VOLUME I

CHRONOLOGY AND SOURCES
CHAPTER I

BEGINNINGS

(1)

There is an interesting passage in the Kāvyamāṃsā in which Rājaśekhara, while giving us a somewhat fanciful account of the divine origin of Poetics, mentions at the same time the names of the supposed original exponents of the discipline. It is said that the Spirit of Poetry (kāvyapurusa), born of the Goddess of Learning (sarasvati), was set by the Self-existent Being to promulgate the study of Poetics in the three worlds; and he related it in eighteen adhikaraṇas to his seventeen will-born pupils. These divine sages, in their turn, are said to have composed separate treatises on the portions respectively learnt by them. Thus Sahasrākṣa wrote on kavi-rahasya, Uktigarbha on aukti, Suvarṇanābha on riti, Pracetāyana on anuprāsa, Citrāṅgada on yamaka and citra, Sesa on śabda-śleṣa, Pulastya on vāstava, Aupakāya on upamā, Pārāśara on atiśaya. Utathyā on artha-śleṣa. Kubera on ubhayālaṃkāra, Kāmadeva on vainodika, Bharata on rūpaka, Nandikesvara on rasa, Dhīṣaṇa on dosa, Upamanyu on guṇa and Kucamāra on apaniṣadika. This tendency on the part of a Sanskrit author towards glorifying his science and thereby investing it with an ancient unalterable authority is not unusual, and such legendary accounts are often fabricated where the actual origin is forgotten; but it is curious that we do not meet with them elsewhere in Alāṃkāra literature, although they find expression in Bharata and in Vātsyāyana with regard to the origin of the allied disciplines of Dramaturgy and Erotics respectively. The historical value of this passage of Rājaśekhara may, indeed, be well doubted; but it is possible that this unique account, apart from its obviously mythical garb, embodies a current tradition, implying the actual existence, at some remote and forgotten period, of
early expounders of poetic theory, some of whose names are still familiar, but most of whose works have apparently perished. Thus, Suvarṇanābha and Kucamāra (or Kucumāra) are also cited with reverence by the author of the Kāma-sūtra (i. 1. 13. 17), both of them as authorities on Erotics, but the latter especially as well-versed in the particular subject of aupaniṣadika, which is thus included in Erotics as well as in Poetics.¹ The present-day text of the Nāṭya-sāstra, which goes by the name of Bharata, deals in an encyclopaedic manner with various topics, but Bharata is well known, as described by Rājaśekhara, as an authority on rūpaka. No work of Nandikesvara on rasa has yet been discovered; but his name is associated with a number of works, mostly late compilations, on erotics, music, histrionic art, grammar and Tantra.²

This traditional account may lead one to make the tempting suggestion of a very early systematic investigation of rhetorical issues but for the serious difficulty that there is hardly any material in the ancient literature itself to enable us to trace the origin of Poetics to a very remote antiquity. The Alamkāra-sāstra is never mentioned among the orthodox disciplines which constitute the so called Vedāṅgas, nor do we meet with any passage in the Vedic Saṃhitās, Brāhmaṇas or the earlier Upaniṣads in which we may find a real basis for a system of Poetics. The word upamā, for instance, is found as early as the Rg-veda (v. 34. 9; i. 31. 15), and Sāyana explains it in the sense of upamāna (as in Pāṇini ii. 3. 72) or drśṭānta; but there is nothing unusual in this use of the general idea of similitude, which need not be interpreted as having a particular speculative significance. It is conceded, on the authority of Yāska and Pāṇini, that the conception of upamā or similitude considerably affected the Vedic language as well as its accent; but beyond this grammatical or philo-

¹ Cf. JDL iv p. 95.
² For Nandikesvara see below under ch. ii.
logical interest, there is no indication of a dogma, much less of a theory, of Poetics in Vedic times. Nor should undue emphasis be laid on the use of poetic figures in Vedic literature; for between this unconscious employment of figures of speech and the conscious formulation of a definite system, there must necessarily be a long step.¹

( 2 )

The first evidence of a definite, if somewhat crude, activity in this direction is traceable in the Nighaṇṭu and Nirukta. From the investigation of the peculiarities of the general form of language, which began early, attention was apparently directed to the analysis of the poetic forms of speech; but the question was still regarded entirely from the linguistic point of view. The term alaṃkāra in the technical sense does not occur in the Nirukta, but Yāska uses the word alaṃkariśṇu in the general sense of ‘one in the habit of adorning’, which Pāṇini explains in iii. 2. 136 and which is apparently the meaning of the word occurring in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (xiii. 8. 4. 7; iii. 5. 1. 36), and in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (viii. 8. 5). But in the Nighaṇṭu iii. 13, a list is given of particles of comparison relating to the Vedic upamā, comprising twelve varieties, which are illustrated in the Nirukta i. 4, iii. 13-18 and ix. 6. Six of these varieties, viz., those indicated by the particles iva, yathā, na, cit, nu and ā, are discussed in connexion with Yāska’s treatment of upamārthe nipātas or particles indicative of comparison (i. 4), and partly included in what he designates as karmopamā in iii. 15. Then Yāska mentions bhūtopamā, in which the upamita becomes the upamāna in character, and rūpopamā, where the upamita resembles the upamāna in point of form. The fourth variety occurs where the

¹ P. V. Kane (HSP, 3rd Ed. Bombay 1951, pp. 315-19; also IA xlii, 1912, p. 120f) argues at some length that the Rgvedic poets have had some ideas about a theory of Poetics, as well as of Drama and dramatic representation. Also B. N. Bhattacharya in JDL ix, 1923, p 100f.
particle yathā is used. Then comes siddhopamā, in which the standard of comparison is well established and known to surpass every other object in a particular quality or act, and is characterised by the suffix vat. The last variety is luptopamā or suppressed simile, also called arthopamā (equivalent to the rūpaka of later theorists), which is illustrated in iii. 18 (also ix. 6), where the example is given of the popular application of the terms simha and vyāghra in a laudatory and śvan and kāka in a derogatory sense. The term upamāna itself is used by Yāska, but only to denote these particles of comparison (vii. 31). The significance of comparison in general is also referred to in i 19, ii. 6, iii. 5, iv. 11, v. 22 and vii. 13. Incidentally Yāska quotes (iii. 13) the grammarian Gārgya's definition of upamā, which is important from our point of view. As explained by Durgācārya, it lays down that upamā occurs when an object which is dissimilar is reckoned, through similarity, with an object having similar attributes. It also states as a general rule that the standard of comparison should be superior in merit and better known than the object of comparison; but the reverse case is also admitted and illustrated (vii. 14-15) by two examples from the Rg-vedu (x. 40. 2; x. 4. 6). The definition, too wide as it is, recalls Māmāṭa's similar dictum, and undoubtedly establishes a very early, but more or less definite, conception of the poetic upamā.

By the time of Pāṇini this conception of upamā seems to have been tacitly recognised and we find him using in this connexion the technical terms upamāna, upamita and

1 athāt upamā yad atat tat-sadhram iti gārgyāḥ, tad āsāms karma jyāyasā vā gunena prakhyatamena vā kanīyamsaṁ vā prakhyātaṁ vopamunite'lhāpi kanīyasā jyāyāmsam.

2 evam atat tat-svarūpena guṇena guṇa-sāmānyad upamāyate ity evam gārgyācāryo manayaṁ.

3 ii. 1. 55; iii. 1. 10, 2. 79, 4. 45; v. 4. 97, 137; vi. 1. 204, 2. 2, 72, 80, 127, 145, 169.

4 ii. 1. 56.
sāmānyas as well as general expressions like upamā (used in the sense of the rhetorician's upamāna), aupamāya, upamārthae and sūtras. It is noteworthy that in nearly fifty sūtras distributed all over his work, Pāṇini incidentally discusses, from the grammarian's point of view, the influence of the conception of comparison on the language in the varied dominion of affixes, including case and feminine suffixes, kṛt, taddhita and samāsanta terminations, in the making of compounds and in accent. The same influence is also traceable in the idea of atidesa, a term which is not used by Pāṇini himself but which is made clear by his commentators, and which may be translated as 'extended application by analogy or similarity'. Kātyāyana, in several vārttikas, follows Pāṇini in noting the same influence of the idea of similitude, while Śāntanava in his Phītsūtra discusses it in connexion with accentuation. In the Mahābhāṣya on ii. 1. 55, Patañjali has defined and illustrated Pāṇini's use of the term upamāna. A māna or measure, he says, is that which is employed in ascertaining a thing unknown; upamāna is approximate to the māna and determines the thing not absolutely (but approximately), e.g. when we say 'a gavaya is like a cow'.

1 ii. 1. 55, 56; viii. 1. 74.
2 ii. 3. 72.
3 i. 4. 79; iv. 1. 69; vi. 2. 113.
4 vii. 2. 101.
5 ii. 1. 6-7; vi. 2. 11.
6 i. 4. 79; ii. 3. 72; iii. 1. 10, 2. 79, 4. 45; iv. 1. 69, 4. 9; v. 1. 115-16, 2. 39, 3. 96, 106, 4. 97, 137.
7 ii. 1. 7, 31, 55-6; vi. 2. 11.
8 v. 1. 18; vi. 1. 204, 2. 2, 11, 72, 80, 113, 127, 145, 169 etc.
9 on i. 3. 21; ii. 1. 55, 2. 24, 4. 71; iii. 1. 10 etc
10 e.g. ii. 16, iv. 18.
11 Mānma hi nāmānirṇāta-jānārtham upādiṣate'nirṇātām arthaṁ jñāsyāmi, tat-samipe yan nātyanyāya mimite tad upamānam, gauri viva gavaya iti, ed. Kielhorn i, p. 397.
poetic upamā,\textsuperscript{1} inasmuch as the characteristic charmingness essential in a poetic figure is wanting in such a plain expression; but this grammatical analysis of the general idea of comparison is an early and near approach to the technical conception of Poetics.\textsuperscript{2}

( 3 )

A special interest attaches to these rules of Pāṇini and the dicta of early grammarians, inasmuch as they form the basis of what may be termed the grammatical sub-division of the figure upamā into direct (śrautī) and indirect (ārthī) similes as well similes based on kṛt and taddhīta suffixes, recognised as early as Udbhata’s time. Thus, the authority for the śrautī upamā, in which the notion of comparison is conveyed by particles like yathā, iva, vā or by the suffix vat, when vat is equivalent to iva, is supposed to be based on two rules of Pāṇini (v. 1.115-16), which lay down that the suffix vat is applied to the standard of comparison in the locative or genitive case and takes the place of the case-ending and iva, as well as to a noun which should otherwise be in the instrumental case in the sense of tenā tulya (like that), if the similarity consists in an action and not in quality. Thus, we get the forms mathurāvat (=mathurāyām iva) pāṭaliputre prakāraḥ, caitravat (=caitrasya iva) maitrasya gāvah, as well as brāhmaṇavad (=brāhmaṇena tulyam) adhīte, but not caitravat kṛṣah. In the same way, we have compounded simile like kumbhāviva stanau, according to the vārttika (ivena samāso vibhaktyalopaḥ) on Pāṇini ii. 4. 71, which is, therefore, taken as an instance of compounded direct simile (samāsagā śrautī upamā). Similarly, the ending kyac, according to Pāṇini iii. 1. 10, is applied to a noun in the objective case, which is expressive of upamāna, in the sense of

\textsuperscript{1} go-sadrśo gavaya iti nopamā, Citr. mīm. p. 6.

