

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

- **Life and date of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa :-**

There is a great problem of almost all Sanskrit poets regarding their personal history, it has concealed under a thick veil of obscurity which appears an impossible task to remove in the present condition. It is naturally created in the mind of a reader, when he starts the study of an author, as to what type of person he was, where from he belonged and how he had passed his life but the answer is not cleared in the case of many poets of Indian literature, only the source to know the life of a poet is from the appreciation of his poetry. Mostly the Sanskrit poets are informed by their works, which has the tendency to write the historical subjects indirect contrast with the authors of the *kāvya*s or *Mahākāvya*s and sometimes given their names to their compositions. Dramatists also forward some personal details like names, lineage, patronage, their life and date sometimes in the prelude to their plays. Such as prelude to the plays of *Bhavabhūti*, especially that of his *Mālatīmādhava*¹. In the prelude to the *Mudrārākṣasa* of *Viśākhaḍatta*.²

¹. C. f.

*asti daṣṣinapāthe vidarbheṣu padmapuram nāma nagaram. tatra kecittaittiriyinah
kāsyapascaranaguravah pañktipavanah pañcagrayo dhṛtavratah somapithina
udumbaranamano brahmavadinah prativasanti sma. te srautriyastattvavingniscayaya
bhuri śrautam sasvtamadriyante.drstaya pūrtaya ca karmanerthandaranapatyaya
taporthamayuh. tadamusnayanasya tatrabhavatah sugrhitamno bhattagopālasya
pautrah pavitrakirternilakanthasyatmasambhavo bhattasrīkanthapadalāncchano
bhavabhūtināmajatukarṇīputrah kavirnisargasauhrdena bharateṣu
svakṛtimevamprayagunabhūayasimasmakamarpitavan.*

- M. M, 2nd Act, p-11,12,13.

². C. f.

*ājñāpito'smi pariṣada yathādya tvaya sāmāntavatesvaradattapautraṣya
mahārājāpadabhakprthusunoh kavervisakhadattasya krtirabhinavam mudraraksasam
nama nātakam nātayitavyamiti.*

- M. R, by M. R. Kale, 1st Act, p-13.

Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa is also a dramatist, who has no distinct communication in this respect. Nothing is found about himself except the title *Kavimārgarāja*³ in the prelude of the drama *Veṅṭsamhāra*. Perhaps he did not feel the necessity to add more details about himself thinking as he was well known in his days. Whatever that may be but the prelude fails to give such information in the case of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*. Though, there are no sufficient references in the concerned text but from some references available in other sources, one comes to know that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was of *Śāṅḍilya* family.⁴ He originally belonged to *Kānyakubja* or *Kannouj* as narrated in “*Kṣītiśavamśāvalīcarita*” of Bengal where it is clearly mentioned that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was one of the five *Brāhmiṇs* brought to Bengal with special request of king *Ādisura*⁵. After the performance of the sacrifice to please the deities like *Indra*, *Varuna*, *Mitravaruṇa* and others for a shower in the rainless territory of *Ādisura*, having seen the scholasticity, ritual expertise of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*, king *Ādisura* became very much impressed and gave him a territory of land (*Jamindāry*) to *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*; mythically he became a king, *Sāmantarāja*. The illustrious Tagore family of Calcutta⁶ was believed to be descended from him though no one of this family at present claim the said identity.

The five *Brāhmaṇas*, who migrated from *Kānyakubja* to Bengal are called *Sārasvatas* and after their settlement they came to be known as *Gauḍa Sārasvatas*⁷. *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was the leader of *Sārasvata* settlers and thus he became the founder of *Gauḍa Sārasvata Brāhmaṇism* in that province.

