

Marta Karcz 

Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland | marta.m.karcz@gmail.com

## Modern Sanskrit Translations of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyats*: Navigating Cultural and Linguistic Landscapes

**Abstract** This article explores two modern Sanskrit translations of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyats*, created independently by Pandit Adibhatla Narayana Das (1937) and Professor Narahari Govind Suru (1981). Both scholars worked from Edward FitzGerald's English version, adapting it into Sanskrit according to classical poetic conventions. Through a comparative analysis, the study examines the translators' differing choices of metre, diction, and cultural adaptation, highlighting how each negotiates the challenges of rendering Khayyam's philosophical quatrains within the rigid structure and aesthetic expectations of Sanskrit poetry. Attention is also given to strategies of domestication and foreignisation, revealing how each translator reinterprets the Persian original within an Indian literary and intellectual context. Ultimately, these translations not only exemplify creative engagement with classical Sanskrit forms but also illuminate broader processes of cross-cultural mediation and the modern reinvention of Sanskrit literary expression.

**Keywords** Modern Sanskrit literature, translation studies, Omar Khayyam, *Rubaiyat*, Narayana Das, Narahari Govind Suru, cross-cultural poetics

### 1 Introduction

In the 19th century, Omar Khayyam,<sup>1</sup> a Persian scholar from the late 11th and early 12th centuries, garnered renown in the Western world for a series of four-line poems known as *Rubaiyats* attributed to him. His poetic works resonated deeply with individuals across diverse cultural realms, to the extent that two Indian scholars of the 20th century were inspired to render his verses into Sanskrit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Omar Khayyam was a polymath, famous for his contributions to mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, and poetry, who lived in the late 11th and early 12th centuries in Seljuk Empire. As a mathematician, Khayyam worked on geometry and developed methods for solving certain cubic equations. In the field of astronomy, the greatest achievement of Omar Khayyam was the reform of the Islamic calendar. He was commissioned by Seljuk sultan Malik-Shāh to undertake the necessary astronomical observations. As a philosopher, Khayyam considered himself an intellectual disciple of Avicenna. See also Boyle (1975: 658–664).



One of them, Pandit Adibhatla Narayana Das, was so captivated by the English translation of the *Rubaiyats* that at the age of 60 he made the choice to learn Persian in order to study Omar Khayyam's work as thoroughly as possible (Narayana Das 1937: i-ii). His effort resulted in publishing the translations of the *Rubaiyats* into Sanskrit and Telugu. Around 50 years later, a translation by another Sanskritologist, Professor Suru, was also published. Both Narayana Das and Professor Suru sought to create translations within the rules of Sanskrit poetry.

This research aims to shed light on how these translations reflect broader themes of cultural exchange and literary innovation, thereby contributing to our understanding of modern Sanskrit literature's evolution.

## 2 The *Rubaiyats*

The *Rubaiyats* are witty, bold and sometimes cynical poems in which Khayyam ridicules various philosophical and theological trends of his time and struggles with a sense of existential futility. They depict a man tormented by questions about the nature of reality and eternity, the impermanence and uncertainty of life, and man's relationship with God. The poet questions the existence of both God and the afterlife and ridicules unshakable faith. He also emphasizes the weakness and ignorance of humans. The poet seeks peace in a joyful appreciation of the fleeting, sensual beauty of the material world. However, even this cannot distract him from bitter reflections on fundamental metaphysical issues (Seyed-Gohrab 2012).

The majority of the *Rubaiyats* are written in Persian; however, there are also twenty-five Arabic poems attributed to Khayyam, attested by Muslim historians from 13th and 14th centuries. Little attention was paid to his poems by his contemporaries, and it was not until two centuries after his death that a few quatrains appeared under his name. Several of them contained views contrary to those propounded in other works by Khayyam. Therefore, some scholars have hypothesized that they were attributed to him because of his fame. For this reason, some scholars even doubt whether Omar Khayyam wrote poems at all. However, John Andrew Boyle, a British Orientalist and historian, pointed out that many other Persian scholars including Avicenna, Ghazali and Tusi, produced poetry. According to him, it is possible, therefore, that poetry for Khayyam was a pastime in his leisure time from scholarly work (Boyle 1975).

