CHAPTER THIRTY (A)

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE—NORTHERN INDIA

I. LANGUAGE

The period of approximately seven hundred years between A.D. 300 and A.D. 985 witnessed some far-reaching changes, which transformed the already modified Aryan speech of Northern India, now well-advanced in its second or Middle Indo-Aryan stage, into its third or New Indo-Aryan phase, which commenced roughly from A.D. 1000.

The most vital or fundamental fact in the linguistic history of North India during the period prior to the establishment of the Gupta empire is the evolution of Classical Sanskrit and its adoption as the vehicle of the newly developing composite Hindu (ancient Indian) culture which resulted from the reaction of the culture worlds of the Aryan, the Dravidian and the Austric speakers. Classical Sanskrit was keeping perfect pact with the spoken Prakrit vernaculars in the matter of progressive admixture with the non-Aryan speeches largely in spirit and to some extent also in form. The syntax and vocabulary were particularly affected. One reason of its immediate success as the unique vehicle of a composite Hindu, i.e., Aryan-non-Aryan culture was this wedding together of the spirit of Aryan and with that non-Aryan worlds in it, despite the fact that the bulk of the roots—affixes and words of the language were from Aryan or Indo-European source. The more this composite North Indian Hindu culture began to gain in strength and spread rapidly over the mainland of India and beyond, the less interest people began to take in their local dialects and Classical Sanskrit as the vehicle and symbol of a pan-Indian culture began to claim greater and greater homage of all sorts and conditions of people—so that by A.D. 300 Classical Sanskrit acquired a place in the general public life of the country that it did never possess before, and it became gradually established (the Gupta emperors enthusiastically taking up its cause) as the sole language of public documents like inscriptions and of international or inter-provincial contacts wherever Hindu (i.e., Brahmanical), Buddhist and Jaina culture prevailed,
The expansion of the Aryan speech over such a vast tract of country was naturally accompanied by the splitting up of the Aryan speech into a number of local or regional dialects. The names of these regional dialects are known from the Prakrit grammarians and from writers on Dramaturgy and Rhetoric, but details or definite information cannot be had.

The numerous regional dialects of the period A.D. 300-1000 developed out of a small number of similar dialects of the middle of the first millennium B.C. which have been noticed before. From Udichya developed the Prakrit dialects of the Panjab and Sindh which were almost ignored by the Prakrit grammarians; only the names of two of these viz., Dhakki or Takki, a speech of the North Panjab and Vrāchāḍa, the speech of Sindh towards the end of this period, are generally known; and we hear also of the Kekaya or Western Panjab speech, also for late or Aparahamsā times. Of course, in the inscriptions from the third century B.C. onwards, we have plentiful specimens of the Prakrit of the Panjab in inscriptions in the Kharosthi script; here the language shows a strong Sanskrit cast, with inevitable influence of or mixture with other dialects. The area of the Midland—Eastern Panjab and Western United Provinces of the present day—was the area of the Sauraseni Prakrit. Rajasthan, Gujarat and Malwa appear to have been a meeting ground of two groups of dialects, the original Saurāśṭra speech which we find in the Girnar edict of Asoka, and the Sauraseni which spread from the Midland and overlaid the eastern dialects. Āvanti and Ābhirī are mentioned as two varieties of Malwa and Rājasthāni speech. To the south was Mahārāśṭra, the source of Mārāṭhi of the present day. This was descended from the old Dākshiṇātya speech. The dialect described as Māhārāśṭri in the Prakrit grammars appears to have been quite different from the real regional dialect of Mahārāśṭra. The Māhārāśṭri of the Prakrit grammarians was a speech which was later in its general phonetic aspect than Māgadhī, Ardha-māgadhī and Saurāśṭra as preserved in literature, and it has been suggested, quite rightly in my opinion, that the Māhārāśṭri Prakrit of the grammarians and of Prakrit literature was not the source-dialect of Mārāṭhi, but was a speech of the Midland, a later phase of Sauraseni which might have been first employed in literature by settlers from the Midland, from the middle of the first millennium A.D. East of Sauraseni was the area of the Prāchya dialect, viz., Ardha-māgadhī, current in the present-day Eastern United Provinces and Ayodhya the source

of the Kosal or Eastern Hindi speeches, and Māgadhī, the speech of Bihar, which spread further to the east and south in Bengal, Assam and Orissa. The Prakrit grammarians were not quite clear in their notions about the character or nature of the various regional speeches. They knew a number of names as connected with places or tribe or as indicative of some phonetic or other peculiarity (e.g., Gan Abhīrī, Drāvīḍi, Bāhlikī, Sākari etc.), and they used the terms Prākrita, Bhāṣā, Vibhāṣa, Apabhraṃśa etc., without any precise sense attached to them. The formulation of a regional linguistic or dialectal atlas of India during the first millennium A.D. will have to be created de novo by modern linguists, working from the modern Indian languages, rigorously checking and utilising the data obtained from the inscriptions, the extant literature and the grammars.

Taking note of the general line of development of the Aryan speech, the history of the spoken forms of Middle Indo-Aryan, roughly from B.C. 600 to A.D. 1000, has conveniently been divided into a number of stages: (i) The first Middle Indo-Aryan stage, from B.C. 600 to B.C. 200; (ii) The transitional Middle-Indo-Aryan stage, from B.C. 200 to A.D. 200; (iii) the second Middle Indo-Aryan stage, from A.D. 200 to A.D. 600; (iv) The third and the later Middle Indo-Aryan, or Apabhraṃśa stage, from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1000. The first stage is, in the main, represented by the Aṣokan dialects, and by Pāli; and the Prakrit dialects in the fragments of Sanskrit dramas ascribed to Aśvaghosa. ‘Old Ardha-Māgadhī’ and ‘Old Māgadhī also belong linguistically to this first Middle Indo-Aryan stage. The transitional stage roughly includes the Prakrit dialects found in inscriptions of the period mentioned above, as well as those of literature composed during the couple of centuries before and after Christ. During this transitional stage, single interior unvoiced stops and aspirates, k, kh, ch, t, th, p and ph became voiced to g, gh, j, d, dh, b, bh, respectively, and these fell together with the original g, gh, j, d, dh, b, bh. The second stage of Middle Indo-Aryan was established when these voiced stops and aspirates, both original and derivative, first became spirantised and were elided and were reduced to h in the case of aspirates. The sequence or line of change is clear, although the epigraphic remains and the MS tradition of the specimens of literature show a great deal of confusion.

The third stage of Middle Indo-Aryan viz., Apabhraṃśa, using the term in the specialized sense which has been given to it in the present day terminology for Indo-Aryan linguistics, may be said to have started approximately about A.D. 600, and Middle Indo-Aryan or Prakrit gradually transformed itself into New Indo-Aryan or Bhāṣā through it by A.D. 1000. Some Apabhraṃśa traits (e.g. change of final -o to -u)
manifested themselves in the speech of the Panjab earlier than elsewhere (witness for example the North-western Prakrit found in fragments of Buddhist literature from Central Asia), and in Kālidāsa’s Vikramorvaśīya we have some early specimens of Apabhraṃśa; and if the MS. tradition of this work is not faulty, we may even think of the Apabhraṃśa stage having been ushered in by A.D. 400, in the colloquial or current speech. It is doubtful if any work in Apabhraṃśa or third middle Indo-Aryan can be as early as that, and we have to take with caution any ascription of Apabhraṃśa as we know it to an age earlier still. The great age of Apabhraṃśa started from the tenth century, and excepting in popular poetry of short lyrics and distiches, long compositions in Apabhraṃśa, mostly narrative poems of Jain inspiration, show a decidedly artificial character.

Side by side with Sanskrit, the various Prakrits were used in literature during the whole of this epoch, with a literary Apabhraṃśa, based on the vernacular dialects of the Midland (Sauraseni area), Rajasthan and the Panjab, establishing itself towards the end of this period.

The Jainas vigorously carried on the practice of composing in Prakrit, and employed various dialects. Brahmanical writers also essayed long poems like the Setubandha, the Bṛihatkathā, the Gandācayūha and dramas like the Karpūramnījārī, but Prakrit never claimed the exclusive homage of the learned in India, whether Brahmanical or Buddhist or Jaina. One great reason was that the usage of employing several dialects made scholars chary of putting their serious contributions in it; and the derivative and decayed character of the language in front of the fuller and clearer Sanskrit was another disadvantage. With the establishment of Rajput ascendancy throughout the whole of Northern India, Sauraseni or western Apabhraṃśa, as an auxiliary or popular literary language besides Sanskrit, came to be established and by A.D. 1000, it acquired a pan-Indian prestige and position from Mahārāṣṭra and Sindh and Western Panjab to distant Bengal. Poets in Bengal cultivated old Bengali which was being established as a literary language in the tenth century, and side by side they were also writing in the Sauraseni Apabhraṃśa. A strong bond of cultural and linguistic unity had thus linked up once again the whole of Aryan-speaking through Sauraseni Apabhraṃśa, which was the real precursor of Pīṇgal and Brajbhākhā and Khari-boli (Hindi or Hindustani) of later times.

The history of the transformation of old Indo-Aryan into new Indo-Aryan through middle Indo-Aryan during this period (A.D. 300 to A.D. 1000) is a special subject coming under linguistic, and for this special technical works have to be consulted. A working list is appended at
end of this section. The Aryan speech shed off a great many of its old inflexions, and developed gradually the habit of employing post-positions in the declensions of the noun. Participial forms supplied the want of inflected tense forms which were lost, and these developed into a series of new tense forms. Far-reaching changes took place in the accent system. Rhyme became established in verse from the age of Apabhramsha. The vocabulary was constantly expanding itself by the addition of words of non-Aryan origin, a good many of which found their way into Sanskrit as well from the spoken languages, by words newly created with the native Indo-Aryan elements and by adopting a number of foreign words. Learned words from early Prakrit as well as pure and modified Sanskrit words came to be borrowed; and the number of such borrowing was on the increase as the centuries passed. Prakrit words, again, found in their turn a place in Sanskrit, and it was but natural when we remember that Sanskrit was written by persons who spoke various Prakrit (and Dravidian as well as Sino-Tibetan and possibly also Austric) dialects; witness words like zapita, lāñchhānā, bhāttrāpa, bhāta, nāṭa, āḍhya, puttalā, nikaṭa, bhalluka etc. which are of Middle Indo-Aryan or Prakrit origin taken over into Sanskrit. Sanskrit, however, was the international or inter-provincial language for the whole of India, and this position of Sanskrit continued in Hindu India down to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The Prakrit and Apabhramsha, spoken dialects of different areas, differed from each other in certain salient matters, but it would appear that on the whole they were dialects of one kind of common spoken Middle Indo-Aryan, rather than different languages which their descendants have become, in many cases, or are becoming so now. It would appear that there was a good deal of mutual intelligibility among the middle Indo-Aryan dialects and even among the different forms of New Indo-Aryan during the first few centuries of the second millennium A.D. Otherwise old Bengali poems would not be found in works attributed to Gorakhnath preserved in Rajasthan, and Marathi poems in the Ādigrantha of the Sikh; and a whole series of artificial mixed literary dialects would not have overshadowed the actual spoken vernaculars of Aryandom from Sindh and Panjab to Bengal (e.g., the mixed Apabhramsha, Hindi and Panjabi of the Panjab poets; 'Pingal', and mixed 'Dingal' of Rajasthan; mixed Braj and Khariboli; mixed Kosala and western Hindi and mixed Bhojpuri and Khosali as well as western Hindi in the upper Ganges valley; and Brajabuli in Bengal, Assam and Orissa). This is why the Turki, Irani and other foreign Muslims who visited India between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, were conscious of one current Hindi or Hindwi speech, which in their general cognisance was but a single
language as obtaining in North India; and only scholars among them like Al-biruni who were interested came to know the existence of Sanskrit as the learned or scholarly form of this Hindi speech. The difference between Sanskrit and the Prakrit and Apabhramśa was not of a fundamental character throughout this period of the hey-day of Hindu life and culture. Taking things in the essential character, they were just the learned and the vulgar forms of the same Indian speech.
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II. Sanskrit Literature

The efflorescence of Sanskrit literature during the Gupta Age, covering roughly the period between A.D. 300 and 600, has been described in chapter eleven. We shall now trace the further development of this literature during the next four centuries, following more or less the same plan as adopted in the earlier chapter.