There is some confusion regarding the caste of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*. Some scholars opined that he was a *Kṣatriya* on two grounds viz (1) In the *Kṣītiśavamśāvalīcarita* *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* and his descendants referred as *Kṣītiśas* and the word *Kṣītiśa* like *Rājan* indicates to the *Kṣatriya* caste. (2) In the prelude of *Veṅṭsamhāra* also *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* distinguishes himself as a

³ . C. f. *Tadīdam kavermargarājalakṣmano Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇasya kṛtim Veṅṭsamhāram nāma nātakam prayuktumudyata vāyam.*

⁴ . C. f. T.V.S.O.B, by Lt.col. A. B. Gajendragadkar, p-3

⁵ . C. f. *The Veṅṭsamhāra*, by The late Lt.col. A.B.G, p-3

⁶ . C. f. *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*, by A.C.Sastri p-9

⁷ . T.V.S, by Lt.col. A.B.G p-3

Kṣatriya by the epithet *Mṛgarājalakṣmaṇah*, which means one whose surname or family name is *Mṛgarāja* or *Simha* or *sinha*. Which is usually found to the names of *Kṣatriyas* such as *Pratāpa-Simha* or *Sinha*, *Jaya-Simha* and others. So *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was a *Kṣatriya*.

But both these are not sufficient to prove him as a *Kṣatriya*. First, *Kṣītiśa* just means a king or *Rājan*. Where as a *Brāhmaṇa* also may hold the position of a king. So there is nothing wrong if the designation of *Kṣītiśas* to be given to *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* who was by caste supposed to be a *Brāhmaṇa* and his descendants. Secondly the elaboration given on the epithet *Mṛgarājalakṣmaṇah* is not a strong ground to prove *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* as a *Kṣatriya*. So also the word *Mṛgarājalakṣmaṇah* is preceded by the *Kavi*. By the term *lakṣmaṇah* it indicates a distinctive personal designation or title, consequently it can not signify a surname or a family name which is common to all family members of a family. Again *Kavemṛgarāja* means lion among poets which finds a place in distinctive titles such as *Kīrtaṇa-Keśarin*, *Vedānta-Keśarin*. Similarly, *Kavimṛgarāja* is just a title of the poet.

On the contrary there are positive evidences to believe that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was a *Brāhmaṇa* by caste. At first the particular word *Bhaṭṭa* clearly proves that he was a *Brāhmaṇa*. *Kṣatriya* are never designated in this way as *Bhaṭṭa*. The meaning of the *Bhaṭṭa* and *Bhata* is well known to all. Secondly the traditional chronicles say that *Brāhmaṇas* are invited by *Ādisura* from *Kānyakubja* to Bengal and he was the chief of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Thirdly, the *Kṣītisavamśāvalīcarita* is enough to give certain incidents and records of these settlers as *Brāhmaṇas*. Fourthly, there are some points in the *Veṅṅisamhāra* which clearly indicate that its author was a *Brāhmaṇa*.

(a) The character of the *Vidūṣaka* brings in the comic or lighter sentiments in a Sanskrit drama and as he is always a *Brāhmaṇa*. Such a character is absent from the *Veṅṅisamhāra*. He has not introduced any *Brāhmaṇic* qualities. Where the readers enjoyed full of mockery. A *Brāhmaṇa* author did not want to introduce in his drama such a character which will only

serve to cast a stain on his caste. *Kālidāsa* has given the character of *Vidūṣaka* in his drama but the caste of him is unknown. *Bhavabhūti*, obviously a *Brāhmaṇa*, has not introduced *Vidūṣaka* in his dramas. Similarly, *Viśākhadatta*, a *Brāhmaṇa*, has no *Vidūṣaka* in his drama *Mudrārakṣasam*. In other side *Śrīharṣa* and *Rājaśekhara*, who were *Kṣatriyas*, have introduced the character of *Vidūṣaka* in their plays. Therefore *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* is a *Brāhmaṇa*, who has not delineated *Vidūṣaka* in his drama.

(b) The human body is essentially constituent with blood, flesh, marrow and others which are needed for a body. There is no difference between the *Brāhmaṇa* blood and *Kṣatriya* blood flowing from the bodies of both. But the author with a sense pride showed his superiority of caste in the *Veṅṅsamhāra*. Which is obviously focused in the 3rd Act of the drama, when *Vasagandhā*, the demoness was known the death *Droṇācārya* then she proposed to her husband *Rudhirapriyā*, the demon that they should go and drink the blood of *Droṇācārya*. But *Rudhirapriyā* remarked with fear (surprisingly) that *Brāhmaṇa* – blood burn the throat when drunk.⁸ Such a remark only can come out from the mouth of a *brāhmaṇa* writer.