It was Edward FitzGerald's translation of Omar Khayyam's poems that made him famous in the modern period. It was published for the first time in 1859. FitzGerald's translations are remarkably free and creative, allowing him to introduce his own ingenuity and vigour. A large number of stanzas have been actually paraphrased, and some cannot be attributed to the source material at all. Moreover, although each of *Rubaiyats* forms a complete poem in itself, FitzGerald arranged the poems into a coherent whole with intellectual unity. *Rubaiyats* have been translated into almost every major language and are largely responsible for shaping European perceptions

of Persian poetry. In fact, both Narayana Das and Suru became acquainted with the *Rubaiyats* precisely through FitzGerald's translation, and it was this that served as the source material in their work (Biegstraaten 2008).

In the 1930s, the *Rubaiyats* gained considerable popularity in India. Poet Harivansh Rai Bachchan (1907–2003) translated them into Hindi. Omar Khayyam's poetry also inspired his own work. In 1935, he published a collection of four poems under the title *Madhusālā*. It presents a vision of an egalitarian society in which caste and religious differences are abolished in favour of national unity. Like the Persian poet, Bachchan criticised religious orthodoxy, social hierarchies and intolerance, promoting humanism and Epicureanism. The poems allude to ideas of Indian nationalism, particularly in the context of the independence movement led by Mahatma Gandhi (Castaing 2012).

### 3 Sanskrit Translations of the *Rubaiyats*

The author of the first Sanskrit translation of *Rubaiyats* was Pandit Ajjada Adibhatla Narayana Das (1864–1945). He was a poet, musician, linguist, dancer, and philosopher from Andhra Pradesh. He was most famous as an exponent of *harikatha*, a solo narrative in which the storyteller explores a traditional Hindu theme.<sup>2</sup> Narayana Das is sometimes referred to as the father of modern *harikatha* in Andhra Pradesh. He created his own *harikatha* narratives, drawing inspiration from Indian and English literature. He was also a talented musician (Lal 2004: 145). Narayana Das was the first Principal of Maharaja's Government College of Music and Dance established by Maharaja Vizianagaram in 1919. At the court of Maharaja Vizianagaram, Narayana Das learnt about Hindustani music and introduced to the Music College a unique style of classical music tradition, a blend of Hindustani and Carnatic styles, which is known today as the *Vizianagaram style*. This polyglot was versatile in nine languages: Telugu, Sanskrit, Tamil, Hindi, Bengali, Urdu, English, Arabic and Persian. He was the author of translations into Sanskrit and Telugu, in addition to creating original literary works in Telugu, English and Sanskrit. His literary output includes poems, *harikathas*, prose works, musical works, dramas, treatises on philosophy, literature and Vedic studies and even children's literature (Parthasarathi 2022).

Narayana Das made clear the reason why he decided to translate the *Rubaiyats* himself. He believed that Edward FitzGerald's English translations did not capture the essence of the poetry of Omar Khayyam. He released his translation in 1937 under the

---

<sup>2</sup> *Harikatha* is a form of solo narration from southern India, originally closely associated with the cult of Vishnu. It originated around the 16th–17th centuries as a way of propagating Vishnuism. It contains elements of chanting, comic improvisation and references to contemporary themes. The storyteller is called a Haridasa or Bhagavatar. Initially, only men were the performers, but after India's independence, *harikatha* began to be performed by middle-class women as well. See also Lal (2004: 145–146).

title *Rubaiyat of Omar Khaiyam with English Translation by Edward FitzGerald, Translated into Sanskrit and Dēsyāndhram*. The publication comprises 110 poems; each item is presented in Persian (both Persian script and Latin transliteration), FitzGerald's English translation, and translations into Sanskrit and Telugu. In the introduction, he states that for the translation he used the original text of the *Rubaiyats* in Persian and also the English translation by Edward FitzGerald. Narayana Das claims that when he read Edward FitzGerald's translation of *Rubaiyats*, he decided to learn Persian and then study this masterpiece in the original language. Moreover, he states that his translations into both languages are more literal and precise than FitzGerald's version. Therefore, to prove his point, he translated into Sanskrit separately Persian original text and FitzGerald's rendering—thus, each verse has two versions in Sanskrit and two versions in Telugu.<sup>3</sup>