1. Brahmanical Literature

The popularity of Vedic learning amply borne out by epigraphic evidence, is further demonstrated by the commentaries on the Vedas written during this period.

Skandasvāmin, son of Bhartrihṛ Dhruva or Dhruvasvāmin of Valabhī, is one of the earliest commentators on the Veda in this period, and is said to have been alive in Kali 3740 (A.D. 638). A layer exegete Venikata Madhava states that Skandasvāmin wrote only a part of his Rīgveda-vyākhyā and that two others, completed the work. The identification of Nārāyaṇa with the father of the Sāmaveda commentator Madhava lacks evidence. There is much uncertainty about the history of Vedic commentators, and there are quite a number of Mādhyas. A Mādhyas of the village Gomati who wrote a bhāshya on the Rīgveda and eleven anukramāṇīs is held to have preceded Skandasvāmin by some, while others place him after the celebrated Śāyāṇa. Another Mādhyas, son of Venkatārya who lived in a village on the southern bank of the Kāverī in the reign of a king described by him as ‘gatamekvira’; the king meant was perhaps Chola Parāntaka I (A.D. 907-53) who had the title Vīra-Chola; but some have suggested a later date of Venkata Mādhyas in the eleventh or twelfth century. He is quoted by Kesavasvāmin who wrote his Nanārthār-ṇaya-saṅkṣhepa under Rājarāja II (1146-73). On the Taṭṭṭirīya-Śaṃhitā of the Yajurveda, Bhavasvāmin wrote a commentary in the ninth century, besides Guhadeva, Kapardin, and Bharuchi at different times; the last three are mentioned together by Rāmānuja.

Harisvāmin, a pupil of Skandasvāmin, wrote a commentary on the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa in A.D. 638 when Avanti was ruled over by a Vikramāditya, whose identity is uncertain. Bhavasvāmin wrote a commentary on the Taṭṭṭirīya Brāhmaṇa and a Bhavatrāta of uncertain date on the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa. On the Shādviśīṇa Brāhmaṇa of the Chhandogas there was a commentary called Anupāda which is mentioned by Dhūrtasvāmin on the Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra and identified by his Vṛttikāra Ramandara.

The Ṣirukta was commented on by the Durgāśinīha who is cited by Skandasvāmin and Udghītha and must therefore be earlier than
A.D. 600. Durgā, described as 'bhāgavata', lived in a hermitage on the Jambumārga usually taken to be Jammu. Skandasvāmin himself wrote another bhāshya on the Nirukta which was probably amplified or completed by Maheśvara, son of Pitṛisarman. The extant text quotes from Bhartrihari, Bhamaha, the Slokavārttika and Tantravārttika besides Karka; on the basis of the last reference, L. Sarup assigns Maheśvara to the eleventh century, while others give him a date very near Skandasvāmin and Udgītha.

The Srauta-and Grihya-sūtras were no doubt commented on frequently and some of the many authors with names ending in rāta, trāta, svāmin, datta etc., whose commentaries are known and published must be assigned to this age; but definite data are lacking. Kapardin is known to have commented on the Srauta- and Grihya-sūtras of Āpastambas besides the Paribhāsha, Pitrimedha, Pravara- and Sulba-sūtras; he also wrote a Grihya-prayoga and a Pūrva-prayoga-kārikā. A Kapardikārikā is known as a summary of his views in which a sishya (pupil) of his a Sivasvāmin are mentioned. Dhūrtasvāmin seems to have preceeded Kapardisvāmin as a commentator on Āpastamba. Bhartriyajñi, cited by Medhātithi on Manu (VIII. 3), commented on the Pāraskara Grihya- and Kātyāyana- Srauta-sūtras. The Vedic commentator Bhavasvāmin explained the Baudhāyana Srauta-sūtra. Devasvāmin, author of Sankarsha-Kauḍābhāṣya, commented also on the Srauta- and Grihya-sūtras of Āsvalāyana and the related Mantrapāth. Gopāla, author of the Gopolakārikās and commentator on the Srauta-sūtras of Āpastamba, Baudhāyana and Kātyāyana is placed by Velankar in the tenth century; he quoted Bhāvavāmin. A Mātridatta wrote commentaries on the Satyashadhā Srauta- and Grihya-sūtras and Bhavatrāta was the author of Jaiminiya Srauta-sūtra-bhāṣya, Jaiminiya-Grihya-mantra-vritti and Kauśitaki-Grihya-sūtra-uyākyā; the father-in-law of Bhavatrāta was Brahmadatta, possibly the same as the commentator on Śaṅkhāyana Grihya-sūtra.

There was great activity in the sphere of sacred law and polity represented by smṛiti works in prose and verse many of which are extant in two recensions, a smaller and a larger, and present complicated textual problems of a more or less insoluble nature. Indeed, so many texts assigned to eponymous sages gained currency that the need arose for handy and authoritative compilations like the Chaturvīnāsati-mata (views of twenty-four sages) or Shatrimśānimata (of thirty-six sages) and the Smṛiti-saṅgraha, all of which were prepared towards the end of our period and paved the way for the more systematic digests (nibandhas) of the next epoch.

Commentaries on the standard Smṛitis was another notable line of
activity. Asahāya (A.D. 600-700) annotated Nārada, Gautama and Manu; he is also known to have commented on Saṅkha and Likhita, and is quoted by Viśvarūpa and Medhātithi. Asahāya's commentary on Nārada was much altered in the revision by a Kalyāṇa Bhaṭṭa, and the work in its original form, is not now available. A Nāradiya Manu Saṁhitā with a bhāṣya of Bhāvasvāmin appears to have been an early text as good reason has been shown to regard Bhāvasvāmin as a native of the Mathurā-Kanauj region of a time before A.D. 600. Viśvarūpa, identified with Suresvara, a pupil of Saṅkara, wrote the Bālakṛṣḍā on Yājñavalkya-smṛiti. He quotes Kumārila and Gaudapāda among others and states that his patron was a king Pratāpaśila. Next comes Bharuchi whose commentary on Vishnu Dharma-sūtras has been known, and to whose commentary on Manu attention has recently been drawn; Bharuchi held the doctrine of 'Salvation through both works and knowledge' (jñāna-karmasamuchchaya) as is seen from Vaishnava tradition and from his commentary on Manu (VI. 74-5). Medhātithi quotes from the commentary which he refers to as Rīju; either it bore the name Rījuvimala or Bharuchi had the title Rījuvimala as some of the colophons imply.

Medhātithi's bhāṣya on Manu may be placed in the ninth century. He makes the interesting observation that Mlechchhas cannot long occupy Āryavarta without Āryas rising up again and throwing them out (II. 22) and shows himself a liberal, rational, and progressive writer. He too accepts Jñāna-karma-samuchchaya though he is conversant with Saṅkara's bhāṣya on the Dharma-sūtras. Besides the Manubhāṣya, Medhātithi wrote the Smṛtitīvika, the earliest of the nibandhas which is cited even in the Manubhāṣya. The Viśvarūpa-nibandha or Samuchchaya, as pointed out by Kane, is not by the author of the Bālakṛṣḍā. Medhātithi cites several writers, no longer extant.

Many of the Purāṇas were finally redacted in this period. They began to attract Smṛiti matter from about A.D. 200 and up to about 500 included only the major heads of the main Smṛitis; but later they widened their scope and included much Dharma-śāstra matter which was availed of to an astonishing extent by the nibandhas of later times. But an orderly chronological treatment of the Smṛiti sections of the Purāṇas is by no means easy.

Dates can perhaps be suggested for parts of particular Purāṇas, but seldom to the entire composite text of any of them, as it was undergoing endless changes by addition and alteration by various heads and at different times according to local needs. This applies to the (upa-Purāṇas) also which began to be composed perhaps in the Gupta age and to which no lower limit could be indicated. The
Sūrya Bhāgavata deserves particular notice. Abhinavagupta (on Gītā, 14.8) is the earliest to quote from it; as the Purāṇa knows the Gauḍapāda-kārikās it is reasonable to place it about the time of Saṅkara. It was perhaps written in South India, where, it says, Bhakti was still alive (XI, 5.38-40). From the synthesis it effects between Advaita and Bhakti, it may not be wrong to assume that it was the work of an Advaitin of South India. Unique among the Purāṇas it takes a place with the epics in its popularity and sanctity.

2. Belles Letters

(a) KĀVYA

As regards Epic poems, the most famous work of the period is the Siśupālavadha of Māgha, who flourished in the eighth century A.D. It is modelled on Bhāravi's work but marks a further stage in the obscurcation of poetic talent by the artifices of learning. The author was a grandson of Suprabhadeva, minister of Varmalāta, a king known from an inscription of A.D. 625.

In the ninth century there were two poets of note in Kashmir. Rājanaka Ratnakara who had the title Vāgīśvara (lord of speech) composed the long poem Haravijaya in fifty cantos. Sivasvāmin, author of Kapphiṇābhuyudaya, a Buddhist story, was a prolific writer of poetry, drama and devotional hymns according to a verse cited by Kshemendra. There was also Udbhata, a rhetorician of the court of Jayāpiṇḍa, who wrote a Kumārasambhava to illustrate his own work on poetics. Under Avantivarman, the critic Ānandavardhana wrote his Arjunacharita and a little later Abhinanda, son of the logician Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, retold in easy verse the story of the Kādambarī of Bāṇa. Another Abhinanda, a Bengali writer patronized by Yuvarāja Haravarsha, produced a voluminous but incomplete Rāmcharitā which attained celebrity in a short time. The voluminous Haravilāsa of Rājaśekhara, known only from citations in the Suktimuktāvali and elsewhere, closes the history of Mahākāvya in this period. That many kāvyas of the time have been lost is clear from references to them in later works like Bhoja's Sṛgāra-prakāśa. The rhetorician Bhāmaha (I. 17) speaks of Kāvyas which are sāstrāsraya and kālāsraya, depending on sciences and arts—a classification of poems which shows the growing intrusion of learning and the arts in the realm of poetry. The tendency to verbal jingles (yamaka and anuprāsa) also became pronounced; the Buddhist writer Dharmanātha illustrated the varieties of such dexterous writing in his Vidagdha-mukha-maṇḍana, mentioned by Bhoja. Such tour de force necessitated commentaries, and the Gaṅga Durvinita's commentary on the fifteenth canto of Bhāravi's
Kirāṭārjuniya was one of the earliest. The distinguished Kashmirian Vallabhadeva who wrote glosses on Rudraṭa’s work on poetics, on the poems of Kālidāsa and Māgha, on the Vakroktipaṇḍhāsikā of Ratnakara, and the Śūryaśatāka of Mayūra deserves mention. He appears to have been a good soldier, and the son of a minister. His grandson Kaiyāta wrote a commentary on Ānandavardhana’s Deviśatāka in A.D. 977 with the aid of notes compiled by his grandfather as ‘mementos of a great mind’ (i.e., Ānandavardhana).