(c) In the third Act of the drama *Veṅṅsamhāra* also it has been noticed that the superiority of *Aśvatthāman* and mean-mindedness and back biting⁹ of *Karṇa* while the quarrel occurs in between them. Here the dramatist supports to the *Brāhmaṇa* as they are mild and gentle by the expression of *Duryodhaṇa-*

“*Athavāsūktamidamabhiyuktaiḥ prakṛtirdustyajeti. yataḥ śokāndhamanasā tena vimucya kṣatradharmakarkasyam dvijāti dharmasulabho mārdo vapari grahaḥ kṛtaḥ.*”¹⁰

⁸. C. f. “*vasagandhe brahmanasonitam khalvetadgalam dahaddahatpravisati.*” V.S, by M.R.Kale, 3rd Act p-58

⁹. C. f. “*evam kilasyabhiprayo yatha asvatthama maya prthivirajye abhisektavya iti. tasyabhavadvrddhasya me brahmanasya vrtha sastragrahanamiti tatha krtavan.*” V.S by M.R.Kale 3rd Act, p-71

¹⁰. C. f. V.S by M. R. Kale, 3rd Act p-70

(d)Most of the time the author has shown his importance and respect towards *Bṛāhmaṇa*. In the ending part of the battle *i.e.* in the 6th Act of the drama though the situation is not favourable for hospitality but *Yudhiṣṭhira* and *Draupadī* have shown their duty as a *Kṣatriya* by showing honour to a *Bṛāhmaṇa*¹¹. At the same time it is also seen that the *Bṛāhmaṇa* s do not will any harm of the any one which is found in the expression of the Chamberlain-
*dīng mune rākṣasasadṛsaṁ hṛdayaṁ bhavataḥ*¹².

Moreover, the benedictory verse of the drama also exhibits that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was an intense devotee of Lord *Śiva* and Lord *Śri Kṛṣṇa*. He had profound knowledge of *Purāṇas*, especially the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and different branches of Philosophy. Among the three verses of the benedictory, two are praised to Lord *Kṛṣṇa*¹³ and the last one has been prayed to Lord *Śiva*¹⁴. The author has shown his inner devotion to Hari is seen in the first Act of the drama also from the mouth of *Draupadī* -

“*Nātha asurasamarābhimukhasya hareriva maṅgalaṁ yuṣmakam bhavatu.*”¹⁵

It may be gathered more about *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* from the *Veṅṣaṁhāra*. According to the traditional view he was invited for the sacrificial work as he was expert in that field and in the science of *Karma Mīmāṃsā*. This is found in the first Act of the drama where the dramatist compares war with a sacrifice.¹⁶

Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa had knowledge of figures of speech and he had studied the *Alaṁkāra* in the same time. At the same time his knowledge on *Rājanīti* or

¹¹ . C. f. “*mune nirvartyamudanyapratikarah,buddhimatike vijaya maharsimanena talavrntena.*” V.S by M.R.Kale 6th Act p-141,142.

¹² . C. f. V.S by M.R.Kale 6th Act p-149

¹³ . C. f. “*nisiddhairapyebhirlulitamakarando madhukaraih.karairindorantaschurita iva sambhinnamukulah. vidattam siddhim no nayanasubhagamasya sadasah.prakirnah puspanam haricaranayoranjirayam.*” V.S by M.R.Kale ,1st Act p-1

¹⁴ . C. f. “*drstah saprema devya kimidamiti bhayatsambhramaccasuribhih. santantastattvasaraih Sakarunamrsibhirvisnuna sasmitena.akrsyastram sagarvairupasamitavadhusambhramairdaityaviraih. sanandam devatabhirmayapuradahane dhurjatih patu yusman.*” V.S by M.R.Kale ,1st Act p-3

¹⁵ . C. f. V.S by M.R.Kale 1st Act p-26

¹⁶ . C. f. “*ka esa yajnah. ranayajnah.*” V.S. byM.R.Kale ,1st Act p-25

polity is also focused in the 6th Act of the drama through the application of political wit of *Yudhiṣṭhira* -

“*Kṛuddhasya vṛkodārasyaṅparyuṣitadaruṇām pratijñāmupalabhya pranaṣṭasya māninaḥ kauravarājasya padavimamvestumatipunamatayasteṣu teṣu sthāneṣu paramārthābhijñāścarāḥ susacibaśca bhaktimantaḥ patupataharavavyaktaḥṣāṅāḥ-suyodhanasamcāravedinaḥ pratiśrutadhanapūjāpratyupakriyaścarantu samantātsamantapañcakaṁ.*”¹⁷