The man who decided to translate *Rubaiyats* into Sanskrit 50 years after Narayana Das, was Professor Narahari Govind Suru (1898–1980). After completing his MA in 1923, he joined Fergusson College as Professor of Sanskrit and Ardhamagadhi. In 1924 he became a member of the Deccan Education Society and worked there until 1932. He served as Principal at Nowroji Wadia College (1951–1959) and then at Ruparel College, Bombay (1959–1964). From 1964 to 1973, he acted as secretary of the Modern Education Society. He was also associated with the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, where he served as treasurer from 1948 to 1960. As part of his scholarly and research activities, he prepared critical editions of classical texts, the most important of which are *Gaūḍavaho* and *Karpūramañjarī*. He was a versatile scholar and an outstanding educationist who dedicated his life to education and learning (Muley 2015: 655–655).

The title of Professor Suru's Sanskrit translation of the *Rubaiyats* is *Umaraśataka*. The word *umara* is a Sanskritized form of the name Omar, while *śataka* literally means 'consisting of a hundred'. This term united with the name of the author, often served as the title of collection of Sanskrit verses meaning 'a collection of 100 stanzas' (e.g. *Amaruśataka* i.e. 'The hundred stanzas of Amaru'). Indeed, Professor Suru selected exactly one hundred stanzas for this publication. The book does not identify the English translator, but it is clear from the included English texts that Suru used FitzGerald's version. The book was released in 1981—about a year after the demise of the author of the translation.

*Umaraśataka* is preceded by two introductions. The first one, written in English, was provided by Professor Aravind Mangrulkar and titled *A Handful of Flowers*. It contains short characterization of Omar Khayyam oeuvre, general remarks on the translation by Professor Suru and more detailed comments on selected verses. The second introduction was written by D.D. Bahulikar and it has a form of a poem

<sup>3</sup> I do not claim proficiency in Persian; this analysis evaluates the translations from the perspective of a Sanskritologist. Although consultations with Professor Tomasz Gacek (Jagiellonian University in Krakow) allowed me to better understand the free manner of FitzGerald's translation and the differences between it and the Persian original, in this paper I limit the scope of my research to indirect translations from FitzGerald and analyse them. I hope that my article might inspire scholars who know both Sanskrit and Persian proficiently to conduct more in-depth study of this subject in the future.

consisting of nine stanzas in Sanskrit. Bahulikar, himself a Sanskrit poet, also edited the translation of Professor Suru.

#### 4 Comparison of translations by Narayana Das and Suru

Analysing the two translations into Sanskrit, one can see that the translators, namely Suru and Narayana Das approached their task quite differently. One of the most important differences is that they chose a completely different kind of metre. Metre is an essential component of Sanskrit poetry. Works should be composed using a certain rhythm, which imposes restrictions on the writer in the composition's structure. However, the metre is also associated with the semantic layer—as it is an important aspect of poetic creation, which contributes to the development of a particular mood and emotions in the recipient.

In the introduction to the translation of Professor Suru, Professor Aravind Mangrulkar praises him for choosing a metre called *mandākrantā* (Mangrulkar 1981: 5–11). The name of the metre means 'slow-stepping' or 'slowly advancing'. A stanza composed in this metre consists of four lines of seventeen syllables each; it typically starts with a sequence of heavy syllables, moves through lighter ones, and ends with alternating light and heavy syllables, producing a slow-to-accelerating rhythm. Thus, the melodic line of the verse begins slowly, and after a while it accelerates noticeably, emphasizing the emotions depicted in the stanza (Cielas 2014: 35–40). Scholars of Sanskrit poetics held that the *mandākrantā* metre is especially apt for expressing feelings of separation from a beloved. Therefore, this metre was most often chosen by poets composing *sandēśakāvya*s—messenger poems usually depicting an exiled lover sending a message to his separated beloved through a messenger, which could be a natural phenomenon, animal or human being (Szczepanik 2014: 17–20). It seems that the *mandākrantā* also highlights very well the emotions contained in the *Rubaiyats*—the inner confusion of a man struggling with questions about the true nature of reality, eternity and the existence of God. The slow pace suits the gloomy mood and overall tone of the *Rubaiyats* perfectly and underscores the meaning of the original verse. Moreover, the emotions connected with this inner dilemma are somehow similar to the suffering of a man separated from his loved one.

