

AUTHORSHIP OF THE DRAMA PĀRVATĪPARIṆAYAM**¹Tina Sarma, ²Dr. Purboshri Borpuzari**¹Research Scholar, Department of Sanskrit, Gauhati University, Assam, India²Golaghat, Assam, India**Abstract:**

Pārvatīpariṇayam is a nāṭakatype of rūpaka consisting of five acts. The general belief is that this drama was composed by Bāṇabhaṭṭa but there remains a controversy over this. Though the Pārvatīpariṇayam is a small drama, it proceeds by following almost all the rules of dramaturgy. Some scholars say that Bāṇabhaṭṭa is the author of this drama, while some other accept Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa is the author. The aim of this paper is to give a threadbare discussion on the controversy of authorship of this drama.

Keywords: Pārvatīpariṇayam, Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa, Drama, Authorship**Objectives:**

The aims and objectives of this paper is to give a discussion on the authorship of the drama Pārvatīpariṇayam.

Methodology:

The methodology used in this present paper is descriptive, comparative and analytical.

Introduction:**A note on Sanskrit drama:**

Sanskrit kāvyas are divided into two parts- dr̥śya and śravya. dr̥śyakāvya is also called rūpaka. In Sanskrit literature, rūpakas are of ten varieties- nāṭaka, prakaraṇa, bhāṇa, vyāyoga, samavakāra, dīma, ihāmrga, aṅka, bīthi and prahasana.¹ Drama or nāṭakacomes as the first variety of the rūpakawhich is defined by the Rhetoricians in their respective works. According to Viśvanātha Kavirāja, the story of a nāṭakashould be taken from a famous book like Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Purāṇa etc. It should have five sandhis and contain minimum of five acts and maximum of ten acts. In a drama, the hero should belong to a famous family or ofrājarsī type and he should be of dhīrodātta² type in nature. According to him the hero of the nāṭakashould be either divineor human. The predominant sentiment of a Sanskrit drama should either be sṛṅgāra(erotic) or vīra(heroic) and other subordinate sentiments are used here as the source to help the predominant one.³

A note on Pārvatīpariṇayam:

Pārvatīpariṇayam is a nāṭakatype of rūpaka consisting of five acts. The general belief is that this drama was composed by Bāṇabhaṭṭa but there remains a controversy over this. Though the Pārvatīpariṇayam is a small drama, it proceeds by following almost all the rules of dramaturgy. As the rule of dramaturgy establishes that the plot of a drama should be conceived from renowned sources like the epics and the purāṇas, the plot of the present drama is taken from the divine story of marriage of lord Śiva and Pārvatī found in the Śivapurāṇa, which is thoroughly dealt with in the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. The hero of the drama is Śiva, a dhīrodātta type of hero and he is a divine character. The principal sentiment of this drama is sṛṅgāra. The characters like Nārada, Himavān, Menā, Vasantikā, Rambhā, Mahendra, Devanandī, Bṛhaspati, Devadūta, Vasanta, Kāma, Baitālika, Nandī, Jayā, Vijayā, Siladhara, Kaiśikī, Brahmā etc. played important roles through their respective dialogues in the drama. In between different dialogues of various characters, we also find description of some natural phenomena. The story of the drama runs as –

Act I :

After the benedictory verse, the conversation between Sūtradhāra and Naṭī is found in the introductory portion of the Pārvatīpariṇayam. From their conversation, it is noticed that the story of the drama is related to the marriage of the

daughter of Himalaya(Himavān) and Menā. After this, Nārada, the celestial sage comes to Himalaya and gives information about Śaṅkara, who would be the perfect husband for his daughter, Pārvaṭī. In this drama, Himalaya is said to have two daughters - Pārvaṭī and Gaṅgā. In this connection, Nārada praises the beauty of Himalaya and that of her daughter also. After getting the advice of Nārada, Himavān and Menā starts thinking about it and come to the decision of sending Pārvaṭī to worship Śiva.

