

SHETH SHRI KASTURBHAI LALBHAI
BIRTH CENTENARY MEMORIAL LECTURES

THE LOST SANSKRIT DRAMĀ

PUSPADUṢITAKA

AND THE STORY OF

NANDAYANTĪ

IN THE JAIN TRADITION

Dr. H. C. BHAYANI



L. D. INSTITUTE OF INDOLOGY

1994

Puṣpadūṣitaka, a lost Sanskrit drama of the Prakaraṇa-type, has been discussed and appreciated by several leading critics, classical and modern. Because of the meagreness of the available information, several key-points in its plot and motivations behind some actions remained obscure, forcing modern scholars to make speculations. The story of *Sagaradatta* and *Nandayanti*, preserved in Jain narrative literature, based as it is on the same plot, but which so far escaped attention of scholars, is shown to be helpful in solving several problems and clarifying a number of issues. Incidentally the value of Jain sources for filling up gaps in the history of Classical literature is stressed by pointing out some similar instances.

PREFACE

Several basic contributions of the Late Sheth Shri Kasturbhai Lalbhai to the numerous aspects of the present day cultural life of Gujarat are wellknown. Especially he made pioneering efforts for establishing various educational and academic Institutions in Ahmedabad, among which the L. D. Institute of Indology established in 1956 has won international recognition as a leading research Institution.

The current Year is the Birth Centenary Year of Sheth Shri Kasturbhai Lalbhai and to honour his memory we have planned to arrange a number of memorial lectures by some leading scholars and eminent literateurs. The present lecture is the first in the series. We are thankful to Dr. H. C. Bhayani for readily accepting our invitation.

Ahmedabad
15th February 1994

UJAMSHI KAPADIA
Co-ordinator

**THE STORY OF NANDAYANTĪ IN THE JAIN TRADITION
AND
THE LOST SANSKRIT DRAMA PUṢPADUṢITAKA**

The Śīlopadeśamālā, containing a total of 114 Gāthā verses, is a Jainistic didactic - religious tract in Prakrit, preaching the virtues of observing chastity (Śīla). It was written by Jayakīrti probably in the ninth century A. C. It gives a list of 23 men and 20 women of legend who were instructive instances of chaste or unchaste conduct. In the catalogue of chaste women, Gāthā no. 56 lists the names of Śīlavatī, Nandayantī, Manoramā and Rohiṇī as famous Mahāsatis.

Somatilaka-sūri alias Vidyātilaka-sūri wrote a Sanskrit commentary on the Śīlopadeśamālā, called Śīlataṅgiṇī, wherein he has given the stories of all the persons named in the former. The story of Nandayantī (pp. 434 to 441) is summarised below.

In Potanapura, ruled over by King Naravikrama, lived the merchant Sāgarapota. His son Samudradatta was married to Nandayantī, the daughter of the merchant Nāgadatta of Sopārapura. Once Samudradatta expressed to his father his desire to visit other countries and earn wealth through his own endeavour. Getting the latter's approval Samudradatta made preparations for a sea-voyage, and loaded his ship with merchandise. On the point of departure he conveyed to his friend Sahadeva, how he felt sorry that although he took leave of all the relatives, he could not meet Nandayantī because she was in menses. Sahadeva assured him he would take care of the last stage of preparations. Samudradatta secretly returned at night from the sea beach and proceeded towards his residence, driven by love for his

dear wife. He reached the door of the residence which was being guarded by the door-keeper Sūrapāla. Samudradatta gave him his jewelled ring as a gift and told him not to tell anybody about his present visit. Reaching his own apartment he saw through latticed window Nandayantī sleeplessly and restlessly wallowing in her bed. Hoping to get some relief from the grief of separation from her husband, she got up, went to the flower - garden attached to the house and lay down on a stone-slab cool under moonlight. But failing to get any relief and feeling aggrieved because Samudradatta did not care to see her before departure, she desperately took off her upper garment, tied it on the branch of a tree and was on the point of hanging herself, when Samudradatta, who was watching her behaviour throughout rushed and rescued her. Overpowered with love he enjoyed her and left. Reaching sea-shore he immediately started on his voyage.

A period of three months lapsed thereafter, when signs of Nandayantī's pregnancy showed up. Her father-in-law suspected her of unchastity, which he felt to be a blot on his illustrious family. He commissioned a man called Niṣkaruṇa, who took Nandayantī to woods and abandoned her. Shocked by this quite unextracted cruel treatment, Nandayantī made several attempts to commit suicide in various ways, but every time she was saved by Divinity on account of the power of her chastity. Niṣkaruṇa, who watched her behaviour from hiding returned and reported to Sāgarapota, vouching about Nandayantī's chastity. In the meanwhile Nandayantī wandering alone and miserably in the woods was seen by King Padma of Bhṛgukaccha, who was out on a hunting expedition. He welcomed Nandayantī with brotherly spirit, and took her with him to his capital,

where she was put in charge of the almshouse, daily distributing food to the needy.

Prior to Nandayantī's accusation and banishment, Sāgarapota had despatched Sūrapāla, the doorkeeper, on a mission to Nandayantī's father Nāgadatta at Sopārapura. He returned after long, and enquired about Nandayantī for whom he had brought presents from her father. When Sāgarapota told him about her illicit pregnancy and subsequent banishment, Sūrapāla reported how Samudradatta had secretly visited her at night previous to his departure on the voyage. He showed to Sāgarapota the fingerring that Samudradatta had given him at that time, binding him with an oath not to say anything to anybody about that visit.

Now becoming convinced about Nandayantī's chastity, and innocence Sāgarapota felt deep remorse for treating her unjustly, and to expiate for this sin he left on pilgrimage.

At that juncture Samudradatta returned from a successful voyage. Learning about Nandayantī's fate during his absence, he immediately left in search of her, disguising himself and taking a few servants with him. As they wandered over towns, cities, settlements and woodlands, they exhausted their provisions, and the servants left him. Continuing alone his search for Nandayantī for a long time, Samudradatta, wan and exhausted, reached Bhṛgupura. He went to the almshouse where Nandayantī habitually distributed food. Both happily recognized each other. The king welcomed Samudradatta and arranged for his medical treatment. Shortly Sāgarapota and Sūrapāla also arrived there. All were united happily.

Another version of the story of Nandayantī is found in

Śubhaśīla's Bharateśvara-bāhubalivṛtti (1453 A. C.) (folios 149 b to 151 a). There also it is used to illustrate the virtues of chastity. It is however to be noted that the name of Nandayantī is absent from the list of Mahāsatīs given in the original anonymous Bharahesara-bāhubali-sajjhāya, on which Śubhaśīla's work under reference is a commentary. Śubhaśīla expressly says that he is giving some additional biographies of the Mahāsatīs not included in the Sajjhāya list (See his remark on p. 142 a, last line). This version is, however, just a prose recast, somewhat abridged, of the verse-text of Somatilaka. Śubhaśīla has affected some changes on his own, it seems. Samudradatta plans to go on the voyage clandestinely against his father's wishes. He secretly returns before his departure to find out how Nandayantī feels and behaves after he has left, and with that purpose he spies on her. The doorkeeper is omitted altogether. After rescuing and sexually enjoying Nandayantī, Samudradatta leaves immediately, forbidding her not to tell anybody about his secret visit to her. The incidents of Nandayantī's divine rescues in the wood from attempted suicides are absent. When Samudradatta reaches Bhṛgupura and sees and recognizes Nandayantī he first tries to ascertain whether the latter had remained chaste during her banishment, and for that purpose he carries out a plan to tempt her to violate her chastity. Finding that she remains firm he reveals himself and accepts her. These are patently secondary modifications which have spoiled human interest and narrative logic of the original and made the version considerably inferior.