\textsuperscript{2} The conception of upamā appears to be fully established in Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapādīya, e.g. i. 63.
'behaviour' (ācāra), and gives us a simile in phrases like paurāṇa Janam Sutiyasi; while the next rule of Pāṇini lays down that the suffix kyañ may be applied to a noun in the nominative case in the sense of 'behaving like', and this forms the basis of a simile in such expressions as tava sadā ramanīyate śrīh. It is needless to cite more examples, for this will be sufficient to indicate that some of the speculations on poetic speech can be traced back to the early grammatical analysis of the same ideas, and they point to the fact that even in the age of Pāṇini, some of these conceptions appear to have been well established and to have considerably influenced his enquiry. It should be admitted that these tentative sallies of the grammarians are not definite enough to indicate the existence of a system, but even the limited stock of notions, thus indirectly relating to Poetics, throws an interesting light on the genesis of later speculations on poetic speech.

If any deduction is permissible from the name 'Alāṃkāra' (lit. embellishment) given to the discipline as well as from the contents of the earliest existing works on the subject, it will appear that the science started *a posteriori* out of the very practical object of analysing poetic embellishments of speech with a view to prescribe definite rules of composition; but it cannot be doubted that it received a great impetus from the highly developed enquiry into the forms of language made by the grammarians. From internal evidence as well as from the testimony, which admits of little doubt, of some of the ancient authorities on Poetics, it is clear that the theoretical background of the discipline was, to some extent, founded on the philosophical speculations on linguistics, so that Grammar, one of the oldest and soundest sciences of India, was its god-father and helped it towards ready

---

1 The theory of V. Raghavan (*JOR* ix, pp. 264-67; and *Some Concepts of the Alāṃkāra-Śāstra*, Adyar 1942, pp. 258-67) that the original name was Kriyā-kalpa lacks definite proof (see Kane's criticism in *HSP*, pp. 329-31). The name Sāhitya is of course late (Kane, *op. cit.* p. 328-29).
acceptance Ānandavardhana speaks of his own system as being based on the authority on the grammarians, to whom he pays an elegant tribute as the first and foremost thinkers (pratihāme hi vidvāmso vaiyākarāṇāh, vyākaraṇa-mūlāt sarva-vidyānām, p. 47); while Bhāmaha, one of the earliest known formulators of poetic theory, not only devotes one whole chapter to the question of grammatical correctness—a procedure which is followed by Vāmana—but also proclaims openly in vi. 63 the triumph of the views of Pāṇini. Apart from such details as the linguistic analysis of the idea of comparison referred to above, it can be easily shown that some of the fundamental conceptions of poetic theory, relating to speech in general, are avowedly based on the views of the grammarians to the exclusion of other schools of opinion. Thus, the question regarding the convention (saṃketa), whereby the expressed meaning of a word (abhidhā) is to be understood, is settled by a reference to the views of the grammarians on this point. The grammarians hold, in opposition to the Naiyāyikas, Saugatas and Mīmāṃsakas, that the import of a word is either jāti, dravya, kriyā or guṇa, as expressed by the dictum catuṣṭayi šabdānām pravṛttiḥ, cited from the Mahābhāṣya¹ by Mukula (p. 4) and Māmaṭa (Śabda-vy. p. 2). Indeed, the whole analysis of the two functions of word and its sense, called abhidhā and lakṣaṇā², is borrowed from the grammatico-philosophical ideas already elaborated by the grammarians; and even the new aesthetic system of Ānandavardhana, in establishing the third function of vyañjanā attempts to seek an authority for its theory on the analogy of the quasi-grammatical theory of sphoṭa, which is associated with the name of the pre-pānicinian grammarian Sphoṭāyana, and which we find fully developed in the Vākyapadṭya.

¹ Mahābhāṣya ed. Kielhorn, p. 19, 1. 20. Cf. also Kumāra-saṃbhava ii. 17, where this view is clearly mentioned, although Mallinātha would explain the catuṣṭayi pravṛtti with reference to the four vibartas of Vāc.

² Cf. Mahābhāṣya on viii. 1. 12.
Some of these ideas, again, are more or less recognised in the different philosophical systems, which concern themselves with śabda or speech in general, in connexion with the question of scriptural revelation and interpretation. The theory of sphoṭa, which, however, has only a far-fetched relation to Poetics, has also its significance in some systems of philosophy; and the idea of manifestation, implied in the vyañjanā-vṛtti, which consists not in the expression of something new but in the manifestation of something already existing, is not altogether unfamiliar to Indian speculation. A similar train of thought meets us in the Śāmkhya idea of causation (i.117-18), in which the effect is not produced but is already comprehended in the cause and therefore can only become manifest. We find another analogy in the general idea of the Vedāntin's mokṣa or liberation, which consists of a condition, not to be produced but to be made manifest or realised, by the removal of enveloping obstacles.¹ The theory relating to the other two functions of words (abhidhā and lakṣanā), which play such an important part in poetic speculation, had already engaged the attention, not only of the philosophical grammarians, but also of the philosophers themselves, especially the Naiyāyikas and the Mīmāṃsakas. The Naiyāyikas, for instance, hold that by denotation (abhidhā) of a word, we understand not only the individual (vyakti) but also the genus (jāti) and the quality (guṇa) ²; while the Mīmāṃsakas maintain that it signifies primarily jāti, and the vyakti is understood by implication (ākṣepa) through its inseparable con-

¹ It is noteworthy that the Vedānta-sūtra makes a direct use of the term rūpaka in the technical sense (i. 4 1), upon which Appayya Dīkṣita remarks: Bhagavatād bādārāyaṇena 'nānumānakam apy ekeṣām iti cen na, bādra-rūpaka-vinyāsta-grhīter darśayati ca' iti Śāṅkara-sūtre rūpakaṁ eñākṛtam (Citr. mīm. p. 54, ed. Kāvyamallā 1907). Cf. also Vedānta-sūtra ii. 2. 18.

² Nyāya-sūtra ii. 2. 68.
nexion with *jati*. The *Nyāya-sūtra*, again, gives an exhaustive list of the relations through which a word may be used in a secondary sense, the idea of secondary sense, variously called *gauna*, *bhākta*, *lakṣaṇika* or *upacārika artha*, having been tacitly admitted in almost all the systems. Indeed, the theories of Poetics on these points are considerably mixed up with the doctrines of the Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā schools; and even Bhāmaha's early work on Poetics devotes a considerable space to the discussion of the logic of poetry and the expressive functions of words.

We shall note in its proper place the influence of the Nyāya, Sāṃkhya and Vedānta doctrines on the poetic theory of Rasa; but it may be pointed out here that the conception of *upamā* (here termed *upamāṇa*), by which is implied the general idea of analogy or comparison, plays an important part in the different philosophical systems in the discussion of the nature and criterion of knowledge. The *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, for instance, treats of three *pramāṇas* (v. 10, 14), viz., perception, (drṣṭa or pratyakṣa), inference (liṅga or ānumāna) and analogy (*upamā* or *upamāṇa*). Kanāda and Kapila, no doubt, reject analogy as an independent and authoritative evidence, but the Naiyāyikas admit it, the purpose served by it being, in their opinion, the perception of a likeness in an object not perceived before. Vātsyāyana, commenting on i. 1. 3, defines it in terms almost similar to those used in the already quoted passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* as *sāmīpya-mūnam upamānam*. According to the Naiyāyikas, therefore, the object attained by analogy or *upamāṇa* consists in the recognition of the connexion between the appellation and the thing designated by it, and thus it forms the very foundation of expression. The idea of

1 *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* i. 3. 33ff.
2 *Vedānta-sūtra* ii. 3. 16, iii. 1. 7; *Nyāya-sūtra* ii. 2. 64, also i. 2. 11, 14, 15; *Sāṃkhya-sūtra* v. 67 etc.
3 P. 5, fn 11 above.
atideśa-vākyya reappears as the means of analogical cognition, i.e., as a helper of the actual perception of similarity between the well-known and the novel object at the first sight of the latter. The co-operation of the upamāna is also maintained to be essential in syllogistic reasoning, where it appears in the form of the syllogistic factor, called upanaya (i. 1. 32) or statement of the minor premise. A relic of this idea of upamāna survives in Poetics in the treatment of Bhoja (Sk iii.50), who distinguishes the figure upamā from the figure upamāna, although this view finds no supporter except Appayya Dīkṣitū, who adopts upamāna as a separate poetic figure.\(^1\) It is needless to dilate more on this point; but the idea of upamāna, together with that of atideśa, is similarly dealt with by the Māmāṣakas. They, however, consider that the upamāna refers to an object, already familiar to us, as being similar to another object which is seen for the first time; or in the words of Upavarṣa quoted by Śabarasaṃśā, the upamāna or analogy, being similarity, produces an idea respecting an object that is not present, just as the sight of a gavaya revives the memory of a cow.\(^2\)

( 5 )

Although these speculations have an indirect bearing on Poetics and might have suggested and helped to develop some of its fundamental theories, they cannot be taken as a definite basis of any deductions as to the antiquity of the discipline itself. It is striking indeed that we have no direct or indirect reference to Poetics as a Śāstra in early texts, although at the end of the 9th century Rājaśekhara speaks of a tradition which makes it the seventh aṅga. Poetics is omitted in the

\(^1\) Kuvalay. ed. N. S. P. 1913 p. 174. Nāgabhāṣṭa takes it as included in the figure upamā itself, and Vāmana appears to deal with one of its varieties (viz. ananubhūta-viṣaya) as an instance of what he calls rātvākhyānopamā or descriptive simile (iv. 2. 7).

