

Ānandavardhana and the date of Māgha.

By

Hermann Jacobi.

In his paper on the date of the poet Māgha (*ante* p. 61 ff.) DR. JOH. KLATT has brought forward a Jaina legend from the Prabhâvakacharitra which makes Māgha a cousin of the Jaina ascetic Siddharshi who composed the Upamitabhavaprapaûchâ kathâ in A. D. 906. If this legend were historically true, Vâmana and Ānandavardhana who quote verses from the Śīsupâlavadha, must be younger than Māgha, and granting the correctness of the Jaina chronology, later than the end of the ninth century. On the other hand Kalhana states in the Rajataranginî 5, 39¹ that Ānandavardhana became famous in the reign of Avantivarman of Kaśmir (855—884 AD). It is evident that these statements cannot be reconciled, and the question to be settled is, which of them deserves greater credit.

I.

The trustworthiness of the Jaina legend can be impugned on general grounds only. First, it may be said that the story of Siddha, as given in the Prabhâvakacharitra, is composed mainly of legendary matter, taken partly from the older legend about the origin of the Digambara sect (*ante*, p. 64, note 1). And it will not be safe to place implicit trust in what a legend asserts about the relations of its hero, if the other details are unmistakably a got up story. Secondly we

have a fine example of the historical character of the Prabhāvaka-charitra in the story of Bappabhaṭṭi in which that saint is made to convert, (as Mr. PANDIT puts it *Gauḍavaho*, introd. cxix) 'every renowned king, every famous poet, and every learned scholar to Jainism'. In our case, I think, the fact or tradition that Siddha was a native of Bhillamāla, would have been a sufficient inducement for the Jaina legend-mongers to make him a relation of the famous poet whom common tradition connects with that town. Yet, however little value we are inclined to attach to the legendary tradition of the Jainas, still we are not entitled to put aside, on such general grounds only, every statement of theirs the acceptance of which may be inconvenient.

On the other hand, Kalhaṇa's account of the events of the period, we are speaking of, is admitted to be generally correct, though few will go with Mr. PANDIT so far as to insist on the correctness of every detail. Notwithstanding the good opinion we have of Kalhaṇa as an historian of the centuries immediately preceding his own time, we certainly must withhold credence from such of his statements as can be proved to be open to doubt. And this has been done by Professor PISCHEL with respect to Kalhaṇa's date of Ânandavardhana (see his edition of *Rudraṭa's Ṛṅgāratilaka* introd. p. 22). His argument is as follows. In his commentary on Ânandhavardhana's Dhvanyāloka Abhinavagupta refers to that author as *asmadguravaḥ* and *asmadupādhyāyaḥ*. If this is to be taken literally, Ânandavardhana must have been at least half a century later than Kalhaṇa states. For Ânandavardhana cannot have become famous in Avantivarman's reign, if he was the teacher of Abhinavagupta who wrote just before and after the year 1000 A. D. The question, therefore, which we must decide, comes to this whether we must take Abhinavagupta's words in their literal sense, or have to interpret them in some other way. For Prof. PISCHEL himself implicitly admits that they may also be taken not literally. I shall endeavour to prove that the latter view of the case is the correct one.

On p. 40 of the edition of the Dvanyāloka in the Kāvya-mālā, Abhinavagupta quotes a lengthy passage by *vivaraṇakṛit*, apparently

a commentator on the Dhvanyâloka, and dismisses the learned discussions of his predecessor with the courteous remark: *ity alaṃ gardabhîdohânuvartanena* "let us have done with milking the she-ass". Hindu commentators are always apt to acknowledge in this way their obligations to the works of their predecessors. In other places also Abhinavagupta seems to refer to older commentaries. Thus in commenting on the verse, quoted by Ânandavardhana (see PISCHEL *loc. cit.* p. 23) he says that the verse is by Manoratha, a poet contemporary with Ânandavardhana, and then refutes an artificial interpretation, which 'kechit' give of the word *vakroktiśūnya* in that verse. In the same way, he quotes an interpretation by *anye* of a Prākṛit verse p. 22 (Kāvya-mâlâ), and on p. 45 he refers to *anyakṛitâ vyākhyâḥ* of the same verse. On p. 99 he cites the discussions by *kechit*, *anye*, *eke* and *itare* of a passage, quoted by Ânandavardhana from the Harshacharita. These explanations apparently occurred, not in commentaries on the Harshacharita, but in works on Alaṃkāra. For they discuss how in that passage the *śabdaśakti* comes to suggest another *alaṃkāra*. Most probably Abhinavagupta found those lucubrations in older commentaries on the Dhvanyâloka. The verse '*jyotsnâpûra*' (p. 110) which '*kechid udâharaṇam atra paṭhanti*', seems to have been derived from the same source.