In the conclusion regarding the life of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* almost all the rhetocicians are in the view that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was invited by the King *Ādisura* according to the Bengal. M. Krisnamāchāriār believes in tradition and says that the author migrated from *Kannouj* to Bengal at the invitation of *Ādisura*. He is also known as *Niśā-Narayana* by anthalogists because of his beautiful description of the night (*Niśā*). A. B. Keith also complies view. Different editors of the drama *Veṅṣamhāra* referred about *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* in their introductory chapters that he was the chief amongst the five *Brāhmaṇa*'s and perhaps the founder of Tagore family. This is found in a book on *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* by A. C. Śāstri, *Sāhitya* Academy and M. R. Kale, in his *Veṅṣamhāra* about the poet. M. J. Rotate in his introduction of *Veṅṣamhāra* has referred more about a popular talk that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* suffered for prevalent Buddhism in *Kānyakubja* and he has to come in Bengal as because he was a follower of Vedic tradition. Late Lt. Col. A. B. Gajendragadkar Bombay- 28 has also given the similar opinion with that of chronicles.

Hence, it may rightly be assumed that it was the same *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* who had to migrate from *Kānyakubja* at the advent and dominance of Buddhism in the said place due to royal patronage and search for a safe heaven for the followers of ritualistic culture and that came to him in the form of Bengal. It may also be added that the term '*Bhaṭṭa*' generally connotes a

¹⁷ . C. f. V.S by M.R.Kale, 1st Act p-130

Brāhmaṇa and its inclusion in the dramatists name reassures that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* is by caste a *Brāhmaṇa*.

It is always a difficult matter to determine the dates of Indian poets. But some India author and enriques give clear hints particularly their dates. Such as *Bhāsa* has been mentioned as of 3rd Century B. C. in his introductory chapter of *Svapnavāsavadattam*. It is clerly mention that the date of *Harṣavardhaṇa* falls in between 606-647 from which the date of *Bāṇabhaṭṭa* because he was the courtpoet of *Harṣavardhaṇa*. Like *Bāṇabhaṭṭa Bhavabhūti* was also popular for his ‘*Uttararāmaharita*’ being a courtpoet of *Yaśovarman* in the first part of 8th Century. Like other poets there is no clear reference about the date of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*.

The most accomplished writer of Sanskrit prose *Bāṇabhaṭṭa*, in his introduction to the *Kathākāvya Harṣacarita* did not mention the name of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*, while eulogizing other poets of great repute. That proves that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was either posterior or contemporary to *Bāṇabhaṭṭa*, for which the later either was not aware of his name and caliber nor did bother to mention and praise him and thus he might be plae in the middele of the seventh century or the later of the seventh century A. D. The same may again be affirmed on the ground that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* had to leave his native place due to kings *Harṣavardhaṇa*’s intervention in promoting Bhuddism and being a firm believer in in litualisam *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* could not comply with kings wishes and migrated to Bengal along with some followers.

It is pertinent that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was more a scholastic poet than a spontaneous one. Because of the richness of his vocabulary appropriacy in word application and correct technicalities *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* attracted the attention of later rhetoricians. *Vāmaṇa*, the author of *Kāvyaśāstra Sūtravṛtti* exemplified from *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*’s usages. Scholars place *Vāmaṇa* in between 750 A. D. to 800 A. D. It is evident from this fact that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* attained certain degree of popularity by 750 A. D. It may also be mentioned that *Bhāmaha*, the author of *Kāvyaśāstra*, a predecessor of *Vāmaṇa* and *Dandī*,

