

MISCELLANEA.

KĀLIDĀSA AND KĀMANDAKI.

THE date of Kālidāsa is yet far from being settled. From the mention of Kālidāsa by Bāna and in the Aihole inscription of the time of the Chālukya king Pulakeśin II. all scholars are now unanimous in asserting that he cannot be later than the 7th century A. D. And most Sanskritists are disposed to place him in the 5th century. In this state of things it behoves everybody interested in the chronology of Sanskrit Literature to bring to the notice of scholars every scrap of information bearing upon the date of prominent authors like Kālidāsa.

In the *Raghuvansā* (IX) Kālidāsa speaks of the advantages of hunting, viz., skill in bringing down a moving mark, knowledge of the change of expression due to fear and anger, a fine body due to being inured to fatigue (*Parichayaṁ chālakshya-nipātane bhaya-rushōś=cha tad-īngita-vedanam* | *Śrama-jayāt praguṇām cha karōty=asau tainum=atō S snumatah sachivair-yayau*). A similar verse occurs in the *Śākuntalā* (2nd Act), where, in addition to the above, the reduction of fat is specially referred to. (*Medas-cheda-kṛis-ōdarani laghu bhavaty=utthāna-yōgyani vapuh sattvanām=apilakshyate vikṛitmach=chittani bhaya-kṛōdhayōh* | *Utkarshah sa cha dhavināni yad=ishavah si-dhyanti lakshye chāle mithyō hi vyananāni vādanti nṛigayām=īdriḡ=vinōdah kutahi*). Hunting is one of those vices which kings are specially advised to avoid by Manu and other lawgivers. Kālidāsa seems to have taken the opposite view.

The *Kāmandakīya-nītisāra*, while speaking of hunting, remarks:—"Some point out the following as the advantages of hunting, viz., rising superior to fatigue, exercise, the decrease of indigestion, fat and phlegm and unsurpassed success in archery directed towards fixed and moving marks; but this is not proper; there are generally some very grave (*lit. fatal*) disadvantages, and, therefore, hunting is a great vice." (*Jita-śramatvam vyāyama āma-mēda-kapha-kshayah* | *chara-sthīreshu lakshyeshu bāna-siddhīr=anutamā* || *Mṛigayāyām guṇān=etān=āhur=anye na tot kshamam* | *doshāh prāna-harāh prāyas=tasmāt=tad vyananāni mahat* || XIV., 25-26). The advantages of hunting selected by the *Kāmandakīyanītisāra* are almost the same as those pointed out by

Kālidāsa. It seems, therefore, that Kāmandakī criticises the views of Kālidāsa, whose poems must have been in his days on the lips of all, whether young or old. If this idea be acceptable, it will furnish another piece of evidence for arriving at the approximate date of Kālidāsa.

I shall now mention some data for arriving at the date of the *Kāmandakīya-nītisāra*:

I. Utpala, who wrote his comment upon the *Bṛihatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira in Śaka 888 (A. D. 966-67), quotes from *Kāmandakī*; e.g., on 77, 1.

II. Vāmana, in his *Kāvya-dānakāra-sūtravṛitti*, quotes a verse, in which the '*Kāmandakī nīti*' is referred to (under IV, 1, 2. *Kāmanā Kāmandakī nītir=asyā rasyā divānīsam*). Vāmana flourished about 800 A. D. (See an article by me in the *Journals of the Bombay Asiatic Society* for 1909).

Bhavabhūti in his *Mālatīmādhava* exhibits the character of a diplomatic lady named Kāmandakī. It appears almost certain that the name was taken from the writer on statecraft whose fame must have been very great in Bhavabhūti's day. Bhavabhūti, we know, flourished about 700 A. D.

In the 7th chapter of the *Kāmandakīya-nītisāra*, there is a list of kings who fell victims to poison and intrigue (verses 51-54). Varāhamihira in chapter 77 of his *Bṛihatsaṁhitā* mentions some kings, who are the same as those in the work of Kāmandakī (e.g., Varāhamihira says '*Sastrena veni—vinigūhiteṇa Vidūbratham svā mahīshī jaghāna*;' compare Kāmandakī: *Venyānī sastrān samādāhāya tathā chāpi Vidūbratham*). I do not dogmatically say that Varāhamihira borrowed from Kāmandakī. Such traditions might have been current in his day. Still I hold that it is not quite impossible that Varāhamihira derives his information from the *Kāmandakīya-nītisāra*.

Apart from Varāhamihira's reference to this intrigue, the *Kāmandakīya-nītisāra* must be older than the 7th century A. D. as just shown, and strongly confirms the position that Kālidāsa is not later than the 6th century of the Christian era.

P. V. KANE.

Bombay.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

A SECOND NOTE ON VĀSUDEVA.

To

The Editor, *Indian Antiquary*.

Dear Sir,

I have since read the article "The Divine Vāsudeva" by Prof. K. B. Pathak, B.A., pp. 96 ff. of the Journal of the Bombay Branch, R. A. Society, No. LXIV. (1909-10). With reference to the concluding sentence of the above article, stating that the Divine Vāsudeva is different from Kshatriya Vāsudeva, my article in the *Indian Antiquary*, for November 1910, may be read. The Divine Vāsudeva is the Eternal Vāsudeva of the Holy twelve-syllabled (*Dvādaś-ākshara*) mantra, called the *Para-Vāsudeva*; and

this *Para-Vāsudeva* incarnates as Kṛishṇa, who is the Kshatriya Vāsudeva.

The passages in the *Bhagavadgīta*:

(1) *Vāsudevas=Sarvam,=iti*. [VII. 19].

(2) *Vṛishṇīnām Vāsudevo=smi* [X. 37].

read together show that the *Essential* Vāsudeva incarnates as Kshatriya Vāsudeva. The two are identical essentially; but when viewed in the *Para*, *Vyūha* and *Vibhava* forms, they may be considered as different.

Thus there is no difficulty presented warranting the speculation about "later interpolations." [p. 103 *op. cit.*, J. R. A. S., Bombay Branch].

A. GOVINDĀCHĀRYA SVĀMIN, M.R.A.S.