In the domain of suabhāshitas, bon mots on different aspects of life, Bharṭrihari had some able successors. The Amaruśatāka, ascribed to the great philosopher Śaṅkara by a doubtful tradition, is a most sophisticated attempt to delineate different moods and situations of love and was composed before A.D. 800. Equally early must be the twenty rhymed verses of the Gaṭakarpakāva in which a love-torn lady speaks out her yearnings in the rainy season; the poem is ascribed to Kālidāsa himself by tradition. A Śilhana of uncertain date continued in his Sāntiśatāka the mode of Bharṭrihari’s Vairāgyaśatāka. Stray suabhāshitas on traits of human character found indirect expression in verses addressed to birds, animals, trees or aspects of nature in the form known as anyapadesa, anyokti or vijñokti; in this line the Kashmirian poet Bhallata was a pioneer who gave poignant expression to the evils of Śaṅkaravarman’s rule (A.D. 883-902).

Several devotional lyrics undoubtedly belong to this period though the association of great names like Kālidāsa and Śaṅkara with their authorship must be received with caution. Mayūra, a poet of Harshavardhana’s court, is said to have been cured of his leprosy by his composition of the Śūrya-śatāka; the Telugu Śaiva writer Palkuriki Somanātha records the story that Śūrya advised Mayūra to praise Śiva for getting a radical cure and that the poet composed the Mayūra-stava accordingly, a poem no longer extant. Mayūra is also credited with a short love poem and is remembered in Kannada literature as an author on prosody. Bāna’s Čaṇḍīśatāka and Daṇḍin’s Anamaya-stotra on Śiva are other works of devotion. Ratnākara of Kashmir wrote the Vakroktipaṇḍhāsikā, a witty dialogue between Śiva and Pārvati, which, however, like the Deviśatāka of his contemporary Ānandavardhana, had rhetorical display as its chief aim. Between the eighth and tenth centuries A.D., the exponents of Kashmir Śaiva philosophy produced several works of devotion which were none the worse for the points of doctrine embedded in them. The Stava-chintāmani of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, the Bhavopahārastava of Chakrapāṇi-nātha, and the Śiva-stotrāvali of Utpaladeva, pupil of Somānanda (c. A.D. 900) are the most notable among them. An inscription of A.D. 1063 from Māndhātā on the Narmadā preserves a stotra
on Śiva by Halāyudha, an ārādhya Brāhmaṇa from Navagrama in the Deccan, along with the Mahimnastotra variously ascribed to Pushpadanta, Kumārila and Grahila; these poems together with the Anamayastotra ascribed to Daṇḍin, are included in a pentad called Śivapāṇīchastavi.

Some women poets of this period deserve particular notice. Rājāsekhara mentions the names of Vijayānkā, Silabhaṭṭārikā, Vīkaṭanitambā, Prabhudevī, and Subhadra. Vijayānkā or Vijayā or Vījīkā, perhaps the queen of Chandrāditya (c. A.D. 660), a son of Pulakeśin II, was the most accomplished of them all; she describes herself as a dark Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning generally conceived of as white in complexion and Rājāsekhara who calls her a native of Karpāṭaka praises her as the exponent of the graceful Vaidarbhi style after Kālidāsa, a tribute justified by her verses preserved in the anthologies. Rājāsekhara’s wife Avantisundarī, a Chauhān princess, is believed to have inspired his production of Karpūrāmaṇjari and contributed her own views to his Kāvyamānaśā.

(b) DRAMA

Dramatic literature flourished after Kālidāsa, but many works have been lost and are known only from citations in works on dramaturgy. The Mudrārākshasa of Viśakhadatta is generally assigned to the age of the Gupta. The son of a Mahārāja Prithu, the author shows a fascination for political themes. He dramatises the political revolution which enthroned the Mauryas; the drama is at once vigorous and full of action; it gave rise to an imitation in the Pratijñā-Chāṇakya of Bhima. His other play, Devī Chandragupta, no longer extant but cited by several writers, has already been referred to above (pp. 46 ff).

Among the dramatic works of this period, reference may be made to the anonymous Kaumudīmahotsava in which some scholar read a lot of contemporary history, as noted above (p. 14). King Harshavardhana was a notable dramatist. He composed three plays of which Priyadarśikā and Rātavālī are nāṭikās on Udayana’s love stories modelled on the Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa; the Rātavālī was a favourite with actors and dancers according to the Kuṭṭanimitra (ninth century). The third play, Nāgānanda, which dramatises the noble sacrifice of the Vidyādhara prince Jimūtavāhana not only attests the Buddhist leanings of the king in his later life, but forms a landmark in the history of the drama by the introduction of the Sānta (quietist) rasa. I-tsing states that the king himself had the play set to music. The celebrated Bāna apparently tried his hand at play writing in the Mukuta-tāḍitaka, a war-story from the Mahābhārata, cited by Bhoja and Chaṇḍapāla.
Bhavabhūti ranks highest among the dramatists after Kālidāsa. His Rāmāyaṇa plays cast into shade many other plays on themes from the Rāma saga, which are now known only from references to them in rhetorical works. One of them was the Rāmābhyaḍaṇa by king Yaśovarman of Kanauj (c. A.D. 725-52), the patron of Bhavabhūti himself. Bhavabhūti’s style, unlike Kālidāsa’s was profuse and exuberant in expression, adding to the poetic quality of the writing, but adversely affecting the drama. It was also learned, and found imitators in Murāri, Rājaśekhara and others. Bhavabhūti wrote a romantic drama in the Mālati-Mādhava, but is more famous for his Uttara-Rāmacarita in which he is believed to have excelled even Kālidāsa in his portrayals of the pathos of the later story of Rāma and the abandonment of Sītā. The Mahāvīracharita, on the earlier phase of Rāma’s life, is incomplete. Though many other authors attempted this part of the story later, relatively few put their hands on the theme of the Uttara-Rāmacarita, and a work, worth notice in this class is the Kūndamālā of Anuparāja Dhīra (Vīra) nāga which combines dramatic effect with simplicity.

We now come upon a group of writers of uncertain date who are however well known to the rhetoricians of about A.D. 800. Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, called Mṛigarājalakṣmaṇa, wrote the Veṇī-saṁhāra on a Mahābhārata theme, achieving the dramatic quality at least in some parts of it and probably throwing other Mahābhārata plays into oblivion. With Burāri (Bālavāmīki), son of Vardhamāna, starts a line of poets who wrote some memorable verses but were no adepts in the art of the drama. About the same time as Murāri’s Anargharāghava were produced two plays by Anangaharshamāyurāja or Māṭrārāja, son of Mahārāja Narendravardhana of the Kalachuri line of Māhishmāti; Murāri himself and Dāmodaragupta mention Anangaharsha with approbation. His Taṉasavatsarāja has Udayana for hero, and his Udāttarāghava is a variation of the Rāma story recovered in a single manuscript by the present writer. Another Udayana play of the time was the anonymous and incomplete Vīṇā Vāsavadattā, perhaps called Vatsarājakarita in its full text.

At the end of the ninth century and beginning of the tenth flourished the celebrated Rājaśekhara, a Maharashtrian, son of minister Durdika and protégé of Kalachuri Keyūravarsha of Tripuri and Pratihāra Mahendrapāla and Mahīpāla of Kanauj. He calls himself a Kavirāja and an incarnation of Vālmiki. His works include the long drama Bālārāmāyaṇa, the incomplete Bālābhārata or Prachanda-panḍava and the Viddhāśālabhaṇḍaja nāṭika. Kṛṣṇemśvara, author of the Chandakauśika and Naishadhaṇanda, was his younger contemporary in the court of Kanauj.
In South India, besides Daṇḍin and his ancestors already mentioned, the great Pallava ruler Mahendravarman I was a notable author. His two farces (prahasanas) Mattavilāsa and Bhagavadajjukīya are remarkable lampoons against the growing religious intolerance of his time which turn the laugh against the Buddhists and Kāpālikas. In his Āścharyachudāmanī Saktibhadra calls himself a pioneer in Sanskrit drama in the South; he also wrote Unmādavāsavaddattī and other works. Kulaśekhara of Kerala wrote two plays—Subhadrā-Dhanañjaya and Tapatīsamvarana.

The Kashmirian Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (ninth century) wrote a metaphysical drama, Āgamaḍambara or Shanmata-nātaka, a series of philosophical debates thrown into four acts, and thus revived an almost forgotten mode of which we get the first glimpse in the dramatic fragments of Āsvaghosha. The advaitic drama Prabhodhachandrodaya of Kṛṣṇa Miśra of the eleventh century marked a further stage in the tradition. In the erotic monologue (bhīna); we have an old collection of four bhānas (Chaturbhāṇī). Two of these the Pudmaprābhritaka and Udbhayādhisārkī ascribed respectively to Śūdraka and Vararuchi do not seem to be so old though they are cited in the Chandovichitti Iñāśrayi; the Dhūrtavīta sanātī of Iśvaradatta and the Pādatāditaka of Šyāmilaka quoted by Abhinavagupta are the two others. The four excellent plays are in a class apart. Plays of other minor types known as uparūpakas are mentioned by name by Abhinavagupta and Bhoja and must have been produced in this period; but as they are no longer extant their names require no notice here.

(c) PROSE, ROMANCES AND FABLES

Prose works, according to Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, fall into two classes, Kathā or imaginative romance and Ākhyaśīkā or historical story. The supreme excellence of Bāna as prose writer apparently threw many earlier works into oblivion and these are now known only by their names cited by Bāna himself and later writers such as Dhanapāla and Bhoja. Bāna mentions a Vāsavadattā, which is usually taken to be the prose work now passing under the name of Subandhu; this work makes mention of Uddyotakara. Its story differs from that of Udayana and his queen and is extremely meagre; it just furnishes a fragile frame on which Subandhu hangs heavy descriptive paragraphs replete with long compounds and double entendre. Its verbal identities with Bāna and Bhavabhūti raise difficult textual and chronological problems. Bāna was the author of Kādambarī, a Kathā and Harshacharita, an Ākhyaśīkā, both masterpieces of art left incomplete by him. The former is a romance based on a story, from the Bṛhatkathā, in which taking two pairs of lovers through a series of
births, Bāna demonstrates that death cannot end either life or love. His son Pulinda-bhūshaṇa Bāna has, with moderate success, tried to complete the story. The Harshacharita which stops abruptly soon after the accession of Harshavardhana of Thāneśvara is also valuable for the author's autobiography found at its beginning. Bāna was a son of Chitrabhānū and a resident of Pṛitikutā on the Sone. His prose style exhibits many variations; while the descriptions are often long, over-wrought and tedious, the narrative at its best is at once simple, elegant and moving. He is universally acknowledged as the unrivalled master of Sanskrit prose. Bāna salutes a certain Bharschu in the opening verses of the Kādambarī, and Rājaśekhara supplies the information that Bharschu was the preceptor of Bāna and the court poet of the Maukharī Avantīvarman; Bharschu's verses occur in the anthologies.