If Abhinavagupta had been instructed by Ânandavardhana, he certainly would have mentioned him, not Bhāṭṭendurāja,¹ in the introductory verse to his gloss. For, that would have been the most effective credentials to prove himself a competent interpreter of Ânandavardhana's work. Either Bhāṭṭa-Indurāja or Bhāṭṭa-Tauta (whom he acknowledges as *asmadupādhyāya* on p. 29) is meant by *asmad-guravaḥ* whose rather subtle than adequate interpretation of Ânandavardhana's introductory verse is referred to on p. 2. These facts prove that Abhinavagupta did not enjoy the personal instruction of Ânandavardhana. For they show that one or even more commentaries on the Dhvanyâloka existed already in his time, and that he does not name Ânandavardhana as his *guru* on that occasion where

¹ He quotes a verse by Bhāṭṭendurāja, p. 25, *yad viśramya* etc.

he ought to have done so. Consequently, wherever the words *asmad-guravaḥ* and *asmadupādyaḥ* refer to Ânandavardhana, they must be taken metaphorically as denoting the *paramparâguru*. As thus the ground for doubting the accuracy of Kalhaṇa's statement has been removed, we are entitled to give it full credit.

Whether Kalhaṇa is right in saying that Manoratha was among the poets of Jayâpīḍa's court (PISCHEL, *loc. cit.*), or Abhinavagupta, in stating that he was the contemporary of Ânandavardhana, we have no means of deciding. But perhaps the one statement may be reconciled with the other in the following way. The interval between the end of Jayâpīḍa's reign and the beginning of that of Avantivarman is forty years. Now Kalhaṇa says that, Mukṭâkaṇa, Śivasvâmin, Ânandavardhana, and Ratnâkara became famous (*prathâm agât*) in Avantivarman's reign. This may be understood, as in Ratnâkara's case it must be understood, to mean that Ânandavardhana commenced his career as an author before Avantivarman succeeded to the throne, but that the unsettled times of civil wars which preceded that reign prevented the writer becoming generally known. Ânandavardhana may therefore have been an aged scholar, when Avantivarman began to rule; and Manoratha probably was an old man, when Ânandavardhana wrote the *Dhvanyâlôka*. For unless Manoratha's authority in *Alaṃkāra* was generally admitted, Ânandavardhana would not have quoted one of Manoratha's verses in support of his own views. It is thus just possible that Ânandavardhana, when a young man, saw Manoratha, and that he lived to be patronised by Avantivarman. At any rate, Ânandavardhana lived about the middle of the ninth century and Vâmana, whose tenets are said by Abhinavagupta to have been taken into account by Ânandavardhana, not earlier than the first quarter of the same century. Accordingly, Mâgha who is quoted by both, cannot, be later than the eighth century.

II.

At the same conclusion we arrive by a different line of argument. As Ânandavardhana quotes from the *Śiṣupâlavadhâ*, his contem-

porary Ratnākara must also have known that poem. It may, therefore, be expected that the influence of Māgha's poetry can be traced in Ratnākara's Haravijaya. And indeed, we need but attentively compare such parts of the Śīsupālavadha and the Haravijaya as treat of the same topics, in order to show in the latter poem unmistakable borrowings from Māgha. I select quite at random the gathering of flowers, described in the Sarga vii of the Śīsupālavadha and in Sarga xvii of the Haravijaya. I place such verses as contain the same conceit, side by side, and italicise like words and phrases in them. The translations, which I subjoin are sometimes but paraphrases of the text, especially when the latter contains intentionally ambiguous words.

Māgha vii, 27: —

upavanapavanānupātadakshair
alībhir alambhi yad aṅganāgaṇasya |
parimalavishayas, tad unnatānām
anugamane khalu sampadogrataḥsthāḥ ||

Ratnākara xvii, 34: —

anvīye madhukaramaṇḍalena tavad
saṁsarpann upavanamārutaḥ sugandhiḥ |
yāvat strīparimalagocharo na lebhe
ko nādyam tyajati padaṁ viśeshalābhāt ||

(Māgha): 'The bees, adroit in following the garden's breeze, enjoyed the voluptuous fragrance emanating from the girls; this proves that fortune is at hand for those who follow the great'.

