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CHAPTER II

VATSARRJA'S PLANE OF EXISTING

(A) The Author's Identification

Before studying the works of a poet it is necessary to be acquainted with his date and place etc., so that the socio-cultural conditions of that particular age and region may be kept in mind while studying his literature from the cultural point of view. We notice in general that an author is highly influenced by the contemporary and regional circumstances. An attempt is, therefore, made to fix the date and place of Vatsarrja in the following pages.

While making efforts to sketch a biography of the Sanskrit poets the main problem to be generally faced is the authors' silence about themselves in their works. Though according to the rhetoricians the purpose of poetry is to acquire fame (kavyam i vasāsa) yet most of the Sanskrit poets have been so idealistic that they have not paid attention to secure fame at all. That's why they did not give much trouble to their pens for mentioning any details about themselves. Rather they wanted to remain far away from self-adulation. Such type of attitude of the Sanskrit authors leaves us in a serious trouble of establishing their life-plane. Secondly, the similarity in names and surnames of the Sanskrit poets also causes great confusion in this regard. Like other authors numerous Vatsarrjas or Vatsas are also heard

* - For this subject see also in general RV. P. 7 ff.
in Indian history and literature. However we should be thankful to our poet that he has written a few significant words about himself. In the prologue of KarpDracarita Bhāna, for instance, Sutradhāra gives the following particulars about the playwright: 'I am ordered...... to stage a Bhāna KarpDracarita composed by Vatsarāja the minister of the king of Kālarāja named Paramarddideva.' (KarpDra. p.23). Further Hävachitämāni Prahasana also mentions that the play was staged by the order of Paramarddideva which was composed by his own minister Vatsarāja (Häva. p. 118). Though this account is not enough to satisfy the curiosity of a reader, yet it may be of inestimable value for his identification and fixing his date and place etc. Taking into consideration the above statements of the author as a basic evidence his existence may be established satisfactorily with the help of other historical sources.

It has already been stated that several Vatsarājas are existing in Indian history and literature. But here, our efforts are concentrated on identifying Vatsarāja, the author of the RŚ, only who is closely associated with the Candella

1.A - We are informed in MB about a Vatsarāja who was the king of Kosala, and one of assembled monarchs in the Drotpadi's Svayāvāvara. (Adiparva. 185.22. Gita Press edn.)

B - According to MB itself Pratardana's son Vatsa of great

Contd. .......
might have been brought up among calves in cow-pen.

(Santiparva. 49. 79-80)

G - Another record of it itself tells us that Vatsa belonged to the Śāryāti's race and had two sons named Haihaya and Talajangha (Anuśāsanaparva. 30. 6-7)

D - In Bhāravata Purāṇa (9.17. 2-6) Vatsa (Dyumāna) is said to have been born in the dynasty of king Kaśtravrūddha. He was a son of Divodāsa and father of Alarke and other sons.

E - Bhāravata Purāṇa (10.11. 42) mentions a demon named Vatsa who was in the shape of a calf and was killed by Kṛṣṇa.

F - We know about another Vatsarāja the grand nephew of Nāgabhaṭṭa. He had made a matrimonial alliance with the dynasty of Avanti whose capital was at Ujjain.

(Walker, Benjamin; Hindu World. Vol. II. P. 237)

G - In this regard mentions may be made of a famous king named Udayana. He was the son of Sahasrāṇika, a king of the lunar dynasty ruling at Kauśāmbi the capital of Vatsya Kingdom, and hence, was also known as Vatsarāja.

He is the beau ideal of Sanskrit literature, and appears as the hero of many Sanskrit masterpieces (Walker, Benjamin; Hindu World. Vol. II. p. 526)

H - Some lexicographers introduce Vatsarāja as belonging to the dynasties of Chauhana and Chalukya also. (Shyam Sundar Das and others. Hindi Sabda Sāgara. Vol. IX. p. 4303)
dynasty. We find that a person named Vatsarāja associated with the same dynasty is mentioned in a Candella record as the minister of a Candella ruler Kirtivarman and a son of Mahādhara. Further Jaganika, a famous Bundelakhandi poet, informs about another Vaccharāja (Vatsarāja) who was the grandson of Kundana Singh a king of Baksara, and the brother of Jassarāja (Jaksarāja). He had a wife named Tilakā and a son named Malakhe (Malakhana). The Candella ruler Pāramāla (Pāramarddideva) is said to have given him the fort of Sirasā. One more Vatsarāja is recorded in a Candella inscription according to which Pāramarddideva's prime-minister Sallaksana was a grandson of Vatsarāja.

But our Vatsarāja is quite different from all the above noticed Vatsarājas of Candella dynasty. Kirtivarman had ruled about one century earlier to Pāramarddideva and thus in the genealogical table the latter was the seventh ruler from the former one. Thus the Vatsarāja of the regime of Kirtivarman must have been quite earlier to the Vatsarāja of the regime of Pāramarddideva. Moreover the evidence of Jaganika and

4. Ibid. pp. 31-32.
6. HCJ. p. 197; GJ. pp. 181-82.
that of the RS seem to be contrasting. For according to Jagannika, Vaccharajya (Vatsarajya) died during the regime of Paramarddideva itself while the RS shows that its author Vatsarajya was existing even in the regime of Paramarddideva's successor Trailokyavarmadeva (Kirata. p. 1). Further Vatsarajya the grandfather of the prime minister of Paramarddideva is also obviously far earlier to our Vatsarajya.

It has already been stated that Vatsarajya has described himself to be a minister of Paramarddideva. Out of his six plays the Hasyavandhmani Prahasana was performed by the order of Paramarddideva himself (Hasya. p. 113) and the Samudramathana Samavakara was staged in order to please the same king (Samudra. p. 150) while the Kiratarjuniya Vyayoga was played by the order of Trailokyavarmadeva (Kirata. p. 1). Epigraphic records indicate that Trailokyavarmadeva was the immediate successor of Paramarddideva. In Garra and Tehari plates the former is mentioned as 'meditating on the feet' (padanudhyata) of the latter. Ajaygarh rock inscription of Kalyana devi also states that 'Trailokyavarman ruled the kingdom after Paramarddideva'. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that Vatsarajya, the author of the RS, had been existing between the regime of Paramarddideva and Trailokyavarmadeva.

Now, our problem of fixing the date of Vatsarāja may be solved if the tenure of reign of both the rulers (= Parmārddideva and Trailokyavarmanadeva) is found out. But in this regard the epigraphic records are not beyond controversy. The copper plates of Candellas mention that Parmārddideva meditated on the feet (rādānudhyāta) of Madanavarman which obviously suggests that the former was the immediate successor of the latter. This is supported by some more Candellas' inscriptions also which mention Parmārddideva's name immediately after that of Madanavarman. But we face some problems when a few records give a different account according to which Madanavarman was Parmārddin's grandfather (pitaṃśa). By not giving the name of Parmārddin's father these records create some problems. This curiosity can be somewhat alleviated with the help of another record. The Baghari stone inscription mentions - 'as the moon, the crest jewel of Maheśvara, arose from the ocean, so was born from Madanavarman Yaśovarman........ and from Yaśovarman has sprung Parmārddideva'.

Now, the next problem arises as to who was the immediate successor of Madanavarman - his son Yaso varman or grandson Paramarddideva. Scholars hold different views on this problem. Smith considers that Yaso varman never came to throne and he died before his father Madanavarman. H.C. Ray indicates that Paramarddideva might have superseded his father and came to the throne immediately after his grandfather. On the other hand, some other evidences tell us that Paramarddideva came to the throne at his very early age. Thus Paramarddideva became king at the age of five. An Ajayagarh inscription also supports this describing him 'a leader even in his childhood (bālo'ni neta)'.

The above facts may suggest a possibility that Yaso varman (= Madanavarman's successor) might have exceptionally had a brief reign and after his very short tenure of power his son Paramarddideva had succeeded him at the early age. The abovementioned Ajayagarh inscription further mentions that 'the fortune of universal sovereignty quickly came to

15. IA. Vol. XXV. p. 205 fn. 4; Vol. XXXVII. p. 129.
him (= Paramarddideva) like an enamoured damsels choosing him of her own will. And this also indicates Paramarddina's succession to the throne at an early age after the premature death of his father.

Thus it seems safe to assume that Madanavarman was succeeded by Yasovarman and the latter by Paramarddideva.