Pandit Adibhatla Narayana Das employed two different kinds of metre. In his Sanskrit translation of FitzGerald's rendering, he used *anuṣṭubh śloka*, and in his Sanskrit translation of the Persian text he used *āryāgīti*. Similarly, both translations into Telugu are composed in different metres. The metre used in the translation from Persian—*gīti* has respectively 12, 18, 12 and 18 syllables in its four *pādas* (Cieślowski 2017: 69). *Śloka* is a 32-syllable verse, derived from the Vedic metre *anuṣṭubh*. It is one of the metres most commonly used by writers of classical Sanskrit literature. The *śloka* consists of four *pādas* or quarter-verses of 8 syllables each. It can be said that it is one of the most basic metres, as it has been used in a wide variety of literary genres (Cieślowski 2017: 64–66). According to Kṣemendra, a theoretician of Sanskrit literature from the 11th century, it was appropriate metre for both scientific texts

(*śāstra*) and poetry (*kāvya*). He also praised this metre for its clarity. Thus, it seems that *śloka* was also a suitable choice for rendering the meaning of the *Rubaiyats*. It should also be noted that, by choosing *śloka*, he made the original quatrains written in two lines.

The translations of FitzGerald's rendering of *Rubaiyats* by Professor Suru and Pandit Narayana Das are very different, mainly because of the kinds of metre employed by both translators. Decisions about metre had their impact on vocabulary and sentence structure. Although both translations convey the same general meaning, their visual appearance and line-lengths differ markedly. This is the reason why the translation of Professor Suru is twice as long as the translation of Narayana Das of the same verse. One translator had to condense the meaning into a shorter form, the other one had to extend it to fit the metre. Professor Suru in particular faced numerous issues in this matter. As Professor Mangrulkar notices in the introduction: 'With its capacity to condense matter in a few compounded words, Sanskrit often poses a problem for the translator' (Mangrulkar 1981: 10). This is clearly visible while comparing translation of Prof. Suru with the English rendering of the same verses. For example, in the verse 6,<sup>4</sup> he translated 'lips' as *dantacchada-yugalaka*—literally 'the pair of tooth covers' (Suru 1981: 3). In Sanskrit there are separate words for upper lip (*oṣṭha*) and lower lip (*adhara*), the mouth is *daśanacchada* or *dantacchada*, but in order to meet the metre requirements the translator had to add the word *yugalaka*—couple, although it would have been enough to use the dual number in the right case.

In some verses Professor Suru introduced even bigger changes. For example, in the verse 13,<sup>5</sup> he changed a metaphor in the second half of the stanza. Instead of 'Ah take the Cash and let the Credit go' he wrote *grāhyā yā bhoḥ karatalagatā tittirir no mayūri yā śvo labhyā*,<sup>6</sup> that means 'Oh, hold the partridge that is in your hand, not the peacock that can be reached tomorrow'. As it can be noticed, the translator

<sup>4</sup> 'And David's Lips are lock't; but in divine  
High piping Pehlevi, with "Wine! Wine! Wine!  
Red Wine!"—the Nightingale cries to the Rose  
That yellow Cheek of hers to incarnadine' (FitzGerald 2009: 19).

<sup>5</sup> 'Some for the Glories of This World; and some  
Sigh for the Prophet's Paradise to come;  
Ah, take the Cash, and let the Credit go,  
Nor heed the rumbie of a distant Drum' (FitzGerald 2009: 75).

<sup>6</sup> *eke bhogān vibhavasulabhān aihikān mānayatē  
tāmyantyanye śrutinigaditam svargasaukhyam tu bhōktum  
grāhyā yā bhoḥ karatalagatā tittirir no mayūri  
yā śvo labhyā, na khalu śṛṇuyā dīṇḍimaṃ dūraśabdān ||* (Suru 1981: 5).

Literally:

'Some regard earthly pleasures, easily attained through wealth;

Others strive to enjoy heavenly joys proclaimed in scriptures.

Oh, hold the partridge that is in your hand, not the peacock that can be reached tomorrow.