The Puṣpadūṣitaka

A Prakaraṇa type of Sanskrit Rūpaka called Puṣpadūṣitaka (or in some source, Puṣpabhūṣitaka) has been critically noticed or cited by some leading authorities on Poetics and Drama : Dhanika, Kuntaka, Abhinavagupta, Sāgaranandin, Rāmacandra - Guṇacandra, Viśvañatha. This shows that, that drama was highly prized by the critics. Unfortunately the work is lost to us. The following information we can derive about it from the Avaloka, the Vakroktijīva (VJ.), the Abhinavabhāratī, the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa (NLR.) and the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND.).

The Puṣpadūṣitaka (= Pd.) was a Prakaraṇa type of Rūpaka in Sanskrit. There are two main varieties of Prakaraṇa : Śuddha, with Kulajā Nāyikā; Sāṃkīrṇa, with Vārāṅganā as the Nāyikā. But according to Abhinavagupta the characterization of the Kūlāṅganā would be such that she comes to be wrongly considered for sometime as Mandakulā, as in Pd. The Nāyaka of Pd. is a merchant. Pd. has six Acts. VJ. informs us about some connected incidents in each of the successive Acts, but as it has been done by Kuntaka with specific aims, the outline cannot give us a complete idea of the plot. Some details, available from the above-noted other sources, can supplement a bit, but there remain a few obscure, key-points, some tantalizing gaps, to clarify and fill up which modern scholars have had to resort to surmises.

We can piece together the outline of the plot of Pd. with the help of the Nandayantī - Kathā as follows :

Sāgaradatta was the head of a merchant-guild. His son Samudradatta, once decides to go on a long voyage for

trading. He leaves his residence and reaches sea-coast in the evening from where the ship is to sail the next day morning. Before leaving he could not properly take leave of this dear wife Nandayantī, the daughter of the merchant Vijayadatta of Mathurā (?), at the moment of his departure, because she was in her menstureal period (?). This was the first occasion after his marriage when he was being separated from her for long. On the sea-coast where he is to spend the night he finds unbearable the pangs of separation and the deep remorse of failing to see his beloved at the last moment. Samudradatta's such a mental state is expressed in the First Act of Pd. (VJ.).

As suggested by Warder it is quite likely that the following verse cited anonymously by Ānandavardhana (DA. under III 4; III 33) and Kuntaka (VJ. I, V. 49) for the poetic beauty of the expression tribhāga occurring in its last line (the verse is also included in the anthologies Sārngadhara-paddhati (no. 3464) and Subhāṣitāvali (no. 1335) as by Brahmayaśas or Yaśaḥsvāmin). It was probably spoken by the remorseful Samudradatta : I think the situation can be identified as Samudradatta recalling his vivid impression of Nandayantī at the moment of his departure from his residence :

ब्रीडा-योगान् नत-वदनया संनिधाने गुरुणां
 बद्धोत्कम्प-स्तन-कलशया मन्युमन्त्रं नियम्य ।
 तिष्ठेत्युक्तं किमिव न तथा यत् समुत्सृज्य बाष्पं
 मय्यासक्तश्च चकित - हरिणी - हारि-नेत्र - त्रिभागः ॥

'With her face bowed through bashfulness in the presence of the elders, with her breast-peachers trembling, holding in her anger, shedding a tear with her third of an eye, which captivating like a frightened doe's, was fixed on me, did she not as if say 'stay' ?' (Warder's translation slightly modified). Ānandavardhana has cited this verse at one place to illustrate

suggestiveness of a part of a word (viz. tribhāga), in the case of the Asaṃlakṣya-krama Dhvani, and at another place to illustrate suggestiveness of gesture. Kuntaka has cited it to illustrate the beauty of epithets. His remarks : "The epithet here, viz. 'lovely like that of a deer in fright' adds a unique charm to the 'one-third of her gleaming eye' by stressing its similarity with the eye of a deer in fright, especially when the girl was looking more beautiful then ever in her embarrassment due to the presence of elders" (Krishnamoorthy's translation).

In that state of mind Samudradatta decides to pay a secret visit to Nandayantī, leaves the coast at mid-night and reaches his residential house. Fired by deep passion for Nandayantī, trembling with emotion, and joyless, as he reaches noiselessly like a thief the entrance - gate, he stumbles against the body of the doorkeeper Kuvalaya who starts to kick up a row. To ward off imminent detection and loss of face, Samudradatta silences Kuvalaya with the bribe of the finger-ring inscribed with his name. Then he proceeds to the bed - room and watches (possibly through the latticed window) Nandayantī, who deeply distressed at Samudradatta's unconcern for her at the time of departure gets up and goes to the house-garden. Samudradatta follows her unwatched. Nandayantī feels the grief of separation unbearable. She says in utter despondence (NLR. p. 300) :

ता किं मे दोहग्न - कलंक - मलिगिदेण - हृद - सरिरेण ।

'What is the use now of this wretched body sullied as it is with the blot of misfortune'. This is cited as an instance of Vinyāsa (i.e. dejection) Aṅga of Bhāṇikā type of Rūpaka.

Becoming desperate she resolves to commit suicide. Her eyes sight the Karṇikāra tree and she says (NLR. p. 300) :

एसो अवरो अज्जउत्त-हिअअ-सरिसो कण्णिआर - पादवोत्थि ।

'Here is the Karṇikāra tree like the second heart of my husband'. (The Karṇikāra flowers have attractive golden colour, but are without fragrance).

This passage also is cited similarly in NLR. to illustrate the Upanyāsa (i.e. utterance about a future course of action) Aṅga of Bhāṇikā.