the author of *Kāvyaḍarśa*, another predecessor of *Vāmaṇa* as rhetoricians are placed chronologically in the first half and second half of the seventh century respectively. Both *Bāmaha* and *Daṇḍī* did not quote from *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s work, that also signify that the scholasticity and the treatise of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* were not much known to the said rhetoricians and hence it can safely be said that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* might be a contemporary of *Daṇḍī*, who flourished in the second half of the seventh century and *Daṇḍī* could not make it to refer *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* because of geographical distance and unavailability of the text before hand. It is something striking that name of the later A. D. rhetoricians ranging from *Ānandavardhana* to *Viśvanātha Kavirāja* skipped to quote from *Veṇīsamhāra* of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*. *ĀnandaVardhana* the author of *Dhvaṇyāloka* flourished in between 840 A. D. to 870 A. D. Quoted several verses from *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s work. Other rhetoricians like *Dhanañjaya*, the author of *Daśarūpaka* who flourished in and around 950 A. D. and *Bhojarāja*, the author of *śāraśvatī Kanthābharaṇa* who flourished in between 1005-1054 A. D. also referred and quoted verses from *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s *Veṇīsamhāra* as examples of rhetoric interpretations of their respective works. *Kṣemendra*, the author of *Aucityavicāracarcā* and *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*, who flourished in between 1025-1075 also referred to *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*. *Mammaṭa*, the author of *Kāvyaṇprakāśa* flourished in between 1050 A. D. to 1100 A. D. also exemplified from *Veṇīsamhāra* *Kṣīrosvamī*, the happy commentator of *Amarakoṣa* also quoted *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*. All these above mentioned references make it clear that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s brilliance of composition was very striking and all major rhetoricians greatly valued that when a rhetorician of *Daṇḍī*'s magnitude did not quote *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*, one intends to say that *Daṇḍī* was either contemporary who did not know much about the author or was an inferior to him and thus the epoch of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* stands to be second half of seventh century A. D.

In support of above statement it may be added that the Bengal tradition where *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was invited by king *Ādisura* was considered as the progenitor of the Sena dynasty. According to *Cunningham* the Sena dynasty

reigned in Bengal in between 650 and 1108 A.D. That means *Ādisura* was reigning in the later half of the 7th century A.D. Consequently *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* may also be considered to belong to same period of *Ādisura*.

Hiuen Tsang in his journey he mentioned the name of a king of Nepal, who was *Amśuvarman* and whose sister *Bhogadevi* was married with Prince *Śurasena*. This *Śurasena* is no one else *Ādisura*, the founder of *Sena* dynasty, and *Amśuvarmana*'s period of ruling was about 644-652 A. D. which was known as the later half of the 7th century and as the period of *Ādisura* and automatically of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*.

Secondly the epoch of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* may also be confirmed from contemporary history. Buddhism was mostly popularized in *Kānyakubja* in the second half of the 7th century. Because of the ascended of Buddhism *Brāhmaṇas* felt troubled and have to prohibit the practices of the ancient Vedic religion of sacrifices such as slaughtering of animals and other rituals. Consequent the author *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* and his associates migrated to Bengal from *Kānyakubja*. In this regard about Samgrama of *Harṣavardhaṇa* i.e. prohibition of slaughter of any living creature is found.¹⁸

Thirdly as a writer *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* tried to follow the naturalness of poet *Kālidāsa* while he himself is an artificial poet. This is evident in the description of autumn season as indicated-

“*Praleyamiśṛamakaraṇdakaralakosaih. puṣpaihsamam nipatita
rājaniprabuddhai arkansubhinnamukulodarasandrāga
ndhasamsucitanikamatanyalayah patanti.*”¹⁹

Also-

“*Jṛmbharambhāpravitatadalopantajalpravistair*

hastairbhaanonrpataya iva sprsyamana vibuddhah

¹⁸ . C. f. The life of Hiuen-Tsiang, by Shaman HwuiLi, p-83

¹⁹ . C. f. V.S by M.R.Kale sl -6 p-33

*sribhīh sardham ghanaparimalastokalaksyāgarāga
muñcāntyete vikacānalīnīgarbhasāyāya dvīrephāh.*²⁰

The style and ideology of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* were greatly influenced by *Bhāravi*'s style. Very often *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* is noticed to follow the ideas and language of *Bhāravi*.²¹ Macdonell refers that *Bhāravi*'s name was found in an inscription of 634 A. D. This implies that *Bhāravi* flourished earlier than the referred date and is pertinent that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* flourished not before the said date, because had he flourished before the said age his name would also have got a place in the referred inscription.

Max Muller suggested that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*, who was mentioned in the *Harṣacarita* as a companion of *Bāṇa* in his wanderings was identical with *Bhaṭṭanarayana*. This makes our poet a contemporary of *Bāṇa*. This idea is reflected in the "History of classical Sanskrit literature" by Krishnamachariar that *Bāṇabhaṭṭa* and *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* are contemporary to each other. This also thus says that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* belongs to 7th century A.D.