(Ratnākara): 'The swarm of bees followed the garden's fragrant breeze till it came within reach of the girls' voluptuous fragrance; who will not leave his first place if he can get a better?' Compare also Śīś 8, 10. Mallinātha explains *vishaya* by *bhogyārtha*, but Ratnākara paraphrases it by *gochara*.

Māgha vii, 29: —

abhimukhapatītair guṇaprakarśād
avajitam uddhatim ujjvalām dadhānaiḥ |
tarukisalayaajālam agrahastaiḥ
prasabham anīyata bhaṅgam aṅganānām ||

Ratnākara xvii, 52: —

bībhṛṇair adbhikaguṇatvam aṅganānām
hastāgraiḥ prasabham akāri pallavānām |
pratyagrojjvalanijaśobhayā sarāgair
bhagnānām api punarukta eva bhaṅgaḥ ||

(Māgha): 'The girls' beautifully raised (proud) fingers, approaching the twigs of the trees, vanquished them by their superior beauty and (then) violently broke (crushed) them'.

(Ratnākara): 'The girls' red fingers possessing superiority, violently broke the twigs a second time, for they were already broken (vanquished) by the fingers' very excellent beauty.'

In Māgha's verse the second meaning is delicately expressed, while Ratnākara by attempting a broad pun destroys what charms the original conceit possesses.

Māgha VII, 61: —

avacitakusumā vihāya vallir
y^uvativishu komalamālyamālinishu |
padam upadadhire kulāny alinām
na parichayo malinātmanām pradhānam ||

Ratnākara XVII, 57: —

bhagnānām agañitatadvipattidoshair
vallinām madhu kusumeshv apāyi bhrū-
gaiḥ |
yuktānām taralatayā malimasānām
na svārthāt kvacid atirichyatenurodhah ||

(Māgha): 'The swarms of bees, leaving the creepers deprived of their flowers, settled on the girls who wore delicate wreaths; for the black (bad) ones make light of long acquaintance.'

(Ratnākara): The bees drank the honey of the broken creepers not minding their distress; the black (bad) ones, who are fluttering, set their gain above respect.

Ratnākara has slightly altered the idea expressed by Māgha, but it is evident that he borrowed it from the latter. In Māgha's verse the girls wear the flowers of the creepers on their heads. Ratnākara does not mention the girls, but we must assume that the girls broke the creepers, and that the broken creepers were placed on the heads of the girls. — There are many cases of a like description, but in which the imitation is less apparent, because Ratnākara frequently combines in one verse hints taken from several verses of Māgha. I shall here restrict myself to cases of obvious borrowing.

Māgha VII, 60: —

avajitam adhunā tavāham akshṇo
ruchiratayety avanamya lajjaye va |
śravaṇakuvalayaṃ vilāsavatyā
bhramararutairupakarṇamāchachakshe ||

Ratnākara XVII, 64: —

na śreyān samam adhikaśriyā virodho
yuktā 'tra prapātir itī 'va pīvarorvāḥ |
uttamśotpalam avanamya dūram akshṇaḥ
prastāvīt stavam iva chañcharīkaśabdaiḥ ||

(Mâgha): 'The lotus which the girl had stuck behind her ear bowed down, as if ashamed, and by the humming of the bees whispered in her ear: 'Now you have vanquished me by the beauty of your eye.'

(Ratnâkara): 'Thinking it better to bend down than to quarrel with one of greater lustre, the lotus stuck behind the girl's ear bowed low and began to praise her eye by the humming of the bees.'

Mâgha VII, 59: —

asmadanam avatamsitedhikarṇam
praṇayavatâ kusume sumadhyamâyâḥ |

vrajad api laghutâm babhûva bhâraḥ
sapadi hiraṇmayamaṇḍanam sapatnyâḥ ||

Ratnâkara XVII, 68: —

naikatra śravasi tathâ sahematâḍi -
tâṭaṅkepy akṛita vadhûḥ prasâdhit
sthâm |

anyatra priyakarakṛiṣṭhâlabapâli -
vinyastachchhadasubhage yathâbhyan
tram ||

(Mâgha): 'When the lover tenderly fixed a flower behind the slender waisted girl's ear, her rival's golden earring, though being made light of, became at once a burden.'

(Ratnâkara): The girl thought the one ear which was adorned by a golden earring, less ornamented than the other in which her lover, pulling down the long tip, had stuck a leaf before the eyes of her rival.