\(^2\) upamānam api sādṛṣṭam a-sannikṛṣte’rthe buddhim uṣṭādayati, yathā gavaya-dārśanaṁ go-smaraṇam, on i. 1. 15.
enumeration of the different branches of study in the well-known passage in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (vii. 1. 2. 4, ed. Böhtlingk). Āpastamba (ii. 4, 11), speaks of the usual six aṅgas, but Yājñavalkya (i. 3) enumerates in all fourteen Śāstras, to which the Viṣṇu-purāṇa adds four more. But in them Poetics is not mentioned at all. In a similar list in the Lalita-vistara¹, there is a reference to kāvyā-karaṇa-grantha and nāṭya, which may be taken to imply Poetics and Dramaturgy respectively; but the designation ‘Alaṃkāra’ is not met with until we come to Sukra-nīti which includes it, in company with Artha-Śāstra, Kāma-Śāstra and Silpa-Śāstra, among thirty-two different Śāstras. It has been pointed out by Rhys Davids² that in the old Pāli texts, Āṅguttara (i. 72. iii. 107) and Samyukta (i. 38. ii. 267), there are references to a similar study. These passages are interesting historically as being opposed to the science, but they do not expressly or by implication mention it as Alaṃkāra-Śāstra.³

It seems likely, therefore, that Poetics as a technical discipline must have been of comparatively late origin, and probably began to develop in the first few centuries of the Christian era.⁴ With the flourishing of Sanskrit learning and literature in the 4th and 5th centuries under the Gupta emperors, its development probably proceeded apace.

¹ Ed. Lefmann i, p. 156.
² In a letter to the present writer dated 24. 2. 1921. Cf. Wijesekera in IHQ, xvii, pp. 196f.
³ In Kauṭilya’s Artha-Śāstra there is a chapter devoted to the procedure of writing śānas, where mention is made of artha-krama, paripūṛṇata, mādhurya, audārya, and spaṣṭatva as excellences which should be attained. These may correspond to the Guṇas defined in earlier Alaṃkāra-works, but perhaps they represent the common-sense view of the matter.
⁴ Patañjali refers to a large number of poetical works (ed. Kielborn i, 283, 340, 426, 444; ii 34, 102, 119, 167, 313, 315; iii 143, 338 etc.), which fact apparently indicates a considerable poetical activity in his age, preluding a systematic investigation of poetic principles; but there is no reference to Alaṃkāra literature in his time.
Bühler's epigraphical researches\(^1\) have confirmed the indication, first given by Lassen, regarding the development of Sanskrit *kāvyā*-style in this period, and it may be taken as the prelude to a rhetorical activity which bore rich fruit in the 8th and 9th centuries in systematic investigations of poetic principles. His examination of the early inscriptions not only proves the existence of a body of highly elaborate prose and metrical writings in the *kāvyā*-style during the first five centuries A.D., but it also establishes the presumption that most of these *praśasti*-writers were “acquainted with the rules of Indian poetics”\(^2\). Bühler attempts to show that the manner in which these writers conform to the rules of Alaṃkāra, crystallised in the oldest available manuals like those of Bhāmbha and Daṇḍin, would go to indicate “the existence of an Alaṃkāra-śāstra or some theory of poetic art”\(^3\).

From this period of the time, we get more or less definite indications of the existence of doctrines of Poetics in the Kāvyā-literature itself. In the two earlier Epics, no doubt, some of the more general terms of Alaṃkāra (like *upamā, kāvyā, nāṭīka, kathā* and *ākhyāyikā*) are used, but no chronological conclusion is safe from the admittedly composite character of the present-day texts. But in the *Buddha-carita* of Aśvaghoṣa, as Cowell notes, we have the use of common

3. *Ibid.* p 243. This conclusion is, to some extent, supported by a passage in the Girnar inscription itself (2nd century A. D.), which contains a reference to “prose and verse embellished (with poetic figures) and rendered attractive by poetic conventions and expressions which are clear, light, pleasing, varied and charming” (*sphuṭa-laghu-madhuracitra-kānta-sabda-samayodālāṃkāra-gadya-padya*), *EI* viii, p. 44. The Sphuṭa, Madhura, Kānta and Citra qualities may correspond to Praśāda, Mādhurya, Kānta and other excellences discussed, e.g. by Daṇḍin. The inscription itself is written in prose having long compounds, and contains alliteration, repetition of sounds and other tricks in the approved style.
poetic figures like upama, utpreksa and rupaka, as well as of elaborate ones like yathasaamkhya and aprastuta-praamsa in an ingenious way, which presumably betrays an acquaintance with the teachings of Poetics. The very first verse uses the word upama in a somewhat technical sense, and we have also in iii. 51 the use of the term rasunara to indicate a counter emotion which cancels an already prevailing one. Avagho is uses the terms haya and bhava (iv. 12) in the sense they have in dramaturgic Rasa-systems. Cowell, therefore, is justified in remarking that a peculiar interest attaches to such poems "from their importance in establishing Prof. Buhler's views as to the successful cultivation, in Northern India, of artificial poetry and rhetoric—kavya and alamkara—in the early centuries of our era." This remark applies with greater force to the works of Kalidasa, which appear with all the polish and perfection imparted to them by a trained and careful artist. To the later theorists they supply an inexhaustible store-house of quotations for the illustration of different poetic figures, expressions and principles. This conscious employment of varied and elaborate poetic figures and general observance of poetic rules in these early Kavya-poets are not without their significance, and we may reasonably presume from them a general diffusion of the knowledge of Poetics in this age.

The same tendency towards artificial or factitious composition is shown also in the prose romances of Subandhu and Bana. Subandhu prides himself on his skill in the use of sthosa in every letter of his composition, and his Vasavadatta justifies this boast as a tour de force of extraordinary verbal jugglery. In the work itself Subandhu speaks of

1 E. H. Johnston in his revised ed. of the work (Punjab Univ. Publication, Calcutta 1936) appears to agree with this view (Pt. ii, Introd. p. lxxxix f).

poetic compositions adorned with poetic figures like śleṣa, divided into ucchvāsas,¹ and displaying skill in the employment of vaktra metre. He specifies also two important poetic figures, viz., utpreksā and ākṣepa.² Equally definite is Bāṇa’s references to rhetoric in his mention, in one of the introductory verses of his Kādambarī, cf the poetic figures upamā, jāti (=svabhāvokti), dīpaka and śleṣa as well as of poetic rasa and śayyā. Bāṇa also refers to verbal puzzles, such as aksara-cyuta, bindumāti, guḍha-caturthapāda and prahelikā.³ and he seems to be aware of the Alāṃkārika distinction between kathā and ākhyāyikā.⁴ In Harṣa-carita iii, para 5. Bāṇa refers to Bharata-mārga-bhajana-gītām, and in ii. 4 speaks of actors acting in the Ārabhaṭi Vṛtti (discussed by Bharata xx. 54 f).

(6)

From all these indications the inference is not improbable that with the growth of a body of highly finished prose and poetical literature, the science of Poetics or at least the

¹ Cf. Bhāmaha i. 25-26, Daṇḍin i. 26-27.
² saṅkuvi-kāvyā rasanām ivaṇāṃkāra-prasādhitām, p. 303; dirghocchvāsana racakūlam su-śleṣa-vaktra-gaṭanā-paṭu sat-kāvyar-viracanam īva, pp. 238-39; utpreksāḥ śēpau kāvyālaṃkāresu p. 146. The reading of the first of these passages in the Calcutta edition is bauddhasaṃgaṭiṃ īvaṇāṃkāra-bhūṣitām, and the commentary of Śivarāma (18th century) explains it as alāṃkāro nāma dharmakīrti-kṛto grantha-viśeṣah. No work of Dharmakīrti’s called Bauddhasaṃgaṭiyalaṃkāra has yet been found. Undue reliance need not be placed on an unauthenticated statement of a very late commentator; and Lévi is probably correct in denying that Subandhu makes any allusion to Dharmakīrti’s literary activity (Bulletin de l’École d’Extrême Orient 1903, p. 18).
³ ed. Peterson, p. 7. Subandhu (p. 146) refers to Śrākhalā-bandha.
⁴ Ibid, p. 7 and Harṣa-c. p. 7. —On the meaning of the word Alāṃkāra see J. Gonda in Volume of Eastern and Ind. Studies presented to F. W. Thomas (Bombay 1939) pp. 97-114; but this has hardly any direct connexion with the meaning it bears in Sanskrit Alāṃkāra literature. A similar attempt is made by A. B. Keith in Commemorative Essays presented to K. B. Pathak (Poona BORS, 1934), pp. 311-14.
investigation of rhetorical rules made considerable progress by the end of the sixth century A.D. The earliest known writers on Poetics, who lived somewhat later, themselves refer to still earlier authorities. Thus, Bhāmaha speaks of Medhāvīn and others, whom he cites and whose work he avowedly utilises. Similarly Daṇḍin refers to earlier writings, and one of his commentators mentions in this connexion two theorists before Daṇḍin, viz. Kāśyapa and Vararuci, who are otherwise unknown to us as writers on Alaṃkāra. Apart from this fact of their own citation of earlier views, it cannot also be maintained with any cogency that the relatively developed style and treatment of even these early writers on Poetics could have been evolved by themselves in the absence of earlier tentative works, the existence of which may be presumed, for instance, by the employment by these writers of certain technical words and formulas (e.g. vakrokti, riti, guṇa etc) without a previous explanation.

