

4

On Beginnings

Introductions and Prefaces in *Kāvya*

HERMAN TIEKEN

A. Introduction¹

In a recent article I drew attention to the occurrence of the word *mādhurya* in Aśoka's fourteenth Rock Edict.² This edict serves as an epilogue to the preceding 13 edicts in providing some reflections on the "genre" of royal missives. With this *mādhurya* I argued that we are dealing with an early instance of a technical term known from the later *kāvya* poetical tradition. On the basis of the occurrence of the term in the Aśoka inscriptions it was next suggested that the *kāvya* literary tradition is heir to, or a continuation of, a scholarly tradition regarding royal missives developed by clerks employed in the royal chancery. This conclusion is corroborated by the close association of *kāvya* with the court.

It is indeed not difficult to see how the careful, self-conscious style of *kāvya* could have developed out of the art of composing diplomatic letters. In addition to that, this finding connects *kāvya* specifically

with communication through writing. While we may assume that in Aśoka's time written communication was a relatively recent phenomenon and while it is not unlikely that this mode of communication may have existed side by side with the oral delivery of royal instructions for quite some time through messengers, in the light of the later developments it may be argued that once the possibilities, advantages and prestige of a written communication—and administration—were realized, royal attention went almost entirely in that direction. It now appears that *kāvya* had its origin in, or was part of, this particular trajectory. In fact, with its long, complicated metres, its many linguistic tricks and its convoluted images, *kāvya* indeed looks typically like written literature, with writing providing the necessary time to plan the text on the part of the author, and time to study and analyze it on the part of the reader.³ For all that, I do not wish to rule out the possibility that *kāvya* was occasionally composed on the spot or could be appreciated when recited. The point I want to make here is that the style of *kāvya* is easier to explain as the outcome of developments in written literature meant to be read.

In what follows I take up the question of the "roots" of *kāvya* again by following yet another avenue. The earliest *kāvya* texts available include so-called *mahākāvya*s, namely the *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* by Aśvaghōṣa (first century AD), plays, such as Aśvaghōṣa's *Sāriputraprakāraṇa*, and a prose inscription, namely the Girnar inscription of Rudradāman (mid-second century). Later, the number of genres multiplied, with, among other texts, inscriptions in verse and prose, lyric poetry, so-called *vamsās* or genealogical poems, prose romances, and historical novels. I will try to show that among all these genres the *mahākāvya* was the first, that is to say, that it was the *kāvya* poets' own invention. I argue that the other genres are the result of attempts on the part of these poets to adopt, and *kāvya*-ize, existing types of compositions of poets and performers from different milieus than their own.

Next, I will argue that *mahākāvya* represents an elaboration in *kāvya* style of the epic. At that point an attempt is made to combine this idea with the one which places the beginning of *kāvya* in the royal chancery by trying to answer the question of what might have been the relationship of the scribes and the clerks employed there and the epic tradition. By way of conclusion the scenario for the origins of *kāvya* developed here will be compared to one recently put forward by Stephanie Jamison, who sees in *kāvya* a direct continuation of Vedic literature.⁴

3. For Pollock, writing is a fundamental component of *kāvya* (Pollock 2006, 5 and passim).

4. Jamison 2007.

1. This contribution, which was originally written in Jerusalem in 2004, has been brought up to date in the end of 2011. The author would like to thank Stephanie Jamison for her stimulating comments on the earlier version of this article.

2. Tieken 2006. Unfortunately the translation given there of the particular passage in the edict is not correct. *atthi cu beta puna puna lapite* (variant *vute itasa tasa aṭhasa mādhuriyāye*) should be translated: "On the other hand here (in these edicts) some things have been said over and over again because of their sweetness."

B. Types of Beginnings

A striking feature of the first generation of epic *kāvya* texts, or *mahākāvya*, is the absence of any kind of introduction. The texts immediately begin with the story. In this they stand apart from the other literary genres, which have “proper” introductions and prefaces. A closer look at the contents of these introductions and prefaces suggests that in *mahākāvya* the poets play, as it were, a home game, while in the other genres they are treading on foreign ground. In order to make that clear, I first present an overview of the beginnings in different *kāvya* genres. In doing so I base myself mainly on the earliest examples of the genres involved, in which the following five main types may be distinguished.

Type 1

As said, the first *mahākāvya*s, or *sargabandhas*, immediately begin with the story itself. A good example is Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* (fourth or fifth century AD), which begins with the word *asti* “Once upon a time there was”. Examples by an earlier writer are Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* (first century). A special case is formed by Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha* (seventh century) and Bhāṛavi's *Kinātārjunīya* (sixth century), both of which begin with the auspicious word *śrī*. In the *Śiśupālavadha* the last verse of each *sarga* likewise contains the same word *śrī*. In the *Kinātārjunīya* each *sarga* ends with a verse containing the equally auspicious word *lakṣmī*. In fact, retrospectively the occurrence of the word *śrī* at the beginning of these two texts might put a different light on the name Gautama with which Aśvaghoṣa's *Saundarananda* begins.⁵ For information on the authors and titles of these texts we have to fall back on colophons, which, strictly speaking, are not part of the texts proper.⁶

In later *mahākāvya*s the situation has changed. For instance, the *Jānakīharṇa* (seventh or eighth century), which begins with the words *āsīd avaryāṃ*, is, like the *Śiśupālavadha* (see n. 6), concluded by a set of four verses providing a genealogy of its author Kumārādāsa. These four verses are again followed by a colophon mentioning the author, the title of the text, and the number of the

5. Unfortunately it is impossible to establish with certainty if something like this is also found in Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* as the beginning of this text is only available in Chinese and Tibetan translations.

6. Note that the *Śiśupālavadha* ends with a section of five stanzas in which the author describes his own lineage. He does not, however, mention his own name.

final chapter. The *Bhāṭṭikāvya* (seventh century), which opens with the words *abhūn nṛpo*, ends with a so-called *kāvya*prāsasti of four verses, in which the author professes, among other things, that his text can be enjoyed only by the highly learned. In the last verse he mentions that he (*mayā*) had composed the poem in the town of Valabhī during the reign of King Narendra, Śrīdhara's son. However, the author's name is known to us only from the colophon. Yet another case which may be mentioned here is Ratnākarā's *Haravijaya* (ninth century). This text opens with three verses, in which Śiva, Viṣṇu, and Brahmā respectively are asked to protect the reader, after which the story begins with the word *asti*. The text is concluded with what has been labeled a *grānthakartuḥ prāsastiḥ*, which, among other things, mentions the name of the author and the title of the work.

Type 2

At the other end of the spectrum of the earlier verse *mahākāvya* we find prose romances. The latter are preceded by proper prefaces, which, as they are in verse, are clearly set apart from the texts proper. The earliest examples of these prefaces are found in Subandhu's *Vāśavadattā* and Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, which, however, are both relatively late texts (probably seventh century). In each of the prefaces we may distinguish three sections. Thus, they begin with several verses praising the gods or asking them to protect the readers. Henceforth such verses at the beginning are referred to as *maṅgala* verses. This is followed by a set of verses, in which, among other things, unjust criticism is anticipated. In what follows this topic of the second section will for brevity's sake be referred to by the term “apology.” In the *Kādambarī* this is followed by the genealogy of the author, in the *Vāśavadattā* by a mere reference to the name of the author. Immediately after this, the story proper begins, with the word *abhūd* in the *Vāśavadattā* and with *āsīd* in the *Kādambarī*. It should be noted that neither preface supplies the title of the work. In fact, they do not even give an indication of the topic. In addition, the two texts differ in the identification of the type of work they belong to, the *Kādambarī* identifying itself as a *kathā* and the *Vāśavadattā* as a *prabandha*.