Do not listen to the distant sound of drum.'

replaced the cash and credit representing a sure profit and the possibility of even bigger profit in the future, with birds. *Tittiri* is a partridge, a small game bird that is obviously worth less than a beautiful peacock but is a sure gain. Thus, the message of the poem in Sanskrit and in English is the same, although it was expressed in a different way. The translator most probably was inspired by a Sanskrit proverb *varam adya kapoto na śvo mayūrah*, meaning 'a pigeon today is better than a peacock tomorrow', or *varam tatkālopanatā tittiriḥ na punardivasāṃtaritā mayūri*—'a partridge obtained immediately is better than a peahen tomorrow' (Apte 1964). Professor Suru most likely adjusted it to the requirements of the metre. Similar proverbs teaching that a certain gain is better than a possibility of even bigger gain in the future, with the example of birds, exist in numerous languages, for example 'a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush' in English. A similar message can also be found in the fourth book of *Pañcatantra*, titled *Labdhapraṇāśam*—'Losing of Gain'.

Pandit Narayana Das while translating the FitzGerald's version of this verse<sup>7</sup> omitted this part and replaced it with words *pibahastagatāmṛtam* meaning 'drink the nectar in your hand', which are not present in the English version. While translating from the original text, he paraphrased it into *hastagataṃ mā tyākṣiḥ pasprhathāmābhaviṣyadarthāya*,<sup>8</sup> literally: 'do not let go what is in your hand longing for what is yet to come'. In this case, instead of a metaphor he conveyed the meaning underlying it. There is no doubt that he communicated the sense of the poem, but it is clear that he simplified it.

While translating the *Rubaiyats*, both scholars had to deal with cultural references appearing in the poems. It may seem that they had to connect culturally very distant worlds. However, it should be remembered that Persian and Sanskrit as Indo-Iranian languages share history, literary heritage and some elements of their mythologies. Moreover, Muslim dynasties have ruled in large parts of India since the 13th century. These new rulers brought with them their own culture linked to the Persian language. During the reign of the Muslim dynasties in India, the Persian was an integral part of the state and was closely linked to the cultivation and consolidation of sovereign

<sup>7</sup> *ślāghate apsarasamjivā vyaṃdrākṣāsaramstumah śravyābhaveddūrabheri pibahastagatāmṛtam* || (Narayana Das 1937: 25).

Literally:

'Worshiper praises apsaras we praise the grape nectar,

Let the far drum would be heard, drink the nectar in your hand.'

<sup>8</sup> *nīyaṃ svarganagaryāṃ ramyā apsarasā itī vadanti eke drākṣāsava evāyaṃ amanojña itī sarvadāpraśaṃsāmi hastagataṃ mā tyākṣiḥ pasprhathāmābhaviṣyadarthāya kāmam bhrātāḥ śravyaḥ syād eva daviṣṭha dundubhidhvānaḥ* || (Narayana Das 1937: 25).

Literally:

'Some always say: "Delightful apsaras are in the heavenly city",

But I, instead, forever praise delightful wine.

Do not let go what is in your hand longing for what is yet to come.

O brother, indeed, even the distant sound of drum may be worth hearing.'

identity. Hence these literary traditions intermingled for centuries (Truschke 2016: 7). Over time, however, Persian declined as the language of culture and science in northern India, and much intellectual exchange shifted to English.

Both translators had to adapt the various proper names to Sanskrit diction and metre yet in such a way that they could still be recognizable to the reader. The scholars had to demonstrate the great ingenuity evident in proposing such changes without compromising the original. Therefore, in the Suru's translation of the verse 5,<sup>9</sup> the toponym Iram becomes just *iramanagarī*.<sup>10</sup> This is a kind of hint for the audience to immediately associate the name with the lost rich city of Iram, which, according to the Quran, was destroyed by God because of the sins of its inhabitants. In the same verse, Professor Suru adapted the name of the mythical king of Iran, Jamshid as *yamajita*. The name Jamshid is derived from Avestan *yima* meaning 'twin', which is related to Sanskrit Yama (*yama*), Hindu God of death and a twin brother of Yami (*yamī*). Therefore, such an adaptation of the name in translation seems to be a very successful choice by the translator. It may also be noted that in describing Jamshid's cup, Suru has added the epithet *saptarekhānkita*, literally—'marked with seven lines' which corresponds to FitzGerald's 'Sev'n-ring'd Cup'. According to Persian mythology, the magical cup filled with elixir of immortality indeed was circled by seven rings. Thus, the translator wanted to bring readers closer to this mythical artefact by describing it in more detail. While translating the same verse Pandit Narayana Das took completely different approach. He simply said *nāmamātrāviśiṣṭā vibhraṣṭhā naṣṭā purānarāḥ*,<sup>11</sup> meaning 'the ancients—distinguished only by name—have perished and been lost'. Thus, he omitted both proper names present in the FitzGerald's translation. The meaning of the verse is similar; however, it cannot be stated that he translated it very accurately.