Dāndin who adorned the Pallava court in the latter part of the seventh century was the next great writer of the prose Kāvyā. Even more learned than Bāna, Dāndin commended a style which though less poetic was more restrained and direct than that of Bāna. Dāndin was long regarded as the author of Daśakumāracharita which has lost both its beginning and end; but its fuller version known as Avantisundarikathā has recently been recovered from Malabar. Following Bāna, whose work is referred to by him, Dāndin narrates his own story at the beginning. His ancestors hailed from the Nasik region. One of them Dāmodara became, through the good offices of Bhāravi, a friend of prince Kubja Vishnuvardhana and later visited the courts of Gaṅga Durviniṇī and Pallava Siṁhavishṇu. Dāmodara's son was Manoratha whose last son Viradatta was the father of Dāndin. Incidentally, Dāndin mentions a Tamil Śudrakacharitam written by the architect Lalitālaya; Bhavatrāta who commented on the Kalpasūtra was also a friend of Dāndin.

The Tilakamaṇjarī of Dhanapāla written in Dhārā under Muṇja Vākpati and Bhoja is another extant prose romance of the period. The Aścharyamaṇjarī of the Kerala king Kulaśekhara, and the Kathā known as Mrigāṅkalekhā of Aparājita, a contemporary of Rājaśekhara, are other works of the age mentioned by Rājaśekhara, but no longer extant.

The Champū form of composition mentioned by Dāndin as including both prose and verse is represented by the Nalachampū or Damayanti-kathā of Trivikrama Bhāṭṭa, the author of the Nausāri Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscription of A.D. 915, and of another Champū (Mādālasāchampū) no longer extant. The Yaśastilakachampū of the Jaina monk Somadevasūri, an author of nearly a hundred works, is an extensive work on a Jaina theme. Somadeva was a contemporary of Rāsh-
trakūta Krishṇa III and his Chālukya feudatory of Vemulavada, Baddega by name.

To the literary genre represented by the Tantrākhyāyikā belong the Nītisāra and Nītīpradīpa of Ghatakarpara and Vētāla Bhaṭṭa respectively; these authors are counted by tradition among the ‘nine gems’ of Vikramāditya’s court. The Nītīdviṣhastikā, a collection of maxims in well-turned āryās, passes under the name of Āchārya Sundara Pāṇḍya, possibly an early Pāṇḍya prince otherwise unknown. Related more to the domain of policy in sex matters is the highly interesting Kuṭṭanimamat, the baud’s instructions to the young courtesan, produced by Dāmodaragupta, the gifted minister of Jayāpiḍa (a.d. 779-813) of Kāshmir.

Mention must next be made of a number of story-cycles, relating to Vikramāditya and Śudraka, of uncertain date. Durviniṭa’s Sanskrit version of the Paiśāchī Brihatkathā of Guṇāḍhya must have been the earliest of many similar attempts. In the eighth century Budhasvāmin produced the Slokasangsāra of which a fragment in twenty-eight chapters comprising 5000 verses has been found in Nepāl; though his version differs in some ways from the Kāshmirī version we lack any decisive evidence to connect him with Nepāl or any other place.

(d) BUDDHIST AND JAINA WRITERS

A word must be said about the contributions of Buddhists and Jains to Sanskrit belles letters. Āryaśūra’s Jātakamālā (fourth century), Buddhist Pāramitā stories in prose and verse foreshadowing the champū form, is written in classical Kāvya style with a sprinkling of Pāli idiom; it is illustrated in the Ajanta frescoes which reproduce the verses of the original and was translated into Chinese in a.d. 434. I-tsing noticed its popularity in his day. Other works of Āryaśūra are reserved in Tibetan and Chinese, and I-tsin refers to the large vogue of devotional hymns attributed to almost every literary man of note. In Tibetan are preserved the hymns of Asanga, Vasubandhu, Māṭrīcheta, Diṇāga, Dharmaśīla, Sāntarakṣita, Chandragomin, and others. Sāntideva, a Mahāyāna writer of the seventh century, wrote the Bodhicharyavatāra which ranks fairly high as literature. The Padyāchudāmanikāvya, also on the life of the Buddha, is said to be by a Buddhist who imitates Aśvaghosha and Kālidāsa but appears to be different from the famous Pāli commentator of that name. Another Buddhist of no mean capacity was Dharmādāsa whose Vidagdhama-mukha-mandana has already been noticed. King Harshavardhana is said to have composed two hymns—the Suprabhāta and Ashṭa-mahāśrīchaitya-vandanā; but the latter is
now seen to be the work of the homonymous Kashmir ruler of the eleventh century. A *Sragḍharā stotra* on Tārā by Sarvajñāmitra patronized by the Lāṭa ruler Kayya (eighth century), feudatory of Lalitāditya of Kāshmir, and *Lokesvarasatāka* of Vajradatta who wrote in the reign of Devapāla (ninth century) are other Buddhist *stotras* to be noted.

Among Jains, Ravishena (A.D. 678) comes first with his *Padmapurāṇa*, a Jain adaptation of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Jāta Śīmhanandin followed with a religious *Kāvya* in thirty-one cantos, Varāṇga-charita, the life of Varāṇga, a contemporary of the Tīrthaṅkara Neminnātha. Jinasena I, who refers to Varāṇgacharita, produced the *Harivaiśā-purāṇa* (A.D. 783) in sixty-six cantos at Vardhamānapura (Wadhwan) in Kathiawar. Jinasena II, who flourished under Rāṣṭrakūta Amoghavarsha I, finished in 837 the *Jayadhavalaṭīkā* began by his guru Viṃsena. In his *Pārvavaiśāyukā* in each verse is worked in a line from Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. His most important work, the *Ādipurāṇa*, was supplemented by Gunabhadra's *Uttara-purāṇa* in A.D. 897; the two together go by the name of *Trishashṭi-lakṣāṇa-mahāpurāṇa* and deal with the lives of the sixty-three saints of the Jainas; like the Brahmanical Purāṇas the composition is replete with varied accounts of polity, architecture, ritual, omens, besides containing hymns and many valuable literary references. In A.D. 869 Silāṅka wrote the *Mahāpurusha-charita*. The *Satruṅjaya māhātmya* said to have been composed at Valabhi at the instance of Silāditya of Saurāśtra is a work of uncertain date. The *Dharmaśāresasubhayudaya* of Harichandra treats of the fifteenth Tīrthaṅkara. Hultsch suggested A.D. 900 for the poet who uses Māgha and Vākpati and whose other work *Jivatindharachampū* is based on the *Uttara-purāṇa*. In 932 Harishena produced his *Bṛhat-Kathākosa*. Asaṅga wrote the *Vardhamānacharita* in A.D. 988; among his other works the *Sāntināthapurāṇa* is extant in manuscript form. In prose Siddharshi wrote the long allegorical work strewed with many verses, the *Upamitibhāvaprapāñcha-kathā*; he mentions the Prākrit *Samaratcchaka-kathā* and names its author Haribhadra among his inspirers. Among *champús* the works of Somadevsūri and Dhanañjaya have been mentioned already. A didactic work, *Praśnottararatnamālā*, available also in a Tibetan rendering, is claimed alike by the Jains, Buddhists and Brahmins who assign it respectively to a Vītāmbara preceptor Vimala or to king Amoghavarsha I himself, to a Śaṅkarāṇanda (with some additional verses), and to the great Śaṅkarāচārīya. Gunabhadra, author of *Uttara-purāṇa*, wrote the *Ātmānuśasana* in 270 verses. Among hymns the most celebrated is Mānauṅga's *Bhaktāmara-stotra* on Rishabhā for which different dates have been advocated from
the third to the ninth century. Siddhasena Divākara, also of uncertain date, wrote the Vardhamāna-dvātriṃśikā; the Kalyāṇamandira may also be his work though it mentions a Kumudachandra as its author. Siddhasena was a celebrated logician whom tradition considers a pioneer of the kavya. Akalaṅka's Akalaṅkāshaṭaka, the Brihatpañcha-namaskara-stotra (in fifty verses) ascribed to Vidyānanda or Patrakesāri, the Sarasvatī stotra and a hymn in 96 verses on the 24 Jinas by Bappa Bhaṭṭi (A.D. 743-838), are other notable works. Bappa Bhaṭṭi figures in Jain story books, and according to the Prabhāvaka-charita he was the author of 52 works including the Taragana (XI. 649) which Dhanapāla assigns to Bhadrakīrti. Sōbhana, the brother and convertor of Dhanapāla to Jainism, wrote in the latter part of the tenth century the Sōbhanastuti on the 24 Jinas; it abounds in figures of speech and verbal tricks which were explained by Dhanapāla who also composed the Virastuti in eleven verses of which the first lines are Sanskrit and the second Prakrit. Other specimens of ingenious stotras are the Siddhipriyastotra of the early writer Devanandi, the Stutividyā or Jinaśatālaṃkāra of Samantabhadra, a Vishāpahārastotra of Dhanaṇjaya.

3. Philosophical Literature

In the domain of philosophical literature the period under review registers a marked advance over the Gupta Age. In the school of Nyāya, the greatest name is that of Bhāradvāja Uddyotakara, a Pānapatāchārya, who defends Vātsyāyana in his Vārttika, 'one of the world's greatest treatises on logic. Uddyotakara is mentioned by Subandhu in his Vāsavadāttā and by Dharmaśīrṣa in his Vādanīyā and Nyāyabindu, and may belong to the early part of the seventh century. He criticises Vasubandhu and Bhadanta (Dīnāga), as well as the works Vādavidhi and Vādavidhāna-ṭikā of the former.

Dharmaśīrṣa who is mentioned by I-tsing (671-95) but not by Hiu-Tsang (629-45) attacked Uddyotakara, and this evoked a reply in the Tātparya-ṭikā on the Nyāya-vārttika from the versatile Vāchaspati Miśra who also determined the text of the Nyāya-sūtras in his Nyāya-sūchi-nibandha (841). With profound respect Udayana offered his gloss Pariśuddhi on Vāchaspati's Tātparya-ṭikā. Udavana wrote other works on Nyāya and Vaiśeshika, devoting a special treatise to a critique of the Buddhist view, and shared with Kumārila and Śaṅkara the task of liquidating Buddhism. His Lakshaṇavādī defining categories was written in 984; his Kīranāvādī is a commentary of Praśastapāda's work; his Nyāya-Pariśishṭa or Prabodha-siddhi is a brief exposition of the elements of debate according to the Nyāya-sūtras:
his Ātma-tattva-viveka or Baudhā-dhikkāra is a refutation of the Buddhist doctrines like apoha and Kṣanabhaṅga held by writers like Kalyāṇarakshita and Dharmottara. His masterpiece is the Iśvara-
Kusumāṇjali (more commonly known simply as Kusumāṇjali), a classic on the proof for the existence of god also occasioned by Buddhist works like Kalyāṇarakshita’s Iśvarabhaṅga-kārikā. An uncompromising opponent of Buddhistic idealism, Udayana accepted to Upanishadic philosophy and its manner of denying the reality of the phenomenal world. His title Nyāyāchārya indicates his high position in the school of Nyāya.