A text type that may be included in this category is the anthology. Probably the earliest example of an anthology is Hāla's *Sattasai*, a collection of 700 erotic *āryā* verses in the so-called Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit. The *Sattasai* is generally taken to have been compiled in the beginning of our era. This early dating is based on the ascription of the compilation to the Sātavāhana King Hāla. However, the first reference to the *Sattasai* is found only in the relatively late *Harīacarita* (seventh

century). Furthermore, as I have tried to show elsewhere, the *Sattasāi* presupposes a text like the *Kāmasūtra* if not the *Kāmasūtra* itself.⁷ This means that the *Sattasāi* may have to be dated much later than has been done so far. In fact, it is uncertain if the text is earlier than, for instance, Kālidāsa.⁸ Like the two romances discussed earlier, the *Sattasāi* opens with a *gāthā* exhorting the reader to honor (*namaha*) Śiva and Gaurī, who are portrayed in an erotic situation here. This *gāthā* corresponds to the *maṅgala*. In the second *gāthā* it is said that though the *Sattasāi* is in Prakrit, this is nothing to be ashamed of. In fact, the *Sattasāi* is claimed to be superior to the *Kāmatantra*, which refers to learned treatises in Sanskrit on the topic of *kāma*. This *gāthā* corresponds more or less to the apology section. Finally, in the third *gāthā* the compilation of the anthology is ascribed to the Sātavāhana King Hāla. With the fourth *gāthā* the text proper begins. As can be gathered from this description, the beginning of the *Sattasāi* resembles the prefaces discussed earlier. At the same time, its preface differs from the ones in the *Kādambarī* and *Viśavadattā* in that it consists of verses in the same meter as those of the text proper. As a result there is in this case no clear formal break between the “preface” and the beginning of the text itself.

Type 3

The prologue of a Sanskrit drama opens with one or more *maṅgala* verses. This is followed by a conversation between the stage manager and an actress, usually his wife, in which the name of the playwright and the title of the play are mentioned. In some cases the occasion for the performance is specified as well and some information on the nature of the play is provided.

The prologues in this category are not detachable from the text of the play proper as in the case of prose romances. On the contrary, they are an indissoluble part of it. As I see it, the prologue is meant to convey the message that the text one is about to read is not a text but a performance to be watched.⁹ The earliest example in question, a play by Aśvaghōṣa, dates from the first century.¹⁰ Unfortunately the beginning of the play is missing, as a result of which we are unable to know if it ever had a prologue. The *Svapnavāsavadattā* and *Pratijñāyāugandharīyāna*, two plays by Kālidāsa's predecessor Bhāsa, do have prologues, but the two plays are known only through relatively late south Indian adaptations.

7. Tiekens 2001a, 72ff.

8. The attribution of the compilation of the anthology to the Sātavāhana King Hāla seems to be part of the fictional world created in the text; see Khoroché and Tiekens 2009.

9. See Tiekens 2001b.

10. The number of plays by Aśvaghōṣa which have survived has probably to be reduced to one; see Tiekens 2010a.

As a result the first certain evidence of prologues is found with Kālidāsa, whose oeuvre includes three plays.

Type 4

The situation in Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*, one of the earliest known historical novels (seventh century), seems to show a combination of the traditions as found in dramas, on the one hand, and prose romances, on the other. *Harṣacarita*'s preface, which altogether consists of 21 verses, follows the pattern of prose romances up to a certain point. Thus, it opens with three *maṅgala* verses. In the remaining 18 verses the poet informs us that if despite many illustrious predecessors his poor self has decided to tell the history of Harṣa, this is basically done out of loyalty to that king (the apology part). Immediately after that the story begins (*evam anuśrīyate purā kila*). If we compare this to the prefaces of prose romances we see that the information about the author is missing. However, this is precisely what the first part of the text proper is about, which informs us in quite some detail of Bāṇa's genealogy, his relationship to King Harṣa, estranged at first but finally patched up, and how he was brought to tell the adventures of Harṣa, or at least part of them.

While the preface to the *Harṣacarita* does not supply the title of the work, it does give an indication of the topic. The *Harṣacarita* appears to be not just a story about Harṣa's adventures, but a story about a poet telling the adventures of his patron. The story of Harṣa's adventures proper begins only somewhere in the middle of the third chapter (p. 94), starting with the words *śrīyātām asti*, “listen, there was” In Vākpati's *Gāuḍaśabo* (eighth century) basically the same pattern is found, though information about the author, or rather, the teller of the story, has been integrated into the text proper in a much more subtle way.¹¹

Another variant is seen in Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacharita* (twelfth century), a historical novel in verses about the south Indian King Vikramāditya. In the eighteenth and final canto of this work the poet relates how he had arrived from Kashmir, where he was born, to Kalyāṇa in south India at the court of King Vikramāditya. In contrast to the *Harṣacarita* the poet's “autobiography” has thus been placed at the end of the poem.

Type 5

The format of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvansha*, which consists entirely of verses divided into *sargas*, agrees with that of the *mahākāvya*. However, as to its contents, we are dealing with a unique work, a *vanśa*, which tells the story of the Raghu

11. On the relationship between the *Harṣacarita* and *Gāuḍaśabo*, see Tiekens 2001c.

dynasty through 30, or rather 31 generations.¹² The only other examples of the genre are found in Buddhist literature (*Dīpa-* and *Mahāvamsā*). The *Raghuvaṃśā* starts with a *maṅgala* verse in which Śiva and Pārvatī are praised. Next, the author contrasts the greatness of the solar dynasty to the pettiness of his own intellectual abilities. In the first of the two final verses of the introduction he announces that he will nevertheless describe the lineage of that dynasty: the very virtues of the Raghu dynasty compel him to commit this rashness. Finally, he recommends the result of his efforts to learned, literary men. After this the work proper begins with a verse describing Manu, the second hemistich of which contains the word *āsīt*.

In this introduction the author refers to himself in the first person (I am not referring to *vande* in the *maṅgala* verse here, which is quite common, but to *vakṣye* in verse 9). Though this is not uncommon (see, for instance, the preface to the *Harṣacarita* as well as the end of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*), the *Raghuvaṃśā* differs in this from prose romances, which refer to the author in the third person. In fact, the beginning of the *Raghuvaṃśā* resembles more the situation in plays than the one in prose romances. Thus, like the prologue to a drama the introductory matter appears to be part of the text itself. In any case, the introduction is in the same *anuṣṭubh* meter found in the first *sarga*. In this connection it should also be noted that while the text proper begins with the word *āsīt*, this word is not found at the very beginning of the verse but in the middle. It is almost as if Kālidāsa was varying on a traditional pattern here.