- **Study Conducted on *Veṅīsamhāra*: –**

The efforts made by different scholars to explore *Veṅīsamhāra* in different dimensions are reckoned below:-

Ratnamayi Devi Diksit in her works 'women in Sanskrit Dramas' discussed the female characters of *Veṅīsamhāra* in an elaborate manner.

Veṅīsamhāra is an extraordinary drama in Sanskrit literature. The importance of the drama and dramatic skills of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* are highly discussed in different works. However, substantial research works are not available on *Veṅīsamhāra*.

²⁰. C. f. V. S by M. R. Kale, sl- 7 p-33

²¹. C. f. A. H. O. S. L, Arthur A. MacDonell. P-277

Maurice Winternitz in his “History of Indian literature” Vol – III has mentioned the main source of the drama *Veṅṅisamhāra* and briefly given a clear picture of the drama till the war description at the end. According to him the popularity of *Veṅṅisamhāra* among the scholars is possibly based on its language alone but not because of the subject- matter. However, the Indian rhetoricians have noticed certain short comings in this drama *Veṅṅisamhāra*.

M. Krishnamachāriar in his “History of classical Sanskrit literature” has mentioned that the drama is taken from the incident of ‘*Sabhāparvan*’ of *Mahābhārata*. As a heroic drama it is predominated by heroic sentiment with certain inclusion of pathos. According to him dignity of thought and for easy expression the last Act deserves high appreciation. He has also mentioned the names of rhetoricians who have qauoted *Veṅṅisamhāra* considering it as a most illustrious work.

“A history of Sanskrit literature” by Arthur A. Mac Donell, has highlighted the theme of the *Veṅṅisamhāra* and explained there how *Duhśāsana* dragged *Draupadī* in the assembly Hall. At the same time he has mentioned the date of the author *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* and also referred the writings of *Rājaśekhara* and his date. A McDonell thinks that though *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was not prominent for his poetic genius, but the drama was a great favourite in India because of great devotion of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* and glorification of *Kṛṣṇa* cult.

“The Sanskrit drama” of A. Berriedale Keith, also discussed the date of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* in detail. A. B. Keith mentioned the tradition which told that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was a *Brāhmiṇ* who came from *Kānyakubja* to Bengal being the invited by *Ādisura Ādityasena*, who was alive in 671 A. D.

Sushi Kumar De in his “Treatment of love in Sanskrit literature” has referred that *Veṅṅisamhāra* is the second drama which does not delineate love sentiment, the other drama is *Mudrārākṣasam*.

“The cultural heritage of India”. Vol- V, languages and literature also mentioned about *Veṅṅisamhāra* while discussing sentiments other than love”.

Accordingly to work *Veṅīsamhāra* is undoubtedly a popular drama without love interest. The *Veṅīsamhāra* is a great drama, which very tactfully managed the great -war of *Mahābhārata* within a six limited Acts. The drama is enough of fire and energy, horror and pathos but the style is laboured and which is fully undramatic. The drama is a good example of half poetic and half dramatic effort, which is a peculiar kind of composition. It may be called declamatory drama. So it bears the merits and defects of this class or work.

Moreover in the column of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* the theme is given briefly and again the *Veṅīsamhāra* and its features are discussed.

“The concept and treatment of dream in Sanskrit literature” authored by Dr. Swapna Devi. In this text in the column - Dream in the *Veṅīsamhāra*: - dream episode of *Bhānumatī* is very clearly described by the author, which has been occurred in the 2nd Act of the drama *Veṅīsamhāra*. The author has also narrated the story along with the belief of auspicious and inauspicious happenings.

Gaurinath Sastri in his “A concise history of classical Sanskrit literature” has referred *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* and mentioned the probable date of flourishing of dramatist to be 8th century A. D. basing on the quotation of *Vāmana* and *Ānandavardhana* in their works. Then he mentioned that drama is written mainly basing on *Mahābhārata* and also mentioned the number of Acts in the drama like other writers. He also mentioned the theme briefly and the main sentiment of the drama to be heroic. According to him the first three Acts of the drama are full of action *i.e.* the predominant emotion there is enthusiasm. Moreover he also quoted the criticisms about *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* made by other critics.