As Nandayantī attempts to commit suicide by hanging, Samudradatta rushes and rescues her. He has sexual union with her. Thereafter in reply to Nandayantī's question Samudradatta tells her about the two constellations seen in the sky at that time of early dawn (NLR. p. 170; ND. 105 with some variants) :

दृश्येते तद्धि यावेतौ चारू चंद्रमसं प्रति ।

प्राह्णे कल्याण-नामानावुभौ तिष्य-पुनर्वसू ।

(V. L. एतौ तौ प्रतिदृश्येते चारू चन्द्र-सम-प्रभौ; ख्यातौ ॥)

'The two beautiful constellations which are seen near the moon at this early dawn bear the auspicious names of Tisya and Punarvasu'. This incident of identification of the constellations to Nandayantī plays a key role in the ultimate development in the drama. It is recalled by Samudradatta in the Sixth Act to establish his paternity of the child. ND. has cited this passage to illustrate the Nirṇaya (i. e. stating a past experience to resolve doubt) Aṅga of the Nirvahaṇa Sandhi. Being informed by the Śabara chief that the natal constellation of the child is Viśākhā, Samudradatta calculates that Viśākhā is the tenth constellation from the Puṣya and Punarvasu constellations which marked the time of Nandayantī's conception. NLR. has cited this passage to illustrate the Nāṭyalakṣaṇa called Anuktasiddhi (i. e.

conveying of the full import by uttering initially a few words). It remarks : The sexual union, that takes place after the menstrual period is over, at the time of the appearance of the constellations bearing the names in masculine gender, indicated without the actual use of words, the probable birth of a male issue. This remark brings out the significance of the adjective kalyāṇa-nāmānu in the cited verse.

Raghavan has noted that this verse is also quoted in Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa to illustrate the use of the form pṛahne.

Soon thereafter Samudradatta returns to the coast and leaves on his voyage. This Second Act is referred to by the title Gr̥ha-vṛkṣa-vāṭikā (NLR. pp. 170, 288, 300). The following dialogue is cited in NLR. (p. 288) as taking place in that Act between the maid Rajanikā and the heroine Nandayantī, as an illustration of the Avahittha (i. e. concealment of what has become known) Aṅga of (strangely enough) the Śilpaka type of Rūpaka :

रदनिका (प्रविश्य) - भट्टिणी, किं णेदं ।

नन्दयन्ती (अपवार्य) - हंजे, ण खु किंचि ॥

'Rajanikā (with entry) - Noble lady, what can be this ? Nandayanti (aside) - Girl, nothing really.' This dialogue takes place possibly after Samudradatta has left in the early morning.

Nandayantī conceives, and when after the signs of pregnancy become evident, her father-in-law Sāgaradatta, knowing nothing about her last secret meeting with Samudradatta, believes her to have been guilty of committing unchastity during the absence of her husband, and arranges, without telling her, to be banished to a forest, where she is

abandoned. These incidents are covered by the Third Act.

When the servant Kuvalaya, who was sent to Mathurā on some mission immediately after Samudradatta's departure, returns at that juncture and comes to know about banishment of the pregnant Nandayanti under the accusation of unchastity, he reveals the fact of Samudradatta's secret visit at midnight prior to the day of his departure on voyage. He shows to Sāgaradatta the inscribed finger-ring presented at that time to him by Samudradatta. Sāgaradatta is now relieved of the mental stress of family infamy due to supposed misconduct of his daughter-in-law. He is convinced that the latter was free from any blemish on her character, her pregnancy being the natural consequence of her union with Samudradatta. He, however, feels deep remorse for the cruel and unjust punishment he meted out to the innocent Nandayanti, which is expressed in the following verse (VJ. under IV 5.6) :

तदङ्गुलीयं सुतनाम-चिह्नं, चरित्र-शुद्धिं विशदीकरोति ।

ममापि सामान्यसमुद्यतोऽनुतापस् तु पापस्य भवेत् स शुद्धिः ॥

'That finger-ring inscribed with my son's name clearly establishes purity of my daughter-in-law's character. The contrition swelling up in my mind for my sinful conduct may perhaps purify me too'.

Then he asks Kuvalaya why the latter did not tell him this previously (भृत्य, किमित् त्वया प्रथममस्माकं नोक्तम्).

The Text of Kuvalaya's reply is, as it stands, hopelessly corrupt. It is as follows. (VJ. p. 253) :

तदोपणिकमन्ते राम पणि यात

त हि एव पविसंति ।

दिग्धाच्छादितं च मए स अं एव पेखिअं छन्वाहनसंपदं

पुतन वेदइस्सदि ।

I suggest the following restoration :

तदा पुणो इत्थं तस्स मए पइष्णादं । तुम्हं एवं पविसंतं मुहाच्छादिदं (or देहाच्छादिदं) इदं जं मए सअं एव्व पेक्खिदं तमहं ण संपदं कस्स णिवेदइस्सं ति ।

‘At that time, however, I bound myself with the following oath before him : “I will not tell at present anybody what I have personally seen myself : You, entering in this manner, with the face (or the body) covered all over”.

Kuntaka has cited this episode ‘to illustrate, an incident in a work, which has besides having its own individual beauty, a beauty of organic unity which connects it harmoniously with the conclusion and provides scope for a relation of mutual necessity or help between the two’. (Knishnamoorthy’s translation). His remarks are : ‘Now this incident of the ring becomes very helpful in resolving the complication arising in the Fourth Act where after his return from Mathurā the same servant breaks this news of Samudradatta to Sāgaradatta’ (Krishnamoorthy’s translation).

Sāgaradatta despatches search parties, but failing to get any information of Nandayantī’s whereabouts, he sets out on a pilgrimage to expiate for what he felt to be his heinous sin. These incidents are covered by the Fourth Act.

Thereafter, Kuvalaya who also had gone in search of Nandayantī finds her in a forest staying at the house of a band-leader of Śabarās. He reports to her Samudradatta’s return from his successful voyage and about his well-being. This forms a part of the Fifth Act of PD., which is called Lāmakāyana (NLR. pp. 97, 267). The first of these two refernces is to illustrate the Sandhyantara called Ruj, which

involves pain due to a blow etc. There is no clue to make out which situation is referred to here. The second reference is to illustrate Dharma-śrṅgāra, which relates to the Śrṅgāra that involves pious acts like observance of vows performed with a view to earn merit and obtain one's welfare. Nandayantī's giving feast to Brāhmaṇas is said there to have that purpose. Raghavan has rightly suggested that the following passage quoted in ND. (p. 94) as from the Fifth Act of PD. to illustrate the Apavāda Aṅga of the Vimarśa Sandhi which involves expressing fault of one's own or of others and, relates to Nandayantī's course of regular acts of propitiation that she was going through during her period of exile :

ब्राह्मणः : मार्जिता हि ब्राह्मणस्य मुख-मधुरः कालपाशः ।

तथाहि -

हतः पुत्रो हतो भ्राता हतो मार्जितया पिता ।

तथाप्येनां स्व-गोत्रधीं निन्दामिव पिबामि च ॥

'Brāhmaṇa - To a Brahman mārjitā (rich dish of spiced sweet curds) is really a sweet noose of death. For

My son was killed, my brother was killed,

my father was killed by mārjitā.

Yet I drink this.

destroyer of my clan, like blame.' (Warder's translation).