Another work that may be mentioned along with Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśā* is his *Meghadūta*. At first sight it is tempting to include this poem in the category of works that lack an introduction, as it begins abruptly with the word *kaścit* "[There was] some [*yakṣa* who ...]". The greatest part of the *Meghadūta* consists of the words with which this *yakṣa*, who had been banished for having neglected his duty, directed a cloud to his wife left behind in his native town Alakā. In the beginning of the *Meghadūta* the situation of the *yakṣa* is briefly described. Only with verse six does the *yakṣa*'s address to the cloud begin. In a way the beginning of the *Meghadūta* resembles that of, for instance, the *Raghuvaṃśā*, except for the fact that the *yakṣa* is not just an objective, professional teller of someone else's adventures but is personally involved in the situation. In fact, the point may be lying precisely in this difference, in that the *Meghadūta*, at least as far as its setting is concerned, aligns with the lyrical tradition, in which each poem requires a fictional speaker and an imaginary situation in order to become convincing.

12. See Tietken 1989.

The patterns discussed so far may be summarized in the following scheme:

<i>TEXTS WITHOUT PREFACES OR INTRODUCTIONS</i>	
Early <i>mahākāvya</i> s:	story
<i>Saundarananda, Kumārasambhava</i>	
Later <i>mahākāvya</i> s:	story
<i>Bhaṭṭikāvya, Jānakīharṇa</i>	
<i>TEXTS WITH INTRODUCTIONS</i>	
<i>Śakuntala</i>	introduction
<i>Raghuvaṃśā</i>	introduction
<i>Meghadūta</i>	introduction
<i>Gauḍaśabho</i>	"introduction"/story ¹³
<i>Vikramāṅkadevacarita</i>	story/"introduction" ¹⁴
<i>TEXTS WITH PREFACES</i>	
<i>Kādambarī, Vāsavadattā</i>	preface
<i>Sattasāi</i>	preface
<i>TEXTS WITH PREFACES AND INTRODUCTIONS</i>	
<i>Harṣacarita</i>	introduction
	story
	"story"

C. The Storyteller in the Text and His Relationship to the External Author

The function of the "introduction" in the *Harṣacarita* may be compared to that of the prologue in Sanskrit drama. In both cases the author is written into the text as its author or as the bard who told the story for the first time. However, in the *Harṣacarita*, the text as a whole, that is, the introduction and the story proper, is preceded by a preface in verse. The main part of the preface is dedicated to the poet's apology. I think one may legitimately ask why in the case of the *Harṣacarita* the apology was not integrated into the first part of the text as well. In fact, it even seems possible to detect a contradiction between the preface and the introductory part. In the preface, Bāṇa is reluctant to tell the story, fearing that he will not be able to match the literary excellence of his predecessors in the field. In the work proper it is modesty of another kind, namely the heroic feats

13. With the term "introduction" I refer here to the remarks made by the storyteller throughout the telling of the story, on which, see Tietken 2001c.

14. Reference is made here to the final chapter, in which the author, or rather, the teller of the story, relates how he had arrived at the king's court. As indicated earlier, this part corresponds to the opening of the *Harṣacarita*, in which we are informed, among other things, how Bāṇa had arrived at Harṣa's court.

performed by Harṣa, which are so many that it is impossible to tell them in a lifetime.

Whatever is exactly the case here, by introducing a second Bāṇa (the author next to the bard or storyteller) the preface seems to destroy the fiction created in the text proper.¹⁵ It is tempting to conclude that the preface in verse to the historical novel is a later addition or else the result of a conflation of two independent traditions, a historical novel with its own fictional introduction and texts with prefaces.

This brings to mind one of the most widely known texts about storytelling, namely Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita* (eighth century). In the *Daśakumāracarita* the storyteller is not a poet or courtier, but the *yuvanāja* and his nine companions. At a certain point during their *digvijaya* these ten young men get separated from one another. In the end they all come together again and each of them is invited to tell what happened to him in the meantime. In their capacity of storytellers, the ten young men in the *Daśakumāracarita* stand on a par with Bāṇa in the *Harṣacarita*, and as in the latter case, their "family histories" and their relationship to one another are dealt with in the first part of the text. But in contrast to the *Harṣacarita*, the *Daśakumāracarita* does not have any additional prefatory matter (except for a *maṅgala* verse), though in this case, in fact, the text assumes an external, all-knowing author besides the ten young men, who is responsible for the work as a whole. However, as in the case of the type-1 *mahākāvya*s, the name of the author is mentioned only in the colophon, though it is practically given away in the *maṅgala* verse, which abounds in instances of the word *daṇḍa*. As far as I know there is no evidence of an attempt to change the situation in the *Daśakumāracarita*; apparently the text as we have it, that is, without any preface, was considered complete and self-sufficient.

However, there are scholars, such as Lienhard, who maintain that the first part of the *Daśakumāracarita*, the so-called *pūrvapīṭhikā*, has been added to it after the original beginning had been lost.¹⁶ In this connection the *Avantisundarī* is mentioned, which corresponds to the first part of the *pūrvapīṭhikā* and might have formed the original beginning of the *Daśakumāracarita*. Unlike the latter text, the prose *Avantisundarī* does have a full-fledged preface in verse. Thus, it opens with a *maṅgala* verse praising Brahmā, Śiva, and Viṣṇu. This is followed by verses in which earlier poets are praised. Next, still in verse, Daṇḍin's genealogy is given. Immediately after that the prose text starts, beginning with Daṇḍin's travels and his arrival at the Pallava court and ending at the point where the tale of Avantisundarī begins (p. 17). The *Avantisundarī* seems to

present us with precisely that external, all-knowing author who had been absent from the *Daśakumāracarita*.

All this, however, does not necessarily mean that the *Avantisundarī* is more original than the *Daśakumāracarita* or that the latter is only an abstract, lifted out as it were from the former work. In this connection it should be noted that the evidence put forward in support of the secondary nature of the *pūrvapīṭhikā* of the *Daśakumāracarita* is slender, or else of an impressionistic nature. Furthermore, on closer consideration, the *Avantisundarī* is a most peculiar text. Thus, anyone who after reading about Daṇḍin's genealogy, his travels, his arrival at the Pallava court, and, next, his expulsion and subsequent return, would expect something political as the trigger for Daṇḍin's storytelling, will be disappointed. The story about Avantisundarī is meant to explain the miracle of the transformation of a lotus into a *vidyābhara*! Moreover, while using partly the same story material, the *Daśakumāracarita* and *Avantisundarī* seem to present two entirely different genres. Thus, while the *Daśakumāracarita*, for all the fantastic elements found in it, is basically a political novel,¹⁷ the *Avantisundarī*, for all the political intrigues it contains, starts off as a fantasy tale. In fact, this seems to mark the beginning of the *Avantisundarī* almost definitely as a hybrid composition. For, while by beginning with a report on Daṇḍin's travels and his final arrival at the Pallava court it aligns with the historical novel (*Harṣacarita* and *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*), through the story of Avantisundarī it resembles the fantasy tale (*Vāsavadattā* and *Kādambarī*).¹⁸ For all we know, the relationship between the two compositions might well be the other way around from what has been assumed so far, the *Avantisundarī* being a later elaboration of the *Daśakumāracarita*, or part of it, and the fantasy tale. For our purpose it is important to note that the absence of any preface to the *Daśakumāracarita* cannot automatically be attributed to, for instance, the loss of part of the text, but might present the text's original form.

In connection with the phenomenon of the preface it should be noted that two of the types of works in which it is found, the historical novel and the fantasy tale, seem to have appeared on the scene relatively late. In general it might be argued that a genre is earlier than its first attested examples. However, in this case there is some evidence to suggest that the historical novel and fantasy tale, as genres, are indeed not much older than their earliest examples and that these two genres did not yet exist, at least not within the *kāvya* tradition, in Kālidāsa's time. The composition of that poet's oeuvre bears this out.