Apparently a little earlier than Kiraṇāvalī was another commentary Vyomavati on Praśastapāda by Vyomaśivāchārya who accepted the third pramāṇa of sabda (verbal testimony) unlike Śrīdhara and other commentators on Vaiśeshika. Vyomaśiva mentions Śrīharsha and has been taken to be a contemporary of Iīrshavardhana; but as he cites and refutes Prabhākara he could not have been so early. Bhaṭṭa Jayanta of Kashmir an adviser to king Śaikara-varman was another writer who preceded Udayana and wrote the Nyāya-mañjarī, a running commentary on select sūtras of Gautama in lively prose interspersed with verses. The Nyāyakalikā was another short work of Jayanta which collected the resume-verses occurring in the mañjarī, and another metrical work of his on Nyāya called Pallava is known now only from extracts in the Suśadvāda-ratnākara. In his play Shaṅmatanāṭaka or Āgama-dambhara he introduced king Śaikaravarman; queen Sugandhā Devī and himself as characters besides different religious teachers who lived just before his time as representatives of different religious systems. Thus Dharmottara represents Buddhism and Viśvarūpa is one of the judges in a disputation; this creates the impression that the other characters may also be historical. The play upholds the superiority of the Nyāya, and finally Dhairyarasi expatiates on the noble idea of all darśanas being but different gates to the same mansion of salvation and of different branches of knowledge being the different streams of the Ganges seeking the same ocean of divinity. and exhorts the adherents of all the schools to preserve the purity of their respective creeds and not allow the corrupter into their fold.

Bhāsarvajña was another leading Nyāya author of the tenth century who refutes Prajñākaragupta (c. 940) and is quoted by Ratnakarāsānti (c. 980). He wrote the Nyāyasāra which evoked eighteen commentaries.

Pūrva Mīmāṃśā

Kumāril-Bhaṭṭa, the greatest exponent of Pūrva Mīmāṃśā, probably flourished in the third quarter of the seventh century A.D. He wrote
five works in all expounding the Sabarabhāsha, the Brhadārikā, Madhyama-tīkā, Tuptika Slokavārttika and Tantravārttika. He had a number of distinguished pupils; the best known to them was Prabhākara who gained the paradoxical appellation of Guru and became the founder of a rival school to that of Kumārila. Legend localizes him in Malabar, holds him as an avatāra of divinity, and ascribes to him a prose hymn on Siva. The great Maṇḍana Miśra has also been counted among Kumārila’s pupils by tradition. A third writer of eminence often mentioned already Bhaṭṭa Umveka, is also believed to have been a pupil of Kumārila, and is sometimes identified with the dramatist Bhavabhūti, though there is no reliable evidence on both these points.

Of Prabhākara’s disciples the chief was Śālīkanātha referred to by Udayana as Gauḍa-mīmāṁsaka. He comments on both the works of his teacher and must have lived at the end of the seventh century and beginning of the eighth.

The ubiquitous Vāchaspati not only commented on Maṇḍana’s Vidhīviveka in his Nyāyakanātikā, but wrote an independent tract called Tattvabindu on what exactly is the means or instrumental cause of verbal cognition which he held to be the padārthas. A regular commentator on Kumārila who may have written in the ninth century is Sucharitamiśra whose Kāśikā on the Slokavārttika is available. The renaissance in Mīmāṁsā studies inaugurated by Kumārila and Prabhākara gave rise to a number of other writers whose works are not now forthcoming.

We now come to the school of Vedānta which owes its pre-eminence to the towering personality of the famous Śaṅkarāchārya.

That theistic Vedānta as well as the Advaita philosophy of the Ātman were generally accepted even at an earlier period, during the Gupta Age is clear from the writings of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and others. Starting from the side of grammar Bhartṛhari developed almost all the essential concepts of classic Advaita in his Vākyapadiya and fought the Buddhist nihilism by his insistence on Sabda-sphoṭa as an imperishable substratum. But much of pre-Śaṅkara Vedānta literature is no longer accessible.

The only pre-Śaṅkara Advaitic work that has survived is that of Gaudapāda, the teacher of Śaṅkara’s teacher. The text is known as Gaudapādakārikā or Māṇḍukyopanishad- kārikā, which has been the centre of much controversy. Gaudapāda echoes Vasubandhu (A.D. 400) and is cited by Bhāvaviveka (c. A.D. 500-50). Such an early date for Gaudapāda must unsettle either the accepted date for Śaṅkara or the tradition regarding Śaṅkara’s teacher being the direct pupil of Gaudapāda.
Advaita differed from the Mādhyamaka philosophy in that it was based upon one ultimate reality, the substratum of Atman or Brahman. Therefore Śaṅkara, who completed the work of Gauḍapada, treated Buddhism as the chief rival and criticised its doctrine unsparingly. According to tradition, he travelled all over India, put down all leftist (vāma) practices in the temples where they were in vogue, introducing the pure Vedic form of worship, and thus earned the title of Ṣaṅmatuṣṭhāpaka (re-establisher of the six orthodox paths of worship). Born at Kaladi on the Alwaye in Kerala, Śaṅkara had only a brief span of life, thirty-two years, in which he firmly established his system of thought by holding public debates and writing great books, and by organising mathas everywhere to serve as centres for the study and propagation of Advaita. His exact chronological position is by no means clear. He came after Kumārila, and Vāchaspati (A.D. 841) commented on him. It is clear that the Buddhist Dharmakirti, Kumārila and his pupils Maṇḍana Prabhañjana and Umveka, Śaṅkara and his pupils Suresvara and Padmapāda, the Jain Vidyānanda and the great scholiast Vāchaspati formed a brilliant galaxy within a few decades of one another. The internal evidence in the writings of Śaṅkara is extremely meagre; his mention of kings Pūrṇavarman, Balavarman, Jayasimha and Krishṇagupta, and even his observation (I. iii. 33) that there was no emperor (sārvabhauma kṣhatriya) in his day have not been found particularly helpful.

The elements of thought that Śaṅkara worked up into a cogent system had already come up before his time. Among Śaṅkara’s works, his bhāshyas on the Brahma sūtras and nine major Upanishads are on all hands accepted as genuine; doubts have been cast, not with good reason, upon the bhāshyas on the Maṇḍūkya and Gaudapāda-kārikās and on the Bhagavad-gitā. Of the minor works associated with his name, the U’padeśa-sūhasri in prose and verse is authenticated not only by his pupil Suresvara in his Naishkarmya-siddhi, but by Bhāskara also who cites it in his Gītā-bhāshya as Śaṅkara’s work. The Dakshīṇāṁurtistotra, a doctrinal hymn, commented on by Suresvara may also be genuine, though some critics see in this a Praty-abhijñā work. Of the Viveka-chuḍāmani and a large number of short prakaraṇas and stotras we can have no certainty. Before taking leave of Śaṅkara, attention must be invited to his great contribution in the doctrine of jīvan-mukta, as against the views of Maṇḍana and others. The jīvan-mukta, one who has attained salvation in life, is the same as the sthita-prajña of the Bhagavad-gitā. The ideal is as splendid as that of the Bodhisattva, and Śaṅkara appears not only to argue its
perfect possibility, but to claim that he had actually attained it (IV. 1. 15).

Some attention is due to Maṇḍana whose contributions to grammar and Mīmāṁsā have been already noticed. He was the last representative of pre-Saṅkara phases of Advaita, and the tradition which identifies him with Saṅkara’s pupil Sureśvara is demonstrably wrong, as the two writers exhibit vital differences, and Sureśvara actually refers to Maṇḍana in sarcastic terms. Maṇḍana was an independent writer and an eclectic with reference to Vyākaraṇa, Nyāya and Mīmāṁsā. His greatest work is the Brahmasiddhi comprising verses and prose gloss.

Tradition remembers four pupils of Saṅkara. Sureśvara is the best known among them. He is believed to be the same as Viśvarūpa, who commented on Yājñavalkya-sūrīti. He is the author of Vārttikas on Saṅkara’s bhāṣyas on the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Taittirīya Upanishads, of a commentary on Saṅkara’s hymn on Dakshaṇāmūrti, and of an independent treatise called Naishkarmyasiddhi; a Paṇḍikaranavārttika is also ascribed to him. On Saṅkara’s bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtras, another pupil, Padmapāda wrote a super-commentary called pañcha-pādikā, covering only the first four sūtras. A third pupil Hastāmalaka has to his credit a stotra in twelve verses on the nature of Ātman and the identity of the individual self with the supreme self. The fourth pupil Toṭakāchārya gets his name from the metre in which he composed a hymn in praise of his teacher: a prakaraṇa in 178 verses in the same metre is also ascribed to him. It is called Sruti-sāra-samuddhāraṇa and gives the essence of upanishadic teachings in the form of a dialogue between a teacher and his pupil.

Vāchaspati Miśra’s work constitutes the next landmark in the history of Advaita. He commented on both Maṇḍana and Saṅkara and essayed to bridge the gulf between them, but he got little thanks from the closer followers of Saṅkara who regarded him as a slave of Maṇḍana’s theories. In fact Advaita Vedānta split up into two schools—one known as Bhāmati-prasthāna after the name of Vāchaspati’s commentary on Saṅkara, and the other Vivaraṇa-prasthāna from the commentary Vivaraṇa of Prakāśatman on the Pañcha-pādikā of Padmapāda.

There came up a number of general works of the nature of easy manuals combining Yoga material with Vedānta in the form of dialogues and associated with the names of sages and epic characters; these need not be noticed in detail. The Yoga-Yājñavalkya may serve as an example of this class; it is a dialogue between the sage and his wife Gärgī, and, like the Bhagavad-gītā which it lays
under contribution, calls itself a Gītā and Upanishad. Possibly taking its name after this text the Yoga-vāsishṭha in which sage Vasishṭha figures as the teacher is a voluminous work in a highly poetic diction on advanced Advaita incorporating a number of other texts and some of the minor works now ascribed to Saṅkara. In its present form it may be assigned to the tenth century, though the kernel of it may be of a slightly earlier time.

Reaction against Saṅkara was strong and immediate. Bhāskara revived the older theories of bhedābheda and Brahma-parināma as against the Advaita metaphysics of Saṅkara, and opposed the new order of Ekadaṇḍī-sannyāsa which advocated complete renunciation including the casting away of the sacred thread and tuft as against the time-honoured Tridaṇḍī-sannyāsa. Bhāskara’s bhāshya on the Brahma-sūtras, which reproduces Saṅkara freely except where it differs, has been published.

4. Technical and Scientific Literature

(A) GRAMMAR, LEXICOGRAPHY AND PROSODY

The study of grammar was pursued in an earnest spirit, though no outstanding work was produced during the period. King Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (p. 536) is said to have studied the subject under Kṣīra. Several commentaries were written on well-known grammatical works. The earliest commentary on the entire Vākyapadiya was perhaps that of Vrishabhadeva, patronized by Vishnugupta who may be identified with the later Gupta king of that name (p. 602). The Vivaranapāṇijīka or Nyāsa by Sthavira Jinendrabuddhi is an extensive commentary on the Kāśikā. Nyāsa is however a genuine name for a type of grammatical exegesis and Jinendrabuddhi himself speaks of Nyāsikās (VI. 1. 8). He may have written about A.D. 800 and his work is mentioned in an inscription in Champā bearing the date A.D. 918. The Bhāgavṛitti was, according to Rāyamukuta, a rival to the Kāśikā, more loyal to the Mahābhāṣya; it cites Bharṭrihari and criticises Māgha and may have been written about A.D. 900. Yet another Vṛtti on Pāṇini was composed by the celebrated logician of Kashmir Bhaṭṭa Jayanta (end of ninth century) who mentions the work in the prologue to his unpublished philosophical play Šaṃmata-nāṭaka.

Ratnasrījīnāna or Ratnamati, author of Sabdārthachintī, wrote a commentary Paṇjikā on the Chandra in the tenth or eleventh century in Ceylon. The Jainendra-Vyākaraṇa of Devanandin alias Pujyapāda, usually assigned to the latter part of the fifth century, but perhaps earlier still, is known in two recensions, a shorter authentic one and a longer amplification of it. It condenses Pāṇini with the aid of new
monosyllabic technical terms, and has a commentary by Abhayandain (c. A.D. 750) who follows the shorter version. The Śākatāyana-Vyākaraṇa with the Amoghavṛitti on it is of the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarsha I. Having about 3200 ślokas the work is a forerunner of the later recasts of Pāṇini arranged under topics. It was drawn upon by Hemachandra for his Haima Vyākaraṇa. A gloss by Durgāśīṁha (c. eighth century) on the non-paninian Kālantra also belongs to this period.