Act II :

The deity of forest, Vasantikā gets ready to go for collecting Kalpadruma flower from Nandanavana. At that time her friend Rambhā, the nymph come to her and tells about the attack of the asuras like Tārakāsura etc. Here, starts the viskambhaka. In this portion, it is seen that Mahendra, Devadūta, Bṛahaspati etc. are discussing the attack of asuras. It is declared that the son of Pārvaṭī and Śiva will be able to fight against this attack. For that reason, through Kāma all of them have decided to undertake a plan to unite Śiva and Pārvaṭī. Then Kāma goes to the place of Śiva with his wife Rati and friend Vasanta.

Act III :

Nārada comes from the place of Śiva by the advice of Mahendra and tells the story about the happening that took place between Śaṅkara and Kāma. He narrates that Kāma couldnot succeed according to the plan of Mahendra. Instead of it, Śiva has burnt Kāma in anger. After the burning of Kāma, his beloved wife Rati also fell down. At that time Pārvaṭī was also there and saw all the incidents when a message is given by ākāśvāṇīat the time of marriage between Śaṅkara and Pārvaṭī, Kāma will get his new life. Then Himavān comes and after taking Pārvaṭī goes home. After saying this story, Nārada left Svargaloka. Rambhā coming from Auṣadhiprasta informs Mahendra that Pārvaṭī had resolved to attain Śiva as her husband by practicing severe penance and her parents have approved her plan.

Act IV :

Nandin is sent by Śiva to see Pārvaṭī's sincerity in penance. Then he meets Jayā and Vijayā, the two friends of Pārvaṭī and comes to know that Pārvaṭī is genuinely in love with Śiva. Then, to check her, Śiva comes to her place in the guise of a Brahmācārīn. Pārvaṭī passes his test successfully and he agrees to get married Pārvaṭī at the abode of Himalaya.

Act V :

The marriage date is fixed by Seven Sages and Himalaya. The preparations of decorating the place of Himalaya get a start. The mountains arrive. Then Śiva arrives with the gods. Pārvaṭī also comes, being accompanied by Jaya and Vijaya. Bṛhaspati unites the hands of Śiva and Pārvaṭī. Brahmādeva, the aged matrons etc. bless the couple. Thus, with the Bharatavākya recited by Himalaya, the drama, Pārvaṭīpariṇayam comes to an end.

Controversy on the Authorship of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam :

It has already been mentioned that the story of the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam rolls through five acts. The title of the drama, here, goes with the central theme of the plot i.e the marriage of Pārvaṭī, daughter of Himalaya and Mena with Lord Śiva. The plot of the drama is seen to be very much similar with the story of the famous Sanskrit court epic the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa it explicitly understood through the projection of various expression of the letter by the dramatist⁴. The chief cause of the confusion about the authorship of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam lies on the fact that this work does not come with the status of the Harṣacarita and the Kādambarī which are undoubtedly accepted as the work of Bāṇabhaṭṭa. Moreover, the existence of the name Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna puts fuel to this confusion in a greater way. So there arises the problem whether our Bāṇabhaṭṭa belonging to 7th century A.D. is the composer of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam or some other with similar name like Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna of 15th century A.D. etc. is the author of this work. Scholars have offered various opinions on this topic. But so far no definite has been derived. A group of scholars accept Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna as the writer of this drama whereas some other offers the authorship to Bāṇabhaṭṭa. T.K. Ramachandra Aiyar mentioned the name of Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna, who wrote the Vemabhūpālacaritam, as the author of the drama Pārvaṭīpariṇayam.⁵ M. Krishnamachariar also furnishes his view in this regard and says that this work is ascribed to Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna⁶. But P.V.Kane has dealt with this point in a much detailed manner in the introductions of his editions of the Harṣacarita and the Kādambarī. His explanations support Bāṇabhaṭṭa as the