17. See Brisson 1984, Porcher 1985 and 1986, and deCaroli 1995.

18. Note that the title of the *Avantisundarī* is of the same type as that of the *Kādambarī* and *Vāsavadattā*.

15. It should, again, be mentioned that in the preface the name of the author does not occur.

16. Lienhard 1984, 236.

If we compare Kālidāsa's oeuvre with that of, for instance, Bhavabhūti or Harṣa, what strikes the eye is the diversity of the types of works or genres represented in it. Bhavabhūti's oeuvre consists only of plays, three in number. Likewise, we possess three plays by Harṣa. As I have shown elsewhere,¹⁹ the plays of each of these playwrights appear to be related to each other through a specific theme: in Bhavabhūti's plays that of women being kidnapped and rescued and in Harṣa's plays that of people getting lost and being found again. Something similar is also found in Kālidāsa's works, which each in their own way deal with the phenomenon of the curse. However, while with Harṣa and Bhavabhūti we see variations of one and the same theme in works of the same genre, with Kālidāsa we see one and the same theme, that is, the curse, elaborated upon in works belonging to different genres, namely a *mahākāvya*, a *mahākāvya*-like work, dramas, and a short lyrical text. And the variation attested goes even further. Thus, as already indicated, the *Kumārasambhava* is clearly a different type of work than the *Raghuvamśa*,²⁰ and the same applies to his three dramas, the *Sakuntalā* which has a story based on epic mythology, the *Mālavikāgnimitra* which is a historical drama, and the *Vikramorviśya* which is experimental in containing *dhruvā* songs. Given this situation it may be asked why, if at the time the historical novel or the fantasy tale had already existed, they were not included in Kālidāsa's oeuvre as well. Admittedly, a curse might have been difficult to give a place in a historical novel (as it was in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, in which case the curse was relegated to the play within a play) but the stories of the fantasy tales actually thrive on curses.

Though this line of argument can hardly be applied to the other text type with a preface, namely the anthology, it is tempting to conclude that, with the historical novel and fantasy tales, the preface is a relatively late phenomenon in the *kāvya* tradition, probably only dating from the time after Kālidāsa. As for the preface in the *Sattisāi*, it should be noted that, tradition apart, there is no evidence that this anthology is indeed older than Kālidāsa (see footnotes 7 and 8).

D. The Significance of the Absence of an Introduction in *Mahākāvya*

One way to find out what it means for a work to have no introductory matter is to look at the kind of information contained in the introductory parts of the texts that do have them. I suggest that for the moment we leave out of consideration the preface, which might well be a later phenomenon. Starting

19. For more details, see Tieken 2001d and 2005a.

20. Both texts have in common, however, that they end seemingly abruptly. On this phenomenon, see Tieken 1989.

with the dramatic genre, besides mentioning the playwright, the prologue refers to the performance of the play. While reading the text of the play one is to imagine that it is performed on stage. The introductions to the *Harṣacarita* and *Dasakumāracarita* likewise present us with storytellers at work or occasions at which stories are told. And the introduction of the *Raghuvamśa* evokes a bard about to recout (*vakṣye* "I will relate") the *vamśa* of the Raghu family.

All these beginnings presuppose live-performances of the texts concerned, namely the performance of a play in front of an audience, the telling of the king's adventures in the midst of a group of friends and relatives, or the presumably public recitation of the dynasty's *vamśa*. Such performances seem to be a far cry from the world of the *kāvya* poets who, as has been suggested above, were writers composing slowly and in silence and not extempore performers. In the introductions the authors of the texts cast themselves in roles, which originally were not theirs. *Mutatīs mutandīs*, it is tempting to argue that in *mahākāvya*, which does not have a beginning, the poets were being themselves, using or re-using material and techniques which they could by right consider their own. In the plays, the *Raghuvamśa*, and the historical novel, which presuppose live performance traditions by professional actors, panegyrists and story-tellers we would be dealing with attempts by these same poets at *kāvya*-ization or bowdlerization of certain existing (popular) genres.²¹

E. *Kāvya* and Epic

If with *mahākāvya*s the poets were indeed on familiar ground, they also produced something new. What, then, is it that they were doing? In what follows I suggest that they were experimenting with the epic tradition by adapting it to a new literary mode.

A striking feature of *mahākāvya* are its long and complex meters as well as their enormous variety within a given text. The distribution of the meters coincides with the division of the texts into *sargas*, or chapters, each of which has a particular meter of its own. Usually, the final verses of a chapter are, however, in a different meter. By presenting a story divided into "chapters" and by being

21. What is said here in connection with the origin of *kāvya* should be distinguished from later developments, when Sanskrit dramas were actually performed, and *mahākāvya*s recited, and submitted to the judgement of live audiences. Furthermore, the type of textual variants found in *kāvya* texts seems to suggest that these texts were learned by heart and recited from memory. Even nowadays one may find pandits who are able to compose Sanskrit verses on the spot or to follow the recitation of *kāvya* verses. As far as I see it, one should be careful, though, to project that state of affairs uncritically on the beginning of *kāvya* poetry. In any case, my argument is that features characteristic of *kāvya* have their origin in written literature.

composed in verse the *Mahākāvya* closely resembles the epic.²² At the same time, by its use of complicated meters, *mahākāvya* is as far removed from the epic as is possible. Thus, while the epic uses a short and relatively free meter, the *śloka* or *anuṣṭubh*, which, we are to believe, is typical of extempore, on the spot composition, the *kāvya* meters are generally much longer and have a rigidly fixed distribution of long and short syllables. These two features presumably coincide with a slow process of composition by writing. As I see it, in *mahākāvya* we might be dealing with the creation of a new kind of “epic” poetry which as a written variety was as far as possible removed from the presumably oral epic poetry.²³ The use of a standardized, classical language instead of the “irregular” epic Sanskrit and the introduction of an elaborate style instead of the straightforward epic style were part of this literary experiment.

F. The Scribes’ Background

What does these poets’ preoccupation with the epic genre tradition tell us about the origin of the clerks or scribes employed in the king’s chancery from whom they seem to have descended? There are some indications, which seem to suggest that the epic tradition as presented by, for instance, the *Mahābhārata* used to be part of the repertory of the ritual specialists officiating at the large-scale royal sacrifices. In this connection I would like to go back to a recent study by me of the *Mahābhārata*, in which I suggested that the story of the *Mahābhārata* portrays the competitive and self-destructive world of the potlatch.²⁴ In this world every act of liberality and sacrifice is seen as a challenge and has to be retaliated by an act of even greater liberality and sacrifice. In the *Mahābhārata*, the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas find themselves caught in such an ongoing competition. At the same time there is no gift that cannot be surpassed and there is no final winner. For even after one has given the greatest gift of all, namely one’s own life, the competition does not end with that. It just begins all over again. Thus, before the Pāṇḍavas start on their final departure, they hand over Hāstinapura to Yuyutsu, a bastard son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. At the same time they place Arjuna’s great grandson Parikṣit on the throne. In this way they create a similar situation to the one with

22. One may wonder if the division of one of the earliest *mahākāvyas*, namely Aśvaghoṣa’s *Saundarananda*, into 18 *sargas*, which number corresponds to the division of the *mahābhārata* into 18 books, is coincidental.