There is a book “*Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*” by Asoke chatterjee Sastri which very elaborately discussed *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s *Veṅīsamhāra*. There in the first Chapter *i.e.*, in the introduction the author has discussed *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* s date basing on references of other rhetoricians on him. And there the author does

not forget to refer *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s devotion to *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva* and about his knowledge on orthodox philosophical schools or systems like *Śāṃkhya* and *Yoga*. *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* is also appreciated for his skill in prosody and rhetorics. Moreover A. C. Sastri also discusses other writings of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*. *Śāstri* mentions that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* was credited with authorship of *Jānakīharṇa* and *Purvapithikā* of *Daśakumāracarita*. The author has also referred that the later period and contemporary period do not accept it. In the 2nd chapter *i.e.* *Veṅṅisamhāra* there the back ground of the story has been narrated and then the theme of the six Acts of the drama briefly chapter three described the source, Deviations and additions made in the drama. In the chapter four there is discussion on the *Veṅṅisamhāra* and the rules of Dramaturgy involved in it. The Dialogues, Hero, Sentiment and Characterizations are given due attention in this chapter. With so many examples the place of *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* in Sanskrit Literature is narrated in the 5th chapter along with style, aesthetic value of the Drama. *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s contribution to the Cultural Heritage of India is found in the 6th Chapter. And the last *i.e.* 7th chapter gives the list of Quotable Lines from the *Veṅṅisamhāra*.

“A companion to Sanskrit Literature” is a book authored by Suresh Chandra Banerji (*Motilal Banarassidass* Delhi, Varnasi, Patna, Bangalore, Madras). In this book the author discusses *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* as the author of *Veṅṅisamhāra* and says that probably he has been flourished between the 8th and 9th Century A. D. And *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* is supposed as the writer of the introduction of *Daśakumāracarita*.

In “The theory of *Rasa* in Sanskrit Drama” by *Hariram Mishra*, the author discusses the *Rasa* in *Veṅṅisamhāra*. The author of the book feels that the excellence of Principal *Rasa i.e. Vīra rasa* in *Bhīma* and the *Bhayānaka* in the enemies are depicted by *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* in a very appealing manner. Moreover the author thinks that the intervention of *Duryodhana*'s love with *Bhānumatī* in the 2nd Act is not relevant rather spoils the scope of a happy and pleasant delineation of love sentiment there.

“Sociology of Sanskrit Drama” is a major work on Sanskrit drama. This work is authored by Prof. Bhagirathi Biswas. This book discusses along with other Sanskrit dramas on the sociological aspects of *Veṅīsamhāra*. While doing that the author discussed prevailing customs, ritualistic culture, language and value system and their co-relation with *Veṅīsamhāra*.

- **Purpose of the study:**

The drama has always been critically appreciated by literary technicians or rhetoricians. The dramatist has chosen the most crucial portion of *Mahābhārata*, The *Kurukṣetra* was along with its precursors and successive events. As it is known to all that *Kurukṣetra* war was being fought in between kiths and kins all the closests of relations were messed in those eventualities. When relations suffer or fail women happen to be worsely affected. These very things are very wel-executed in the drama and that appeal to an inquisitive reader. Again, the drama also has delineated very compatible relations of two pairs of spouse, one that is of *Bhīmasena* and *Draupadī* and the other pair is of *Duryodhaṇa* and *Bhānumatī*. It may again be mentioned that *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa*'s *Veṅīsamhāra* is the only Sanskrit work where the character of *Bhānumatī* is portrayed with so much of attention and care. Even the concern of *Bhīmasena* to *Draupadī* is though a theme of *Mahābhārata* is very wel-portrayed in the drama. In this drama the female characters exhibit a commendable effort to smoothen the war-torn hearts of dear ones, be it *Gandhari*, *Draupadī* or *Subhadra*. The drama is also appealing on the ground that the author has been very successful in creating pathos in the fourth Act and brilliant heroic sentiments in the earlier Acts. The technicalities, sociological aspects, character delineations and deviations from the original story make the drama an interesting subject of style. The paucity of substantial research works on this work also makes it a major point of attraction .Hence the present study is being carried out on *Veṅīsamhāra*.