In lexicography, a Nāmāmulā is cited by the rhetorician Vāmana (I. 35), and a Nāmaratnamālā by Viśvarūpa in his commentary on Yājñavalkya (II. 266). Among other lexicons of the period may be mentioned Śāsvata’s Anekārthasamuchchaya (ninth century?); Paryāyaratnamālā, a medical dictionary of about the same age, by the physician Mādhavakara of Silahrada, son of Indrakara, author of Rugvinīścaya; Anekārthadhvani-muñjari called in some manuscripts Subdaratnapradipa of Kshapanaka, a contemporary of Kālidāsa according to tradition; the Abhidhānaratnamālā of Halāyudha who wrote his Kavirahasya on Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishna III; a Nāmāmulā of synonyms and homonyms of Dhananāya, a Jaina poet who is referred to by Bhoja in his Sṛṅgāraprakāśa; and a Nānārthakośa of the Jaina Asaṅga (c. 988) known from a manuscript in Warangal, are other lexicons of the period.

In prosody we have the Janāśrayī, probably by the Vishnuṇaṃdīn ruler Mādāvā-varman II Janāśraya (585-615), or perhaps a work of Gāṇasvāmin dedicated to him; it cited Bhaṇavi and may safely be placed c. A.D. 600. It names a few new metres and its code words for ganas are not confined to three syllables, but include those of two, four, five and six syllables. The ascription of Sṛutabodha to Kālidāsa cannot be accepted. The Bṛihatsanikhīta affords a text on metrics (ch. CIII) and Bhaṭṭotpala comments elaborately on it with the aid of other authorities. Jayadeva’s Chhandas cited by Utpala was known to Vākpatirāja according to the commentary on the Gaudacāho. The work was commented on by Harshaṭa, son of Bhaṭṭa Mukula, possibly the same as Kallaṭa’s son who wrote his excellent commentary Mṛitas-aṅīvanī on Piṅgala’s sūtras, and the Jaina logician Ratanākaraśānti composed the Chhandoratnākara which is preserved in Tibetan.

(B) POETICS AND DRAMATURGY

Literary and dramatic criticism made great progress during the period. Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra was followed by Kohala who codified the new operatic forms that arose after Bharata and were partly inspired by folk forms; he called them uparūpaka and gave them a
place by Bharata’s rūpaka. We do not have his text, but Abhinavagupta’s observations lead us to infer that Kohala’s amplifications came to be incorporated in Bharata’s text as its last chapter under the name uttara-tantra. In the middle of the sixth century Mātrigupta, afterwards king of Kashmir, produced an elaborate work on Nātyaśāstra in anushṭup verse which, as the late commentator Rāghavabhaṭṭa discloses, collected a wide variety of views of the post-Bharata period and discussed them with originality and acumen; the work is quoted by Abhinavagupta and Sāgaranandin. Another early writer was Śrīharsha whose Vārttika on Nāṭya was available only in a fragment comprising the first six chapters even to Abhinavagupta, who also cites frequently another work on Nāṭya by Rāhula, a Buddhist. Jayāpiḍa of Kashmir developed a taste for Nāṭya during his early wanderings in Pundravardhana where he fell in love with a temple courtesan named Kamalā. As king of Kashmir he got one of his courtiers Udbhata to expound Bharata in a systematic commentary. Udbhata was followed by Lollaṭa, son of Aparājita, by Saṅkuka perhaps the same as the author of Bhuvanābhujudaya, and above all by the illustrious Abhinavagupta, whose work Abhinavabhūratī which falls in the next period, yields much valuable information on the early history of dramaturgy and has conserved the names of many authors otherwise unknown.

In Bharata poetics occupied a small place; but it was soon developed separately by many rhetoricians, such as Kāśyapa and Vararuchi. Subandhu, Bāṇa and Bhāravi bear indirect testimony to the flourishing state of criticism after Bharata by their references to many major concepts like sauṣābdya, guna, uprekhā, ākshepa and so on in their works. The relation between word and sense, and the refinement of the former and richness of the latter formed leading subjects of discussion at the time.

Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin are the earliest extant authors in the field of rhetoric. Though they differ among themselves they form a trinity. Bhaṭṭi in his Rāvanavadha, already mentioned, deals with figures of sound and sense, the quality of sweetness, sauṣābdya and other topics in the cantos (X-XIV) called Prasanna-kāṇḍa, i.e., the section embodying the quality of prasāda (grace and clarity). Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha agree in several respects, but as Bhāmaha makes an adverse reference to poetic works such as Bhaṭṭi, the agreement must be taken to be due to both drawing upon a common source. The relation between Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin is also similar; they both belonged to the latter part of the seventh century, and their texts show that already there were two different traditions, Bhāmaha following one and Daṇḍin the other. Bhāmaha on the whole repre-
sents an earlier phase of development than Daṇḍin. He gives figures of speech in bunches, suggesting stages through which the figures increased from the form mentioned by Bharata. He attached importance to figures and was the earliest to emphasise the charm of form as the essence of poetic expression which he called vakra (expression with a charming turn), a term which hardly seems to do justice to the high poetic ideal that underlies his critique on the two styles known as Gaṇḍī (Eastern) and Vaidarbhī (Southern).

Daṇḍin expounded a different school of thought in his Kāvyādāra, his emphasis being on the two styles of composition and ten qualities of expression which are the basis of this distinction. He favoured the Vaidarbhī (Southern) manner in which grace, simplicity, clarity, moderation etc., were the dominant features as against the involved expression, bombast, hyperbole, long compounds etc., which marked the Gaṇḍī (eastern) style. He went into detailed sub-classes on figures of speech and treated of the sixty-four arts (Kalās) in his Kalāparichchhedā, not a separate work as was thought till recently, but the missing last chapter of the Kāvyādāra. Daṇḍin, an accomplished poet himself, became the maker of literary criticism in the South where the Kannada Kavirāja-mārga, the Tamil Daṇḍiyalangaram, and the Sinhalese Siwa-bas-lakara were all based on his Kāvyādāra, a name taken over bodily for an old Javanese work on the grammar of poetry.

In Kashmir Udbhāta commented on Bhāmaha’s Alankāra and compiled the Kāvyālankāra-sūtra-saṅgraha, a compendium of figures. His contemporary Vāmana, a minister, took a different point of view in his Kāvyālankāra-sūtra and its Vṛtti, following Daṇḍin and laying stress on style and its qualities rather than on Alankāra (figures of speech). Udbhāta commenting on Bhāmaha pointed out the existence of two distinct meanings of words, the primary and the secondary, and spoke also of an implicatory capacity of words, exclusive of the expressed sense; this soon led to the elucidation of the third, the highest and most artistic signifcatory capacity of words—suggestion or dhyāni—which became the basis of the new school of criticism founded by Ānandavardhanas. Rudrāta and Rudra, often confused the one with the other by ancient writers as well as modern scholars, preceded Ānandavardhana and helped the growth of his system of thought. Rudrāta, in his work, Alankāra, dealt with rasas in detail as part of poetics, and Rudra Bhaṭṭa carried this new stress on rasa one stage further, thus effecting a departure from the practice of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana who assigned it quite a subordinate place. This brought poetics and dramaturgy nearer, and paved the way for Ānandavardhana effecting a revolution in the very conception of
poetry and its enjoyment by doing away with the ancient dichotomies between drama and poetry, prose and verse, poet and critic. All the resources of the literary craft, from the crude jingle onwards, were duly organized and intelligibly explained as subserving the primary poetic end; Dhvani or Vyañjanā, as the principle of expressing or realising an idea by leaving it out of the scope of express statement and deriving it by the infinite capacity of language to suggest, was called the ‘soul’ of poetic expression, because it comprehended the whole realm of a poet’s expression; but really Rasa or Rasa-dhvani was the most important, and it was through Ānandavardhana that the ancient rasa doctrine got re-enthroned. While formulating the technical aspects of Dhvani, Ānandavardhana did not forget the essential requisite of beauty; in fact by its sidelights and the argument drawn from the allied artistic field of music, the Dhvanyāloka forms the main classic of Indian aesthetics.

Ānandavardhana’s doctrine evoked much criticism from his elder contemporary Manoratha, from Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka—a literary critic with predilections to Mīmāṃsā—and from the logician Jayanta Bhaṭṭa who in his Nyāya-maṇjarī dismissed Ānandavardhana as a mere literary critic not worth serious consideration. But this was wrong, as the author of Dhvanyāloka also wrote a gloss on Dharmakīrti’s Viniśchaya, a work of Buddhist metaphysics, besides an original treatise Tatvaloka in which, among other things, he elucidated the exact manner in which Kāvyā (poetry) differed from sāstra (scientific treatise). Mukula Bhaṭṭa, in the early tenth century, was another opponent of Dhvani in Kashmir who wrote a brief tract in verse and a prose gloss called Abhidhāvrittimārtikā; his pupil Pratihārendurāja from Konkan supported him by reviving Udbhāṭa’s views and arguing that Dhvani was comprehended by lakṣanā. Mukula seems also to have resuscitated Vāmana’s work which had gone out of vogue. In his Hṛdayadarpana Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka accepted Dhvani as one of the elements of charm, but could not see how it was all in all. He too held rasa to be supreme and gave out many valuable ideas besides on the function of poetry, on the distinction between poetry and other forms of expression and so on, all of which were accepted by Abhinavagupta later. Nāyaka flourished under king Saṅkaravarman and was praised by Kalhaṇa for his learning. Lastly, Rājaśekhara’s Kavyamīmāṃsa planned on an extensive and comprehensive scale on the basis of Rudraṭa’s scheme has survived only in its initial chapter; the encyclopaedic nature of Rājaśekhara’s learning so well attested by this magnificent fragment puts an edge on one’s sense of loss at the disappearance of the bulk of the work.
(C) MEDICINE

I-tsing noticed the study of medicine in Nālandā and Vikramasīla and refers to an author who lately put together the medical science in eight sections; Hoernle suggested that this author was Vāgbhaṭa, author of Ashtāṅga-saṁgraha, and this has generally been accepted. A more recent opinion is that the reference is to the later Vāgbhaṭa and his Ashtāṅga-hridaya, the earlier one of that name being a pre-Yājñavalkya author. In Vāgbhaṭa’s name we have another work Rasaratna-samuchchaya. In fact there is great uncertainty about the number of writers bearing the name Vāgbhaṭa and their chronology. One of them is described as a Rājarṣi ruling from Mahājāhnu. And P. C. Ray considers the Rasaratna-samuchchaya a work of the latter part of the thirteenth century.