The Sanskrit translations of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyats* by Pandit Narayana Das and Professor Suru can be analysed also through the lens of domestication and foreignization, as discussed by Lawrence Venuti (1995). Narayana Das's translation employs **domestication**, making significant adaptations to align with Sanskrit literary norms. It often omits proper names and focuses more on conveying the message of the poem than on accuracy. Conversely, Professor Suru's version, while incorporating similar imagery, retains the exotic quality of the source text by Sanskritizing proper

<sup>9</sup> 'Iram indeed is gone with all his Rose,  
And Jamshyd's Sev'n-ring'd Cup where no one knows;  
But still a Ruby kindles in the Vine,  
And many a Garden by the Water blows' (FitzGerald 2009: 18).

<sup>10</sup> *smartavyābhūd 'iram'nagari tyājītā padmajātaṃ  
pātraṃ naṣṭaṃ kva yamajitaḥ saptarekhānkitaṃ yat  
kiṃtu drākṣā vahita ruciraṃ raktamadyāpi ratnaṃ  
puṣpāmodo jalataṭaruhāṃ jṛmbhate vāṭikāsu ||* (Suru 1981: 2).

<sup>11</sup> *nāmamātrāviśiṣṭā vibhraṣṭhā naṣṭā purānarāḥ  
adyāpi phalitādrākṣā puṣpitā vanamallikā ||* (Narayana Das 1937: 11).

names (e.g. rendering 'Iram' as *iramanagari*) and preserving original stylistic markers. This hybrid strategy, between domestication and foreignization, preserves the source text's distinct cultural identity and invites readers to engage with its 'otherness'. Thus, the translators' choices not only reflect differing aesthetic priorities but also mediate a complex dialogue between indigenous literary traditions and global cultural influences. For instance, he replaces FitzGerald's metaphor of 'cash and credit' with the altered Sanskrit proverb of the **crow and peacock**, ensuring cultural resonance for Sanskrit readers. Of course, in both cases the changes in translation were also motivated by the choice of metre. These strategies are not mutually exclusive, yet they demonstrate different approaches to the translator's role and the intended outcome of the translations.

## 5 Conclusion

Both translations are unusual yet fascinating publications. It is unlikely that these books were released to bring the contents of the *Rubaiyats* to Sanskrit readers. After all, at the time of publication, several English translations were available, as well as translations into some Indian languages. Thus, the translators' goals likely differed from the usual aim of simply transmitting content. It is probable that Professor Suru sought to demonstrate his expertise in Sanskrit while rendering the ideas of the *Rubaiyats* through techniques appropriate to classical Sanskrit poetry. It could also have been a kind of experiment on how certain content from another cultural background can be rendered in Sanskrit. Pandit Narayana Das probably had slightly different motives, as he translated the poems also into Telugu. Perhaps he really wanted to introduce the *Rubaiyats* to users of that language. Therefore, it is possible that the translation into Sanskrit was a side project. Possibly, like Professor Suru, he wanted to demonstrate his knowledge in Sanskrit, or it was a kind of experiment on how the same content would look translated into two languages by the same author.

In conclusion, a comparative analysis of Sanskrit translations of the *Rubaiyats* by Pandit Adibhatla Narayana Das and Professor Narahari Govind Suru demonstrate the difficulties faced by translators adapting their work to the requirements of classical Sanskrit poetic styles. Their works illustrate how the challenges of metre and linguistic economy in Sanskrit can drive innovative translation strategies. Rather than replicating FitzGerald's interpretation, each translator offers a unique interpretation that highlights the dynamic potential of cross-cultural literary transmission. Ultimately, these translations not only broaden the reception of Omar Khayyam's poetry but also contribute to the ongoing evolution of contemporary Sanskrit literature. It might also be seen as a form of manifesto—a translation into Sanskrit, the language of the gods, alongside a translation from Sanskrit into Persian,<sup>12</sup> could be a cultural link between Hindu and Muslim cultures.