author of this drama. Nagendra Nath Basu also mentions this drama as the work of Bāṇabhaṭṭa⁷. Thaneswar Sharma, a scholar from Assam, has taken the view of P.V.Kane in his work and accepts Bāṇabhaṭṭa as the author of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam. Though in this connection he has also referred to the views of other indologist like, A.B. Keith, P. Ganapati Sastri etc., ultimately he seems to accept Bāṇabhaṭṭa as the author of the present work⁸. According to Keith, Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna is the author of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam⁹. But Haramohan Deva Goswami clearly stated that Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna is the author of the dramatic piece Pārvaṭīpariṇayam.¹⁰

If we go through the preface of the drama Pārvaṭīpariṇayam, it can be seen that the author himself declares here that this work is a composition of Bāṇa belonging to Vatsagotra¹¹. Again Bāṇa, the author of the Harṣacarita and the Kādambaṛī is a descendent of Vatsyayana family. Bāṇabhaṭṭa has given his own identities in the Harṣacarita in a detailed manner and also told about himself in the introductory part of the Kādambaṛī, which resembles quite a lot with information furnished in the introductory part of the present work¹². In the uccvasa of Harṣacarita, Bāṇa refers to his birthplace as the abode of Brahmins belonging to Vātsyāyana vaiśya¹³. The self declaration made by the author of the present drama states the similar identity. Another important point to be noted here is that through his works, Bāṇabhaṭṭa appears to be a worshipper of Lord Śiva and Pārvaṭī, the fact that might take him closer to the works of Kalidasa, another staunch follower of Lord Śiva and Pārvaṭī. Bāṇabhaṭṭa's submission to Lord Śiva and Pārvaṭī is evident from almost all benedictory verses used in his works like the Harṣacarita¹⁴ and the Kādambaṛī¹⁵. This custom is also followed in the benedictory verse of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam¹⁶. Thus when a writer takes resort to the marriage of Lord Śiva and Pārvaṭī as the central theme of his drama, it undoubtedly establishes the author's inclination to the concerned deities. Thus this can be considered as substantial proof to establish Bāṇa as a devotee of Śiva. So from this analogy it can be said that the author of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam was also a devotee of Lord Śiva and Pārvaṭī and he is none other than Bāṇabhaṭṭa-the author of the two famous prose romances.

It is to be noted here that if Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna, who belonged to South India, is considered as the author of the present dramatic work, there would have been sufficient references regarding the dresses, ornaments etc. of South Indian region while describing the marriage ceremony as it is a normal instinct of every writer to project his own tradition and custom through his own writings. But in the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam, it is not found. On the other hand in this drama the description of bridal dress, customs regarding the marriage ceremony, ornaments etc. seem to be related to the traditions and customs followed in the Northern part of India, to which Bāṇabhaṭṭa belonged.

Besides these evidences, some ideas and expressions of this drama which are quite common to the Harṣacarita and Kādambaṛī, can be cited to establish a conformity between Pārvaṭīpariṇayam and the prose works of Bāṇabhaṭṭa. For example, the following portion of the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam-

Himavān- devī kanyāpitṛtva khalu gṛhamedhināmadhikataram duḥkhamāvahati.....¹⁷

kuca yūgalam pariṇaddham yathā yathā vṛddhimeti tanvaṅgyaḥ /

varacintahr̥tamanasastathā tathā karsyameti me gātram//.¹⁸ which means Gaurī is getting physical maturity which makes her parents anxious for her marriage, has a very close similarity with the following portion of the Harṣacarita- yauvanāmbha eva ca kanyānabhindhani.....seyam sarvabhībhāvini śokāgrer dāhaśaktiryadapatyatve samāne'pi jātāyām duhitari dūyante santaḥ.¹⁹

that states that Rājyaśrī is also getting maturity, for which her father Prabhākaravardhana is brooding over that.