23. Most verses in an epic tradition stand on their own. In *mahākāvya* we may come across strings of verses, each of which contain a relative clause depending on the main clause, which may follow or precede. This appears to be the metrical counterpart of the descriptive embedded sentences typical of *kāvya* prose style. At the same time, however, the stringing of verses does involve a radical break with epic literature in verse.

24. Tiekens 2005b. See also Tiekens 2009.

which the *Mahābhārata* started, with the Kauravas as the legal heirs to the throne but the Pāṇḍavas being the actual rulers.

In its portrayal of such a society, the *Mahābhārata* seems to reflect the same concern which preoccupied the authors of the *śrautasūtras*, who, as shown by Heesterman, resolved the “problem” by taking the sting out of the sacrifice by removing the rival.²⁵ There is also some more concrete evidence that the epics were indeed preserved in the milieu of these ritual specialists. Thus, while the epics abound in stories about bards who are invited to sacrificial undertakings to recite epic stories, or who drop in on them,²⁶ reminiscences of such incidents are found in the so-called *pāriplava* of the *āśvamedha*. However, in the *śrautasūtra* version of the horse sacrifice the recitation of the *itihāsas* and *purāṇas* is not carried out by bards but by the officiating priests (*hotrs*) themselves.²⁷ The epics appear to have been part of the curriculum of the ritual specialists.

To sum up: as mentioned, in the course of the sacrifice the priests recited epic stories, a task which in the pre-*śrauta* period was performed by wandering bards. When these same priests subsequently started to take care of the king’s correspondence, they brought with them, beside their theory of sacrifice,²⁸ the epic tradition. When these scribes subsequently started experimenting with the writing of literature in the style and language developed for diplomatic correspondence, they began, I would say almost naturally, with the literature with which they themselves were most familiar, the epic.

The scribes’ concern with epic poetry in a way helps to understand their step from formal letters and legal documents to fictional, imaginative literature. A question, which in this context immediately arises is, however, why they did not experiment with Vedic poetry, with which they must have been familiar as well. Later I discuss a recent, alternative scenario for the origin of *kāvya* which indeed traces it back directly to the Vedic poetic tradition. Here I only want to note that Vedic poetry is not literature in the strict sense of the word. It consists of powerful mantras with which it is possible to influence the cosmos and life itself.

25. Heesterman 1993, *passim*. It may be interesting to note that later thinking about Vedic ritual, which tries to remove all forms of potential conflict from the sacrifices, or rather, the communal sacrificial feasts, agrees with Aśoka’s rejection of *śamājas* expressed in Rock Edict 1, even though in the latter case the reason given for disapproving these meetings is not the destructive nature of the sacrifices or the obvious law-and-order problem they create but the need to slaughter so many animals at such occasions.

26. At the very beginning of the *Mahābhārata* we see how Ugraśravas arrived at Śaunakā’s 12-year sacrifice, where he repeats Vyāsa’s *Mahābhārata* as he had heard it being recited by Vaiśampāyana at Janamejaya’s Snake Sacrifice. Note also that Kuśa and Lava make their appearance and recite the *Rāmāyana* at their father Rāma’s *āśvamedha*.

27. Chakrabarti 1989.

28. This (investigative) theory of sacrifice (*nimāṇā*) fathered the later juridical argumentation (see Lingat 1967: 163ff.), which may be supposed to have another occupation of the king’s scribes.

More importantly, precisely because of the power attributed to these mantras one does not meddle with their style and language. Epic poetry, on the other hand, for all its ritual and mythological significance, has always had an element of diversion: during the year-long *āśvamedha*, when the princes were following the horse which had been set free in the countryside, bards helped those who had stayed behind to pass away the time by telling stories. Furthermore, the epic stories dealt largely, if not exclusively, with royal concerns. It was the type of stories the court was familiar with and interested in, and in which it could recognize much of itself.

However, *mahākāvya* is not a direct successor of the epics, that is to say, it did not succeed the epics in their ritual function. Instead, it seems to belong exclusively to the “new” position of the scribes in the royal chancery, who in the poems bear witness to their linguistic and stylistic skills. Beside letters, these skills found expression in inscriptions (in particular the *prāśastis*) and in literary texts. It is unclear, however, what role these literary texts played in court life. They may have featured in contests between poets organized by kings and other rich patrons mentioned in later sources. One such contest, a so-called *kavisamājya* or *kāvyaśāṣṭhī* presided over by the king, is described in Chapter 10 of Rājasekhara’s *Kāvyaśāṣṭhī*.²⁹ An earlier description of contest is found in *Kāmasūtra* 1.4.14–17. It concerns a so-called *ghaṭātambandhana*, that is, a contest between bards (*kuśilavas*), which, however, could equally well be taken to refer to one between *kāvya* poets. The event is announced (it takes place on a day made known, *prajñāte’hami*) and organized by the *nāgaraka*, the *Kāmasūtrās* “hero,” and it involves performances, or “spectacles” (*prekṣanaka*), by wandering bards (*kuśilavāsī... āgantavaḥ*) before an audience of *niyuktas*. The latter term is somewhat enigmatic, but from what follows in the text it becomes clear that it refers to people who are well versed in the bardic art themselves. For, if for some reason (illness or a busy schedule) no bards show up, persons from the audience could take over their role. Vice versa, if no audience shows up, the bards, or at least some of them, could take a seat in the audience.³⁰ The bards get a regular fee on the second day, but may be invited by the audience to perform another time. Interestingly, the guests who have joined the meeting—and most probably the reference is simply to the audience—receive prizes and honors as well. A similar picture arises from the description of the so-called *kavisamājya* of the

29. See Tietken 1992.

30. Note that the passage in the *Kāmasūtra* is aptly concluded with the phrase *iti gaṇadharmah*. *gaṇa* in *gaṇadharmah* is a synonym of *saṅgha*, which, according to Pāṇini 3.3.42, denotes a meeting of equals (*saṅghe cānuttarādharye*).

Kāvyaśāṣṭhī: the evaluation of the poems is left to an audience, which consists entirely of poets. While the *ghaṭātambandhana* is presided over by the *nāgaraka*, the *kavisamājya* is presided over, and organized, by the king; the meeting takes place at his invitation at his court. The role of the *nāgaraka* and the king was basically that of distributing presents and honors. On these occasions the court could present itself as a centre of competition, that is, as the place that of all types of people and of all kinds of professions was capable of attracting the most excellent performers.

G. The Proliferation of Genres within the *Kāvya* Tradition

As suggested earlier in this chapter, the *mahākāvya*, in any case as far as its format is concerned, was the result of a kind of makeover of the epic. In their use of the epic, the poets were falling back on a literary tradition which was part of their own repertory. As may be gathered from the present form of the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyana*, the scene of bards dropping in on sacrifices was, as fiction, already a part of these epics as they presumably circulated among ritual specialists and scribes. Therefore, it did not do for the poets to introduce this element of the epic a second time in their *mahākāvya*s. Interestingly, Kālidāsa in the *Raghuvaṃśā*, in contrast to the *Kumārāsambhava*, by way of introduction did present a poet about to recite the text, while genealogies, or *vaṃśās*, were part of the epic tradition as well. I think this situation underlines, at least in Kālidāsa’s time, the difference between the epics, which include genealogies side by side with the main theme, which is sacrifice, on the one hand, and genealogical texts like the *Purāṇas*, which deal with genealogy as an independent theme. Apart from its story, moreover, the *Raghuvaṃśā*, which shares all the characteristics of a *mahākāvya*, such as the division into *śargas* each with its own meter and different meters at the end of it, seems to show the dominance of the *mahākāvya* format in the *kāvya* tradition in Kālidāsa’s time.

