमुदितदीप्तिर्याति यः संगती मे
पतति न वरमिन्दुः सोपरामेष गत्वा ।
स्मितरुचिरिव सबः साभ्यसूयं प्रभेति
स्फुरति विशदभेषा पूर्वकाष्ठाङ्गनायाः ॥

"The light in the eastern sky becomes suddenly bright, as if the (guardian nymph) indignantly laughed at (her lover) the Moon who with splendour bright had attained eminence in her embrace, but who was now sinking low in going to her rival (or the West)."

The idea being exactly the same in both passages, it can be demonstrated that Subandhu borrowed from Mâgha, by an argument

which DR. CARTELLIERI has so successfully used in order to prove Bâṇa's posteriority to Subandhu, viz the circumstance, that the borrower not simply reproduced the original idea, but refined it by adding a subtle double meaning.

Another instance of borrowing is furnished by the following passage of the *Vāsavadattâ* p. 52, occurring in a description of the morning: नवनखपदसंसक्तकेशनिर्मोकवेदनाकृतसीत्कारनिर्गतदुग्धमुग्धदशन-किरणच्छटाधवलितभोगावासासु. "The sleeping rooms of the ladies were whitened by the mass of rays issuing from their milk-white teeth shown when they drew in their breath under the pain of detaching the hair which adhered to the fresh marks of (their lovers') nails."

Compare Śiś. XI, 54:

सरसनखपदान्तर्दृष्टकेशप्रमोकं
प्रणयिनि विदधाने योषितामुल्लसन्त्यः ।
विदधति दशनानां सीत्कृताविष्कृतानां
अभिनवरविभासः पद्मरागानुकारम् ॥

"The resplendent rays of the rising sun lend the colour of rubies to the ladies' teeth shown when they drew in their breath under the pain of the lover's detaching from the still wet marks of his nails the hair sticking to the wounds."

Subandhu has given to the idea expressed in Mâgha's verse a different turn in order that his borrowing may be concealed.

Our discussion has proved that Mâgha is anterior to Subandhu and Bâṇa. Bâṇa lived in the first half of the seventh century, he gives great praise to Subandhu who accordingly must be older, and belongs at least to the beginning of the seventh or the end of the sixth century. Now I think we may be pretty sure that Mâgha was dead when Subandhu wrote his *Vāsavadattâ*. For had Mâgha then be among the living, Subandhu who, as we have seen, knew the Śiśu-pâlavadhâ, could not have spoken of the contemporary poets in the contemptuous terms he uses in that wellknown verse which occurs in the poet's introduction to the *Vâvasavadattâ*:

सा रसवत्ता विहता नवका विलसन्ति चरति नो कं कः ।
सरसीव कीर्तिशेषं गतवति भुवि विक्रमादित्ये ॥

“The fullness of taste is gone, new makers of verses are thriving, every one attacks everybody else (or: the prowess has perished, paltry moderns disport themselves, and the strong devour the weak) now that Vikramāditya exists only in the memory of mankind, even as a lake whose water is gone, and in which no more the egret sports nor the heron strides about.”

Whatever may be thought of Vikramāditya whether Mâgha lived at his court or not, thus much is certain that a poet who fully deserved universal fame, could not be ranked among the *navakâh*. We therefore cannot place Mâgha later than about the middle of the sixth century; and Bhâravi who is older than Mâgha by at least a few decades, about the beginning of the sixth century.

It should however be kept in mind that these calculations do not fix the time at which these authors lived, but the limit after which they cannot be placed.

VIII.

In concluding this discussion I make bold to hazard a few remarks on the tradition about Mâgha's personal history. Merutuṅga, besides enlarging on Mâgha's connection with king Bhoja, relates that he began as a rich man, but lavishing all his money on the needy, ended poor. This story is supported by some facts which can be gathered from the poet's own Praśasti. His family apparently was noble and wealthy. For we learn from verses 1—2 of the Praśasti that his grandfather Suprabhaddeva was prime minister to some king, a situation which in India generally brings much money to its owner. Whether Suprabhaddeva's son, Dattaka, continued in office or not, cannot be made out with certainty from verses 3—4. But from the name Sarvâśraya 'the asylum of all' which the people gave him, and from the praise bestowed on him by his son, we may conclude that he exercised no small influence over his countrymen, which presup-

poses great riches to back it. His son, our poet, does not mention any patron of his. Accordingly we may infer that he lived as an independent gentleman of easy means, since he came from a wealthy family. But as an opulent poet courting universal fame, will be courted by greedy flatterers, and as Mâgha seems to have lived fast (for he describes the pleasures of life apparently as one who did know them not merely from books) we may credit him with having run through his fortune and having at last landed in indigence, as both versions of the legend relate. I am further inclined to give credence to the tradition that Mâgha was a native of Gujarât; for as such he would be familiar with the western ocean and with mount Gîrnâr, which are described in the third and fourth cantos of the Śîśupâlavadha.

I intend continuing this inquiry regarding the earliest Mahâkavyas in some later number. The results of this discussion will, I trust, serve as a sound basis for my future researches.