Moreover, the prose style projected in Pārvaṭīpariṇayam has a close similarity with that used in the Kādambaṛī and the Harṣacarita. P.V. Kane is also of opinion that the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam might have been composed before Bāṇabhaṭṭa had attained his mastery of his mature years.²⁰

In the Sanskrit preface of the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam edited by R.V. Krishnamachariar, it is stated that one Bāṇa who called himself Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna was the author of works like Vemabhūpālarita, Śabdaratnākara etc. He was also referred to as a Vātsa descendant belonging to 15th century A.D. This preface says that any passage from the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam is not found as quoted in any work of Bāṇabhaṭṭa-the author of the prose works. Moreover, it is pointed out that a total submission to Kalidasa cannot be accepted in connection with the matured writer like Bāṇabhaṭṭa. The style of writing, the power of imagination projected in Pārvaṭīpariṇayam also do not tally with those of Bāṇabhaṭṭa. So, Krishnamachariar wants to say that Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna is the author of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam. But these arguments cannot be

granted to deny the authorship of Bāṇabhaṭṭa here. Though the Harṣacarita and the Kādambarī are accepted as Bāṇabhaṭṭa's own creation yet the subject matter of the former has been taken from history. So it cannot be ruled out that Bāṇabhaṭṭa has taken the Kālidāsa's theme as the source of his drama. Though the language used in this drama is full of Prasāda guṇa and the work is composed in Vaidarbhī style, it cannot be thumb rule that Bāṇabhaṭṭa is matured only in narration that exhibits the characteristics of ojas. He may show his difference of taste here. All these have been discussed elaborately by R. D. Karmarkar in his book²¹. So to accept Bāṇabhaṭṭa as the author of Pārvaṭīpariṇayam takes us more on the safer side.

Conclusion:

From the above discussion on the authorship of the dramatic piece Pārvaṭīpariṇayam, we can consider that no argument is convincing to reject the view of the authorship of Bāṇabhaṭṭa of 7th century as the author of the present drama. In the introduction of the Pārvaṭīpariṇayam, Bāṇa himself utters the word kavisārvabhauma, which can establish that he wrote the drama when he became famous as a poet among the people. The style of writing, use of metre, characterisation etc. found in this drama stand as a proof of Bāṇa's mastery over literary style. Therefore, we can say that the drama Pārvaṭīpariṇayam is composed by Bāṇabhaṭṭa, 7th century A.D., the famous prose writer in the field of Sanskrit literature.

REFERENCES:

1. nāṭakamatha prakaraṇam bhāṇavyāyogasamavakāraḍimāh/
ihāmṛgāṅkavīṭhyah prahasanamiti rūpakāṇi daśa//, Sāhityadarpaṇah, VI,3
2. avikatthanaḥ kṣamāvānatiḡambhīro mahāsattvaḥ/
stheyānṇigūḍhamāno dhīrodāttodṛḍāvratāḥ kathitaḥ //, ibid., III,32
3. nāṭakam khyātavṛttam syāt pañcasandhisamanvitaṁ...etc., ibid., VI, 7-11
4. (i) astyuttarasyām diśi devatātmā, Kumārasambhava I.1 vis-à-vis tribhuvanagurūnāgunātīrāga....aviratamanuśāsti devatātmā, Pārvaṭīpariṇayam (PP) I.12
(ii) rativalayapadāṅke cāpamāsajya kaṅṭhe, ibid II.64 vis-à-vis tribhuvanajayayogyam cāpamamśe dadhānaḥ, ibid, II.9
5. A Short History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 153
6. History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, book IV, p.452
7. Hindi Visvakosh, vol XV, p. 302
8. Sanskrit Sahityar Itivṛtta, khanda II, p.245
9. The feebleness of that work both in construction and style might have deterred critics from accepting the attribution, and in point of fact it is clear that it was the production of Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāna in the 15th century.
10. Sanskrit Sahityar Burānji , XIII, p. 286
11. asti kavisārvabhūmo vatsānvayajaladhikaustubho bāṇah/
nṛtyati yadrasanāyām vedhomukharāṅgālāsikā vāṇī//, PP, I.4
12. " bābhūva vātsyāyanavamśasambhavo dvijo
yaśomśusuklikṛtasaptaviṣṭapattataḥ suto 'bāṇa' iti vyajāyata// , Kādambarī, 10 - 19
13. vātsyāyanavamśamatmano janmabhuvam., Harṣacarita, ucchvāsa I
14. namastuṅgaśīrascumbicandracāmaracārave/
trailokyanagarārambhāmūlastambhyāya śambhave//, ibid., ucchvāsa I.1
15. jayanti bāṇāsūramaulilālītā daśāsyacūḍāmaṇicakracumbinaḥ/
surāsūrādhisasikhāntaśāyino bhavaccidastryambakapādapāmsavaḥ//, Kādambarī, 2
16. ādau premakaṣāyitā haramukhavyāpāralolā śanai
rbrīḍabhāravīghūrṇitā mukulītā dhūmodgamavyājataḥ/
patyuh saṁmilitā ḍṛśā sarabhasavyāvartanavyākulā
pārvatyāḥ pariṇītimāṅgalavidhau ḍṛṣṭiḥ śivāyāstu vaḥ//, PP I.1
17. vide, Act I
18. ibid., I.14
19. vide, ucchāsva IV