Receiving report from Kuvalaya about the whereabouts of Nandayantī, Samudradatta plans to go to the tribal settlement to meet Nandayantī. Some rumours spread by Aśokadatta and others about Nandayantī's character had come to Samudradatta's ears. So with his mind clouded and torn by

doubts, Samudradatta was preparing to commit suicide. The following verse expresses his desperate state (NLR. p. 291, ND. p. 102). :

भर्ता तवाहमिति कष्ट-दशा-विरुद्धं, पुत्रस् तवैष कुत इत्यनुदारतैषा ।

शस्त्रं पुरः पतति किं करवाणि कष्टं, व्यक्तं त्रिरौमि यदि साभ्युपगच्छते माम् ॥

'To say that I am your husband - supporter contradicts your present grievous state. To ask from whom you have got this son is patently uncharitable. The weapon held in front is ready to fall. O misery, what am I to do ? I would cry full-herartedly if that brings her to me'. In this state of mind Samudradatta leaves for the Śabara settlement to ascertain facts about Nandayantī. This possibly concludes the Fifth Act.

Thereafter Samudradatta reaches the tribal settlement, meets the band-leader, sees Nandayantī, when he has the following dialogue with the Senāpati. It is quoted in (ND. p. 110-111) to illustrate the Nirvahaṇa-Sandhyaṅgas: Sandhi, Nirodha, Grathana, Paribhāṣaṇa, Dyuti, Prasāda, Ānanda, Samaya and Parigūhana. ND. has cited the passage to illustrate the Yukti (i. e. statement of rupture of relationship) Aṅga of the Vimarśa Sandhi. NRL. has cited it to illustrate the Tarka (i. e. decision of some matter dependent upon reflection).

स. “स्वप्नोऽयम्”, से. “न हि”, स. “विभ्रमो नु मनसः”, से. “शान्तम्”, स. “तदेषाऽत्र का”, से. “जाया ते”, स. “कथमङ्क-बाल-तनया”, से. “पुत्रस् तवायम्”, स. “मृषा”, से. “आलम्बायन एष वेत्ति नियतं संबन्धमेतद्गतम्”. स. “केनैतद् घटितं विसन्धि”, से. “विधिना”, स. (सुतरूपं दृष्ट्वा) “सर्वं समायुज्यते” ॥

Samudradatta : Is this a dream ?

General : No.

S. : Is it mental derangement ? (Conjunction)

G. : Don't say such a thing.

S. : Then who is she, here ? (Investigation)

G. : Your wife ? (Knotting)

S. : How then does she have a young baby in her lap ?
(Censure)

G. : That is your son.

S. : It is false. (Removal of the Adverse)

G. : Ālambayana here surely knows the connection of what
has happened. (Propitiating service)

S. : By whom has this been clumsily effected ? (Delight)

G. : By fate. (Disappearance of Grief)

S. : Everything is fitted together ? (Marvelling) (Warder's
translation).

Ālambayana was possibly the person who brought Nandayantī to the residence of the Senāpati. Samudradatta asks the General, 'What is the birth - constellation of the baby ?' The General replies, 'Viśākhā'. Then Samudradatta recalls that on the night of his union with Nandayantī he had pointed out to her in the sky the constellations Puṣya and Punarvasu. The Constellation Visakhā comes ten months after them. This provided certain proof for his paternity of the baby. There ensues a happy reunion of Samudradatta, Nandayantī and Sāgaradatta. This Sixth Act is called Nandayantī-Samhāra.

The Puṣpadūṣitaka in the critical tradition

Indian literary theorists and critics favoured PD. to typically illustrate various characteristics of the Śuddha variety of Prakaraṇa, wherein the Nāyikā and Nāyaka are not Uttama-prakṛti but are Manda-gotra i.e. not of royal descent but such as a merchant, an army-chief, a Brahmin etc. The Nāyikā is either a Kulajā or a Vārāṅganā only as against the Saṁkīrṇa variety of Prakaraṇa. Abhinavagupta dismisses the objections that because in PD. the father-in-law suspects her daughter-in-law of lapse of character during the absence of her husband, the heroine stays for sometime at the abode of a Śabara-senapati, and the hero entertains some doubts about the heroine's behaviour-these are shortcomings in the characterization appropriate in a Prakaraṇa, in view of the fact that the suspicions were baseless and are cleared in the end (Abhinavabhāratī, II, pp. 431-432). The same points are touched upon in the ND. (pp. 117-120). The latter stresses another point also. In the Prakaraṇa, as for example in PD., because of suffering there is limited scope for Śṛṅgāra and Hāsyā, hence Kaiśikī Vṛtti is sparingly used. Kuntaka has praised PD. for 'an organic unity which strikingly underlies the various incidents described in different parts of the work leading to the ultimate end intended, each bound to the other by a relation of mutual assistance' (Krishnamoorthy, p. 545) and for 'its plot constructed so as to have delightful junctures; each of the parts being organically related to each other, the succeeding one following logically from the preceding one' (Krishnamoorthy, p. 566). ND. and NRL have made frequent use of PD. to illustrate Nāṭya-lakṣaṇas, Sandyaṅgas etc. All this shows how important and well-known PD. was as a dramatic work.

There is one more observation in ND. (p.57) regarding the roles of Fate and human endeavour in our life. Its purport is that the types of dramas like PD. and the Mṛcchakaṭika wherein the final result depends upon chance, do contribute to the psychological refinement of the spectators and hence should be certainly welcomed, because after all Fate presupposes human actions.

Explaining Bharata's rule that in the Prakaraṇa the heroine should be Mandakulā, Abhinavagupta says that actually a Kulāṅganā is to be shown as if she has some blemish and hence from a low family. Keeping this in view Nandayantī in PD. is shown as suspected by Samudradatta of lapse of character on hearing the remarks of Āsokadatta and others, but it does not constitute a defect because, it accounts for Nandiyantī's banishment and staying with a stranger and is crucial for the Nirvahaṇa Sandhi. Its figuring in the Mukhasandhi is basic as it implies possibility of liaison. But Abhinavagupta denounces those critics who criticized Brahmayaśas for depicting blamable characters (like Nandiyantī, Samudradatta and Sāgaradatta) in PD. He observes that by such criticism it is not the dramatist, but the critics themselves who have sullied their reputation (Abh. II, pp. 431-432). Stressing the importance of PD. modern scholars also like Krishanachariar (pp. 582-583), Raghavan (pp. (23-36), Warder (III, pp. 115-120) and others have critically discussed various available references to PD. in Sanskrit critical literature and attempted to reconstruct a connected picture on which I have heavily relied here.

Raghavan's following observations regarding the unique position PD. occupied in Sanskrit dramatic literature are quite apt :

'The Puṣpadūṣitaka is as serious a loss in the field as the Devīcandragupta. Citations from it are, in respect of extent, next only to those from the latter. The oblivion into which its author fell is undeserved, for when an example of a Prakaraṇa with a theme of pure domestic love and a virtuous heroine is to be cited, authorities cited regularly the Puṣpadūṣitaka rather than the Mālatīmādhava'. (pp. 23-24).

'If the Devīcandragupta departs from the Mṛcchakaṭika with a daring fratricide and a widow remarriage, the Puṣpadūṣitaka, with equal boldness, breaks new ground with the scandal of unchastity on circumstantial misunderstanding, which is not less intense because it is so common. If the true ideal of a Prakaraṇa is to see the joy and tragedy and the triumph of character among the common folk, we may confidently say that some at least of the Sanskrit dramatists had a true comprehension of this medium and gave us dramas which could take high rank among productions in this branch of literature' (pp. 35-36).