It has also been argued earlier that in Sanskrit plays the poets were adapting a living performance tradition to the new style of writing developed and maintained by them in the royal chanceries.³¹ For all we know this must have

31. The supposed authors’ backgrounds in sacrificial (investigative) theory, or *mīmāṃsā* referred to earlier (see also n. 28) seems to have left their trace on Sanskrit drama in a particular way. A recurring theme in Sanskrit drama is the king’s love affair with a princess and his marriage with her as a second wife beside his first one. Marriage is politically important, as it provides the king with an important ally in the person of the princess’s father. What is most striking in all this is the passive role of the king. In the end his desires are fulfilled, one is tempted to say, almost despite himself. The king’s desire is the most important thing, its fulfillment happening

taken place almost simultaneously with their experiments with the epic format. Aśvaghōṣa, the earliest known *mahākāvya* author, for instance, wrote at least one play as well as the *Sāriputraprakaraṇa*.³² The script of a Sanskrit drama is made up of conversation in prose interspersed with verses. The verses are generally of the same type as those found in *mahākāvya*s. A peculiarity of the drama, however, is the great variety of the meters of the verses, and that successive verses rarely have the same meter. If in Sanskrit drama we are indeed dealing with a written, polished-up version of an original performance tradition, what these verses corresponded to in the original folk-tradition of drama largely remains a puzzle. In this connection it should be noted that the verses in Sanskrit drama are texts to be recited; only very exceptionally are they sung (for example, *Śakuntalā* v. 103), in which case this is expressly mentioned. Singing seems to have formed a regular feature of a performance. However, the songs concerned, called *dhruvās*, were not included in the script and were not part of the characters' roles. They functioned as interludes, serving to fill up a lull in the action, for instance, during the exits and entrances of the characters. The *dhruvās*, some examples of which have been transmitted in *Nāṭyaśāstra* XXXII, are in what seems to be a kind of Aphabrahamsha, which is supposed to represent, or imitate, the local languages spoken by the actors.³³ A "performance" of a Sanskrit play would thus have involved conversation in prose, recited verses, and songs. It is not at all certain if we may apply this multi-colored picture just like that to the underlying dramatic tradition. For instance, it may be asked if the verses in the scripts of Sanskrit dramas correspond to songs in the original performance tradition.³⁴

almost automatically. In this connection one may compare *Nāṭyaśāstra* 19. 9: *antsulyanātrabandhas tu yad bijeya nibadhyate / mahatāḥ phalagāyā sa phalārambha isyate*. This presentation of the situation may well be an echo of ideas such as those found in later *Pīrma-nimānāsā* concerning the fundamental unity of ritual action (*karma*) and aim (*artha*). In this way in the plays the king's sexual desires, as the most obvious example, are accounted for in a scholarly way.

32. On a scene from the *Sāriputraprakaraṇa*, which was previously identified as part of a separate play, see Tietken 2010b.

33. Tietken 2001a, 180ff., and 2008.

34. As I have discussed elsewhere (2010a) songs as part of the characters' roles in "Sanskrit" drama are found for the first time only in the fourteenth-century play *Gonakāvijaya* by Vidyāpati. Side by side with Sanskrit drama there were, however, all kinds of so-called minor dramatic types composed in Prakrit or Aphabrahamsha, which contained songs and involved dancing. As I see it, in contrast to these minor dramatic types, which were full of songs sung like arias (that is, with little regard for the meaning of the words), the effect of Sanskrit plays, with their often complicated plots, depended mostly on the texts.

H. The Preface

In the course of the history of *kāvya* certain texts came to be introduced by prefaces. At first sight we seem to be dealing with a relatively late phenomenon, found for the first time in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* and *Harṣacarita*. In the case of Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* the preface turns the storyteller in the text into the author of the text. If the function of the preface is indeed, among other things, to introduce an external author, as discussed earlier, in the *Harṣacarita* the problem is that the latter, historical author turns out to be the same person as the storyteller featuring in the text. In this connection I want to draw attention to the prologues of Sanskrit drama. In these prologues the director of the dramatic troupe announces the play that is about to be performed before the audience present. In doing so he also mentions the name of the playwright. However, in the case of the *Mṛcchakatika* the author Śūdraka, who is not only responsible for the script of the play but also for that of the prologue, is in that same prologue said to be already dead! The situation in the *Mṛcchakatika* may be contrasted with the one in Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*. In the case of this play more was needed than a dead author. In the prologue Kālidāsa is expressly said to be a contemporary, living author, which is emphasized by mentioning presumably famous predecessors. As I have tried to show elsewhere, this reference to Kālidāsa as a living person most likely contains a hint at the topic of the play, which, for once, does not involve heroes from epic mythology, but real, historical people. This particular prologue appears to have several elements in common with later prefaces: the name of the author, a reference to earlier authors in the field, and a kind of apology (verse 2). Apparently all this was needed to present a living author. Unfortunately, it is difficult to find out if in Kālidāsa's time prefaces such as we find later were already in vogue and if in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* he was playing with the phenomenon, or that we are dealing with a pure coincidence here.

I. Epilogue

If certain Sanskrit compositions were in need of an apology, this is no less the case with the present study. What is presented here is not much more than the outline of an idea. It is basically an attempt to formulate some hypotheses for my own further investigations into the beginnings of *kāvya* literature. These investigations are to a large extent determined by the idea that *kāvya*, which started as a by-product of clerks responsible for the king's correspondence and administration, was in origin written literature exploiting, and experimenting with, the possibilities offered by writing.

In this chapter the clerks' background has been filled in with more details. Thus, it is argued, they appear to have had close contacts with ritual and legal specialists employed at the royal court, if, as a class, they had not themselves evolved from these specialists. As ritual specialists they were the custodians of the epic tradition. Yet, as members of the court administration they must have already been far removed from the wandering bards who used to recite epic poetry at royal sacrifices. As scholars they will have been, or they considered themselves to be, a class apart from these and similar wandering performers, including drama actors.

The scenario mentioned here of the origin of *kāvya* differs from the one drawn up quite recently by Stephanie Jamison.³⁵ The poetic techniques of *kāvya* and the *kāvya* poets' "verbal exuberance" are traced back by her directly to the Vedic poetic tradition.³⁶ The link in the connection was, according to her, the *prāsasti*, or panegyric poetry, which, as the product of *kavis*, had clear roots in the Vedic tradition. Jamison suggests that the typical *kāvya* style had its basis in *prāsastis* and was gradually extended to other genres of *kāvya*, in doing which she has no need of intervening scribes or the epic. As to the intervening scribes, however, I think that their role is demonstrated by the Aśoka inscriptions, which testify to the presence of an element of the later poetical tradition of *kāvya* in the royal chancery. The supposed role of the epic is a more complicated matter, because the first evidence of *kāvya* is Buddhist poetry of the lyric mode in Pāli found in the *Thera-* and *Therīgāthā*. The latter two texts are generally dated well before the beginning of our era and, as has been demonstrated by Lienhard, show a number of points of agreement with later secular erotic poetry in Prakrit (for example, *Sattasāī*) and Sanskrit.³⁷