In 1938 was recovered by excavation in Gilgit a leaf of a Nyāsa on Kharanāda’s lost work; the fragment may be dated between the seventh and ninth century; the original work Kharanāda is extensively quoted by later commentators. In the eighth century Charaka, Suśruta and Ashtāṅga-hridaya were rendered into Tibetan and Arabic. Drīḍhabala of Pañchanāda in Kashmir revised the text of the Charaka-saṁhitā, and added to it seventeen chapters in book VI and the whole of books VII and VIII. Mādhava or Mādhavakara, placed by Hoernle in the eighth century, along with Vāgbhaṭa II and Drīḍhabala, was a native of Silahrāda and author of several works. His father Indukara may have been the same as Indu, author of a medical lexicon quoted by Kshirasvāmin, and of commentaries on both Ashtāṅga-saṁgraha and Ashtāṅga-hridaya. The best known work of Mādhava is the Nidāna or Ruviniścaya on nathology, translated into Arabic under Harun-Al-Rashid (A.D. 786-808). Mādhava did not know Drīḍhabala’s text of Charaka. His other works are: Chikitsā which mentions the Nidāna, the short Kūtamudgara, the medical lexicon Paryāyaratnamālā, a Vārttika on Suśruta, Dravyagūna, and Yogavyākhyā. Jajjāṭa or Jaivata, pupil of Vāgbhaṭa II, wrote commentaries on Suśruta and Charaka; he mentions several older commentators on Charaka, including Bhattāra Harichandra whose commentary has survived. Tisaṭā, son of Vāgbhaṭa II, was responsible for the Chikitsā- kalikā or Yoga-mālā, and his son Chandraṭa for a commentary on his father’s work, an edition (pataḥ-suddhi) of Suśruta, and the Yogaratna-samuchchaya; he mentions several medical works otherwise unknown Brinda of East Bengal wrote his Siddha-yoga between A.D. 973 and 1000.

Ugrāditya, the Jaina author of Kalyāṇakāraka, says (XX. 87) that he wrote his work at Rāmagiri in the territory of the Lord of Vengi and
Trikaliṅga. At the end of it he says that he argued the futility of meat eating in the midst of scholars in the court of Nṛipatuniga Vallabha, i.e., Amoghavarsha I. He says that his work is the essence of the Jaina medical literature comprising a work on Sālākya by Pujvapāda, on Śalvatantra by Patravāmin (Vidyānanda), on Vīsha by Siddhasena, on Kāvāchikitsā by Daśarathaguru, on Śīśu-Chikitsā by Meghanāda, on Vṛishya by Sīnhanāda, and on the entire Ashṭāṅga by Samantabhadra.

Buddhadāsa, king of Ceylon at the end of the fourth century, was himself a surgeon and physician, appointed a doctor for every ten villages in his kingdom, and wrote in Sanskrit the medical treatise Sārārtha-sāṃgraha, a work mentioned in the Pagan inscription of 1442.

A good number of works on veterinary science ascribed to mythical authors are known. That there were writers on elephantology before Kālidāsa appears from his Rāghuvāṃśika (VI. 27); a treatise on the same subject Rājaputrīya ascribed to Buddha is mentioned in the Māṭṣya Purāṇa (XXIV. 2-3). Of historical authors on horses and elephants many are known, but not their dates: Jayadatta, son of Vijayadatta (Āśvavaidyaka), Dīpankaram, son of Nanakara, perhaps a Buddhist (Āśvavaidyaka), Gaṇa, son of Durlabh (Śiddhāyoga-sāra-sāṃgraha). There is at least one work Hastivaidyaka of Viśasoma which is quoted by Bhāṭṭotpala, and this gives some idea of its chronological position.

(D) ASTRONOMY AND MATHEMATICS

In Astronomy and Mathematics the greatest writer during the period was Brahmagupta. He wrote the Brahma-sphuṭa-siddhānta in A.D. 628 when he was thirtv. He criticised the followers of the Romakasiddhānta for not following the Purānic division of time. He was the son of Jishnu of the Bhilamāla family and wrote under king Vyāghramukha of the Chāpa family. Two of his works, Brahma-sphuṭa and Khaṇḍakhādyā were translated into Arabic in A.D. 773. Alberuni mentions two works Brihan-mānas of Manu and Laghu-mānas of Pu(Mu)ṇijala, a southerner. The Laghu-mānas of Muṇijala (or Muṇjulāchārya) is a short treatise in 60 verses; its calculations are for A.D. 662, and from its opening verse it would seem that the Brihan-mānas was also his work. On the Laghu-mānas there was a commentary by Praśastidhara. Lalla (c. 638), son of Trivikrama, wrote the (Sishya) Dhiwriddhi-tantra, a well-known work besides the others referred to by Bhāskarāchārya, a Paṭigaṇita and a treatise on Phalita. A commentary of his Khaṇḍakhādyā or Triṣatikā on algebra, flourished about A.D. 750. The Jain Mahāvīrāchārya wrote his Gaṇitasāra-sāṃgraha under Amoghavarsha I Rāshtrakūṭa,
Saṅkaranārāyaṇa wrote his commentary on Laghubhāskarīya in 869 under Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara of Quilon. The author records his patron’s interest in astronomy and the erection of an observatory by him at Mahodayapura and a clock in the Balakridēśvara near by. He mentions many early authors and works. Āryabhaṭa II (c. 950) wrote the Āryasiddhānta. Bhaṭṭa Utpala, a Kashmirian is best known as the commentator of Varāhamihira’s works. The commentary on Brihajjātaka was written in 966. He also commented on the Shatpaṃchāśikā of Varāhamihira’s son, the Khandakhāḍīya of Brahmagupta, and according to Alberuni, on the Brihannāmāṇīsā. Vāstuvidyā, a Horāśāstra in 75 verses, two treatises on Karana and Praśna mentioned by Alberuni are his independent works. The Gūḍhamaṇa of Alberuni is evidently the Jáñamālā on Praśna mentioned by the author himself in his Shatpaṃchāśikā-Vyākhyā and known from manuscripts. Utpala appears to have supplemented Kalvāṇavarman’s Sārāvalī, a fact mentioned in a Bombay manuscript of the work, and earned the title ‘Sārāvalipūraka’. He quotes extensively from Sārāvalī. Another commentator whom Dikshit places c. A.D. 978 is Caturveda Prithūdakasvāmin, mentioned by Alberuni. He commented on both the works of Brahmagupta, and seems to have known Mahāvīrachārya’s work. Apte mentions a commentary of his on the Laghumāṇasa also.

(E) MISCELLANEOUS

The paucity of technical Arthaśāstra literature in our period was perhaps due in part to the incorporation of Artha matter in the Dharma-śāstras and Purāṇas, not to speak of its popularisation in Kāvya works and others like Paṅchatantra, Nitiśataka of Bhartrihari and so on, but partly also to a moral revolt against its immoral teachings reflected in the literature of the time. A Nitiśāstra by Māthara is mentioned among works useful to a judge in the bhāshya on the third Chhadasūtra, Vyavahāra, of the Jaina canon dating from the sixth century. Two other important works are the Nitiśāra of Kāmandaka which is a metrical resume of Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra, the Nitiśākyāṃṛita of Somadevasūri, a moralised version of Kauṭilya’s doctrines. The former was probably a product of the Gupta age and the latter is a tenth-century work written perhaps for king Mahendrapāla II of Kanauj.

The province of Kāmāśāstra was heavily invaded by the rhetorical works which dwelt at length on various aspects of Śrīgāra-ṛasa: still this branch fared a little better than Artha. The earliest work in the period we hear of was a commentary on the sūtras of Dattaka
by the Gaṅga prince Mādhavavarman II (fourth century). Another
lost work, but much better authenticated, is the Guṇapataka, men-
tioned not only in later commentaries, but by Kokkaka who draws
upon it thrice in his Ratirahasya. Guṇapataka derives its names per-
haps from a courtezan the answers to whose questions by Māladeva
constitute the work. One of the most interesting works of this period
is the Haramekhalā written in Prakrit by Mahuka or Maghaka, son
of Mādhava and grandson of poet Manḍana; it was produced at
Chitrakūṭa (Chitor) in the reign of king Dharanīvarāha. The author
gives the date 887 at the end which the Sanskrit commentator re-
fers to the Vikrama era; but it is the Śaka era and corresponds to
A.D. 965 when the Paramāra Dharanīvarāha was ruling in Marvar.
From the manuscript of the work in Nepal it is seen that Mahuka
belonged to Bhīllamāla and to the family of Māgha. The work con-
tains recipes for medicinal, toilette, health and love purposes, be-
sides others calculated to harass and destroy others to attract and
captivate them, for ointments, smokes for destroying mosquitoes,
flies and reptiles, for increasing memory and intelligence, and for
counteracting poisons; yet others are meant as maternity aids and
aids to the growth of horses, trees and creepers. There is also a
nighanṭu (glossary) at the end of the names occurring in the recipes.
The work attained quick recognition, and was drawn upon by some
Tantra works like the Kakshapuṭa and cited by Kṣhūrvāmin who
called it Haramekhalatāntra in his commentary on the Amarakośa;
it is also cited in the section on enticement in the Ratirahasya by
Kokkaka, the most noteworthy author on Kāmaśāstra after Vātsyā-
yana. Kokkaka was the son of a poet Gadyavidyādhara, and wrote
his work for the delight of one Vainyadatta. Usually the work is
assigned a date later than our period, but it is cited in the comment-
tary Jayamaṅgala (on Vātsyāyana) which is known to Bhoja; and
possibly there is also an indirect reference to it in Somadeva’s Yaśas-
tilaka (A.D. 959). The Rativilāsa cited by Bhoja as an example of a
Kāmaśāstra treatise in Kāvya form is a work of a different type which
most probably falls within our period. It is cited in Māṅkha’s Kośa.

The literature of music (and dance) is closely allied to that of
Nāṭya (dramaturgy) which has been reviewed along with rhetoric
(Ālaṅkāra). Kohala’s work, for instance, covered the field of music
also, and Màṭanga cites from him often. The steps in the transi-
tion from the Gāndharva or Mārga style of music to Gaṇa or Deśi,
and from the earlier melodic types called to Jātis to Rāgas of popu-
lar origin are obscure. Bharata does not know of Rāgas; the epic
rhapsodies were not sung to them, but to the seven old Jātis. A few
Rāgas come into view in the Sikṣā of Nārada, and Kālidāsa men-
tions just one specimen In this transition we hear of a large number of texts associated with the names of gods and sages; they are mostly known only from citations by later authors and most probably fall within our period. They fall into three groups, viz., those that belong to the older Gāndharva stage such as Kambala-Aśvatara, and Dattila; those that belong to the early Deśī stage—Kāśyapa, Sārdūla, Yashṭika, Durgāsakti and Mātaṅga; those that are very much later, like Aśiyaneya. A fragment of Dattila is known; parts of the saṁhitās of Sārdūla and Yashṭika, are found in the Mātaṅga text. Kambala and Aśvatara are two Nāgas who, according to the Māra-kandeya Purāṇa, propitiated Siva with a class of Gāndharva songs called Kapāla and Kambala.

Some interval must be taken to separate Kāśyapa and Mātaṅga from Nārada and Kālidāsa. Though Kāśyapa’s work is lost (Nāyadeva quotes from a Brihat Kāśyapa) a long citation from him by Abhinavagupta shows that, among other things, Kāśyapa dealt at length with the interesting question of the connection between particular Rāgas and Rāsas. Mātaṅga’s work which marks the next important stage bears the significant name Brihaddeśī, the big book of popular music. Mātaṅga quotes the Dhātupātha as codified by Bhi-masena (A.D. 600) and is clearly earlier than Dāmodaragupta (c. 800), author of Kuṭṭanīmata. Rudraṭa also wrote on music as Abhinava-gupta shows, and Bindurāja and Kshetrarāja are other writers of the period.