<sup>12</sup> For more on cultural exchanges between Sanskrit and Persian traditions see Truschke (2016).

## Funding

This article is part of the project *How Hard Can a Dead Heart Beat? Reflections on Modern Sanskrit Literature*, led by Professor Lidia Sudyka and funded by the National Science Center, Poland (grant no. 2021/43/B/HS2/02046).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## ORCID

Marta Karcz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6177-3758>

## References

- Apte, Varman Shivram. 1964. *The Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Accessed 19 February 2025. [https://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/6\\_sres/2\\_dict/aptees\\_u.htm](https://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/6_sres/2_dict/aptees_u.htm).
- Biegstraaten, Jos. 2008. 'Omar Khayyam (Impact on Literature and Society in the West)'. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica, online edition*. Accessed 19 February 2025. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/khayyam-omar-impact-west>.
- Boyle, John Andrew. 2007 (1975). 'Umar Khayyām: Astronomer, Mathematician and Poet'. In *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume IV: From the Arab Invasion to the Saljuqs*, edited by Richard N. Frye, 658–664. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Castaing, Anne. 2012. 'Vernacularizing Rubaiyat: The Politics of Madhushala in the Context of Indian Nationalism'. In *The Great 'Umar Khayyam: A Global Reception of the Rubāiyāt*, edited by Asghar Seyed-Gohrab, 215–232. Leiden: Leiden University Press, Project MUSE.
- Cielas, Hermina. 2014. 'Wolno krocząca, czyli kilka uwag o uroku metrum mandakranta'. In *Wokół Meghaduty. Nieprzerwana nić literackiej kultury sanskrytu*, edited by Lidia Sudyka, Teresa Miązek, and Mariola Pigionowa, 35–40. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Cieślakowski, Sławomir. 2017. *Teoria literatury w dawnych Indiach*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- FitzGerald, Edward, transl. 2009. *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*. Edited by Daniel Karlin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Machalski, Franciszek. 1969. 'Poetycka sława Omara Chajjama'. In *Omar Chajjam. Rubajaty*, edited by Jan Reychman, 5–20. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Lal, Ananda. 2004. *The Oxford Companion to Indian Theatre*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Mangrulkar, Aravind. 1981. 'A Handful of Flowers'. In *Umarashatakam: A Sanskrit Version of the Rubaiyats of Omar Khayyam*, 5–11. Pune: Madhumalati Suru.
- Muley, R.M. 2015. 'Contribution of N.G. Suru to Sanskrit Studies'. In *Contribution of Maharashtra to Sanskrit Language and Literature*, edited by B.K. Dalai, 655–656. Pune: SP Pune University.
- Narayana Das, Adibhatla, transl. 1937. *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam with English Translation by Edward FitzGerald, Translated into Sanskrit and Dēsyāndhram*. Mazagon, Bombay: The British India Press.

- Olivelle, Patrick. 2009. *Pañcatantra: The Book of India's Folk Wisdom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parthasarathi, B.N.V. 2022. 'Versatile genius Adibhatla Narayana Das'. *Hindu Post*, 24 August 2022. Accessed 19 February 2025. <https://hindupost.in/history/versatile-genius-adibhatla-narayana-das/>.
- Seyed-Gohrab, Ali-Asghar. 2012. 'Khayyām's Universal Appeal: Man, Wine, and the Hereafter in the Quatrains'. In *The Great Umar Khayyam: A Global Reception of the Rubaiyats*, edited by Ali-Asghar Seyed-Gohrab, 11–38. Leiden: Leiden University Press, Project MUSE.
- Suru, Narahari Govind, transl. 1981. *Umarashatakam: A Sanskrit Version of the Rubaiyats of Omar Khayyam*. Pune: Madhumalati Suru.
- Szczepanik, Lidia. 2014. 'Sanskryckie poematy *dūtakāvya*. Rys historyczny gatunku'. In *Wokół Meghaduty. Nieprzerwana nić literackiej kultury sanskrytu*, edited by Lidia Sudyka, Mariola Pigoń, and Teresa Miążek, 17–33. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Truschke, Audrey. 2016. *Culture of Encounters: Sanskrit at the Mughal Court*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.