The *Thera-* and *Therīgāthā* apart, other early *kāvya* texts all belong to Buddhist literature. They include, apart from stray quotations, Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmanāḍītikā* and other early Buddhist *campūs*. The first examples of the *mahākāvya* are Aśvaghōṣa's (first century) *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda*,

the stories of which are based on the Buddha's biography. The first *mahākāvya*s (including dramas) dealing with themes derived from the "Hindu" epics are those by Kālidāsa (fourth or fifth century).³⁸

On the basis of the evidence of the *Thera-* and *Therīgāthā*, Jamison surmised that "between the Rig Veda and the dawn of *kāvya* proper" the *kāvya* literary tradition had survived at courts, which made use of Middle Indic languages.³⁹ However, as I have tried to show elsewhere, available evidence for courts using a Middle Indic language needs considerable fine tuning; in both known cases (Aśoka and the Sātavāhanas and their successors in the Deccan) the influence of Sanskrit seems to have been present in the background.⁴⁰ Contrary to Jamison's, in my scenario *kāvya* was in all its phases intimately connected with Sanskrit and in particular with brahmanic culture. Buddhist *kāvya* literature would represent an early offshoot of that tradition, which as far as *kāvya* in Sanskrit is concerned is attested almost simultaneously. The odd-one-out here is the so-called *kāvya* literature in Pāli (in particular *Thera-* and *Therīgāthā*). In fact, this might be a reason to have a closer look, if not at the date of the compilations then at their interpretation as examples of *kāvya*.

The fact that the earliest examples of *mahākāvya* are Buddhist texts may well be a trick played by history.⁴¹ In any case, Aśvaghōṣa's *mahākāvya*s are full of material derived from, for instance, the epics.⁴² As I see it, this may well be explained with reference to the composition and orientation of the chancery concerned, which was probably only marginally affected by Buddhism. For royal rituals, for instance, the king remained dependent on specialists of the *śrauta* ritual because Buddhism did not provide him with alternative royal rituals. Knowledge of Buddhism was probably merely added to the curriculum of the clerks, whose primary schooling included, among other things, Vedic ritual and epic literature.⁴³ All this might also explain how Buddhist *kāvya* could have

38. The plays, which can with any certainty be ascribed to Kālidāsa's predecessor Bhāsa, namely the *Suppanāśanaudatta* and *Pratijñāyagandharvāyana*, typically, do not deal with epic themes but with themes belonging to the Udayana cycle (see Tietken 1993 and 1997).

39. Jamison 2006, 146.

40. Tietken 2008.

41. On the role of the "foreign" Buddhist rulers in the early history of Sanskrit literature, see Lévi 1902.

42. See Johnston's introduction to his edition of the *Buddhacarita*, p. xlvii–l.

43. The situation is comparable to the one in the Aśoka inscriptions. In Rock Edict 8 we are told how the emperor visited the place where the Buddha had received enlightenment, a visit, which subsequently greatly affected the king's administration. In Rock Edict 9, however, heaven (*svarga*) is mentioned as the ultimate goal, which besides to popular Buddhism, also belongs to the world of the *śrauta* sacrifice.

35. Jamison 2007. This is a publication of a series of lectures given at the Collège de France in Paris in 2004. I refer in particular to the end of the third lecture (pp. 115–18) as well as to the fourth lecture (pp. 119–50).

36. Jamison leaves out of consideration elements like the stories of *kāvya* or their protagonists, human and divine, which as found in *kāvya* do not seem to derive directly from the Vedas but seem to have been filtered through the epic (Jamison 1996: 137). In the case of vocabulary the situation is not different. As has been argued by Renou, Vedic words in *kāvya* are not borrowed directly from the Vedas but from the subsequent scholarly tradition represented by the *Nīghaṇṭu* and *Nirukta*; Renou 1959, 398–401.

37. Lienhard 1975. See also Jamison 2006, 143–46, who also draws attention to several instances of the word *kāvya* in Pāli texts.

escaped from the ban on pleasurable pastimes such as enjoying literature. We are obviously dealing with a ban which was relevant only in monkish circles and which the court did not feel obliged to obey.

References

- Ācāryadañjiniśāitī Avantisundarī*. ed. Śūranād Kunjan Pilla. Anantaśayanamskrāgranthāvalīh 172. Trivandrum, 1954.
- Bhāṭṭikāyaṃ*. ed. and trans. Maheshwar Anant Karandikar and Shailaja Karandikar. Delhi, 1982.
- Brisson, Luc. "La géographie politique de *Dāsakūmāracarita*," *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 2 (1984), 43–59.
- Buhler, Georg. "Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstpoesie." *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historischen Klasse* 122XI. Wien, 1890.
- Chakrabarti, S. C. "A Study of the *pāṇḍava*," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32 (1989), 255–67.
- deCaroli, Robert. "An Analysis of Daṇḍin's *Dāsakūmāracarita* and Its Implications for Both the Vākāṅka and Pallava Courts," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115/4 (1995), 671–77.
- The Gāndārho: A Prakṛit Historical Poem by Vākepati*. ed. Shankar Pandurang Pandit. Poona, 1927.
- The Harivijaya of Rājānaka Ratnākara with the Commentary of Alaka Rājānaka*. ed. Paṇḍit Durgaprasāda and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Varanasi, 1890 (reprint 1982).
- The Harshacharita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa with the Commentary (Sañiketa) of Saṅkara*. ed. Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab and Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Shāstrī Paṇḍīkar. Bombay, 1925.
- Heesterman, Jan C. *The Broken World of Sacrifice*. Chicago, 1993.
- Jamison, Stephanie. "Vṛna et Vṛdhgna and Sur la structure du *Kāya*—Some Intersections: Vedic motifs in *Kūmārasambhava* III," in Nalini Balbir and Georges-Jean Pinault, eds, *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien. Centenaire de Louis Renou*. Paris, 1996, 123–42.
- . *The Rig Veda between Two Worlds/Le Rgveda entre deux mondes. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne* 74. Paris, 1997.
- The Jānakīharṇya of Kumāradāsa*. ed. S. Parānavitana and C. E. Godakumbura. Colombo, 1967.
- The Buddhacarita or Acts of the Buddha*. Parts I and II. ed. and trans. E. H. Johnston. Lahore, 1936 (reprint 1972).
- The Kādambari of Bāṇabhaṭṭa and His Son (Bhūshanaḥabhaṭṭa)*. ed. by Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Bombay 1896.
- The Kāmasūtram of Śrī Vātsyāyana Muni with the Jayamañgalā Sanskrit Commentary of Śrī Yāśodhara*. ed. Śrī Devduṭṭa Śāstrī. Varanasi, 1964.
- Khoroch, Peter and Herman Tieken. *Poems on Life and Love in Ancient India: Hālās Sattasāi*. Albany, 2009.
- Kīrtīyājñiya of Bhāruvī with the Commentary (Ghāṭāpāṭha) of Mallinātha*. ed. Paṇḍit Durgaprasād and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Bombay, 1902.
- The Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa with the Commentary (the Sañjivini) of Mallinātha (1–8 Sargas) and of Sūtrāna (8–17 Sargas)*. ed. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa Parvaṇīkara and Kāśinātha Pāṇḍuranga Paraba. Bombay, 1886.