The latest date of Madanavarman known epigraphically is V. S. 1219 (1162 A.D.) which is mentioned in the Semra plates and the earliest recorded date of Paramarddideva is V. S. 1223 (1167 A.D.) which is mentioned in the same Semara copper plate inscriptions. Thus it is most probable that after Madanavarman's reign in 1163 A.D. Yasovarman had come to the throne and after his short reign Paramarddideva had succeeded him in around 1165 A.D. According to a contemporary Muslim historian Hasan Nizami Paramarddideva died in 599 H. (1202 A.D.). In this way Paramarddideva's tenure of power can be decided from 1165 A.D. to 1202 A.D.

There is sufficient evidence - internal as well as

samajsam)


22. H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson: The History of India as told by its own historians. Vol. II. pp. 231-32.
external, which proves Vatsarśāja to be contemporary of Paramarddideva. As is indicated earlier Vatsarśāja writes about himself to be a minister of Paramarddideva. Secondly some of the Vatsarśāja's dramas were presented in the presence of Paramarddideva himself. Thirdly in a Kālaṅjara inscription containing a long Praśasti to lord Śiva composed by Paramarddideva there is a verse which is also found in the KŚ of Vatsarśāja (Karpṭra. Verse 1). Fourthly in an Ajayagarh inscription of the time of Candella ruler Viravarman, Ratnapīla the scribe of the inscription tells about himself to be a son of Haripāla and a grandson of Vatsarśāja. Here it may be observed that the Vatsarśāja's grandson Ratnapīla was working under the patronage of Paramarddideva's grandson Viravarman. Thus Paramarddideva and Vatsarśāja both seem to be contemporary.

Further the reign of Trailokyavarman extended from 1203 A.D. to 1245 A.D. Although Vatsarśāja does not mention himself to be a minister of Trailokyavarman so clearly as in the case of Paramarddideva, but still it is certain that he was availing of the patronage from Trailokyavarman. That's why

24. Vatsarśājakavah nautro haripālakavah sutah
   Ratnapīla imāḥ sūdhāḥ praśastimakarodbudhāḥ.
25. CJ. p. 155.
the king had ordered to stage his play *Kiratarjunya* Vyayoga which contains the praise of the same ruler (*Kirata*, pp. 1-2). So it seems to be reasonable that Vatsarāja had spent some part of his life in Trailokyavarmān's regime also. Thus Vatsarāja had experienced a long life and enjoyed the reigns of two Candella rulers. On the bases of above account the date of our poet Vatsarāja may be satisfactorily decided from the second half of 12th century to the first half of 13th century A.D.

(C) Place

India is a multifarious country. There is also a vast diversity in its natural conditions, customs and dialects. There are numerous regions in India having their own socio-cultural traditions. So in order to study the literary works of an author from the cultural point of view it is basically needed that the place, region or locality of the author must be clearly known. Then only we can understand the social conditions existing in that particular region and those depicted in the poet's works.

The informations collected so far may help us to identify the surrounding area of Kālaṇjara as the place of Vatsarāja's birth and work. The following points may be mentioned in this regard:

1) V.V. Mirashi and N.R. Navalekar aptly say that the place where a person is born, where he has lisped and tottered, played and gambolled, learnt and formed his
first attachments, where his mind has unfolded gradually like a bird, that place remains constantly present in his subconscious mind, and if poetry is an expression of one's personality, the ineffaceable impressions of the natural and social surroundings of his early life are bound to be reflected directly or indirectly in his poems'. One who goes through the text attentively with an open mind may find that Vatsaraja has shown his deep attachment with Kalañjara and its neighbouring region. The venue for some of his plays is Kalañjara itself which directly suggests that at the time of composition and representation of these dramas the author must have been living in the vicinity of Kalañjara.

ii) As will be occasionally dealt with afterwards, Vatsaraja's depictions give sufficient scope to the various socio-cultural activities of the age of Candellas whose state capital has been Kalañjara for many centuries. Such type of allusions help us in assuming that Vatsaraja might have been living in that place.

iii) The fact that Vatsaraja was a minister in the Candella

26. V.V. Mirashi and N.R. Navalekar; Kālidāsa. p. 75.
28. CRK. p. 237. For a discussion on the place of Vatsaraja see in general AV. p. 17 ff.
government also strengthens the surmises of his attachment with Kālañjara the capital town of Candella dynasty.

iv) Several mentions of various places like Kālañjara, 29 Nilakantha, Gakrasvāmi, Ceṣi and Tripūra which came then under the territory of Jejakabhukti or Bundelkhand ruled by the Candella dynasty are available in the RS.

v) Further the life of the aboriginal tribes of this area like Śabara and Kirāta is portrayed by the author.

vi) Śaivism was, in the region ruled by the Candella kings, quite popular because of their being Śaivas. It was a general tradition among the residents of Vindhyā region to have fidelity with Lord Śiva, and to promulgate the Śaiva religion. Various allusions to Lord Śiva and

33. Rukmī. II.7; Tripūra. I.3,6; IV.22; III.19; pp. 109 ff.
35. Kirāta. Verses. 37, 42.
36. CRK. p. 206.
Saiva religion available abundantly in the RS may be treated as a casual evidence to identify Vatsarāja as a resident of Vindhya region.

(D) Caste and Family

There prevails an uncertainty about Vatsarāja's caste. Some scholars consider him to be a Jain while some describe him to be a Brāhmaṇa and others call him Kṣatriya. It will be proper to examine these views critically. In Siddheśvara Stāstri Chitrava's opinion Vatsarāja was a Jain. But he does not give any further evidence in support of his statement. L.N. Shukla, refusing the statement of Chitrava, has quoted the views of Muni Punyavijaya as follows - 'Scholars consider Vatsarāja a Jain perhaps because of availability of the manuscripts of his dramas in Jain Bхāndāras at Pattan (Gujarat). But such type of inference seems to be far from truth. For, in Jain Bхāndāras not only does the Jain literature exist, but they contain the literature of other Indian sects also.' Secondly the plots of Vatsarāja's mythical dramas are taken

37. Kirāta. Verses 2, 23, 56, 58; Karpūra. Verses 1, 2, 32; Tripura. I. 1, 2, 3; IV. 21, 23; Hāgya. I. 1, 2; II. 14; Samudra. I. 1; III. 13.
38. Siddheśvara Stāstri Chitrava; Madhyavuḍina Caritra Kośa. P. 722. For Vatsarāja's Caste and Family see in general RV. P. 23 ff.
39. Quoted by L.N. Shukla; RV. P. 21.
from only Hindu Purāṇas and not from Jain Purāṇas. If Vatsarāja were Jain atleast his anyone drama would have been based on Jain Purāṇas. Thirdly in the benedictory and valedictory portions of his dramas Vatsarāja refers to Lord Śiva, Viṣṇu and other Hindu deities but not to any Jain Tīrthaṅkara which obviously suggests that he must have not been Jain. Fourthly Vatsarāja ridicules the Jain concept of omnism (kevālī vidyā) in his Āgyaṇaṇḍaṇaprahasana. All these evidences may firmly establish that Vatsarāja was not a Jain.

Further the Candella history tells us that the rulers of this dynasty used to select some of their high officials like ministers and captains from Banāfara Kṣatriyas. Since Vatsarāja was also a minister of the Candella ruler Paramardideva, it may be normally supposed that the former might have been a Banāfara Kṣatriya. But none of the internal or external definite evidences is further available to support this idea. One reference, of course, may be quoted in this regard. As is already mentioned, in the Candella records

41. Čā. p. 130.
Vatsarāja is said to be the father of Haripāla who is mentioned in another record to be a Thakkura. Although Thakkura is a synonym of Kṣatriya now-a-days, but still in Indian epigraphical glossary it seems to be risky to take Thakkura in the sense of Kṣatriya. P.V. Kane suggests that Thakkura was a mere title whereby the holder was entitled to wield some kind of power in the state. This may be supported by some other records also. In the above quoted record (foot- 

42. It is to be observed here that Vatsarāja was working under Paramarddideva. Haripāla is mentioned as a son of Vatsarāja and as an official of Paramarddi's son Trailokyavarman. (EI. Vol. XXV. pp. 2, 5). Further Ratnapāla is recorded to be the grandson of Vatsarāja and the personal of Parmarddi's grandson Viravarman (EI. Vol. I. p. 328, Verse 21). Thus Vatsarāja, Haripāla and Ratnapāla all the three must have been sprung from the one and the same race. It may be clarified from the following table -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Loyalist</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Vatsarāja</td>
<td>Paramarddideva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Haripāla</td>
<td>Trailokyavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandson</td>
<td>Ratnapāla</td>
<td>Viravarman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. EI. Vol. XXV. p. 5.

44. HDS. Vol. III. p. 984.
Haripāla himself is given the title 'Sandhi-vigrahika Thakkura' (minister for peace and war, or foreign affairs). Further an Ajayagarh rock inscription of the time of a Candella ruler Bhojavarmann records that 'from the race of Vāstavya Kāyastha sprang a matchless person named Jájuka who was endowed with the title of Thakkura and was appointed to superintend at all times the affairs of the state. Two more inscriptions engraved on the pedestal of some sculptures of at Ajayagarh fort of Bundelakhanda mention that the images were caused to be made by Devalladevi, the daughter of the Thakkura Devadhara and the wife of Suhādadeva of Vāstavya Kāyastha family. Suhādadeva was the son of Thakkura Ashau, the grandson of Thakkura Vāse and the great grandson of Thakkura Vidana who was incharge of the Ajayagarh fort.

The word Thakkura occurs as a title in Rājarṣiṇī (12th century A.D.) also. All these evidences tend to show that Thakkura was to be used as an official title and not as a synonym of Kṣatriya in that age, and hence, it will not be safe to call Vatsarṣi a Kṣatriya.

It may be noticed in the Kṣ that the author has quite


47. RT. VII. 290.
allegiance with Brāhmaṇas and Brāhmaṇic religion. He obviously seems to be pro-Brāhmaṇas and that’s why he did not like a Brāhmaṇa to be dishonoured. In Tripurādāya Dīma a Brāhmaṇa is stated to be worth-saluting because he can pacify all kinds of suspicions and thus he is shown superior than even a government secretary. Further in the same play the Brāhmaṇa’s tongue is said to be unrestrained. Samudramathana Samavakāra also mentions that the Brāhmaṇa is not worth-killing in spite of his faults. Furthermore the Candella rulers used to appoint mostly Brāhmaṇas as their ministers and Vatsarāja is one of their ministers. The characters of Brāhmaṇa ministers and masters are drawn by Vatsarāja himself in his dramas. Thus for example Viśadāsaya (Tripura. p. 97) and Śukra (Tripura. pp. 107 ff; Samudra. pp. 181 ff) may be referred to in this regard. Thus the above account is likely to be used in order to strengthen the conjecture that Vatsarāja should have been a Brāhmaṇa.

50. Dvijo’śi ceti kṛṣṇapādho’ni na ma vadvya’śi. Samudra; p. 188.
51. ČAK. p. 149; HCJ. p. 152.
However, the possibility that Vatsarāja might have been belonging to a Kāyastha family, can not be denied. Even if it is true that Vatsarāja has maintained the supremacy of Brāhmaṇas to a certain extent in accordance with the age old tradition, still the slander of Brāhmaṇas also is not unknown in the FS. In Tripurādana Brāhmaṇas are said to be unworthy of belief, and habitual of frivolity. In another stanza of the same play it is hinted that Brāhmaṇas are too foolish to be able to decide whether someone is brave or craven. These counter references may present a slight suspicion in supposing Vatsarāja/Brāhmaṇa.

The aforesaid contemporary epigraphic records make it clear that during that period the title 'Thakkura' was given mostly to the Kāyasthas. Some more additional references may also be quoted in this respect. Jalhana, a scribe of the Gāhāvalla inscription (1116 A.D.), was a Kāyastha Thakkura belonging to the Vātser Vāstavya family. Another record of the Candella rulers mentions that the Kalañjara inscription of V.S. 1147 (A.D. 1090) was composed by the Kāyastha

54. Bhīrūḥ āura iti sthitam kathamaha jānati virro bhavān.
Tripura. I. 20.
Moreover in some contemporary records the references are made to Śrīvāstava Thakkura. Mēthura Kāyastha Thakkura and Gauda Kāyastha Thakkura. If we are more or less justified in showing Thakkura Harīpāla identical with the son of Vatsarañja, our surmise may be, of course, corroborated.

Moreover the historical sources tell us that in early medieval age Kāyasthas were playing a significant role holding the top official posts in administration. An inscription of 13th century A.D. from Narvara (Rājasthāna) reveals that the son of Dēmodara, an early ancestor of a Mēthura Kāyastha family, held the post of treasurer (kośādhina). Rājatarāṅgini (12th century A.D.) also reveals that the civil officials in Kaśmīra were mostly Kāyasthas who were sometimes appointed as prime minister and military commander. The most significant reference in this context is that the Candella ruler Paramaruddideva himself was availing of the services

56. EI. Vol. XXXI. p. 166. line 17.
61. RT. VII. 560.
62. RT. VII. 1320.
of Gadādhara, the minister for peace and war and belonging to the Gauda family which is known to be one of the Kayastha families. Since Vatsarāja himself was a minister of Paramarddideva, and his son Haripāla was given the title Thakkura (which was given mostly to the Kayasthas) it is probable that Vatsarāja might have been another Kayastha official of the Paramarddideva's rule. In our humble opinion this surmise may be acceptable until some further sound and positive evidence is found out.

Almost all sources are silent about Vatsarāja's family life. As has already been pointed out, only one inscription of the Candella dynasty mentions Vatsarāja as the father of Haripāla and grandfather of Katnapāla. This evidence obviously suggests that Vatsarāja must have enjoyed a family life. Not only so, he belonged to a learned and loyal family which served the Candella rulers for three generations. Thus Vatsarāja had served as a minister under Paramarddideva, his son Haripāla as a minister for peace and war under Trailokyavarman.

(or Trailokyamalla), and his grandson Ratnapāla as a scribe under Viravarman. It is interesting to note that according to the record all the three were poets, and Ratnapāla of them is specifically stated to be intelligent (buddhā).

It is interesting to note that in the H3 Vatsarāja has mentioned a large number of familial terms such as father, father-in-law, father's sister (pitrāvāśr. Rukmi. p. 53),


One possibility is to be pointed out here that Vatsarāja's son (= Haripāla) and grandson (= Ratnapāla) both, being poets, might have composed some literary works which may pave the path for further researches.

70. Arjuna's father Indra in Ṛṣṭe; Rukmi's and Rukminī's father Bhīṣmaka, and Kṛṣṇa's Vasudeva in Rukmi; Nārada's father Brahmā and Kurttikeya's Śiva in Tripura; and Lākṣmi's father ocean in Samudra.

71. Kṛṣṇa's father-in-law Bhīṣmaka and Rukminī's Vasudeva in Rukmi; Viṣṇu's father-in-law Ocean in Samudra; and Śiva's father-in-law Himalaya in Tripura. p. 84.

About the religion of Vatsarāja the benedictory, valedictory and other contexts of the RS apparently suggest that

72. Vilāsavatī's mother Kalāvatī and Candrasenā's Māyāvatī in Kapvātra; Kṛṣṇa's mother Devakī in Rukmi.; and Madanasundari's mother Karaṭakelī in Hāsya.

73. Rukmini's mother-in-law Devakī in Rukmi.

74. Indra's son Arjuna in Kirāta; Vasudeva's and Devaki's son Kṛṣṇa, and Bhīṣmaka's Rukmi in Rukmi.; Brahmā's son Nārada and Śiva's Kūrtīkṛṣṇa in Tripura.


76. Śīśurāla was the son of Kṛṣṇa's paternal aunt Śrutaśāvatā in Rukmi.

77. Kalāvatī's daughter Vilāsavatī and Māyāvatī's Candrasenā in Kapvātra; Bhīṣmaka's daughter Rukmini in Rukmi.; Karaṭakelī's daughter Madanasundari in Hāsya.; Ocean's daughter Laksṇī in Samudra.

78. Vasudeva's and Devaki's daughter-in-law Rukmini in Rukmi.
the author was a unique follower of Śaivism, because he has paid his utmost homage to Lord Śiva in various ways. However, he has invoked other gods and goddesses also in various contexts which shows his broad religious tolerance. Vatsarāja was, of course, a man of letters. His familiarity with various branches of lore will be reflected occasionally in the different chapters of his work.

(E) Geographical Situation

Kālañjara:

It has already been discussed that Kālañjara is the holy place in the vicinity of which Vatsarāja had been born, lived and worked. In the RS itself Kālañjara has been variously referred to. Historically it has been an important place during ancient and medieval ages. In medieval period it was considered to be one of the best forts of India and its victory was supposed to be the victory of entire Central India. During ancient age also it was well known for its religious grandeur. According to Mahābhārata - 'there is the mountain

79. Kirāta. Verses 2, 22, 23; Tripura. I. 1, 2, 3; IV. 25;
    Śākya. I. 1, 2; II. 14; Samudra. I. 1; III. 9, 10, 13.


82. CRK. pp. 231, 237; For the Geographical Situation of Kālañjara see RV. pp. 44 ff.
known over the whole world and called Kālañjara. Bathing in the celestial lake that is there, one acquires the merit of giving away a thousand kine. He who after a bath offers oblations (to the gods and ṛtṛa) on the Kālañjara mountain is, without doubt, regarded in heaven. In Vāyu Purāṇa also Lord Śiva had predicted - 'at that excellent mountain the poison (kāla) will be wasted (jara) by me, so the mountain would be known as Kālañjara'.

However there could not be unanimity of opinion as regards the original construction of Kālañjara fort. Traditionally it is known to have been founded by Candravarm the traditional progenitor of Candella dynasty. Some other informations tell us that it was conquered (not built) by a Candella ruler Yasovarman in 10th century A.D. Nevertheless most of the sources agree on this point that the Candella rulers had possessed this fort for hundreds of years and it had been the capital of Candella reign for centuries. At the time of Vatsarāja it was under possession of Paramaraddideva and later on of Trailokyavarmadeva. Thus both these rulers

83. MP. Vanaparva. 85. 56-57 (Cita Press edn.).
84. Vāyu Purāṇa. 23. 204.
85. Parmālarāśi (Mahobā khandā) of Candavaradhi. 1. 108-12.
87. Mg Cf. CKB. p. 237.
are styled in the RS as Kâlanjarapati and Kâlanjarâdhipati.

Kâlanjara is such a durable stronghold that after centuries of its construction even now it is existing in some good shape. Facing innumerable attacks of storm, rain, various types of natural disorder, and foreign invasions it is still enduring and reciting its past dignity. Although the informations about antiquities of this fort are meagre in the RS, still a brief account of the present Kâlanjara may be presented by means of some other sources in addition to the internal evidences, whatever available, in the dramas under study.

Geographically Kâlanjara is situated 90 miles to the South-West of Allahabad (Uttar Pradesh) and 60 miles to the North-west of Rewa (Madhya Pradesh). Now-a-days it is a small town in Badausa sub-division of Banda district (Uttar Pradesh). But in the ancient days it was a big town surrounded with a rampart. The descriptive ramparts (prâkâras) of Candratâpanagara and Sûryatâpanagara in the RS (Tripura, pp. 103 and 99) may remind us of the bulwark of Kâlanjara.

This fortification was containing four gates, three of which Kâmata gate, Pannâ gate and Bêwa gate are still existing

The fort stands on an isolated flat-topped hill of the Vindhyā range, which here rises to a height of 800 feet above the plain. The lower part of the ascent is somewhat easy, but the middle portion is very steep, while the upper part is nearly perpendicular and quite inaccessible. The main body of the fort, which lies from east to west, is oblong in form, being nearly a mile in length by half a mile in breadth. At the north angle there is a large projecting spur nearly a quarter of a mile square which overhangs the town; and on the middle of the southern face there is another projection of about the same size, but triangular in shape. The distance between the extreme points of these two projections is nearly one mile. The whole area is therefore considerably less than one square mile, while the parapet walls are nearly four miles in length. 92

There are two entrances to the fort, the main of which is on the north side towards the town, and the other at the south-east angle leading towards Pannā district of Madhya Pradesh after which it is named Pannā gate, but closed now. The main entrance is guarded by seven different gates which may be described as follows.

Upto the first or lowest gate there is an ascent of about 200 feet from the base of the hill. The gate contains

an inscription recording the construction of the gate during the reign of Aurangzeb Alamgir (1673 A.D.) after whom the gate was named 'Alama darawāzā'.

The ascent between the 1st and 2nd gateways is called Kaffira ghāṭī which is very steep. On the right of this gate there is a sculpture representing a seated Ganesa about 18 inches high from which the gate is titled Ganesa darawāzā.

The third gate is called 'Cāndī darawāzā' situated at the angle of the hill. This is, in fact, a double gate with four towers on which account it is also known as 'Cau-burja darawāzā' or gate of the four towers.

The fourth gate is of very solid construction and named Svarga-rohana or 'heaven ascending gate' owing to the stiff climb required to reach it. The fifth gate is known as Hanumān darawāzā named after a figure of Hanumān carved on a slab resting against the rock. Near the top of the ascent there is sixth gate called Lāla darawāzā from its red colour. This is in very good preservation and has the

93. ASI. Vol. XXI. p. 29.
95. ASI. Vol. XXI. p. 29.
96. ASI. Vol. XXI, p. 29.
wooden doors standing. From sixth gate a short ascent leads to the seventh or main gate (baḍā darawāzā).

Inside the fort on the north there are four notable places:

1) Sitākunda (a big reservoir of water named after Rama's wife Sitā);
2) Sitāgala (a small cave or recess containing a stone couch with bed and pillow on which Sitā is traditionally told to have slept during her dwelling in forest with Rāma and Laksmana);
3) Patālagaha; and
4) Pandukunda (both cisterns of water).

Near the middle of the east face there is a natural hollow, in the bottom of which a reservoir has been excavated with steps around. This is called Buddhi Budhiyā or Budhiyā ke tālāba and bathing in it is told to be very beneficial for soul and body. At the south-east angle is situated the Pannā gate which is now closed.

The next object of interest after leaving the Pannā gate is the mrgadhāra or 'antelope's spring' a small pool in

an inner chamber of the rampart into which water trickles constantly perhaps from the Kota tirtha, a large tank on the high ground above. On the right of the cistern there is a small excavation of seven deer from which the name is derived 'mrga' (deer) and 'dhāra' (stream or current).

Almost at the centre of Kālanjara fort there is Kota-tirtha, a large reservoir of water, nearly 100 yards in length with several flights of steps. This is told to be the chief object of pilgrimage at Kālanjara and the word Kota-tirtha is explained as follows:

1. Kota-tirtha (equivalent to ten million places of pilgrimage) and

2. Kota-tirtha (leprosy place of pilgrimage where lepers are to be cured by bathing).

The main attraction of Kālanjara fort is the Nīlakantha temple situated in the middle of the west face of the fort. It is interesting to note that Vatsarāja's two plays - Karpūra-carita Bhāna and Hāsyacūḍāmaṇī Prahasana, were staged on the occasion of journey-festival of Nīlkanṭha itself. The existence of Nīlakantha temple at Kālanjara is evidenced by some Purāṇas also. According to Vāmana Purāṇa Prahlāda had...

100. ASI, Vol. XXI. pp. 31-32.
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102. Karpūra, p. 23.
103. Hāsya, p. 118.
seen Nilakantha at Millennials. The actual shrine of Nilakantha is a small cave with the remains of a fine mandapa or hall in front. Just outside the mandapa there is a deep kūnda or rock-cut reservoir called Svara-rohini or Svara-vāhinī which is, though conventionally, also referred to by Vatsaraśīja.

The surrounding area:

A verse in the RŚ (= Vīrata. Verse. 19) contains a very significant mention of Bhukti through which the geographical extent of the territory of Candella kingdom may be established. In the above-quoted stanza Arjuna says that the Bhukti (usufruct) has been ramped by the enemies. Historically it is learnt that the wide area ruled by the Candella kings was named Jejākabhukti after the name of Jejā (Jayāśakti) the third king of the dynasty. Bhukti may be treated as a short or corrupt form of Jejākabhukti. Since the drama Kṛṣṭarjunyā Vyūhaga containing the mention of bhukti was staged during the reign of the Candella king Trailokyavarman it appears to be indicative of a political incident in which the bhukti or Jejākabhukti was snatched earlier by the enemies of Candellas and was re-acquired later by Trailokyavarman.

104. Vṛṣamāṇa Purāṇa. 57.50.
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along with the possession of Kālañjara fort. Some of the Candella records witness this occurrence. Ajayagarh rock inscription of Viravarman (A.D. 1260) mentions, '.... Trailokyavarman was like Vignu in lifting the earth emerged in the ocean formed by the streams of Turnakas'.

Moreover, it is significant to note that in the Candella history Trailokyavarman is recorded to have ruled over quite an extensive kingdom and thus his territory bhukti or Jejakabhukti included 'the former states of Chatarapura, Panna, Ajayagarh and Bijāvara in Bundelkhand, some parts of Sāgara district of Madhya Pradesh, Walisapura district and Kālañjara in Banda district of Uttar Pradesh.'

Further it is also noteworthy that Paramardideva is called 'Kālañjarapati' (lord of Kālañjara) by Vatsarṣaja (Karpura, p. 23) and at the same time some epigraphic records style him as dāśārṇādhinātha (lord of Dāśārṇa region).

According to Sircar's identification Dāśārṇa was one of the old names of east Mālawā and the adjoining region, with

---

111. The vast area between Bundelkhand in the east and Rāja-
sthāna in the west has been known as Mālawā since medieval times.
its capital at Vidiśā (Madhya Pradesh) and with the rivers UaśSrM and Vetavatī running through it. From the above account it may be assumed that Paramarddiśa kingdom might have been spread over a large area being governed from the two capital places - Kālanjara and Vidiśā.

That Candella kings were ruling over a large region is evidenced by internal as well as external allusions. Thus Dhaṅga, a Candella ruler, is described in the inscriptions as 'the sole ruler of the earth' (ekamahāparatau) who 'by his arms ...... firmly established his upright rule over the earth' and 'who held unrivalled sway over the whole earth encircled by the ocean'. In another record it is stated that Gadadhara, the minister of a Candella ruler Madanavarmā, made (the king's) sovereignty over the earth characterised by a single umbrella. Though these accounts are somewhat vague and exaggerated, yet they appear to corroborate the above surmise. Further as an internal allusion in Kirātārjuniya Vyāyoga Mahendra advised Arjuna as follows - 'If you want to rule over

the earth encircled by the four seas, you should exercise in the archery'. This may indirectly support the fact that Candella kings were having the earnest desire of ruling over a larger area, and they did it also to a certain extent.

Some more topographical data may be collected from the dramas under study. Through the perusal of internal and external evidences it seems that in these plays the author has been appears. to indicate the Candellas' capital city Mahotsavana-gara (modern Mahobā in Hamirapur district of Uttar Pradesh). For example Karpūracarita Bhāna and Hāsyachādāmani Prahasana contain frequent references to Madanodyāna (cupid garden).

According to the tradition gardens and tanks are naturally expected to be situated near each other and this suggests that the Madanodyāna should have also been associated with a tank. Hāsyachādāmani Prahasana tells us that a pond was existing near the Madanodyāna. It is known that in the territory of Candellas there was a famous tank named Madanasāgara (cupid tank) near Mahotsavanagara. So it may be justly inferred

118. Mahobā or Mahotsavanagāra has been the capital town of Candellas. CPK. p. 30.
120. nenu pratvyāpannaiva dirghikā. Hāṣva. p. 147.
121. CPK. p. 230; Ud. p. 130.
that Madanodyāna depicted in the RS might be situated somewhere near Madanasāgara of Mahotsavanagara which is mentioned as a pond (dirghikā) in Hāvyacucādāmani Prahasana (p. 147).

Further in Karpūracarita Ehāna (p. 31) Vatsarāja has mentioned a temple of Manibhadradeva. According to Candella he history there was a tutelary deity of Candellas which was known as Maniyādeva and the shrines of this deity were existing at various places of Jejākabukti like Maniyāgarh (in the Chatarapura district of Mādhyā Pradesh) and Barel (in the Nararupura district of Uttar Pradesh). A shrine of Maniyādeva is there at Mahotsavanagara also. It seems probable that Maniyādeva may be the corrupt form of Manibhadradeva mentioned by Vatsarāja (Karpūra, pp. 31, 35). Thus the Madanodyāna garden and Manibhadra temple both depicted in the RS may be established within the vicinity of Mahotsavanagara.

According to Cunningham the name 'Mahotsavanagara' (the city of great festivals) was given to this town from the great festival which was celebrated there by Candravarman the traditional founder of the dynasty. In this connection we may add that there are frequent references to celebrations of great festivals (Mahotsava) in Vatsarāja's plays. Thus one celebrated a great festival on account of getting some gift

122. CJ. p. 7.
123. ASI. Vol. II. p. 439.
from his/her sweetheart (Karpūra. p. 30); on various religious journeys (Karpūra. p. 23; Ḥāśya. p. 118); on recovery of the robbed articles (Ḥāśya. p. 123); on winning money in gambling (Ḥāśya. p. 134); and on getting rid of calamity (Ḥāśya. p. 148) etc.

Moreover, in Samudramathana Samavākāra Vatsarāja has referred to 'Veiāvana' frequently. The word generally means 'a forest on the sea-shore'. But this word can better be understood as garden or forest named Vela and this interpretation is fruitful further. Candellas' history records a beautiful tank named Velatāla existing in the vicinity of Mahotsavanagāra i.e. Jaitapura town of Hamirapura district in Uttar Pradesh. It is said to be a big tank of a circuit of about nine miles and thus it looks like an ocean.

According to the depictions in Samudramathana Samavākāra all things come out of the ocean after its churning were requested to take rest in the garden of Velāvana. It seems quite likely that the ocean-like tank Velatāla must have been associated with the garden Velāvana, and while the composition of the play both these places - the tank (= Velatāla) and the garden (= Velāvana) might have been existing in the author's

125. CRK. p. 230.
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The renowned cities of medieval age - Tripúrī, Cédi and Kaundínāpura are depicted in the RS. Though their depiction seems to be conventional there, yet the contemporary history testifies the existence of these cities still in that age, and being more or less related to the Candella dominion.

Tripúrī is called now Tewár (Teor) situated seven miles to the west of Jabalapura district in Madhya Pradesha. During the regime of Kalacuri dynasty it was the capital of Cédiása. The Candella ruler Trailokyavarman is said to have conquered the Jewā area from the Kalacuri kings of Tripúrī. Further a Candella inscription states that 'the lord of Tripúrī (probably Jayasimha 1163–1188 A.D.) fainted whenever he heard the songs of valour of his (= Paramardin's) arms'.

127. Rukmi. II. 7; Tripura.
131. Ibid.
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About Cedi it is told that before Candella dominion various parts of Jejakabhukti or Bundelakhandã were included in Gedidesa. Tod identifies Cedi with Canderl, a town 18 miles west of Lalitapura district in Bundelkhandã. The ruins of old Canderl, however, are eight miles north-west of the modern town. At the time of Mahãbharata Ñuktirati was the capital of Gedidesa and during the Gupta period Kàlahàjara was its capital while at the time of Kalacuri dynasty its capital was Tripurã. The Kalacuri dynasty, and Candella dynasty, and epigraphic records tend to show that the Candella—Kalacuri rivalry had been of a long standing.

As a matter of fact these two dynasties have been coterminous, often allied with each other, but more often fighting among themselves. There is an abundance of records showing that Kalacuri or Cedi kings were defeated by Candella kings and the latter by the former.

Thus the above-mentioned details allow us to assume

134. C.W. p. 12.
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that Vatsarajja might have been prone to imply the Candellas' victory over the Kalacuri kings of Cedi through the figurative conquest over the Cedi king Siṣupāla by Prāna in Rukmiṇiharana Thāmāra; and over the Tripuri kings - Sarvatāpa, Sūryatāpa and Candratāpa by Mahēsa and other gods in Tripuradāha Dima.

Kaundinapura is known to be the ancient capital of Vidarbha. According to D.C. Sircar's identification the territory of Vidarbha lay on both sides of Vardā river (modern Wardē, a tributary of Godāvari) and roughly corresponded to the western part of Madhya Pradesh. This town is situated on the Wardē in Chandur Taluk of Amarāvatī district in Vidarbha region. Thus Kaundinapura is also one of the neighbouring places of Jejākabhuṣti or Bundelakhanda.

Besides, some other towns like Dwārkā (Rukmi. p. 73) Krṣnapura (Rukmi. p. 62), Amarāvatī (Tripura. p. 96), and Indrapurī or Īkrapurī (Tripura. II. 15) are also referred to by Vatsarajja but in a mythical and conventional manner.

On account of the enormous increase in India's population the natural vegetation has been destroyed by men for their worldly settlement. However much of the forest is still existing in the hilly and less thickly populated areas. Most 139. Sircar, D.C.; Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India. p. 188.
of the parts of Bundelakhandi region were, like present days,
full of primeval and green jungles in ancient medieval ages.
The mention of various types of flora like Sahakara (Mango
tree (Hasya. II. 3), Khadra (Catechu) (Tripura. III. 12),
Asoka (a tree of moderate size belonging to the leguminous
class with magnificent red flowers) (Hasya. p. 133),
Srikhanda (Sandal tree) (Hasya. II. 3), Haricandana (a kind
of sandal of yellow colour) (Hasya. p. 133), Caladalaturu
(Asvattha or tremulous-leaved tree) (Hasya. p. 137), Vicakila
(Jasmine) (Samudra. p. 150; Hasya. I. 3), Vata (Banyan)
(Karnura. Verse 5) and Faleka (a fig tree) (Tripura. IV. 3);
and various kinds of fauna like Kanthirava or Keeari (lion)
(Rukmi. I. 14, 23), Simhi (lioness) (Tripura. III. 4), Gaja
(elephant) (Rukmi. I. 23; II. 1, 21; Tripura. II. 15, 16),
Karin (female elephant) (Rukmi. I. 4), Khadga (rhinoceros)
(Kirata. Verse 35), Varaha or Kroda (Swine) (Kirata. Verses
27, 30, 32, 36), Vrca (deer), Rohisa (a special kind of deer),
Rahku (a special kind of antelope) and Nyahku (reindeer)
(Kirata. Verse 36), Harini (doe) (Rukmi. III. 5; I. 3),
Harinarbhaka (fawn) (Samudra. I. 61), Krostu (Jackal) (Kirata.
Verse 53), Siya (female of jackal) (Rukmi. I. 27; IV. 16),
Cakora (partridge) (Rukmi. III. 9), Sasa (hare) (Tripura.
p. 87), Mayura (peacock) (Tripura. p. 92), Kalakantha (cuckoo)
(Samudra. II. 4) and Leva (quail) (Tripura. III. 9) in the KS
may suggest the existence of large and primeval jungles of
Bundelakhandi wherein these plants and animals were adequately
found.

The graphic depictions of ocean and several aquatic animals with their characteristics in *Samudramathana Samavakāra* (I. 13, 24, 32, 38; III. 4) obviously bespeak of the author's own experience of the ocean-like cisterns and reservoirs of water numerously made by the Candella kings at several places of Bundelakhandā.

Various mountains and rivers have been referred to in the text but in a purely mythical way. So they are not required to be discussed here in detail. However their mere mention will not be out of place - Himavān, Vaiśeṣa, Maināka, Mandara, Udayagiri (Rukmi. I. 3), Caramaśikhari (Hāsyā. I. 3), Kanakaśikhari, and Cañca and Yamuna (Rukmi. IV. 7).
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(2) The Works of Vatsarāja

The first two decades of 20th century A.D. must be regarded as highly remarkable for the discoveries of the dramas of two great dramatists - Bhasa and Vatsarāja. It was in the years of 1910 and 1915 when T. Panapati Sastrī and C.D. Dalal discovered the thirteen plays of Bhasa and six of Vatsarāja respectively. It is interesting to note that these two are the only dramatists in whole Sanskrit literature whose so many dramas of different types are found.

In Jain Bhandāra of manuscripts at Khetarwasi, Pattan (Gujarat) two palm-leaf collections were found by C.D. Dalal. The first of them contains four dramas - KarnUracarita Bhāsa, Nāyacchandāmani Prahasana, Tripuradāha Dima and Kīrātārjuneva Vyāyoga. The other palm leaf possesses two plays - Samudramathana Samavakṣa and Kukminiharana Īhāmraṇa. All these dramas of Vatsarāja have been published in 'Rakṣakatkam' in the

149. Ibid. p. 261.
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following order:—

i) **Kālūtārjunīya Vyāyoga** (pp. 1-21)

ii) **Karnādīracarita Bhāṣa** (pp. 23-35)

iii) **Rukminīharana Dīma Ṣ̄iṅgara** (pp. 37-74)

iv) **Tripurādāha Dīma** (pp. 75-117)

v) **Ḍ̄hyāṇadāmanī Prahasana** (pp. 118-148)

vi) **Samudramathana Samavakāra** (pp. 149-191)

Now let us have a general acquaintance with each drama which may of Vatsarāja in the light of its dramaturgical characteristics, which may be helpful indirectly in gauging also the developed state of dramatic art of that age. The first play **Kālūtārjunīya** is called Vyāyoga by the dramatist himself.

The Vyāyoga', according to Dhanañjaya, 'has a well known subject and has well known male characters of vehement type; it lacks the *Garbha* and *Vimāraṇa* junctures; the sentiments in it are the excited ones as in the *Dīma*. It represents a combat not occasioned by a woman. It consists of one act presenting the doings of single day and contains many male characters'.

The Vyāyoga of our poet possesses all these peculiarities. It has a well known subject of struggle between Arjuna

150A. For this subject in general see also *RV. p. 82 kš*.


152. *PR. III. 60-62.*
and Śiva in the form of a Kirāta. Its principal characters - Arjuna, Śaṅkara, Indra and Duryodhana, are also well known and particularly its hero Arjuna is of quite vehement type. Since its seed (= bija i.e. to see Lord Śiva through penance) is not seen being lost, there does not arise the question of searching after it and hence this play lacks development juncture (= garbha-sandhi). Further the means of attaining the end (= phala i.e. to get the great weapon from Śiva) is not successfully impeded by any curse or the like and hence our Vyāyoga is deficient in pause juncture (= vimara-sandhi) also. The excited sentiments - Vīra, Raudra and Adbhuta etc. are found here sufficiently. The combat also depicted in the play is occasioned by the problem as to who killed the swine and thus not by any woman. It is composed in one act and presents the happenings of a single day. As is already shown it consists of many male characters - Arjuna, Śaṅkara, Indra, Duryodhana, Siddhādeśa, Narakirāta, Haradhuryodhana, Ārdūla, Kāntihirava, and Gomūyuka.

Karpūracarita, the second play of the Kāñ, is a Bhāna in its nature. 'Bhāna' is a kind of drama in which a single clever and shrewd parasite describes roguish exploits engaged

---

in by himself or by some one else. He is to make remarks conveying information, as well as replies to imaginary remarks, by means of conversations with imaginary persons, and he should indicate the heroic and erotic sentiments by means of descriptions of prowess and of beauty. Generally the eloquent style is employed; and the subject which is invented by the author is to be treated in a single act. It has two junctures - the opening (= mukha) and the conclusion (= nirvana), with their subdivisions and also the ten subdivisions of the Gentle Dance (= lasya).

It is found that in Karṇḍuracarita Bhāṣa a dexterous parasite named Karṇḍuraka describes the activities and characteristics of various cunning people like Maṇḍīraka, Haradatta, Caturaka, Nipuṇaka, Gandanaka, Virodhaka, Vilāsavati, Candraseṇa, Kalāvatī, Māyāvatī and even of himself. In the whole play he often makes remarks conveying information and replies to imaginary characters - Gandanaka, Virodhaka and Maṇibhadra. He also presents the erotic sentiment by means of the descriptions of various erotic activities of Vilāsavati, Candraseṇa and Maṇḍīraka; and heroic sentiment by means of the descriptive influence of Māyā and the heroic conversations with Maṇibhadra and Virodhaka. Generally the eloquent style (= bhāratī vṛtti)

156. DR. III. 49-51 (translated by C.O. Haas. p. 58).
157. bhāratī sanskritarāgo vāgyvānāra maṭāravaḥ, DR. III. 5.
is used and other dialects are employed only when the hero 
is to express the remarks of other imaginary persons. The 
subject of this play is absolutely invented by the dramatist 
and it is not based on any legend. It is composed in one act. 
The opening juncture (= mukha-sandhi) may be found in the 
portion of our Bhāṣa from Karpūraka's statement - 'now I should 
go to the gambling house which is the proper place for getting 
such wealth which is not won so far' to his later talk with 
Candanaka that 'the good result of my action itself will propi-
tiate you'. 

The conclusion juncture (= nirvāhā-sandhi) may also be seen from Mañjiraka's saying to Karpūraka, 'who are 
we of Viḷāsavatī fascinated by heart to Karpūraka' to the 
cluding verse of the Bhāṣa.

Of the ten subdivisions of Gentle Dance (= lākṣaṇa) the 
following are obviously seen in Karpūraka-carita :-

158. mukham bijasamutattirnānārthaśaśasambhayā. DR. I. 24.
159. tadahamidānapīrthatirthapratipādanāyā durodarsādāmeva 
vrātānuv Karpūra. p. 25.
160. tattvād phalasampattirevādāhavyati. Karpūra. p. 27.
161. DR. I. 48-49.
p. 28.
i) Gayapada (song)

ii) Sthitapāthya (recitation by one standing).

iii) Asīna (recitation by one seated) and

iv) Uktapravvukta (amoebbean song).

Rukminīharaṇa, the third play of Vatsarāja, is of

Ihāmrge type. Dhanārājaya defines it as follows:—

'In Ihāmrge the story should be mixed i.e. partly legendary
and partly invented; it is divided into four acts with three
junctures (i.e. mukha, pratimukha and nirvahana). The Hero
and his opponent may be either human or divine; both should
be renowned and of self controlled and vehement type, the
latter committing improper acts by mistake. One should
also present, though only to a slight extent, the semblance
of love on the part of one who tries to obtain a divine woman
against her will by carrying her off or some such means.
Though hostile wrath is provoked, the battle should be pre­
vented by an artifice. One should not present the death of

a great person'.

It is found that Vatsarāja's Ihāmrge is composed on
a well known mythical story of Bhāgavata Purāṇa (X. 52-54)


164. DR. III. 72-75 (translated by C.O. Haas. p. 105).
being introduced a few inventions by the dramatist. It consists of four acts. The opening juncture (= makha sandhi) is found from the statement heard behind curtain in the first act - 'May this undiscriminating idea be the place of misfortunes' to the Balarama's suggestion in the second sect - 'let us all go to our respective mansions and get ready for expedition'. The progression juncture (= pratimukha sandhi) may also be traced out from the conversation between Subuddhi and Suvatsala in the third act to the verse recited behind curtain in the fourth act where Rukmi and Sisupala both are said to be protected by Krishna because of being his relatives. Further the conclusion juncture (= nirvaha sandhi) is employed in the last act from Subuddhi's dialogue 'My dear child

105. A major change is as follows: - According to the legend Rukmi was made defaced by Krishna after cutting hair of his beard and mustaches (Bhagavata Purana, X. 54. 35) while in this play Rukmi, without facing such type of trouble, was set free by Krishna.

Fortunately you are being now twofold exhilarated to the valedictory verse of the play. The hero Kṛṣṇa and his opponent Śiśupāla are divine, well known and of controlled and vehement type. Śiśupāla commits improper acts by mistake and thus he tries to obtain the divine woman Rukminī against her will by force. In this play though the adverse fury between Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma versus Śiśupāla and Rukmi is excited, the battle is hindered by the pretence that since both the latters are the relative of the former, they are to be protected i.e. not to be killed. Thus the death of Śiśupāla and Rukmi is prevented by an artifice.

The fourth drama in the Pāṇḍava is Tripurādāsa which is said to be a Dīma. According to the treatises of dramaturgy the subject of a Dīma must be well known; and all the styles may be employed in it excepting the Gay style (= Kaiśiki vṛtti). Its heroes, sixteen in number, should be gods, Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Pārgasas, Mahoragas, Bhūtas, Preetas, Piśācas, and the like, all of vehement type. It contains the six sentiments, omitting the comic and the erotic, the customary principal sentiment being the furious, called forth

by deeds of magic, sorcery, combat, wrath, excitement, and the like, and by eclipses of the sun and moon. It is declared to have four acts and four junctures, there being no pause juncture (= \textit{Vimarśa sandhi}).

Being a mythical drama, the subject of \textit{Triruradāha} is well known. Since it is characterised by the examples of virtue, courage, self-sacrifice, compassion and uprightness of various dramatic characters, the Grandiose style (= \textit{sattvati vr̥tti}) is found there. Further in the descriptive deeds of magic, conjuration, conflict, rage, frenzy, and the like the Horrific Style (= \textit{arabhati vr̥tti}) is employed there. Moreover in the whole play, Sanskrit language is used (excepting a verse and a few words in Prakrit used by \textit{Prthivī}, pp. 82-83) and it is used only by the actors and not by actresses which is the obvious employment of the Elocuent Style (= \textit{bhārati vr̥tti}). On the other hand, our \textit{Dima} is quite free from the outward expressions of love, such as:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Dima} is quite free from the outward expressions of love, such as:
\item \textit{Prthivī}, pp. 82-83.
\item \textit{Prthivī}, pp. 82-83.
\item \textit{Prthivī}, pp. 82-83.
\item \textit{Prthivī}, pp. 82-83.
\end{itemize}

175. \textit{DR.} III. 57-60 (translated by C.O. Haag, pp. 100-101).
177. \textit{Viṣokā sattvati satvāgauravatvāgadvārjavaīh}. \textit{DR.} II. 53.
178. \textit{Arabhati punah māvendrajālaśaṅgrāmakrodhodbhrāntādīcāstīteiḥ}. \textit{DR.} II. 55-57.
179. \textit{Bhārati sanskritanreśyo vāsyvānāro naṭṭāravah}. \textit{DR.} III. 5.
as song, dance, coquetry and the like. So, apparently there is absence of the Gay Style (= Kaiśiki Vṛtti). This play contains its sixteen heroes - Maheśa, Kṛṣṇa, Brahmā, Indra, Agni, Yama, Varuna, Vāyu, Kubera, Śṛṣṭa, Candra, Kārttikeya, Dharma, Śeṣaṅga, Himalaya and Varṛṣya who are the gods, Yakṣas and Rākṣasas etc. and of vehement type. It may be pointed out here that the aim of the play (i.e. the burning of Tripūra) is achieved by all these sixteen characters as is acknowledged by Maheśa (Tripūra. IV. 22) so they all may be called the heroes of the play.

Six excited sentiments - Vīra, Raudra, Abhūtā, Karuna and Bhayānaka, are found there being dominated by Raudra one. Since it lacks the Gay Style (= kaiśiki vṛtti), there is no occasion for Kāsa and Trirāga sentiments. This play consists of four acts and mentions the eclipses of the sun and moon. The opening juncture (= mukha sandhi) may be seen there from the 'departure of Mārāda to Śiva; Mārāda who is intolerent to the violence caused by demons,' to the 'Lord Śiva's order to gods for getting ready in order to burn the Tripūra'. Further from the 'conversation between Alika

180. tatra Kaiśiki sitanītvam ābhodvairārdhān śāntīśrceṣṭihāh. Dh. II. 47.
181. śūrvacandraśādinarva. Tripūra. p. 75.
182. Tripūra. p. 78.
183. Tripūra. p. 80.
and Viparīta to Śrāvaka's request to Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśa for going to Amāravati; and his effort to take the gods to heaven the progression juncture (pratimukha sandhi) is applied there. The development juncture (garbha sandhi) is existing from 'the conversation between Viśadāśaya and sphutākāśa' to 'the urge made by Śukra to Sarvatāpa and Viśadāśaya for attending the demons injured in battle'.

Since the end (phala i.e. the burning of Tripura) of the play is not successfully obstructed by any curse or the like, it lacks the pause juncture (vimarśa sandhi).

The next drama of Vatsarāja is Ḫasyācudāmanī which is characterised as Prahasana by the author. Defining the Prahasana Dhanañjaya states that 'it is like Bhāna i.e. mainly invented by the author and having the characteristics of various cunning people. It is of three kinds - regular, modified and mixed. The regular (suddha) Prahasana contains heretics, Brāhmanas, and other such characters; servants, serving-maids, and parasites. It is to be performed with appropriate costume and language, and full of comic

184. Tripura, pp. 87-88.
185. Tripura, p. 96.
188. Ḫasya, p. 118.
speeches. The modified (= Vikrta) Prahasana contains eunuchs, chamberlains and ascetics represented with the speech and dress of lovers and the like. The mixed (sahākara) Prahasana is called because of its admixture of features of the vīthī, is filled with rogues. The sixfold comic sentiment (= hāsyā) is generally to be employed in it.

The Hāsyacudāmani Prahasana is also invented by Vatsarāja and consists of the conducts of various rakes like Jñānarāsi, Kaundinya, Kalākaraṇḍaka, Pṛśavata, Kokila, Mudgaraka, Madanasundari and Kapatākeli. Since it is full of vragents and most of the subdivisions of vīthī are employed there, it falls under mixed (= sahākara) type of Prahasana. In the whole play the comic sentiment is used, though its subdivisions not so distinctively, at a large scale.

Samudramathana, the last drama of the Rājā, is said to be a Samavakāra. Dhanañjaya defines it as follows: *In the Samavakāra there is to be an introduction, as in the Nāṭaka and the other varieties of drama. The subject is to be well known and connected with gods and demons. It should have all the junctures except the pause, and all the styles, with but

190. Dr. III. 12-13.
192. Samudra. p. 150.
little of the gay style. Its heroes are to be gods and demons, twelve in numbers, of the type known as exalted and far famed each striving for and attaining a separate object. It contains all the sentiments, with much of the heroic. In its three acts it presents the three kinds of deception, the three kinds of love and the three kinds of excitement. The three kinds of deception should be those caused by the nature of the subject, by supernatural action, and by enemies. The three kinds of excitement should be those resulting from the besieging of a city, from a battle, and from violent winds, fires, and the like; the three kinds of love should be that according to virtue, that actuated by love of gain, and that actuated by passion. It has no expansion and no introductory scene. One may employ the subdivisions of viṭṭhī in it according to one's requirements, as in the frahasana'.

The Samudramathana Samavakāra of Vatsarāja is also composed along with most of these peculiarities. It begins with an introduction and has taken the well known subject from Rāmāyana (Bālakānda, 45th canto) and Mahābhārata (Adiparva, Chapters 17-19). It is associated with all the junctures excepting the pause one. The opening juncture (= mukha sandhi) may be seen from Sthāpaka's suggestion that 'You all together should wait upon either the king Paramarddideva or the ocean

for attaining all your desires' to the 'worship of Vissu by Lakṣmi where she offers a handful of flowers'. Moreover, from 'the information of dreadful storm and of arriving the gods and demons with Mandara mountain for the churning of ocean' to Lord Śiva's instruction given to Ṛṣṇa that 'your duty is to protect the articles that have come out as a result of churning'; so now you should look after these things, and I shall put a stop to this calamity'. The progression juncture (= pratimukha sandhi) may be ascertained there. Further the development juncture (= garbha sandhi) is employed from 'the deceiving of Bali by Vaikuntha and Vainateya in the form of beautiful women; and Bali's departure, avoiding the nectar, for the battle in spite of Śukra's admonition' to the Śukra's statement after recognizing Viṣṇu in the form of a woman through meditation - 'Fie on nectar spring up as a result of the churning of ocean. Fie also on all the things that have come up, and that are not easily available. What, indeed, has not been secured by the brave leaders of the demons, when you, Oh Vaikuntha! have been turned into a woman'. The third act of the play contains

196. Samudra. p. 159.
197. Samudra. p. 177.
199. Samudra. II. 16.
the conclusion juncture (= nirvahana-sandhi) from conversation between Krsna and Laksmi to the concluding verse of the drama. Like Trirudhbdha Dima in this play also the three styles - grandiose, horrific and eloquent, are found abundantly but here the fourth style i.e. the gay style is also employed to some extent through the amorous description of Visnu and Laksmi. Its twelve renowned heroes - Visnu, Brahma, MaheSA, Indra, Kubera, Vayu, Varuna, Yama, Vasuki, Meru-Mandara, Nirrti and Agni, are gods and demons and of exalted type. It may be clarified here that the different types of fruits of the play are attained by these twelve characters. For instance, Laksmi and Kaustubha are received by Krsna, Vedas by Brahma, moon by MaheSA, Airavata and Uccatarav by Indra, treasures by Kubera, goad by Vayu, wine and noose by Varuna, stick by Yama, poison by Vasuki, great medicines and jewels by Merumandara, sword by Nirrti and nectar by Agni (Samudra. pp. 190-91). So, all these characters are the twelve heroes of the play. All the sentiments - Srngara, Kaudra, Bhayanasaka, Ribhatsa, Karuna, Hasya, Adbhuta and Dnta, are found there but the heroic sentiment is the principal one. In its three kinds of deception are employed, the first of which is used in the first act by Bali and Kujambha according to

the nature of the subject. The second kind of deception is shown in the second act by Vaikuṇṭha and Vaināteya which may be called supernatural; and the third one is presented in the third act by Śukra who is the renowned guru of the enemies of the gods.

Besides, three kinds of love are also preserved there. In the first act the mutual love between Viṣṇu and Lākṣṇi is depicted where the latter is impressed by the virtues of the former and tries to get him by means of the worship. It may be called the love according to virtue (= dharma-āṅgāra). Further the love of gain (= artha-āṅgāra) is observed where in Lākṣṇi is obtained to Viṣṇu along with the precious jewel Kōjatubha. The love of passion (= Kāma-āṅgāra) may be noticed in the artificial love between Mohanikā (a beautiful woman form of Viṣṇu) and Bali where both are depicted being highly libidinous.

The play has three sorts of excitement also. The arrival of gods and demons along with Mandara mountain on the bank of ocean for its churning may be indicative of some

---

kind of besieging of a city. The second kind of stimulation is reflected in the second act where it is stated that 'the frightened demons are giving up the battle field and flocking together, as they have been driven away by the gods who have captured all the precious things obtained from the ocean'. The third type of stimulation is resulted from the violent wind and fire. Since the subject of the drama is not interrupted, there is no question of its resuming and hence this play obviously lacks the expansion element (= bindu).

Thus it is worth-noticing how largely the peculiarities of the dramas vary and how skillfully the author of the has followed them in the composition of his six different plays. However, it is to be pointed out that the dramatists of medieval age, including Vatsaraja, were paying less attention to follow strictly some ancient dramaturgical rules. They seem to be fond of making some exceptional experiments. Such instances will be noticed in a subsequent chapter on Fine Arts.

209. Samudra. I. 69; II. 13, 14.
The foregoing delineation may lead us to the following epitome. Among numerous Vatsarājas of Indian history and Candella regime our Vatsarāja, the author of the Kālāñjara, is distinguished as a minister of the Candella ruler Paramardideva and an incumbent of another Candella king Trailokyasvarmadeva. His life time belonged to the period between second half of the 12th century to first half of the 14th century A.D. Kālañjara and its surrounding land was the holy region where the author seems to have spent his life. He might have been belonging to Kāśyastha community. His loyal family had been serving the Candella dynasty for three generations. Vatsarāja, his son Haripāla and grandson Ratnapāla, all of them poets, had been attached to the Candella rulers Paramardideva, his son Trailokyasvarmadeva and grandson Viravarman respectively. Jejākabhukti, the territory ruled by the Candellas is called by the author in its short form 'bhukti'. Being well-versed in dramaturgy the author has followed most of the varied peculiarities of different dramas in his Kālāñjara.

CONCLUSION:

The foregoing delineation may lead us to the following epitome. Among numerous Vatsarājas of Indian history and Candella regime our Vatsarāja, the author of the Kālāñjara, is distinguished as a minister of the Candella ruler Paramardideva and an incumbent of another Candella king Trailokyasvarmadeva. His life time belonged to the period between second half of the 12th century to first half of the 14th century A.D. Kālañjara and its surrounding land was the holy region where the author seems to have spent his life. He might have been belonging to Kāśyastha community. His loyal family had been serving the Candella dynasty for three generations. Vatsarāja, his son Haripāla and grandson Ratnapāla, all of them poets, had been attached to the Candella rulers Paramardideva, his son Trailokyasvarmadeva and grandson Viravarman respectively. Jejākabhukti, the territory ruled by the Candellas is called by the author in its short form 'bhukti'. Being well-versed in dramaturgy the author has followed most of the varied peculiarities of different dramas in his Kālāñjara.