Relationship between the Nandayantī and the Puṣpadūṣitaka

The story of Nandayantī as we find in the Śīlataraṅgiṇī, helps us to clarify some obscure points and fill up some gaps, to do which scholars were forced to resort to unaided speculations: We can now altogether reject the idea of the PD. plot having been derived from the story of Mūladeva and Samudradatta found in Daṇḍin's Avantīsundarī. Raghavan and following him Warder were evidently misled by Samudradatta's name-sake in Daṇḍin's story. Why Samadradatta could not meet Nandayantī before his departure, console her and take her leave, and why he returned and spent the night with her secretly, which intri-

gued these scholars, is also made convincingly clear by the Nandayantī-kathā. Raghavan's very sound critical sense, however, is evident from the serious doubt he expressed regarding the hypothesis that the plot of PD. was derived from the story of Samudradatta and Mūladeva occurring in Daṇḍin's Avantīsundarī-kathā (Raghavan has referred to the Avantīsundarī-kathāsāra, IV, 77-91). He has observed :

'Two general references in Abhinavagupta bear on the source of the play, which is, by itself, an interesting question. Abhinavagupta says that the story of Samudradatta is an example of what a Prakaraṇa author takes from the literary production of an earlier author and handles with some innovations. In Daṇḍin's Avantīsundarī, there is a story of Samudradatta bound up with the character Mūladeva, but we cannot, in the present state of our knowledge of the Puṣpadūṣitaka, say whether it was based on this version or comprised all the incidents mentioned here. On a fundamental point, the Daṇḍin version says that the tragedy in Samudradatta's relations with Nandayantī was due to his rivalry with the clever and all powerful Mūladeva, that Samudradatta had courted Mūladeva's enmity by making love to a courtesan of his and Mūladeva had sworn to carry off Samudradatta's wife and marry her; consequently, Samudradatta had married secretly, but Mūladeva had contrived to contact her in secret by an underground passage, declared her his wife before the King and got Samudradatta banished on the charge of stealing his wife. The unfortunate lady was determined to commit suicide in the Ganges when a man, who turned out to be her own husband, rescued her'.

S. K. De also assumes that the plot of PD. involved secret marriage of Samudradatta and Nandayantī and Sāgaradatta's opposition to that marriage : 'A Prakaraṇa in six acts, it (PD.) had for its theme the love-story of a merchant

Samudradatta and Nandayantī, which involved their secret marriage, opposition from Samudradatta's father Sāgaradatta, her pregnancy, suspicion of her chastity, and the final reunion of the lovers by means of a ring of recognition and by the identification of the constellation under which their child was born.' ('History of Sanskrit Literature', p. 302).

AB. (p. 431) and ND. (p. 119-120) (Someśvara is dependent upon ND. for this) clearly state that the plot of PD. was derived from a Kāvya work of some earlier poet which figured Samudradatta and Nandayantī as the hero and the heroine. Brahmayaśas, however, had made some modifications in the plot of the story to suit delineation of Rasa.

The close similarity between the plots of PD. and Nandayantī in most respects is self-evident. Jayakīrti and Somatilaka also may have used in all probability the same source as was used by Brahmayaśas. The differences that we find in some incidents and details between the PD. and Śīlātaraṃgiṇī versions may be due to changes made in their source by Brahmayaśas for dramatic purposes and by Somatilaka to make N. a model satī-story. We know that Śubhaśīla made further changes in Somatilaka's version on which he relied.

Two speculative suggestions

1. Ālambāyana and Lāmakāyana

As observed earlier NRL. twice refers to a Lāmakāyanāṅka, (pp. 97, 267), which because of the mention of Nandayantī in the second reference is definitely from PD. From the citation given in ND. (p.94) Raghavan has pointed out that the same incident is mentioned by Sarvānanda in his commentary on the Amarakośa which specifies that it is from

the Fifth Act of PD. He has rightly concluded that it is the same as the Lāmakāyanāṅka. Now the problem is who was this Lāmakāyana and what or in which way his role was so important as to give that character's name to the Act ? Raghavan's remark and Warder's statement that Lāmakāyana brings Nandayantī, in the forest, news of Samudradatta, looses support in view of the correct reading kurvalaya instead in that passage (Krisnamoorthy's edition) which makes it certain that it was doorkeeper Kuvalaya who performed that task. From the citation given on ND. p. 110, we know that one Ālambāyana knew with certainty, that the son borne to Nandayantī was by her husband. It may be that this Ālambāyana was first to meet Nandayantī when she was abandoned in the forest and he arranged for her shelter at the Śabarasenāpati's abode. Secondly the person whom Nandayantī had feasted is called simply Brāhmaṇa. Therefore the question arises what was the role of Lāmakāyana, over and above those of the Brāhmaṇa and Ālambāyana in the Fifth Act ? I may hazard a suggestion - it is obviously speculative. लामकायन is simply a scribal corruption of आलंबायन. In the early Nāgarī script, in an old MS. with slightly damaged writing, the slightly damaged आ can be read as ला, ल as म and बा as का. In that case the name of the Fifth Act would be आलंबायनांक, which would be in keeping with what little we know. The reading लामकायनांक could be just result of scribal confusion.

2. Significance of the title Puṣpadūṣitaka.

Kuntaka under 4,24 mentions the Puṣpadūṣitaka also along with the Abhijñāna-śākuntala, Mudrārākṣasa, Māyā-puṣpaka and others as a drama which has a title that is not just referential but has suggestive beauty. But from the few slight fragments, critical comments and the bare outline that we have, the title Puṣpadūṣitaka remains unexplained. Now we know that the sight of the constellations Tiṣya i.e.

Puṣya and Punarvasu (Act. II) play a key role in determining the fatherhood of Nandayanti's baby (Act VI). Secondly for Puṣpadūṣitaka we have also once Puṣpabhūṣitaka (Sāhityadarpaṇa, VI, 226). Can it be that the actual title was Puṣyabhūṣitaka, meaning 'adorned' i. e. auspiciously associated with the Puṣya constellation ? Confusion in the MSS. between पुष्य and पुष्य is usual, and combined with भूषितक one becomes easily prone to read पुष्प. To get some support for this suggestion, it may be noted that NLR. (p. 169-170), defining the Nāṭya-lakṣaṇa called Anukṭasiddhi ('suggestion of full significance without verbal expression'), illustrates it with the verse spoken by Samudradatta which identifies to Nandayanti the constellations Puṣya and Punarvasu in the sky. Sāgaranandin remarks that here, without actually saying, it has been conveyed that if the sexual union takes place at the time of the appearance of the constellations bearing the masculine name, there is quite a chance of a male issue being born. Significantly the Constellations are qualified by Samudradatta as kalyāṇa-nāmānau. The points, however, that seem to go against my suggestion are that all the sources read पुष्पा and not पुष्या, and all the sources except one read dūṣitaka.

The Abhijñāna-śākuntala and the Puṣpadūṣitaka

It may be noted that the plot of of PD. has several significant parallels with the plot of Kālidasa's Śākuntala.

(1) The pregnant wife's rejection (or banishment) ; (2) her finding refuge in a hermitage (or a Śabara settlement in a forest), where a male child is delivered; (3) the part played by the fingerring with the hero's name inscribed thereon in removing the suspicion about the heroine's character; (4) in the plot development, a situation devised in a previous Act playing very significant dramatic role in a later Act (Duṣyanta told the Vidūṣaka that he was joking about his attraction for the Āśrama girl. Thereafter he sent him away. This serves an important dramatic purpose. Vidūṣaka could not be helpful in Fifth Act in establishing the real fact about Śākuntalā's relation with Duṣyanta. Similarly Nandayantī is accused and banished during the absence of the servant Kuvalaya, who having returned thereafter gives eyewitness account of Samudradatta having secretly visited Nandayantī and presents Samudradatta's inscribed fingerring as irrefutable evidence. Earlier he could not inform Nandayantī's father-in-law as he was bound by oath by Samudradatta not to tell immediately anybody about his visit.)

Similar motifs found in other stories

The motif of false accusation (or suspicion) of unchastity suffered by a married noble woman of chaste character and her subsequent unjust and cruel banishment to wilderness is very frequently used in Indian tales of all times. In the Jain Tradition, when the tetrad of Dāna, Śīla, Tapas and Bhāvanā came into focus within Jain ethics, we have an abundant crop of literary works relating Śīla-kathās. The above-noted motif is found in the biographies of Sītā, Añjanā, Nandayantī, Kalāvati and Sudarśanā, narrated in numerous narratives in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa and Old Gujarati Jain

literatures. In the case of Sītā the accusation comes from the people. In the case of Añjanā and Kalāvati, the husband becomes suspicious. The stories of Añjanā and Nandayanti commonly share the motif of the husband secretly visiting the wife prior to departing on a long journey, spending a night with her, whose consequent pregnancy becomes the cause of her abandonment in woods by the in-laws convinced of her unchastity. Sītā and Kalāvati (and Śakuntalā) find refuge in a hermit's Āśrama¹, and in the early version of the Nandayanti, in a Śabara settlement. Añjanā and Nandayanti of the later versions are rescued by some benign relative or stranger. The Kalāvati and the later versions of the Nandayanti are influenced by the biography of Damāyanti (Davadanti) as it is found in the Jain tradition (miraculous rescue through divine help from suicide attempts, calamities etc., shelter given by a relative, the duties at the alms-house eventually serving as an instrument of reunion etc.).

Concluding Remarks

Countless valuable works, veritable brilliant gems, of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa literature have become, due to numerous factors, consigned to oblivion. In the case of some, traces are left in the form of abridgements, summaries, citations, references etc., which may help us in providing some idea of their contents, character and worth. The number of lost Sanskrit dramatic works only, about which we know something from the works on poetics and dramaturgy like AB., VJ., Śrīgāraprakāśa, ND., NRL. etc. runs into scores. Jain literature, due to its centuries-old tradition

1. In the story of Mrgāvatī found in the Jain tradition, Mrgāvatī abducted by a Bhārvṇa bird and then abandoned in a forest, similarly finds shelter in a hermitage.

of preservation of written texts proves an invaluable help (like the Tibetan and Chinese translations of lost Indian Classical texts) more or less in the task of reconstruction and recovery of lost works. From this point of view we can point out for example the importance of the Vasudevahiṇḍi for forming a more reliable view of the content and character of Guṇāḍhya's Brhatkathā, or for tracing the sources of some Kṛṣṇa-carita episodes; the later available versions of the original tales of Nanda, Vararuci and Śūdravatsa; the significant parallels between certain lost versions of the Pañcatantra¹ and the Book of Sindbad; the present story of Nandayantī and PD. These are only a few typical instances². The vast Prakrit narrative literature calls for vigorous efforts to scrutinize it for this purpose. In the Appendix I have drawn attention to another case of a lost important Sanskrit drama for getting a better idea of the plot of which we get significant clues from a tale preserved in regional versions.

On the Source of the Lost Sanskrit Drama Anaṅgasenā - Harinandi

1. Anaṅgasenā - Harinandi is a lost Prakaraṇa - type of Rūpaka of the Saṁkīrṇa variety i. e. wherein there are two Nāyikās : Kulajā and Veśyā (Gaṇikā). Its author was Śuktivāsakumāra. Our only source of information about it is the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (p. 95). On the basis of that information the account of that drama with some observations, given by V. Raghavan in his The Social Play in Sanskrit (Second impression, pp. 20-22) I reproduce below :

'The Anaṅgasenā - Harinandi is one such, of which a single glimpse is given to us by the authors of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (p. 95). We are glad we know the name of its author as Śuktivāsa - kumara, but anything of him beyond this we do not know. The occasion for the citation in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa is the illustration of the Sandhyaṅga called Chādana, which,

according to a second interpretation, is said to be the putting up with an unbearable thing for the sake of an ulterior higher purpose. The play from which the Nāṭyadarpaṇa draws the illustration for this is expressly mentioned as a Prakaraṇa, the Act from which the actual quotation is made being the ninth. The illustration, instead of quoting any particular verse or prose passage, gives the gist of a part of the plot : as the name of the play implies, Harinandi is the hero and Anaṅgasenā, figuring in the title, is evidently, as the "senā" ending of the name denotes, the courtesan, having as prominent a role in the play as the heroine herself; that the actual heroine is different is confirmed also by the words of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa which mentions her as Mādhavī.

A third important character of the play is a Prince, Candraketu by name. The Prince gives Mādhavi a pair of earornaments which she sends to the hero. The hero, Harinandi, gives it to the mother of a Brahman named Puṣpalaka for the purpose of securing the latter's liberation from the imprisonment imposed on him by the King. This Brahman, Puṣpalaka, is probably the Vidūṣaka, or if we are to take it that there is no Vidūṣaka in the play because this Brahman is not so designated, we may take Puṣpalaka as an intimate friend of the hero, functioning in much the same capacity as the Vidūṣaka.

As fate would have it, Harinandi's effort to save his Brahman friend landed them in greater trouble; the earornaments being those of the palace, having been sent originally by the Prince, the poor Brahman is proclaimed a thief who had stolen ornaments from the palace; and, condemned by the King to death, he was about to be taken to the gallows, At this juncture Puṣpalaka's mother rushed to Harinandi with the adverse news, upon which, to save his Brahman friend, Harinandi himself accepted the guilt of theft on his own part and bore the calumny.

The drift of the story would suggest rivalry between Prince Candraketu, the Prati-Nāyaka, and Harinandi. Even the solitary citation shows sufficient originality on the part of the author and also variety of incidents. The noble character of Harinandi comes out prominently, as also the loyalty of his Brahman friend, who endures, for his friend's sake, victimization from the palace.'

2. The twenty eighth chapter of Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa treats the topic of sending of love - messengers as a part of the treatment of Pūrvānurāga, the first variety of Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra. Messengers are classified on the basis of various types of their characteristics. Functionally distinguished messengers include Gardner, Vidūṣaka, Viṭa, Pīṭhamarda etc. As an instance of Pīṭhamarda, serving as a love - messenger, Bhoja mentions Dantaka, who is said to serve Sūdravatsa in a work called Kāmasenā - vipralambha . Raghavan's note on this is as follows (Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, p. 826.) :

"The examination of the Kathāsaritsāgara, the Brhat-kathāmañjarī and the Kathākośa have (sic) not produced any fruits in the matter of indentifying at least some version of a story with the heroine called Kāmasenā and a hero called Sūdravatsa (?) with a Pīṭhamarda-aid named Dantaka".

Now, we come across several casual literary allusions from the beginnig of the eleventh century onwards, to an Apabhramśa romantic tale, which relates to the adventures of a prince called Suddaya, i. e. Śūdraka. Moreover, we have several literary compositions in Old Gujarati and Rajasthani, which present different versions of that tale. There is also a Sanskrit recast of the earliest known Gujarati version. The tale continues to live to the present day in folk-literary traditions of Gujarat and Rajasthan.

I have collected early references to this story from Vīra's Janbūsāmicariya (1020 A.C.), Nayanandin's Sudāmsana -

cariya (1044 A.C) and Sayala-vihi-vihāṇa-kavva and Abdala Rahamāna's Saṁdeśarāsaka (13th Cint. A.C.). The earliest available version of the story is the Sadayavatsavīra - prabandha by Bhīma (c. 1400 A.C.) in Old Gujarati.

The following is a brief outline of the story according to Bhīma.

Sudayavatsa (S.) was the son of king Prabhuvatsa and queen Mahālakṣmī, ruling at Ujjayinī. He was a gambling addict. Once he rescued a pregnant Brahmin girl from the clutches of the Royal elephant which had gone mad, by killing it. The King appointed him as heir-apparent in appreciation of this act of bravery., But the minister of the King, fearing to lose the favour of the prince because he had earlier restrained him from spending liberally at the time of his marriage with Sāvaliṁgā, the princess of Pratiṣṭhāna, succeeded in turning the King against S., whom the latter ordered to leave the kingdom. Sāvaliṁgā accompanied S. in exile.

Passing through a dreary tract, S. procured water for the thirsty Sāvaliṁgā by offering his blood in exchange. But this turned out to be just a test devised by Harisiddhi, the presiding divinity of Ujjayinī. Mightily pleased with his fortitude, she gifted him with miraculous dice and cowries and a steel knife, which made him invincible in gambling games and battles.

Resuming their journey, they came to a temple of Śiva where Līlāvātī, the daughter of King Dharavīra ruling at Dhārā, was practising penance to obtain S. as her husband. S. accepted her. The marriage was celebrated. S. stayed at Dhārā for a few days. Then he left for Pratiṣṭhāna to deposit Sāvaliṁgā at her father's house. He promised to take Līlāvātī with him on the return journey.

While passing through a dense forest, S. met a band of five thieves in a den. In a challenge game of gambling they lost

against him. S. declined their offer of magic gifts. So the thieves clandestinely inserted in his shield a jewelled bodice worth a million, and promised to go to his help when remembered in a critical situation. S. and Sāvalimṅā left that place. Proceeding further they came across a deserted city, where the presiding deity of the buried treasures of King Nanda of yore appeared before S. and offered him the treasures. But unwilling to take possession of the treasures without offering ceremonial worship, S. moved on and reached the precincts of Pratiṣṭhāna. He left Sāvalimṅā in charge of a bard there, and proceeded towards Pratiṣṭhāna to procure funds through gambling.

As he entered the city gate he chanced to see a fellow with his hands, nose and ears maimed. He took this to be an evil omen, but that Thumṭhā introduced himself as the prince of Sīmḥala. He had lost all his money at gambling during his visit to Pratiṣṭhāna and having failed to pay dues, he was maimed by the gamblers. S. accepted him as his trusted companion.

The pair arrived at the temple of the Sun-God, where a dispute raged between the royal courtesan Kāmasenā and a city merchant. Kāmasenā was demanding five hundred gold coins from the merchant's son Somadatta as her charge for cohabiting with her in her dream ! The disputing parties appointed S. as the arbiter. He resolved the dispute by offering to the courtesan's mother the mirror-image of the demanded amount. The amount was piled in front of a mirror. Kāmasenā, receiving report of the arrival of an attractive noble young man, came to the temple. She was love-stricken at the first sight. She gave a dance performance at the temple with such passion that she collapsed with exhaustion. The royal physician diagnosed her ailment as love-affliction. Kāmasenā invited S. to stay with her. When S. sought Thumṭhā's advice in this matter, the latter warned him about the viles of prostitutes. But Kāmasenā won over Thumṭhā by

offering him the services of her younger sister. So they accepted Kāmasenā's hospitality which solved S. 's boarding problem. Next day, S, went to the gambling house and won huge sums from expert gamblers. He presented a part of the win to Kāmasenā, distributed another part in charity to all and sundry, and with the rest he purchased costliest garments, cosmetics etc. for Sāvaliṃgā.

On the fifth day, S. prepared to leave Kāmasenā's residence, to keep his promise to Sāvaliṃgā. Kāmasenā, madly in love with him, tried to detain him by pulling his shield. The jewelled bodice that was smuggled in the shield-cover by the thieves dropped down. Kāmasenā kept it as a parting gift. Shortly, wearing it she left to attend upon the King. On her way, she was seen by the city mayor, who, indentifying her bodice as one which was stolen from his house some time back, lodged a complaint with the King. On being questioned by the latter, Kāmasenā did not reveal the identity of the person who had gifted her the bodice. She was ordered to be executed. Her mother traced S. at the gambling house and told him about the developments. S. rushed to Kāmasenā's help as she was being taken to the execution ground, freed her and put to rout the city guards. Hearing about this Somadatta reached there. S. requested him to take his message to Sāvaliṃgā. Somadatta secured from the King S. 's release by pledging himself as the hostage. S. visited Sāvaliṃgā, who on failure of S. 's return by the promised fifth day, was on the point of immolating herself on a burning pyre. S. presented her with clothes and cosmetics. Next morning he returned to the execution ground. S. boasted of having committed many thefts. The King discovered S. 's identity by examining a sword bearing the latter's signature. The sword was procured from the courtesan. But to test S's prowess the King sent an army to attack S. A band of fiftytwo crack heroes mounted an attack. The five thieves informed by Nārada rushed to S. 's help and overpowered the

attackers. The King acknowledged his defeat. He warmly welcomed his son-in-law and daughter. The story continues further but that last section is not relevant for our purpose here. Comparing AH. and SP. we find the following close parallels :

Harinandin = Sadayavatsa

Mādhavī = Sāvalimṅā

Anaṅgasenā = Kāmasenā

Candraketu = The chief of the robber-band.

Puṣpalaka falsely becomes victim of the charge of stealing ear-ornments and ordered to be executed. To save Puṣpalaka Harinandin takes charge of theft upon himself.

Kāmasenā falsely becomes victim of the charge of stealing a jewelled bodice and is ordered to be executed. To save Kāmasenā S. takes the charge upon himself.

It will be seen that these similarities of characters, incidents and situations are quite significant.

The differences between AN. and SP. can be accounted for as changes affected in his source by the dramatist. The Puṣpaduṣṭaka Prakaraṇa is a comparable case. It is likely that the story figured in some later version of Guṇādhyas Bṛhatkathā. The Kāmasenā-vipralambha referred to by Bhoja obviously used the same source.

Bibliography

Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta (c. 1000 A.C.), Baroda.
Akhyānakamaṇikośa of Nemicandra-sūri (about 1070 A.C.)
with Vṛtti of Āmradeva-sūri (1133 A.C.). 1962. Varanasi.
Bharateśvara-Bāhubali-vṛtti of Śubhaśīlār -gaṇi (1453 A.C.)

Ed. Pradyumanavijaya -gaṇi. Part I, 1984; part II, 1989.

Ahmedabad (Part-II, folios 149b-150b).

The Br̥hatkathā, the Vashudevehiṇḍi and the Sources of Two Purāṇic Kṛṣṇacarita Episodes", Indological Studies. H.C. Bhayani, 1993 (pp. 257-261).

Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya (10 cent. A.6) with Dhanika's Avaloka (10th Cent. A.C.), Ed. T. Venkatacharya. 1969. Adyar, Madras.

Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana (C. 1000 A.C.). (= DA.)

'Eine neue Version der verlorenen Br̥hatkathā des Guṇādhya'. Atti del XIX congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti. 1938. Rome (pp. 344-349).

History of Classifical Sanskrit Literature. K.

Krishnamachariar. 1974. Reprint. Delhi (pp. 582-583).

History of Sanskrit literature (Prose, Poetry and Drama).

S.K. De. 1947, Calcutta (pp. 301-302).

Indian Kāvya Literature. A.K. Warder. vol. III, 1977. Delhi. (pp. 115-120).

Kāvya prakāśa-saṁketa Kāvyaḍarśa (= Kāvya prakāśa - vṛtti of Someśvara. Ed. R. C. Parikh, 1959. Udaipur. (pp. 214).

Nāṇḍabatrīsī. Ed. H. C. Bhayani, K. Sheth, 1989, Jodhpur.

Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa of Sāgaranandin (end of the 11 Cent.). Ed. B. L. Shukla. 1972, Varanasi.

Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra (12th Century). Ed. G. K. Shrigondekar and L. B. Gandhi, 1929, Baroda.

1977, Dharvad.

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha (14th Cent. A. C.). Ed. P. V. Kane. 1951 edition.

Śīlataṛaṅgiṇī (1337 A. C.) with Śīlopadeśamālā (end of the 9th Cent.), pub. Hiralal Hamsaraj, 1909, Jamnagar. (folios 434 to 441).

Śīlopadeśamālā (Text, its Gujarati Translation and only the

- Gujarati Translation of Śīlataraṅgiṇī. (Published by Vidyashala, 1900, Ahmedabad (pp. 324-329).
- Śīlopadeśamālā-bālāvabodha : Text of Śīlopadeśamālā, its Translation and the Translation of Śīlataraṅgiṇī, both in Old Gujarati by Merusuandara-gaṇi (1469 A. C.). Ed. H. C. Bhayani, R. M. Shah, Gitabehen. 1980, Ahmedabad. (Śīlopadeśmālā, Gāthā 56; Bālāvabodha, pp. 131-133).
- The Social play in Sanskrit by V. Raghavan. Second Impression 1966, Bangalore. (pp. 23-36).
- Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhadeva (15th cent. A.C.) Ed. P. Peterson and Durgaprad, 1986, Bombay.
- Sudāmsaṇā-cariya by Devendra-sūri, Ed. Umamgavijaya-gaṇi. Valad. 1932. (Kalāvatīkathānaka; vv. 515-773). Gujarati Translation : 'Rajkumāri Sudarśanā yāne Samṇīvihār,' by Kesarvijay-gaṇi. 1921. Bombay (pp. 229-260).
- 'The Śudravatsa Kathā. Indological Studies. H. C. Bhayani. 1993. Ahmedabad (pp. 235-256) (= Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes, no. 6, 1988, pp. 69-91).
- Upadeśapada of Haribhadra-sūri (8th Cent. A. C.), Gujarati Translation by Hemsagar-sūri, 1972, Bombay.
- Uvasesapaya of Haribhadra-sūri (8th Cent. A.C.). Ed. Pratapvijayagani. I, 1923, II. 1925. Baroda.
- Vakroktijīva of Kuntaka (10th Cent.), Ed. K. Krishnamoorthy. Vasudevahiṇḍi, J. C. Jain, 1977. Ahmedabad (pp. 28-155).
- Vasudevahiṇḍi - Madhyamakhaṇḍa by Dharmasenagaṇi. Ed. H. C. Bhayani, R. M. Shah. 1987. Ahmedabad (Introduction, pp. 63-76).

Dr. HARIVALLABH C. BHAYANI

1912 Birth 26-5-1917, Mahuva (Sauratra)

1941 M.A. Sanskrit and Prakrit

1945 to 1965 Research Scholar-cum-Professor : Bharatiya
Vidya Bhavan, Bombay

1951 Ph.D. Thesis on Svayambhū's Paumacariu prepared under the
guidance of Muni Jinavijayaji

1965 to 1975 Professor at School of Languages, Gujarat University

1975 Honorary Professor, L. D. Institute of Indology

LIST OF SOME PUBLISHED WORKS

Līlāvati-sāra 1983; Saṁkhitta-taraṅgavai-kahā 1979; Vasudeva-
himḍi-Madhyama-Khaṇḍa (with R. Shah) Part I 1988; Paumacariya,
Part I, II, III 1953, 1961; Apabhraṁśa Language and Literature
1990; Madanamohanā 1955; Traṇ Prācin Gūjar Kāvya 1955;
Ratnacūda-rāsa 1977; Nandabatrī (with K. Sheth) 1990; Kṛṣṇa-
bālacaritra 1993; Bhāṣā Vyākaraṇ (with Bholabhai Patel) 1992;
Sodh ane Svādhyāy 1961; Indological Studies-I 1993; Mukta-
mañjarī 1989, 1991; Apabhraṁśa Vyākaraṇ 1961, 1971, 1993; Studies
in Deśya Prakrit 1990; Gujarātī Bhāṣānī Keṣhik Aitihāsik Samaśyāo
1976; Gujarātī Bhāṣānum Aitihāsik Vyākaraṇ 1988; Bhāvan-
vibhāvan-I, II 1991, 1992; Lokkathānām Mūl ane Kuḷ 1990;
Madhyakālīn Gujarātī Kathākoś 1991.

Rs. 10-00

Krishna Printery Harjibhai Patel

966, Naranpura Old Village, Ahmedabad-380 013.

☎ : 484393