Query. Has it ever been the custom for Hindu girls to wear an earring only in one ear? Or has Ratnâkara been led to this untrue and unnatural description by his intention to vary Mâgha's conceit?

Mâgha VII, 57: —

vinayati sudṛiṣo dṛiṣaḥ parâgam
praṇayini kausumam ânanânîlena |
tadahitayuvateḥ abhikṣhṇam akṣhṇor
dvayam api rosharajobhir âpupûre ||

Ratnâkara XVII: —

kântâyâḥ kusumaraḥ vilochanastham
yat preyân vadanasaṁrâṇair nîrâsthat
tenaiva pratiyuvateḥ saṁipabhâjah
kâlushyam yugalamanâyi dûram akṣhṇor

(Mâgha): '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.'

(Ratnākara): 'The pollen, which sticking to the eye of the fair one was blown off by her lover with the breath of his mouth, darkened very much both eyes of a rival beauty standing close by.'

Ratnākara's imitation is decidedly a failure. The antithesis between the one eye of the girl and the two eyes of her rival, an antithesis which is evidently intended and which is essential to the point, has been deficiently worked out by him. For *vilochanastham* may mean *vilochane tishṭhati* and *vilochanayos tishṭhati*. — The last part of his verse Ratnākara has nearly *verbo tenus* taken over from Śiś. xvii, 38 *tair eva pratiyuvater akāri dūrāt, kālushyam*.

In the following pāda we have an unmistakable borrowing though in the rest of the verse the likeness ceases:

Māgha vii, 72: —

Ratnākara xvii, 84: —

mṛiducharanatalāgraduṣṭhītatvād

smerānyā mṛiducharanāgradurnivishṭā.

I give one more example from another sarga.

Māgha xiv, 68: —

Ratnākara xvi, 73: —

matkuṇāv iva purā pariplavau
sindhunāthaśayane nisheduṣaḥ |
gachchhataḥ sma Madhu-Kaiṭabhou
vibhor

yasyādhivârinidhikharvita-Śesha-bhoga
śayyânirgala vivartanavibhramaśriḥ |
helâvinirmṛiditaṣoṇitapaṅkagarbha -

yasya naidrasukhavighnatâp kṣaṇam ||

dûrâvamagna-Madhu-Kaitabha-ṭiṭṭibhâ-
sīt ||

(Māgha): 'Madhu and Kaiṭabha, like two nimble bugs, disturbed only for a moment the pleasant sleep of the Lord reclining on his ocean-bed.'

(Ratnākara): 'Who when violently tossing in the ocean on his bed, the coiled up body of Śesha, crushed in sport Madhu and Kaiṭabha like two bugs, deeply immersing them in a quagmire of blood.'

Māgha's simile is quaint, yet not unpleasant; the imitation becomes repulsive by the working out of the details.

On considering the verses of Ratnākara, confronted by me with those of Māgha, nobody will fail to see that the former bear the characteristic marks of imitations. But students familiar with classical

Sanskrit poetry will scarcely need such proofs. For the perusal of a few cantos of the *Haravijaya* will convince them that Ratnākara's muse belongs to a later phase in the developement of classical Sanskrit poetry than that of Mâgha. Mâgha belongs to the Golden age of classical Sanskrit literature, Ratnākara to the Silver age. It is evident from the facts brought forward that already in Ratnākara's time the study of Mâgha's classical poem formed an indispensable part of the training through which every aspirant to the fame of a *Kavi* had to pass, just as was the case in much later times. A long interval of time must intervene between Mâgha and Ratnākara, the exact length of which we are unable to make out at present.

To sum up the results of our inquiry, it has been proved that Mâgha

1. being quoted by Ânandavardhana, must be earlier than the middle of the ninth century,

2. being quoted by Vâmana, must be still earlier by at least one generation, if Abhinavagupta is right in asserting that Ânandavardhana was acquainted with the work of Vâmana;

3. being imitated by Ratnākara, the court poet of Bâlabrihaspati or Chippaṭa-Jayâpîḍa of Kaśmir (835—847 A. D.), must have been earlier than the beginning of the ninth century.

The preceding discussion has deprived the Jaina tradition regarding Mâgha of all the historical interest which Dr. JOH. KLATT seems inclined to claim for it. The only interest left to it is, that it is a further instance of the well-known tendency of the Jainas to connect in one way or other, on the slightest possible pretext, every Indian celebrity with the history of their creed.