20. Introduction of Harṣacarita, etd. By P. V. Kane, p. xviii

21. Bāṇa, Extension lecture series-6, Karnāṭaka University, Dharwar, 1964, P.18-21

BIBLIOGRAPHY**A.ORIGINAL WORK:**

Harṣacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, etd. by P. V. Kane, Motilal Bāṇarsidass Indological Publishers & Booksellers, Delhi, 1918.

Harṣacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, etd. by Pt. Jagannath Pathak, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, 1998.

Harṣacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, etd by Dr. Keshavarao Musalgaonkar, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, Varanasi, 1992.

Kādambarī of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, etd. by Dr. Jaya Shankar Lal Tripathi, Chowkhamba Krishnadas Academi, Varanasi, 1993.

Kumarasambhava of Kalidasa, etd. by M. R. Kale, Motilal Bāṇarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Bombay, 1908.

Pārvaṭipariṇayam of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, etd. by R. V. Krishnamohan Sastri, Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1906.

Pārvaṭipariṇayam of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, etd. by Dr. Ramapati Misra, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, Varanasi, 1984.

Sahityadarpanah of Visvanath Kaviraja, etd. by Dr. Satyavrat Singh, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, 1979 (fifth edition).

B.MODERN WORK:

Aiyar, T. K. Ramachandra : A Short History of Sanskrit Literature, R. S. Vadhyar & Sons, Palghat, South India, 1989

Basu, Pracyavidyamaharnava Sri Nagendra Nath : Hindi Visvakosh, Vol.xv, B. R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 1919

Goswami, Haramohan Deva : Sanskrit Sahityar Buranji, Bookland, Guwahati, 1977

Krishnamachariar, M : History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, Tirunalai-Tirupati Devasthanams press, Madras, 1937

Kane, Mahamahopadhyaya P. V : The Harshacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Motilal Bāṇarsidass Ideological Publishers & Booksellers, Delhi, 1918

Karmarkar, R. D : Bāṇa, Karnatak University, Dharwar, 1964

Keith, A Berriedale : A History of Sanskrit Literature, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1973

Krishnamachariar, M : History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, Tirunalai-Tirupati Devasthanams press, Madras, 1937

Sarma, Dr. Thaneswar : Sanskrit Sahityar Itibritta, Chandra Prakash, Panbazar, Guwahati, 1995

Tripathi, Dr. Jaya Shankar Lal : Kādambarī, Chowkhamba Krishnadas Academi, Varanasi, 1993