- Lévi, Sylvain. "Sur quelques termes employés dans les inscriptions de Ksatrapas," *Journal Asiatique* (1902), 95–125.
- Lienhard, Siegfried. "Sur la structure poétique des Theratherīgāthā," *Jas* (1975), 375–96.
- . *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit*. A History of Indian Literature III/1. Wiesbaden, 1984.
- Lingat, Robert. *Les sources du droit dans le système traditionnel de l'Inde*. Le monde d'outre-mer passé et présent. Première série. Études XXXII. Paris, 1972.
- Kālidāsa's Meghadūta Edited from Manuscripts with the Commentary of Vallabhadeva and Provided with a Complete Sanskrit-English Vocabulary*. With a Foreword by Professor Albrecht Wenzler. ed. E. Hultsch. Delhi, 1998.
- Nāyāśāstra of Bharatamuni with the Commentary Abhinavabhāratī by Abhinavaguptācārya*. Vol. II. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 68. Baroda 2001, Vol. III. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 124. Edited by M. Ramakrishna Kavi, V.M. Kulkarni, and Tapasvi Nandi. Baroda, 1954.
- Pīṇinī's Grammatik*. ed. and trans. by Otto Bohtlingk. Leipzig, 1887 (reprint Hildesheim 1971).
- Pollock, Sheldon. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley, 2006.
- Porcher, Marie-Claude. "La princesse et le royaume: Sur la représentation de la royauté dans le *Dāsakūmāracarita* de Daṇḍin," *Journal Asiatique* (1985), 183–206.
- . "Modalités narratives et modalités idéologiques dans le *Dāsakūmāracarita* de Daṇḍin," *Journal Asiatique* (1986), 269–89.
- Raghuvamśa. Kālidāsa-Lexicon*. Vol. I, *Basic Text of the Works*, Part IV. ed. Bragge A. Scharpé. 1964. Renou, Louis. "Sur la structure du Kāya," *Journal Asiatique* (1959), 1–114.
- Sakuntalā: A Sanskrit Drama, in Seven Acts*, by Kālidāsa. ed. Monier Williams. Oxford, 1876.
- Das Saptatākam de Hāla [Sattasāī]*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes VII/4. ed. and trans. Albrecht Weber. Leipzig, 1881 (reprint 1966).
- The Saundarananda of Atvaṅhoṣa*. ed. and trans. E. H. Johnston. Lahore, 1928 (reprint Delhi 1975).
- Schneider, Ulrich. *Die grossen Felsen-Edikte Aśokas. Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Analyse der Texte*. Wiesbaden, 1978.
- Maghabhāṭṭa's Shishupalaṅkha with the Commentary (Sandeha-vishvaśhadit) of Vallabhadeva*. Edited by Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhaṭṭa Shastri. Srinagar, 1935.
- Tieken, Herman. "The Structure of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa*," *Studies sur Indologie und Iranistik* 15 (1989), 151–58.
- . "Style and Structure of Rājāśekhara's *Kāyaminimāṃsā* with Special Reference to Chapter X on the Relation between King and Poet," in A. W. van den Hoek, D.H.A. Kolf, and M.S. Oort, eds, *Ritual, State and History in South Asia: Essays in Honour of J.C. Heesterman*. Leiden, 1992, 366–74.
- . "The So-Called Trivandrum Plays Attributed to Bhāsa," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 37 (1993), 5–44.
- . "Three Men in a Row (Studies in the Trivandrum Plays II)," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 41 (1997), 17–52.
- . *Kāya in South India: Old Tamil Cankam Poetry*. Gonda Indological Studies X. Groningen, 2001a.
- . "The *Pīravanāga*, the *Prastāvanā*, and the *Shāpaka*," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 45 (2001b), 91–124.

- Tieken, Herman. "Mahānambhā as a Description of Vākpati's *Gaṇḍarvabā*." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 22 (2001c), 91–202.
- . "The Place of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* within Kālidāsa's Oeuvre." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44 (2001d), 149–66.
- . "The Dissemination of Aśoka's Rock and Pillar Edicts." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 46 (2003), 5–42.
- . "The Interrogative Pronouns *Kam*, *Kāni* and *Kīni* in the Aśoka Edicts." *Acta Orientalia* (2004), 39–63.
- . "Authors' Signatures in Early Kāvya." *Caucas Indological Studies* VII 2005a, 285–93.
- . "The *Mahābhārata* after the Great Battle." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 48 (2004 [appeared 2005b]) 5–46.
- . "Aśoka's Fourteenth Rock Edict and the *Guna Mādhurya* of the Kāvya Poetical Tradition." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 156/1 (2006), 95–115.
- . "The Process of Vernacularization in South Asia." *Journal of the Social and Economic History of the Orient* 51 (2008), 152–97.
- . "Kill and Be Killed: The Bhagavadgītā and Anugṛā in the Mahābhārata." *The Journal of Hindu Studies*, 2/2 (2009), 209–28.
- . "Songs Accompanied with So-Called *Bhāratas* in Dramatic Texts." in Karin Steiner and Heidrun Brückner (eds), *Indische Theater: Text, Theorie, Praxis, Drama and Theatre in Südasien* 8. Wiesbaden, 2010a, 63–75.
- . 2010 b. Id., "Aśvaghosa and the History of Allegorical Literature in India." In: Eli Franco and Monica Zin (eds), *From Turfan to Ajanta. Festschrift for Dieter Schlingensiefel on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*. Lumbini, 2010b, 993–997.
- Viśavadattā: A Sanskrit Romance by Subandhu*. ed. Louis H. Gray. Delhi, 1962.
- The Vikramādikāśa-Charita: A Life of King Vikramāditya-Tribhuvanamalla of Kalyāna Composed by His Vidyapati Bilhana*. ed. George Bühler. Bombay, 1875.

South Asia Research

Series Editor

Patrick Olivelle

A Publication Series of

The University of Texas South Asia Institute

and

Oxford University Press

INDIAN EPIGRAPHY

A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages
Richard Salomon

A DICTIONARY OF OLD MARATHI

S. G. Tulpute and Anne Feldhaus

DONORS, DEVOTEES, AND DAUGHTERS OF GOD

Temple Women in Medieval Tamilnadu
Leslie C. Orr

JIMUTAVAHANA'S *DAYABHĀGA*

The Hindu Law of Inheritance in Bengal
Edited and Translated with an Introduction and Notes by
Ludo Rocher

A PORTRAIT OF THE HINDUS

Balthazar Solovyus & the European Image of India
1740–1824
Robert L. Hareldgrave

MANU'S CODE OF LAW

A Critical Edition and Translation of the Manava-Dharmasāstra
Patrick Olivelle

INNOVATIONS AND TURNING POINTS

Toward a History of *Kāvya* Literature
Edited by
Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb

NECTAR GAZE AND POISON BREATH

An Analysis and Translation of the Rajasthan Oral Narrative of Devnarayan
Aditya Malik

BETWEEN THE EMPIRES

Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE
Patrick Olivelle

MANAGING MONKS

Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism
Jonathan A. Silk

SIVA IN TROUBLE

Festivals and Rituals at the Pasupatinatha Temple of Deopatan
Axel Michaels

A PRIEST'S GUIDE FOR THE GREAT FESTIVAL

Aghorasiva's Mahotsavavidhi
Richard H. Davis

DHARMA

Its Early History in Law, Religion, and Narrative
AIF Hiltebeitel

INNOVATIONS AND TURNING POINTS

TOWARD A HISTORY
of
KĀVYA LITERATURE

edited by

Yigal Bronner

David Shulman

Gary Tubb

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS