

overlooked a note published by M. Senart in the *Indian Antiquary* for 1891 (vol. xx, p. 231), which shows that that distinguished scholar had to some extent anticipated my interpretation. M. Senart observes:—"In the first line of this edict at Khâlsî, Dr. Bühler's new materials allow him to read *atikāntam aṁtalam devānāmpiyā vihālayātām nāma nikhamisu*; at Kapur di giri, also, the true reading is *devānāmpriya*, instead of *java jaraya*. It looks as if *devānāmpiyā* corresponded here purely and simply to the *rājāno* of Girnār and Dhauli."

But no room for doubt remains, as the comparison of the texts shows:—

Girnār.—*Atikātam aṁtaram rājāno vihārayātām ṅayāsu*.

Shāhbāzgarhi (Kapur di giri).—*Atikratnam aṁtaram devanam priya viharayatra nama nikramishu*.

Manserā.—*Atikratam aṁtaram devana priya viharayatra nama nikramishu*.

Kālsî (Khâlsî).—*Atikāntam aṁtalam devānāmpiyā vihālayātām nāma nikhamisu*.

Dhauli.—*[Ati]kāntam aṁtalam lājāno vihālayātām nāma khamāsa* (sic, leg. *nikhamisu*).

In each case the nominative plural, *devānāmpiyā* or *rājāno*, as the case may be, is construed with the aorist plural, *ṅayāsu* or the synonymous *nikramishu*.

May 16, 1901.

V. A. SMITH.

6. THE DATE OF KUMĀRADĀSA.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—In his interesting article on the Jānakiharaṇa of Kumāradāsa in the April number of this Journal, Mr. Thomas alludes to some five facts bearing on the author's date: his identification with Kumāradāsa of Ceylon, A.D. 517–526 (p. 254), his friendship with Kālidāsa (*ibid.*), his probable knowledge of the Kāsikāvṛtti (p. 266), the probable quotation in Vāmana's Kāvya-lāṅkāra-vṛtti

(*ibid.*), and the clear reference in Rājasekhara (p. 253).¹ He is inclined to accept the traditional date, and the difficulty *re* the Kāśikā, he suggests, may be solved by throwing doubt on I-tsing's dating of that work (p. 267). As against this view I would suggest that the traditional date is inconsistent with known facts, and that the evidence at present available tells decidedly in favour of dating Kumāradāsa in the period about 700–750 A.D.

The identification with King Kumāradāsa, or Kumāradhātusena, seems to rest partly on the reading *Anīśabhūpasya* in the colophon. But I learn from Don M. de Zilva Wickremasinghe's Catalogue of Singhalese MSS. in the British Museum, p. xiii, that this part of the text is mutilated and doubtful, while Leumann² shows the first part of the word is but a variant of *atīśaya*^o, the reading of the *sanne*, which, however, is palaeographically very like *anīśa*. Leumann, however, is, as Mr. Wickremasinghe has pointed out to me, quite wrong in reading the second part in the *sanne* as *bhūpasya*. It is quite clearly *bhūtasya*,³ and restoring *atīśayabhūtasya*, as we must do, we are rid of any reference to Kumāradāsa as a king. Even if this were not the case, an Indian scribe who knew of the existence of a king of the same name as the poet would have little scruple in adding the epithet. Moreover, the identification will not suit the legend of the friendship with Kālidāsa. The latest date of a Kālidāsa is undoubtedly A.D. 472, as the Meghadūta, Raghuvamśa, and Ṛtusamhāra (which I assume to be his) are all very evidently plundered by Vatsabhāṭṭi in the famous Mandasor inscription.⁴ For the upper limit we have only Jacobi's astronomical and astrological data, which point to A.D. 350. As Kālidāsa's fame in A.D. 472 must have been great to have penetrated to a comparatively small town and a third-rate poet, we are justified in assigning him to

¹ The supposed quotation in Patañjali (Peterson's paper on Kṣemendra's *Aucityavicāracarā*) may safely be neglected in this regard.

² Vienna Orient. Journ., vii, 227–8.

³ See Dharmārāma's edit., p. 305, footnote.

⁴ See Buhler, "Die indischen Inschriften," p. 72; Kielhorn, Gött. Nachrichten, 1890, p. 251; Macdonell, Sansk. Lit., pp. 321 sq.

A.D. 400 at latest. In any case, however, he could not have been the friend and contemporary of a king of A.D. 517–526.

The legend, however, itself rests on the weakest possible evidence, though Geiger¹ accepts it. Wickremasinghe, l.c., says that it first appears in the Perakumbāsirita, a Singhalese work of the sixteenth century. To place any faith in such testimony is unwise: one might as well trust the Jyotirvidābharaṇa or the Bhojaprabandha, which are only a century younger. Still, if one had to choose, I should prefer this Kālidāsa story, but it is not difficult to conjecture that it owes its origin to the fact of the use of the Raghuvamśa by Kumāradāsa or to Rājaśekhara's verse.

On the other hand, I think Mr. Thomas has fully proved, so far as the case admits of proof, that the poet knew the Kāśikā. But I-tsing clearly refers the death of Jayāditya, who is now held by Bühler and Bhāṇḍārkar to be the author of Kāśikā i–v, to A.D. 660 or thereby. To I-tsing's accuracy Mr. Thomas objects that he states that Patañjali wrote a comment on the Kāśikā. It is, however, not quite clear whether this objection is justified. Max Müller,² quoting the translation as supplied to him by Takakusu, held that such an interpretation of the passage was not necessary, though quite possible. At any rate, we may point out that I-tsing's date for Bhartṛhari has proved most fruitful in clearing up the questions concerning Kumārilabhaṭṭa and Śāṅkara, and has thereby established its right to be regarded as accurate.³ As Bhartṛhari is a grammarian, the argument from analogy is fairly strong. It may be added that a certain amount of confirmation may be derived from the newly settled date of Candragomin, the author of the Candravyākaraṇa, whom Liebich (*Vienna Oriental Journal*, xiii, 313–5) has shown from the example Ajayad Gupto Hūṇān to have lived circa A.D. 480. Now, Kielhorn (*Indian Antiquary*, xv, 183–5) showed that Candra was used by the Kāśikāvṛtti;

¹ So also Hari Mohan Vidyābhūṣaṇ, *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, LXII, i, 212 sq.

² "India, what can it teach us?" p. 347.

³ See Pathak's articles, *Journal of Bombay Branch R.A.S.*, xviii.

so the latter cannot date before A.D. 500, and probably is considerably later.

Is there anything to hinder our putting Kumāradāsa about A.D. 680–700, allowing time for the knowledge of the Kāśikā to spread south? The date of the Kāvya-lāṅkāravṛtti of Vāmana is a puzzle. Cappeller (“Vāmana’s Stil-regeln,” p. iii) attributed the work to the twelfth century, but this date is now universally abandoned. An identification with the part author of the Kāśikā has no arguments in its favour, and is rendered improbable *primā facie* by this case, where Kumāradāsa seemingly knows the Kāśikā, including Vāmana’s part (vi–viii), yet is quoted by Vāmana. We may therefore accept the date, end of eighth century, under Jayāpīḍa of Kaśmīr, A.D. 779–813, proposed by Bühler, Kaśmīr Report, p. 65.¹ The matter, of course, would be further complicated if we were to accept Bhāṇḍārkar’s² view that Vāmana is long subsequent to Jayāditya, or Stein’s³ opinion that the Kāśikā belongs to the eighth century, but these opinions, I think, are in themselves improbable, and are not supported by any evidence of weight.

At any rate, Kumāradāsa is anterior to A.D. 900, as he is known to Rājasekhara.⁴ That the Rājasekhara of the memorial verses is really the poet, is neatly proved by Mr. Thomas, who has pointed out probable borrowings of words in the Bālarāmāyaṇa (p. 268). This fact may have important bearings on the very difficult Kavirāja and Dhanañjaya problem.

We seem, therefore, to be left with A.D. 650 and A.D. 800 as the limits of date possible, and perhaps we may fairly assign the poet to A.D. 700–750. But though I think the evidence for the traditional date worthless, I feel the insecurity of the basis on which I have founded the new date so deeply that I venture to suggest to Mr. Thomas

¹ Cf. Pischel, Rudraṭa, pp. 22 sq., whose objections to Bühler’s view seem weak.

² Report, 1883–1884, p. 58.

³ Jammu Catal., pp. xix, xx, who dates Jayāpīḍa thirty years earlier.

⁴ For his date see *Ep. Ind.*, i, pp. 170, 171.

that he would be conferring a real benefit on students of Kāvya literature if he would seek for evidence to settle the position in literary history of a poem so unique and so interesting. But I think, at any rate, we must be very jealous of any effort to dispute any of our established dates, like that of the Kāśikā, in favour of dubious legends.

My best thanks are due to Mr. Wickremasinghe for much information regarding the Singhalese tradition.¹—I am, yours truly,

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

Oxford.

May 4, 1901.

¹ He has pointed out to me that it is *a priori* improbable that the first Ceylonese-Sanskrit work known should be a grammatical Kāvya, and that the later date suits the literary history of Ceylon best.