In the literature of other arts, the Mānasāra, the leading text on architecture, has been assigned to A.D. 500-700. Bhaṭṭa Utpala wrote a work on Vāstuvidyā which he quotes in his commentary on the corresponding chapters (52-57) of the Brihatasāṁhitā. On cosmetics, besides the information given in the Purāṇas, we hear of a work called Lokesvara cited as a gandhaśāstra by Padmaśri in his work on erotics (eleventh century). The Vishnudharmottara gives much attention to painting and iconography; an independent work on painting was the Chitrāsūtra mentioned by Dāmodaragupta (Kuṭṭanīmata, 124)

141. PRĀKRIT AND PĀL LITERATURE

Prākrit as a literary medium became stylized and fixed by means of Prākrit grammars in the same way as Sanskrit. Māhārāṣṭri being treated at length and the other varieties more briefly and on the basis of Māhārāṣṭrī. Vararuchi and Chaṇḍa are the earliest Prākrit grammarians now known; the former may be assigned to the fifth or sixth century A.D. and there is a gloss on his work by a Bhāmaha who is generally identified with the rhetorician though with no tan-
gieble proof. Chanda's Prakrit-Lakshana is taken by Hoernle to have preceded Vararuchi, though it was amplified later; but Gune thinks that Chanda wrote sometime after the sixth century A.D. when Apabhramsha had ceased to be a spoken language and had become a literary language like the Prakrits, its place in popular speech being taken by the incipient modern Indian languages of the Indo-Aryan group.

The Setubandha or Ravanavadha, written in Mahrashtri Prakrit and ascribed to Pravarasena identified by some with Vakataka Pravarasena II, is the earliest Prakrit poem we possess. Dandin calls it 'an ocean of gems of poetry,' and tradition associates Kalidasa with the poem which may be no more than a tribute to its merit. Vakpatiraja (styled Kaviraja) of the court of Yashovarman of Kanauj (c 700-25) wrote the Gaudavaho in Mahrashtri. This long poem treats of Yashovarman's victorious military campaigns and the death of the Gauda king in battle. Its commentator Bhatta Upendra Haripala calls his text Gaudavahosara, which may indicate that it is an abridgement of a longer original. An earlier and better poem of Vakpati which he himself mentions was Mahumahavijaya, possibly the same as the Prakrit poem Madhumathanavijaya mentioned by Anandavardhana and quoted by Alhinaavagupta and Bhoja. Jain story books associate Vakpati with Bapta Bhatti and refer to his imprisonment in early life and eventual retirement as a recluse. Harivijaya of Sarvasena, known to Anandavardhana, Kuntaka and Bhoja, was perhaps the most famous of the lost Prakrit kavyas; it was also in Mahrashtri and according to Bhoja carried the sign-word 'utsaha' in the last verse of each canto; Kuntaka classes Sarvasena with Kalidasa as an example of the graceful style. Anandavardhana himself wrote a Prakrit poem on the exploits of Kama, Vishwanabandila quoted more than once in his Dhvanyaloka. Marichavadha and Ravanavijaya are two other Prakrit poems named by Bhoja and others. The well-known Lilavati is a Prakrit Katha in verse (c. A.D. 800) by an unknown poet, son of a Bhashana Bhatta, dealing with the marriage of Hala Satavahana with a Sinhalese princess; Bhoja mentions a Suddarakathaka and cites a short Prakrit passage from it. He has also preserved the names of some other types in Prakrit like the Khandakath (in verse), Kshudrakathaka (in prose) and Pravahilik (mixed prose and verse with some Sanskrit passages also), as of Apabhramsha works as well.

Hala's anthology Sattasa (seven hundred) attests the early accumulation of large numbers of stray lyrics, muktakas by learned and aesthetic authors, adepts in the art of love. These verses, known 'alia' among Prakrit poets, doubtlessly continues to be composed in
our period and possibly some found their way into the anthology that passes under the name of Hāla.

The saṭṭaka (corresponding to Sanskrit nāṭīkā) is represented by Rājaśekhara’s Karpīramanjarī which employs Māhrāṣṭrī and Sauraseni, and presents in four acts called yavanikāntaras, a romance of love variegated by the elements of wonder, magic, festival and dance. Some late imitations of the work are known. Prākrit was employed in texts dealing with technical and arts subjects like polity, love, cosmetics, omens, rearing of animals and so on.

From the beginning the Jains had a predilection for Prākrit, the Digambaras preferring Sauraseni related to the Ardhamāgadhī of their canon, and the Śvetāmbaras a variety of Māhrāṣṭrī. The earliest Jain Māhrāṣṭrī work in this period was the voluminous Vasudevahīndī, written in the beginning of the sixth century a.d. by Saṅghadāsa and Dharmasena in a hundred lambakas and giving the Jain version of the Harivamśa and the wanderings of Krishna-Vāsudeva. A version of the Brihatkathā is also imbedded in it. The versatile and prolific Haribhadra flourished in the first part of the eighth century. Originally a Brāhmin, he assumed the title Virahūṅka when two nephews of his, who were also his pupils were destroyed by the hostile Buddhists. His Samarāichcha-kahā deals with Retribution, Nidāna or Karmavipāka, in the story of two inimically disposed persons traced through nine births. In his Dhūrtākhyāna Haribhadra parodies the miraculous stories in the Brahmanical Purāṇas and epics to cast ridicule upon them; the language here shows traces of Ardhamāgadhī. Other works of the poet known only by name are; Munipati-charita, Yaśodhara-charita and Virāṅgadā-kathā. The Kuvalayamālā of Uddvotana, pupil of Haribhadra, is a more important story book. The author, also known as Dākshina-chīnna, was a Kshatriya of the lunar line, descendant of a Devagupta, author of Tripurusha-charita. Uddvotana wrote his work in a.d. 779 at the temple erected by one of his teachers Virahhadra at Jāhālipura (Jhālor in Marwar) when Vatsarāja of the Pratihāras was ruling there. Though it is in Jain Māhrāṣṭrī, it uses Paiṣāchī and Apabhramśa, and illustrates all the eighteen deśa-bhāṣās (dialects) with the peculiarities of the men speaking them. It refers to a number of authors and works otherwise unknown to different classes of kathās like ullapa, pariḥāsa and vāra not noticed by Ānandavardhana and Bhoja, the features of all of which are combined in this saṅkīrṇa (mixed) kathā in champū form. In a.d. 868 Śilāchārya produced Chaupanna Mahāpurīṣacharita on the fifty-three saints. His real name was Vimalamāṭi and he mentions an one-act play of his called Vibudhā nanda. Vijayasiṁhasūri wrote a Bhuvanasundarikathā in a.d. 917
and the short Kālakāchārya-Kathānaka may be assigned to the tenth century.

Pushpadanta, originally a Kāśyapa Brahmin of Saiva faith, became the leading Apabhraṃśa poet after he took to Jainism. He was patronized by Bharata, minister of Krishṇa III (Rāśṭrakūṭa) and by Nanna, Bharata's son. His first and most important work was the Mahāpurāṇa or Tisaṭṭhi-mahā-purisagāṇāṇkāra began in 959 and completed in 965. The author claims that in this work could be found the characteristics of all Prākrits, polity, metrics, figures of speech, in fact everything in the world of Jainism. Pushpadanta himself added a Mūla-tīkā (original notes) on which Prabhāchandra based his commentary. The work consists of two parts, an Ādiapurāṇa in 37 and a Uttarapurāṇa in 65 chapters. Two shorter Apabhraṃśa works of the author were a Nīyakumārachāri and a Jasanarachāri (Yaśodharacharita) the latter handling the same theme as Somdevasūrī's Sanskrit champū (Yaśastilaka) written about the same time. Among the authors mentioned by Pushpadanta is the important writer Svayambhū whose Harivāṃśa-purāṇa and Paśimachāri were both left incomplete and completed by his son Tribhuvana Svayambhū.

Asaga, another predecessor of Pushpadanta, wrote the Viracharita or Vardhamāna-kavya between 853 and 988. Dhaivala wrote a Harivāṃśapurāṇa in which he mentions many authors and works; some of these are referred to by other writers also. Other Apabhraṃśa works produced at the end of our period are Harishena's Dharma-parīkṣā (A.D. 968) based on the earlier Prākrit work of Javaraṇa, and the Bhavishyatka-kathā of the Bania poet Dhanapāla on the fortunes and final nirvāṇa of a merchant prince. The dohās of Saraha and Krishṇa (c. A.D. 700) shows that the Buddhists of the East also employed Apabhraṃśa.

In Prākrit didactic poetry we have the Upadeśa-pada of the well-known Haribhadra, with a commentary by Vardhamāna (A.D. 998) and the Upadeśa-mālā in 542 gāthās by Dharmadāsagāmi with the commentaries of Siddharshī (ninth century) and of Jayasiṃha, whose Dharmopadeśa-mālā with his own gloss (856) is another important work of the same class. Jayasiṃha wrote it under a Bhoja of Kanauj, doubtlessly the famous Prāthīhāra Mihira Bhoja. In hymnology may be noted Mānatiṅga's Bhavahara and Parameshthī stavas, Nandisaṇa's Ajita-Sānti-stava, and Dhanapāla's Rishabhha-paṅchāśikā and Virastava. Dhanapāla also composed for his younger sister Sundarī a lexicon in 275 verses called Pāiyalachchhi (Prākritā Lakṣmī) which mentions the Paramāra raid on Mānvakheṭa (A.D. 972). In prosody, Virahāṅka wrote the Vṛttā-jāti-samuchchaya in the ninth century; in the next
century we have besides Svayambhū's work already mentioned Nanditādhyā's Gāthā-lakṣaṇa. All these writers adopt their own methods of scansion and ignore yatī (caesura). Svayambhū defines even Sanskrit metres by mātras and quotes fifty authors in Prākṛit and Apabhraṃśa, including two poetesses Rāhā and Vijjā. Virahāṅka defines Sanskrit metres in Sanskrit and Prākṛit metres in Prākṛit, and observes that the same metre is sometimes known by different names and that there is no end to metrical varieties as poets invent new forms every day.

Pāli witnessed little development on the purely literary side and was more or less confined to the religion and philosophy of Buddhism. The oldest grammar of Pāli and some chronicles of Ceylon however deserve to be noticed here. Kachchāyana's Pāli grammar was, according to Geiger, later than Buddhaghosha and Dharmapāla. Buddhaghosha does not follow Kacchāyana whose work shows the use of Pāṇini, Kātantra and even the Kāśikā. Kachchāyana was a South Indian according to the Talaing records of Burma, and two other grammatical works are said to be his, viz., Mahāniruttī-gandha and Chuttaniruttī-gandha. The Dipavāmaṇa is the earliest chronicle of Ceylon which presents in Pāli material gathered from older Sinhalese commentaries; Buddhaghosha knows it. It is anonymous, irregular, and repetitive and is defective in metre and language; it goes up to the reign of Mahānāman and may be placed between A.D. 350 and 450. Based on it and far better finished in the form of an epic poem is the Mahāvaṃsa which uses much additional material and belongs to the fifth or the sixth century A.D. Its author Mahānāman is traditionally identified with a Thera uncle of King Dhātusena. The tīkā on this work which embodies much valuable matter of quasi-historical nature was written perhaps in the tenth century according to Geiger; but Malalāsekhara assigns it to the seventh or eighth century. The Anāgatavāmaṇa on the future Buddhas by Thera Kassapa, the Bodhivāmaṇa or Mahābodhivāmaṇa, a translation or a Sinhalese original by Upatissa who also commented on the Anāgatavāmaṇa in the tenth century, may also be mentioned. A work of conspicuous literary merit is the Jinālamkāra of Buddhadatta, a life of Buddha in 250 verses, written not earlier than the sixth or seventh century.