As a cognate branch of study, however, which probably supplied Poetics with a model and the poetic theory with the important content of Rasa, Dramaturgy (Nāṭya-śāstra) appears to have established itself a little earlier. Comparatively early texts, both brahmanical and buddhistic, speak of some kind of dramatic representation; and we have a very early reference in Pāṇini to Kṛśāśva and Śilālin as authors of nāṭa-sūtras (iv. 3, 110-11). The early existence of treatises on the dramatic art is also evidenced by the fact that all the early authors on Poetics, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana, omit a discussion of this subject and refer their readers for information to such specialised works. The older specimens of these are perhaps lost; but Bharata's Nāṭya-śāstra, which is cited as the oldest known and most authoritative, cannot possibly be put, even in its present version, at a date lower

1 It is interesting to note that both Amara and Śāśvata in their lexicons do not explain the technical terms of Alaṃkāra, although they have distinct references to dramaturgic technicalities and to Rasa.
than the 6th century A.D. Bharata himself, however, devotes a whole chapter to the treatment of poetical guṇas and alaṃkāras as decorative devices of dramatic speech. It seems, therefore, that the study of Alaṃkāra was older than Bharata; and the tradition of opinion, followed by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, may have been post-Bharata in date, but was probably pre-Bharata in substance. Indeed, the different schools of opinion, represented by the alaṃkāra- rīti- and dhvani-theories, probably flourished some centuries before their views became crystallised in the present works of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and the Dhvanikāra respectively, none of whom, as we shall see, can be taken as the absolute founder of the system he represents. This process of crystallisation must have covered a tentative stage whose productions, if they had been extant today, would have shown Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and the Dhvanikāra in the making. We cannot, therefore, start with the works of these writers as the absolute beginnings of the science, although with them we enter upon the historic and most creative stage of its existence. Taking this fact into consideration, we may presume without dogmatising that the Alaṃkāra-śāstra started as a separate technical discipline from about the commencement of the Christian era and probably flourished in a relatively developed form in the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. The course of this development is unfortunately hidden from us, until it emerges in a more or less self-conscious form in some chapters of Bharata and in the Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha.
CHAPTER II

BHARATA

(1)

Although Indian tradition glorifies Bharata, the reputed author of the Nāṭya-śāstra, with the title of muni and places him in a mythic age, the widest possible divergence of opinion exists among scholars as to his actual date; and he has been variously assigned to periods ranging from the 2nd century B.C. to the 2nd century A.D.¹ That he is the oldest writer on dramaturgy, music and kindred subjects, whose work has survived, is generally admitted; but at the same time the question arises as to how far the extant version of his work represents his original text. Abhinavagupta in the second introductory verse of his commentary on Bharata informs us that Bharata’s text, as known to him, consisted of thirty-six chapters (ṣaṭṭriṃśakaṇṭi bharata-sūtram idam); and he is aware of two recensions (dvividhah pāṭho drṣṭyate on ch. xv) of some chapters. A comparison of the different printed editions mentioned in our Bibliography below, as well as available MSS, would go to show that they do not agree about the number and sequence of chapters, nor about the number of verses in each chapter. The text is, thus, very uncertain and unsatisfactory.²


2 For instance, Deccan College MS no. 68 (or 69) of 1873-74 contains 38 chapters.—For some of these discrepancies see P. V. Kane, HSP, pp. 10-14. It should be noted that neither the printed text nor any MS contains the full text of Abhinava’s commentary. Abhinavagupta in many places refers to the views of others with kecit or anye, and discusses various readings (pp. 50, 93, 96, 226, 241, 269, 340 etc).
It is clear from these indications that it had been subjected to considerable rehandlings in later times before it assumed its present shape, and this fact has an important bearing on the date of the supposed author.

There are several passages in the present-day text which probably throw some light on this process of gradual interpolation and recasting. The curious colophon at the end in the Kāvyamālā edition, which appears to have puzzled its editor, designates the latter portion of the work as Nandi-bharata.\(^1\) Rice mentions\(^2\) a work called Nandi-bharata on music; while a chapter, apparently from a work on dramatic gesture, is referred to as nandibharatotka samkara-hastādhyāya in a manuscript of a treatise on music and Abhinaya, noticed in Madras Catalogue xii. no. 13009. These works, probably late compilations, are named after Nandi or Nandikesvara, whom tradition acknowledges as an ancient authority on music, erotics and histrionic art. A Nandin is quoted by Vātsyāyana (i.1. 8). Aufrecht is inclined to identify him with Nandikesvara cited as a writer on Erotics in the Pañca-sāyaka i. 13 and Rati-rahasya i. 5.\(^3\) Nānyadeva mentions him as Nandin. Again, a work on histrionic art, attributed to Nandikesvara, is known as Abhinaya-darpaṇa \(^4\); as this work refers to Bharata and his views several times (e.g. st. 12, 128, 149, 159, 162) it must be a later compilation. Rājaśekhara, as we have seen above, mentions Nandikesvara as a writer on Rasa. But Nandikesvara is better known as an authority on music and is cited as one of his sources by Śāṅgadeva (13th century) in his Saṅgīta-ratnākara (i. 1. 17) and by his commentator Kallinātha (p.47). Besides the references given

---

\(^1\) samāptaś cāyam [granthaḥ] nandibharata-saṅgīta-pustakam.
\(^2\) Mysore and Coorg Catalogue, p. 292.
\(^3\) Pañca-sāyaka, ed. Sadananda Sastri Ghiladia, Lahore, 1921; Rati-rahasya, ed. ibid Lahore, no date. See Schmidt, Ind. Erotik, 1911, pp. 46, 59.
above, works on music attributed to Nandikeśvara are: *Nandikeśvara-mate Tālādhyāya* (Weber 1729), and *Bharatā-

naṛa*\(^1\) supposed to be a condensed version of Nandikeśvara's work by Sumati, dealing with dramatic gestures and Tālā.

A *Nāṭyāṅrṇa* of Nandikeśvara is cited in Allarāja’s *Rasa-

ratna-pradipikā*. Abhinavagupta (comm. on Bharata, ed. GOS, ch.xxix) says that he had not himself seen (*sākṣān na dṛṣṭam*) Nandikeśvara's work, but relying on Kūrīdhara (yat tu kūrti-

dhareṇa darśītam……tat-pratayayā) he would briefly refer to Nandikeśvara-mata. But he knows (p. 171) a work called Nandi-mata from which he quotes a verse on the Āṅgahāra called *recita or recaka* Elewhere he tells us that by Nandi-
mata is understood the views of Taṅdu; for the names, Nandi and Taṅdu are, in his opinion, identical. The designa-
tion, therefore, of the latter part of Bharata’s text, a part of which deals, among other things, with music probably implies that it was compiled or recast at some later period in accordance with the views of Nandikeśvara.

Similarly, we hear of a work called *Matasāṇa-bharata*\(^2\) (of uncertain date) by Lākṣmaṇa Bhāskara, which apparently sets forth the views of Mataṣaṇa. This is another old authority cited by Abhinavagupta (as Mataṣaṇa-muni) who quotes (ch, xxx) two of his Anuṣṭubh verses; by Śāṅgadeva and his conementator (on i. 3. 24-25; i. 4. 9; i. 8. 19 etc.); by Śīṅgabhūpāla (i. 51); and by Arūṇacalanātha on *Raghu* (p. 100) with *tathā ca mātaṇge*. A work called *Brhad-deśi* ascribed to Mataṣaṇa has been published\(^3\).

1 In *Catalogue of MSS, BORI*, xii, pp. 460-63; *Madras Cat.* xxii, 13006-08.

2 The term *bharata* appears in course of time to mean the dramatic or histronic art generally, as it also came to mean the actor.—Rāghavabhaṭṭa on *Sakuntalā* expressly refers to Ādi-bharata by whom he might have meant our author, in contradistinction to these later Bharatas. On this question see S. K. De, *The Problem of Bharata and Ādi-Bharata* in *Our Heritage* i, pp. 193 207 (reprinted in *Some Problems of Skt. Poetics*.

3 In *Trivandrum Skt. Ser.* 1928.
The last chapter of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, to which the colophon mentioned above is appended, contains a prediction that the rest of the topic will be treated in detail by Kohala (who apparently belonged to the same school), plainly shewing that the rewriting of the portion in question was done some time after Kohala, as well as Nandikeśvara, had spoken on the subject. Nandikeśvara's date is unknown; but Kohala, side by side with Bharata, is recognised as an ancient authority as early as the end of the 8th century A.D. in Dāmodara-gupta's *Kuṭṭanī-mata* (śl. 81). It is interesting to note in this connexion that Abhinavagupta, commenting on Bharata vi. 10, says that although Nāṭya is usually said to consist of five *āṅgas*, the enumeration of eleven *āṅgas* in the text is in accordance with the view of Kohala and others, to whose opinions the commentator makes many other incidental references mostly on the topics of Nāṭya and Geya. Kohala is cited also by Maṇḍikya-candra (p. 65) on Mammaṭa, by Śāṅgadeva (i. 1. 15), by Śāradātanaya who frequently quotes his views (pp. 204, 210, 236, 245, 251), by the authors of the *Nāṭya-darpāna* pp. 25, 38, 132), while Śīngabhiṣṭā (i. 51) acknowledges him as an authority on drama and allied arts. Hemacandra, with reference to the classification of the drama, says (p. 329; also p. 325): *prapañcas tu bharata-kohalādi-śāstreḥvyo-vagantavyah*. Kohala is credited by most writers on Dramaturgy with the introduction of Uparūpaka. Mallinātha on *Kumāra* vii. 91 quotes Kohala on the subject of Tāla. A work on music called *Tāla-lakṣaṇa*, probably a late compila-

1 *Seṣaṇaḥ prastāra-tantrena kohalaḥ kathayasyati, xxxvii. 18.*
2 See xxxvii. 24.
3 *Abhinaya-trayam gītātodye ceti pañcāṅgaṃ nāṭyam .. anena tu ślokena kohalādi matenaikādaśāṅgatvam ucyate* (on vi. 10).
4 For references see P. V. Kane, *HSP*, p. 24, 54-55. See also his Fragments of Kohala in *Proc. A-I O.C.* (Patna), 1930, pp. 577-80.—Abhinavagupta, however, holds that the entire text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as known to him was composed by Bharata himself.
tion, is attributed to him,¹ and a Kohaliya Abhinaya-śāstra,² purporting to embody his views, is also known. A work, called Kohala-rahasya³ in at least thirteen chapters, dealing with musical modes, is ascribed to the sage Kohala (described as son of Bharata) who reveals the subject on being requested by Mataṅga. The description that he was son of Bharata is perhaps due to the indication⁴ in Nāṭya-śāstra i. 26 (ed. Chowkhamba 1929, ed. GOS, Baroda 1956; but not included in the NSP ed. 1894) that Kohala, along with Śāndilya, Dhūrtila and others, are spoken of as sons of Bharata. Since Abhinavagupta says (Abh. bh. p. 25) that Kohala describes the verse jitam uḍupatinā from Ratnāvalī (i. 5) as an example of Nāndi in accordance with the rules of Bharata, P. V. Kane is of opinion that Kohala was later than Ratnāvalī, i.e. than 650 A.D. But this conclusion cannot be very well reconciled with the fact that Bharata and Kohala are already recognised as ancient authorities in the 8th century A.D. From Abhinavagupta’s references and citations Kohala’s lost work appears to have been mostly in verse.

A work on music, entitled Dattila-kohaliya, is mentioned by Burnell (p. 606), apparently a compendium of the opinions of Kohala and Dattila. The latter, whose name occurs variously as Dantila and Dhūrtila, is mentioned by Dāmodara-gupta ( śl. 123) and is cited as an old authority by Abhinava-gupta (as Dattilācārya, chiefly on music) who quotes (on Bharata xxviii, also p. 205) a verse of his in Anuṣṭubh; by Śāṅgadeva (i. 1. 16) and his commentator Kallinātha (p. 49);

---

¹ IOC 3025, 3089; Madras Cat. with a Telugu comm. 12992.
² Madras Cat. 12989, with a Telugu comm.
³ Madras Trm. 1, C, 787 (the 13th chapter only).
⁴ The editions (GOS) of M. R. Kavi, and Chowkhamba Skt. Ser. include this verse (i. 26) but they note that it does not occur in the MSS consulted. It is, however, commented upon by Abhinava-gupta (p. 18)—Kohala’s views are referred to by him p. 25, 103, 173, 182, 266 etc.
by Śīṅgabhūpāla (i. 51), as well as in various works on music. A work called Daṭṭila on music is also published.¹

In the same way Śāṇḍilya is mentioned as Nāṭya-śāstra-kāra by Śīṅgabhūpāla (i. 51). Kāśyapa or Kaśyapa as a muni who preceded Bharata and his opinion on Rāgas are cited by Abhinavagupta (on xxix, p. 394), as well as by Nānyadeva². Śātakarṇi is cited as a writer on dramaturgy by Sāgaranandin (on Śūtradhāra, 1, 1101). Viśākhila is also cited as an authority on Kalā-śāstra by Vāmana (i. 3. 7), by Abhinavagupta (on xxviii, xxix. 31-33) and by Nānyadeva as an authority on music. Parāśara or Pārāśara, mentioned by Rājaśekhara, is also cited as a Bharata-putra in Nāṭya-śāstra (i. 32); his views on Nāndī and Toṭaka are quoted by Sāgaranandin (ll. 1091, 2770 3202-3). Similarly, another Bharata-putra is Nakhakuṭṭa, who is also cited by Sāgaranandin (ll. 2668, 2994). Even the mythical Nārada is regarded as propounder of Gāndarva-veda; and the Bhāva-prakāśana says that Nārada taught Bharata the subject of evolution of Rāsa, having learnt it from Bhrahmā himself.

From these indications it is likely that between Bharata’s original text and its existing version, there came “Kohala and others” whose views found their way into the compendium, which goes by the name of Bharata and which indiscriminating posterity took as genuine and unquestionable. The text-problem of the Nāṭya-śāstra, therefore, cannot be solved until the works of Kohala and other early writers, some of which appear to have been available to Abhinavagupta, are recovered.

The process of incorporation must have occurred very early and was apparently complete by the end of the 8th century, when the work assumed more or less its present shape. Udbhaṭa, about this time, actually appropriated

¹ In Trivandrum Skt. Series, 1930.
² On Kāśyapa see below under Daṇḍin. Abhinavagupta’s reference to Kāśyapācārya at p. 239 shows that his work was, at least partly, in verse.
(iv. 4) the first-half of the verse vi. 15 of the Nāṭya-śāstra, and makes only enough verbal change in its second half to admit Śānta as the ninth Rasa in the category of eight recognised by Bharata. Abhinavagupta, who commented on the existing text at the end of the 10th century, himself mentions several other previous commentators, of whom Lollāṭa and Śāṅkuka in all probability belonged to the 8th and 9th centuries. These indications will make it clear at any rate that the text existed in its present form in the 8th century A.D., if not earlier.

(2)

We have, on the other hand, the tradition as well as the statement of Bhavabhūti, who refers to the mythical Bharata as the tauryatrika-sūtra-kāra, that Bharata's work existed originally in the sūtra-form; and this is also made likely by Pāṇini's early reference to such nāṭa-sūtras in his own time. Reminiscences of the sūtra-style may indeed be presumed in the Nāṭya-śāstra vi and vii, which deal with rasa and bhāva;

1 It should be noted that Abhinavagupta immediately after the passage cited (see p. 21, fn 3 above) goes on to say: anena tu slokena kohalādi-matenaśīduśāṃgatam ucyate, na tu bhāra, taisamgrhītasyāpī punar atroddeśūn, nirdese caitat krama-vyatāsanā ity udbhāṭaḥ neti bhaṭṭa lollāṭaḥ ...vayam tvatra sattvam agre viṇīṣyāma ity āstāṃ stāvat (on Bh. vi. 10). This difference of opinion between Udbhāṭa and Lollāṭa on a question of textual interpretation supports the conclusion that Udbhāṭa was probably familiar with the text of Bharata as Abhinava knew it and as it has come down to us. The tradition is recorded by Sāṅgadeva (i. i. 19) that Udbhāṭa was one of the early commentators on Bharata. Abhinava himself refers to Lollāṭa, Śāṅkuka and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka as principal commentators whose views on Rasa he thought worth refuting in detail. Sāṅgadeva omits from his list Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka but adds Udbhāṭa, as well as Kīrtidhara who is earlier than Abhinava having been cited by him (see above p. 20). For other reputed commentators on Bharata see below.

2 Uttara-carita, ad iv. 22 (ed N. S. P. 1906., p. 120). Abhinavagupta in his commentary refers to Bharata's work as a Sūtra-work.
for in ch. vi we find a dictum¹ on the genesis of Rasa, put in concise form of a sūtra, to the elucidation of which, after the manner of a bhāṣya or vṛtti, the rest of the chapter (written in prose with verse-quotations) is apparently devoted. It should also be noticed that a preliminary explanation is added at commencement of the chapter to reconcile this curious portion of the text with the rest of the work. Bharata, we are told, being requested by the sages, explains the characteristics of a samgraha, kārikā, and nirukta, and incidentally gives an illustration of a sūtra-grantha by putting a part of the text in that-form. This discussion of the nature of a samgraha, kārikā, nirukta and sūtra would not have been relevant to the subject in hand but for this somewhat flimsy explanation, which, however, affords a device, far-fetched as it is, to introduce into the kārikā-text some vestiges of the older sūtra-form. It is not maintained that a sūtra-text is necessarily older than a text in the kārikā-form; for in our sūtra-text itself there are quotations in the vṛttis of anubaddha or anuvamśya ślokas², betokening the existence of earlier teachings on the subject, and disproving at the same time the orthodox belief that Bharata was the earliest teacher of the Nāṭya-veda. But if the tradition that Bharata’s original work was composed in the sūtra-form be accepted, then this portion of the existing version may be presumed to have been a survival of the original form. Similar fragments of the sūtra-bhāṣya style

¹ tatra vibhūvīnubhūva-vyabhicāri-samyogād rasa-nispattiḥ, ed. Grosset p. 87, 1. 8; ed. Kāvyamāla p. 62, 1. 6. This dictum is cited as a Sūtra by all later writers, including Abhinavagupta and presumably his predecessors Lollata and others. For other instances of the Sūtra-bhāṣya style in the work see P. V. Kane, HSP, pp. 15-16.—The references to the text of the Nāṭya-sāstra here are generally to the Kāvyamāla ed.

² The anubaddha verses, apparently of earlier writers, are those related to the subject in hand. By anuvamśya verses (verses of this kind occur also in the Mahābhārata) are meant, according to Abhinavagupta, those handed down traditionally from teacher to pupil (anuvamśa-bhavam śīyācārya-paramparāṣa vartamānam) vi, p. 25-26.
are seen in ch. xxviii-xxxi in such passages as beginning with ātodya-vidhim idānīṁ vakṣyāmaḥ (xxviii. 1) ; also in xxxiii. 212 vādyā-vidhānāṁ vakṣyāmi; in xxiv. 93 atra sūtra-
dhāra-guṇān vakṣyāmaḥ etc.

If we get the lower limit to the date of Bharata’s work at 8th century A.D., the other limit is very difficult to settle, when we consider that there were apparently two versions, either independent or one based on the other. But it is not clear what weight should be placed on the testimony of Bhavabhūti; for if in the first quarter of the 8th century Bharata was known to him as a sūtra-kāra, it is not intelligible how at the end of the same century Udbhaṭa makes use of Bharata’s kārika, and Lollāṭa and others, immediately following, apparently comment on the same text. The short space of less than half a century is not enough to obliterate all signs of the older version and replace it entirely with a new kārikā-text which, to all intents and purposes, is taken as the only author-
itative version in later times, and in which, strangely enough, we find still lingering traces of the earlier sūtra-text. The only possible explanation of Bhavabhūti’s reference is that the historical Bharata, who was the sūtra-kāra on the three arts of dancing, singing and instrumental music, had already in Bhavabhūti’s time become identified with the mythical Bharata; for the passage in the Uttara-carita gives an obviously mythical account, through the mouth of Lava, that bhagavān Vālmīki, having composed his story of Rāma, gave it to bhagavān Bharata (the sūtra-kāra on the three arts and apparently the nāṣyācārya of the gods) who revised it and got it acted through celestial nymphs.

But this does not exhaust all our textual difficulties. Independent prose-passages also survive, in the midst of kārikās, in chs. xvii, xxviii, xxix, xxxi and xxxiv which, form-
ing an integral part of the text, cannot be taken as mere vṛtti, but which resemble, in some respects, the prose Smṛti-frag-
ments or more closely, the prose-fragments in the apocry-
phal Bhela-saṃhitā. Again, the anubaddha or anuvāṃśya
ślokas, referred to above, correspond to the parikara- or saṃgraha-ślokas in later writings, and certainly indicate the probability of earlier speculations on the subject. These verses are generally taken from two distinct sources; for some of them are in āryā, while others are in anuṣṭubh metre. On the Āryā-verses Abhinava remarks (on vi. 85, p. 328) : tā etā hy āryā eka-praghāṭakatayā pūrvācaryar lakṣaṇatvena paṭhi-tāh, muninā tu sukhā-saṃgrahāya yathā-sthānaṃ viniveṣitāh. In his opinion former teachers composed these Āryās and Bharata inserted them in proper places.

From the facts adduced above, we are confronted with the problem of the inter-relation of these apparent survivals in our text, which contains vestiges of (1) independent prose-fragments (2) anuvamśya ślokas in āryā and anuṣṭubh metres and (3) passages in sūtra-bhāṣya style, as well as (4) the present systematic kārikās. Space is too limited to dilate upon the question here, but an examination of these passages will reveal that these different styles do not possibly belong to the same period, but they probably indicate several stages in the growth of particular forms of composition of dramaturgic works in general, each stage betraying its own partiality towards a particular form. Taking the present kārikā-text as the starting point, we find in it traces of earlier passages in sūtra-bhāṣya style, of which it is presumably a recast. In the sūtra-bhāṣya, again, there are fragments of metrical passages which indicate, in their turn, another and still earlier kārikā-stage; while the independent prose-fragments perhaps represent the earliest form taken by such technical treatises. We can, therefore, distinguish in their order of development (1) a stage of prose-treatises (2) a tentative period of kārikā-writing (3) the sūtra-bhāṣya stage and (4) the final period of compilation of compendiums, which reverts again to the kārikā-form.1 This

1 This conclusion does not apply to the more or less imitative periods after the 10th century in which we find the kārikā- and the sūtra-style, existing almost side by side.
conclusion perhaps finds some support in the repetition, more or less, of a similar phenomenon in the sphere of the Dharma-śāstra, Artha-śāstra, Vaidya-śāstra and probably Kāma-śāstra. The loss of earlier treatises makes it difficult to designate; but if this conclusion is correct generally, then our text may be supposed to contain remnants of all these styles and forms. It is not argued here that Bharata’s work itself passed through all these stages or forms, from a rudimentary prose-version into a systematic metrical manual; but our text contains enough to betray the existence of previous speculations in prose and in verse, as well as indicate the fact that it might have itself been once written in the sūtra-bhāṣya form, which was recast, with considerable additions from other sources, into a convenient metrical compendium.

( 3 )

Taking the substance of the work, apart from the vexing question of different versions, the portion of the Nāṭya-śāstra, which deals principally with music, has been conjectured on internal evidence to have been compiled about the 4th century A.D.; and it appears likely that the other portions were also put into their present shape about the same time. Pischel’s argument, however, on the date of the work, derived from the reference to Śakas, Yavanas, Pahlavas and Bāhlikas (e.g. xxxii. 103. Ch. ed.) in a text of such composite character is of doubtful value in determining the question finally; but

1 Kane believes it possible (HSP, p. 16) that the original nucleus of the Nāṭya-śāstra was in mixed prose and verse. He is also of opinion that the first five chapters were comparatively late additions. Abhinavagupta knows Bharata’s text as consisting of 36 chapters, although he comments on the 37th ch. of what M. R. Kavi speaks of as the Northern recension (according to Kavi the Southern is the earlier text and consists of 36 chapters).

2 IA xii p. 158 f.
it perhaps makes it probable that the upper limit of its date cannot be put too early.

We are in a position, however, to infer that the substance of Bharata's work is probably much older than that of Bhāmaha.\(^1\) who may be assigned to the last quarter of the 7th century. Bhāmaha, in his treatment of poetic figures (kāvyālāṃkāraś), groups them in a curious but suggestive way, which probably indicates the different periods in the growth and multiplication of such figures.\(^2\) At the outset, he names and defines only five poetic figures (ii. 4) recognised, as he says, by other writers, viz., anuprāsa, yamaka, rūpaka, dipaka and upamā. This represents the first stage; but in course of time, six other figures appear to have been added, and Bhāmaha mentions and deals with them next in ii. 66. Then he goes on to enumerate, two (or three, including svabhāvokti) more figures admitted by writers like Medhāvin (ii. 88), who also appears to have dealt with upamā etc. (ii. 40). Finally, Bhāmaha defines and illustrates a further long list of twenty-three more figures in a separate chapter (iii. 1-4). The differentiation and multiplication of poetic figures with the progress of speculation is a familiar fact in Alaṃkāra literature; and the way in which Bhāmaha successively enumerates and groups these figures probably shows that to the original five mentioned by him at the outset, others were added in course of time as the study itself advanced. Now Bharata, in his treatment of Alaṃkāras names (xvi. 41) only four such figures known to him, viz., yamaka, rūpaka, dipaka and upamā. These four in reality correspond to the five mentioned by Bhāmaha; for anuprāsa may be taken as falling in the same class as yamaka, the one being varṇābhyāsa and the other padābhyāsa. At the same time

1 Besides showing himself conversant with some theory of Rasa (ii. 281, 283 f.), Daśdīn mentions the dramaturgic technical terms samādhi, aṅga, vr̥tti and lakṣana and refers to ugamāntara for their discussion (ii. 366).

the very fact that _anuprāsa_ is thus differentiated from _yamaka_ may indicate further refinement in these poetic figures. It is clear, therefore, that Bharata’s work belonged to a period when the number of figures had not yet multiplied; and one, if not more, stages must have intervened between it and Bhāmaha’s _Kāvyaāṃkāra_ in which the number had already swelled into nearly forty in all.¹ To this intermediate stage belonged Medhāvin and others, whom Bhāmaha cites, and the loss of whose work makes it difficult for us to trace the development thus indicated by Bhāmaha.

There are also indications that Bharata’s teachings are probably older than Kālidāsa, who generally adheres to Bharata’s dramaturgic prescriptions.² Kālidāsa refers, in _Vikramorvaśīya_ ii. 18, to Bharata as the mythical _nātyācārya_. In _Raghu_ xix. 36, again, Kālidāsa speaks of _āṅga-sattva-vacanāśraya nṛtya_ which, as Mallinātha rightly points out, agrees with Bharata’s dictum³: _sūmānyābhinayo nāma jñeyo_.

1 By the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th century, Bhatti illustrates as many as 38 different species of poetic figures, indicating that the process of refinement had proceeded very far indeed even in his time.

2 The discovery of the dramas, ascribed to Bhūsa, does not invalidate this argument, for it is possible that they follow a tradition or a system of opinion of which all traces are now lost; and the date of Bhūsa itself is uncertain.

3 The _Amara-kosa_ only mentions _āṅgika_ and _sāttvika abhinaya_. This lexicon, which is said to have been translated into Chinese about 561-66 A. D. (see Nandargikar’s introd. to _Meghadūta_, 1894, p. 73), admits after Bharata the eight Rasas, and explains some of the dramaturgic technicalities, giving three synonyms of the actor (śāilalin, krśāvin and bharata) from the names of the three well-known teachers of dramaturgy. Piṇinī refers to the formation of the first two terms, but not that of the third; but this silence of the grammarian does not prove anything. The _Jaina Anuogadāra-sutta_ (ed. N. S. P. 1915, fol. 134-145, also quoted in Weber ii 2, pp. 701-02) which, Winternitz thinks, was probably put together by the middle of the 5th century, mentions nine Rasas; and the enu-
vāg-ānga-sattvajah; while in Kumāra vii. 91 mention is made of saṃdhis, as well as of lalitāṅgahāra mentioned in Nāṭya-śāstra xx. 17 (ed. Chowkamba xxii. 17).

The lower limit of the date of Bharata’s work, therefore, can be provisionally shifted back to the fourth or fifth century A.D., while it is almost certain that it existed in its present shape in the 8th century A.D.1 The upper limit cannot be put too early, because of the mention of Śakas, Yavanas, Pahlavas and other tribes, and probably does not go beyond the commencement of the Christian era; but we have already pointed out (p. 28 above) that their mention in a composite text is hardly of a conclusive value. It is difficult to settle the relative age of the sūtra- and the kārikā-texts; but if the tendency towards sūtra-bhāṣya style may be presumed to have been generally prevalent in the last few centuries B.C., then the presumed sūtra-text of Bharata belongs apparently to this period2. It was certainly much earlier than the present kārikā-text, in which Bharata is already a mythical sage as an expounder of the nāṭya-veda.

COMMENTATORS ON BHARATA

No commentary on Bharata’s Nāṭya-śāstra exists today except that of Abhinavagupta. But the names of some reputed

1 With this view Kane (HSP. p 19. 22) generally agrees.

2 It will be shewn later that the tradition that Bharata was the author of a Kāvya-laksāna, which forms in substance of the kārikā-verses of Mammaṭa’s Kav. prak., is entirely erroneous, as is also the statement made use of by Lévi that these kārikās are abridged from the Agni-purāṇa. Somadeva in his Yaśastilaka (959-60 A. D.) refers, indeed, to a bharata-praṇīta kāvyādhyāya (Peterson ii. p. 45) which, considering Somadeva’s date, could not have alluded to this tradition of Bharata’s authorship of Mammaṭa’s kārikās, but possibly, from the term of reference, to ch. xvi of the Nāṭya-śāstra, which deals with kāvya-laksānas, kāvyālambkāras kāvyā-guṇas and kāvya-doṣas as embellishments of dramatic speech.
as well as actual commentators on Bharata are known from Abhinavagupta, śarṅgadeva and other writers. They are:
1. Mātrgupta-cārya
2. Udbhata
3. Lollāta
4. Śaṅkuka
5. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka
6. Harṣa
7. Kṛśtidhara
8. Abhinavagupta

We have also the views of several other writers cited by Abhinavagupta. They are: Bhaṭṭa Yantra (on Nāṭya and Nrťta p. 208), Priyātithi (on Lāśyāṅga), Bhaṭṭa Vṛddhi (on Tāla), Bhaṭṭa Sumanas (on Tāla), Bhaṭṭa Gopāla (on Tāla), Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara (Vṛtta-prakaraṇa) and Ghaṅtaka (on Nāṭikā-bhedā). Rāhula or Rāhala (pp. 115, 172, 197 etc), also mentioned by śarṅgadeva (i.1.17), is quoted several times. As in one of his verses Bharata is named (bharatenoditam, Abh.bh. i, p. 72) he must have been, as most of the writers mentioned above, later than Bharata. From his name, as well as from Hemacandra (p. 316), who mentions him as Śākyācārya, he appears to have been a Buddhist teacher, whose view Hemacandra pointedly ignores. It cannot be determined if all these writers composed commentaries on the whole or a part of Bharata’s work: but from the references it seems


2 śarṅgadeva mentions: vyākhyātāro bhārāiye lollatodbhata-
śaṅkukāhī bhāṭṭabhāṅnavaguptaś ca śrimat-krśtidh areasparah. He mentions Rāhula and Mātrgupta elsewhere as two of his authorities, apparently on music.

3 The references to Abhinava-bhārati by vols. and pages are to M. Ramkrishna Kavi’s ed., Baroda 1926. Where the vol. is not indicated by a number but only by page, vol. i is meant.
that most of them wrote generally on music, and some especially on topics of dramaturgy as well.

Bhaṭṭa Tauta, Abhinava’s Guru, and Utpaladeva, his Parama-guru, are frequently quoted in his commentary. Tauta is known as having written a work called Kāvyakautuka, which is now lost; on this work Abhinava appears to have written a Vivaraṇa (Locana p. 178). At the beginning of his commentary Abhinavagupta pays an elegant tribute to Tauta as having expounded to him the Nāṭya-śastra, and references1 to Tauta’s view on various topics confirm this. But it need not mean that Tauta actually composed a commentary on Bharata. Utpaladeva, author of Īśvara-pratyabhijñā and other works, is well known in the history of Kashmir Saivism. He is quoted chiefly in the chapters on music. It is not clear if he wrote a commentary on these chapters or an independent work on music. Similar remarks apply to Śakaligarbhā who is cited once along with Udbhata (see below). Mention is also made of Taṇḍu2 in Nāṭya-śāstra (iv. 17-18) as one who instructed Bharata in the representation of Aṅgahāras together with various karaṇas (postures) and recakas (gestures). An unknown Tīkākara or Tīṭākṛt is frequently cited by Abhinava throughout the text.

Māṭṛguptācārya

Rāghavabhaṭṭa on Sakuntalā3 and Vāsudeva on Karpūra-maṅjari4 quote Māṭṛguptācārya as a writer on Dramaturgy;

1 See Kane in the work cited p. 388; also in his HSP, pp. 209-12; V. Raghavan as cited above pp. 153-62. Three metrical lines from Tauta are cited by Abhinava p. 291-92
2 With regard to Taṇḍu cited on p 90 (vol. 1) we are told that Nandi is another name for Taṇḍu, as the word Muni designate. Bharata (taṇḍu-muni-sahdau nandi-bharatayor āpara-nārāṇi) Hence Nandi-mata (cited on p. 171), in Abhinava’s opinion, stands for the views of Taṇḍu. See above p. 20.
3 Ed. NSP, 1922, pp. 5, 6, 7 (on Rasa), 8 (definition of Nāṭaka). 13 (Vāṭyāṅga), 15 (languages to be employed by various characters), 20 (Bhūṣaṇa), 57 (Saṃcārikā), 62 (Cenāpati), 74 (Hasita), 110 (Pātaṅkṣṭhāṇa), 123 (same). 126 (Sanskrit employed by Nica Pātra), 154 (Kaṅcukin), 156 (Pratihari). 199 (Parīcārikā), p. 230 (Phala-yoga), etc.
4 Ed. NSP, 1900, p. 5 (Sūtradhāra); cf Aufrecht i, 448a.
and Sundaramisra in his Nāṭya-pradīpa (dated 1613 A.D.) commenting on Bharata’s remarks on Nāndī says: 

\[
\text{asya vyākhyaṇe matṛguptācāryaiḥ...iyam udāṅtā.}^1
\]

This has been taken by S. Lévi to imply that Mātrgupta wrote a vyākhyaṇa or commentary on Bharata, and that assuming him to be the poet who lived under Harṣa-Vikramaditya (Rājatarang. iii. 125, 252) we get in him a very early commentator (7th century) on Bharata. But the available evidence does not appear to be conclusive. Our Mātrgupta, as the profuse metrical quotations on dramaturgic topics by Rāghavabhaṭṭa and others show, probably wrote an independent metrical work on Dramaturgy, in which he might have in the usual course commented on Bharata’s precepts; and the word vyākhyaṇa need not be construed to mean a commentary. Mātrgupta of Kahaṇḍa was a king and poet; how is it that he is cited in these works with the designation of Ācārya which signifies a teacher? Mātrguptaḥcārya is known to Abhinavagupta who quotes him on music (ch. xxix). Sāradātanaya in his Bhāva-prakāśana quotes his view on Naṭaka-vastu; Sāgaranandin in his Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa quotes several verses of his (pp. 5, 14, 20, 21, 23, 50); and Sāṅgadeva mentions him as an authority on music.²

Udbhata

As already noted above (p. 32, fn 2), Sāṅgadeva in his Samgīta-ratnākara (i. 1. 19) informs us that Udbhata was one of the early commentators on Bharata’s text. This is very likely, although Udbhata’s commentary has not yet been recovered.

1 Quoted in IOC iii. p. 347. Mātrgupta is also cited by Raṅganaṭtha on Vikramorvaṣṭya (dated 1659 A. D.). ed. NSP, 1914, p. 5 (on Nāndī); by Sarvāṇanda on Amara, p. 145 (Adbhuta Rasa), 147 (Bibhatsa Rasa), 150 (Vyabhicāri-bhāvas), 161 (Anubhāva in Śrāgāra), 16 (on Tāla).

2 The citations from Mātrgupta are collected together by T. R. Chintamani in his Fragments of Mātrgupta in JOR ii, 1928, pp. 118-20.
Sāṅgadeva’s statement appears to be confirmed by several citations of Udbhaṭa’s views by Abhinavagupta. One of these references, already quoted above (p. 24, fn. 1) occurs in Abhinava’s commentary on vi. 10 (p. 266-67) in which it is stated that certain views of Udbhaṭa on textual interpretation were not accepted by Lollaṭa, another commentator on Bharata. On ix. 182 (vol. ii, p. 70) and xviii. 76 (vol. ii, p. 441), again, Abhinava quotes certain readings of the text made out differently by Udbhaṭa. In two other passages (on xxi. 17 and xxi. 42 on Saṃdhis) Abhinava takes exception to the interpretation of Udbhaṭa as lakṣya- or agama-viruddha. In still another passage on the Vṛttis (on xviii. 110 vol. ii, pp. 451-52) Abhinava informs us that Udbhaṭa accepted only three Vṛttis (and not the usual four of Bharata), namely, Nyāya-ceṣṭā, Anyāya-ceṣṭā and Phala-saṃvitti. In this connexion Abhinava further refers to a certain writer, called Śakalīgarbha, who would admit five Vṛttis (namely, the four of Bharata and another called Ātma-saṃvitti in place of Udbhaṭa’s Phala-saṃvitti); but these views have been refuted by Lollaṭa and others. Again, Kuntaka (pp. 113-15) disagrees with Udbhaṭa’s view of the śva-śabda-vācyatā of Rasa as being opposed to Bharata’s opinion. These detailed references to Udbhaṭa’s views or comments on topics dealt with in such far apart chapters as vi, ix, xviii and xxi, make it probable that Udbhaṭa commented on the whole of the Nāṭya-śāstra.

But this presumption is not applicable to the case of Śakalīgarbha who appears to have flourished between Udbhaṭa and Lollaṭa. He might have been a writer on certain topics of Dramaturgy; but whether he composed a commentary on Bharata is not clear.

Lollaṭa

Lollaṭa is extensively cited by Abhinavagupta not only in ch. vi (on Rasa-sūtra), but also in ch. xii, xiii, xviii and xxi. Lollaṭa is mentioned as rejecting Udbhaṭa’s views on the Vṛttis.
(see above) and on the eleven topics of Nāṭya (on vi. 10).
Several other characteristic views of Lollaṭa are also mentioned; for instance, his view that Rasas are numerous (on vi. 45), although eight or nine are traditionally accepted for the stage; that Nāṭikā is Śaṭpadā (on xviii. 60) against Saṅkuka’s opinion that it is Aṣṭapadā. References are also made to Lollaṭa’s views on Dhruvā Tāla (on xii. 14); on Kakṣyā (xiii. 1); on what he calls (on xxi. 29) Anusāṃdhi (dealing with the acts of a Patākā-hero); on his omission of xviii. 32 from the text. These references to different parts of the text would go to confirm the tradition that Lollaṭa was also a regular commentator on Bharata’s text.

We have no definite material to determine the date of Lollaṭa; but all later citations agree in supporting the tradition that he was earlier than the commentator Saṅkuka whose theory of Rasa is said to have been directly levelled against that of Lollaṭa. Judging from his name, Lollaṭa was probably a Kashmirian; and if any chronological inference can be drawn from the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta’s reference (mentioned above) to an opinion of Udbhata being controverted by Lollaṭa, he was later than or contemporaneous with Udbhata, also a Kashmirian, whose latest date is 813 A.D.

The theory of Rasa advocated by Lollaṭa probably obtained traditionally before he definitely formulated it and became its first noted advocate; for Abhinava in his commentary (on ch. vi) tells us that Daṇḍin in his idea of Rasa follows the same view. Unless we presume Lollaṭa’s priority to Daṇḍin, we should take this to indicate that some theory or dogma similar to it was already known to Daṇḍin, even before Lollaṭa brought it into prominence.

Lollaṭa is also taken to be what is technically described as Dīrgha-vyāpāra-vādin with reference to the controversy about the function of Abhidhā; for he is said to have maintained that the primary function of Denotation of a word is

so far-reaching that it is competent in itself to express all other implied or suggested sense. But it is doubtful if this view is directly ascribed to Lollatā by any standard Sanskrit theorist of importance, although it is criticised without the name of the promulgator by Māmaṭa (p. 225), Mahimabhaṭṭa (p. 27), Hemacandra (p. 215), Vidyānātha (p. 43) and others. Govinda in his Kāvyā-pradīpa (p. 149) thinks that adherents of this view are followers of Bhāṭṭa-mata. Abhinava attributes a similar view (Locana p. 188) to the Bhāṭṭa or Prabhākara school; this might have been the source of Govinda’s statement. The Mīmāṃsakas and grammarians had already discussed the question of Abhidhā; and it must not be forgotten that several attempts to explain the fact of Dhvani (suggested sense), including Rasa-dhvani, obtained before the Dhvanikāra himself. It is probable that Lollatā was one of those who offered one of the several solutions to the question alluded to in the first verse of the Dhvanyāloka. We shall see that Lollatā was probably a Mīmāṃsaka in his view of Rasa, even if he was not a Dīrgha-vyāpāra-vādin.

The only direct quotation from Lollatā (and not mere consideration of his views) consists of two verses given by Hemacandra (p. 215). If he was a prose commentator, how do these metrical quotations fit in?¹

**Śaṅkuka**

Abhinavgupta very frequently refers to Śaṅkuka’s views on different dramaturgic topics; e.g. on Raṅga-pīṭha (on iii. 21-22)²; on Rasa-sūtra (on ch. vi)³; on Nāṭaka (on xviii.10)⁴; on the king as a character (on xviii. 12)⁵; on Nāṭkā-bheda (on xviii.60)⁶; on Pratimukha and Vimarsa

¹ V. Raghavan believes (Some Concepts pp. 207-8; JOR vi. p. 169) that Lollatā’s other name was Āparājīti, son of Aparājīta, because a quotation from Āparājīti by Rājaśekhara (p. 45) is given by Hemachandra (p. 215) with the name of Lollatā.
² Vol. i, p. 75.
³ Vol. i, pp. 239, 298, 318.
⁵ V. ii, p. 414.
Saṃdhis (on xxi.40,42) etc.¹ As the citations relate to matters covered by ch. iii to xxix, it is probable that Śaṅkuka composed a commentary on the entire text of Bharata. Abhinavagupta informs us (p. 275) that his teacher Bhaṭṭa Tauta disapproved of Śaṅkuka’s views on Rasa.

To Śaṅkuka are also ascribed several verses in the anthologies of Śāṅgadhara, Jahlana and Vallabhadeva,²—which indicates that there was also a poet of the same name. Kahlanā mentions (iv. 703-5) a poet Śaṅkuka and his poem Bhuvanā-bhyudaya. The reference is to the time of Ajitāpīda, whose date is given as 813 A.D. by Cunningham and 816 A.D. by S. P. Pandit. If our Śaṅkuka is identical with this poet, then he may be assigned to the first quarter of the 9th century.

_Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka_

Besides referring to his view on the Rasa-sūtra of Bharata (ch. vi)³ Abhinavagupta (Locana p. 27: also Abh. bh. xvi. 4)⁴ quotes under the name of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka a verse sabdapraḍhānyam āśritya⁵, which Hemacandra (p. 3-4) gives as a quotation from a work, named Hṛdaya-darpaṇa⁶, and which is also cited without the name of the author by Mahimabhaṭṭa and his commentator. Jayaratha also speaks (p. 12) of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka as Hṛdayadarpaṇa-kāra. It is probable, therefore, that some lost work of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s bore this title; and the references also indicate the probable source.

¹ See P. V. Kane, HSP, pp. 50-51. For six other instances from ch. xxiv to xxix where Śaṅkuka has been cited by Abhinavagupta.

² In the first two anthologies Śaṅkuka is called son of Mayūra, who is identified by some with the author of Sūrya-tataka, a contemporary of Bāṇa.

³ Vol. i, p. 278.

⁴ Vol. ii, p. 298.

⁵ This verse is also quoted by Jayaratha p. 9. Māṇikyacandra (p. 4) also ascribes the verse to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, whom he refers on p. 8 as the Ḥṛdayadarpaṇa-kāra.

⁶ P. V. Kane (HSP p. 187) suggests that the proper name of work was Ḥṛdaya-darpaṇa, but evidence is meagre to support this suggestion.
of the quotation which occurs immediately before the verse in question in Abhinavagupta. It is, however, not clear whether this Hṛdaya-darpāṇa is his alleged lost commentary on Bharata. Mahimabhaṭṭa's anonymous commentator tells us that this Hṛdaya darpāṇa, like the Vyakti-viveka, was composed with the special object of demolishing the Dhvani-theory¹ formulated by Ānandavardhana ; and this statement may explain why Abhinavagupta, as an adherent of the theory, takes so much pains to controvert Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's views in his Locana ², as well as in his Abhinaya-bhārata.³ Mahimabhaṭṭa, who had a similar object of combating the Dhvani-theory, claims entire originality for his own treatment by boasting that he had never looked into the Darpaṇa at all.⁴ The citations from the Hṛdaya-darpaṇa also indicate that it was probably composed in metrical form, and apparently never took at all the shape of a prose commentary.

A careful examination of the very few passages apparently referring to this work will shew that the topics dealt with in it centre round the question of Dhvani in poetry, in correlation with the theory of Rasa intimately connected therewith. Abhinava, for instance, while discussing (p. 16) the verse bhama dhammīa visatttho, which is given by Ānandavardhana as an instance of suggestion with an expressed injunction implying a prohibition, refutes Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's opinion as to this negative implication. In another place, Abhinava criticises (p. 21) the significance attached by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka

1 darpaṇo hṛdaya-darpāṇākhyo dhvani-dhvanīsa-granthopī, explaining the pun on the word darpāṇa used by Mahimabhaṭṭa in i. 4.

2 Both Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and his Hṛdaya-darpaṇa are cited by name in Locana pp. 27, 28, 63. Other references occur on pp. 11, 12, 15, 19, 21, 29, 36, 67, 68—all of which consist mostly of direct criticism in support of Dhvani-theory.

3 For instance, on Bharata p. 1: bhaṭṭa-nāyakas tu brakmanā parāśīmanā yad udāhṛtam......iti vyākhyānā hṛdaya-darpāṇe pravagyagrihit.

4 adṛṣṭa-darpāṇa mama dhīk i. 4.
to the word aham in the verse atta ettha nimajjai, which is discussed by Anandavardhana as an example of suggestion of a contrary kind where the expressed prohibition implies an injunction. It is evident from these references that Bhatta Nayaka’s work, like Mahimabhatta’s, was designed not merely as a refutation of the general theory of Dhvani, but also as a special attack on Anandavardhana’s exposition of the same. To take a minute point, the Dhvanikara in i. 13 uses the verb vyanaktah in the dual number with a special object in view, as Anandavardhana’s (as well as Abhinava’s) explanation rightly indicates Bhatta Nayaka seems to have attacked this use of the dual number, upon which Abhinavagupta remarks (Locana, p. 33): bhatta-nayakena yad dvi-vacanaṃ dūṣitaṃ tad gaja-nimilikayavasu.¹

It appears, therefore, that the Hridaya-darpana was not a commentary on Bharata,² but a metrical treatise in the anushtubh with a running prose commentary, dealing with the question of Dhvani, and incidentally with the question of Rasa-dhvani. No doubt, Abhinava in his own commentary on Bharata, as well numerous other later writers taking their cue from Abhinava, criticises at some length Bhatta Nayaka’s theory of Rasa, along with those of Lollatha and Shaṅkuka and with special reference to Bharata’s particular sūtra on the subject in ch. vi (also Locana pp. 67-68); yet Bhatta Nayaka is nowhere mentioned directly as a commentator on the same text. Very rarely Bhatta Nayaka’s interpretations of particular passages of Bharata are cited by Abhinavagupta, as they are with regard to those of Udbhata, Lollatha and Shaṅkuka.³ It is probable that Bhatta Nayaka’s peculiar theory

¹ Mahimabhatta also refers (p. 19) to this discussion, quoting these words of Abhinava from the Locana.


of Rasa (which, however, bears a resemblance to Abhinava’s own) called for a special refutation in the hands of this champion of the Dhvani-theory, because Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka denied the expressive function of Dhvani and attempted to explain the concept by postulating the function of Bhogī-karaṇā. But there is no definite indication to shew that this theory of Rasa, being a corollary to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s general theory of expression, was not incidental to his main thesis, which was directed towards the demolition of the new idea of Dhvani and establishment of another explanation of that concept. This may be the reason why Śāṅgadeva, in his enumeration of Bharata’s commentators before his time, omits the name of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka.¹

There can hardly be any doubt that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka was familiar with the text of the Dhvanyāloka, including Ānandavardhana’s Vṛtti, and should, therefore, be placed in a period later than the date of Ānandavardhana. The conclusion is supported by the statement of Jayaratha (p. 12) that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka lived after the Dhvanikāra by whom Jayaratha, like many other later writers, invariably means Ānandavardhana without distinguishing him from the so-called Dhvanikāra. On the other hand, the oldest writer to mention and cite Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka is Abhinavagupta, from whom he does not appear to be chronologically very distant. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, therefore, flourished between the last quarter of the 9th and the last quarter of the 10th century; and it will not be wrong if we assign him to the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century A.D. This date makes it likely that he is identical, as Peterson suggested, with Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who is mentioned by Kahlana (v. 159) as having flourished in the

¹ See p. 32 above, footnote 2. With this view P. V. Kane (HSP. p. 214) agrees. Similarly Ruyyaka, while reviewing the different systems which obtained before his time, mentions Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka not as a commentator but as an independent author who advocated a new system in common with other explanations of the Dhvani theory (p. 9, ed. N. S. P.)
reign of Śaṃkaravarman, son and successor of Avantivarman of Kashmir.

Harsa

Harṣa or Śrī-harṣa is said to have composed a Vārttika on the Nāṭya-śastra. He is cited by Abhinavagupta sometimes by name (on v 7, 180; xxix, 101) and sometimes as Vārttika-kṛt or Vārttika-kāra (i. 84; ii. 97-98; iv. 267-68), while Vārttika without the name of the author or Harṣa-vārttika (iv. 331) is also cited. On v. 8-15 there is a prose passage from the Vārttika quoted. The citations are more profuse from the first six chapters, but there is one reference to ch. xxix. Śāradātanaya (p. 238) refers to Harṣa’s view that the Toṭaka differs from Nāṭaka in having no Vidūṣaka. As the Vārttika is no longer available no definite conclusion is possible. These citations however, make it highly probable that it might not have been a regular commentary (in spite of its name), but dealt, mostly in Āryā metre (with occasional prose), with relevant parts of the Nāṭya-śastra.

Kirtidhara

Śāṅgadeva informs us (see above p. 32, fn 2) that Kirtidhara was a commentator on Bharata’s text. He must have been earlier than Abhinavagupta who tells us (ch.xxix) that not having seen Nandikesvara’s work himself, he is relying on Kirtidhara’s account of it (see above p. 20). There are several references in Abhinava’s commentary to Kirtidhara or

1 Vol. i. p. 211 and p. 251.
2 Vol. i. p. 31; i, p. 67; i, 172, 174 respectively.
3 Vol. i. p. 174.
4 Vol. i. p. 207
5 Vol. i. p. 212.
6 Śrīharṣa Miśra quoted in Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa’s Rasa-pradīpa (a prose passage) may or not be our author.
7 As in the case of Nānyadeva’s Bharata-bhāṣya or Bharāṇa-vārttika.
Kirtidharacarya on Nāṭya and Nṛtta (ch. iv) and on the Geyādhikāra section. These citations show that Kirtidhara, like Sāṅgadeva, was interested mostly in music, but they are not sufficient to establish that he wrote a regular commentary on the entire text of Bharata.

Abhinavagupta

Although Abhinavagupta contented himself with the writing of commentaries in the field of Sanskrit Poetics, his works have almost the value of independent treatises for their profound erudition and critical acumen. As his reputation in Poetics rests on his exposition of the Dhvani-theory, it would be better to take him up in connexion with the Dhvani-kāra and Ānandavardhana.

The entire text of Abhinava’s commentary, called Abhinava-bhārati, on Bharata’s text which consisted of 36 chapters, is not available, either in the printed edition or in any MS. His comments on ch.vii (except the prose portion and the first few verses), ch. viii and ch. xxxiii-xxxiv are missing, and there are also short gaps (e.g. on the last verses of ch. v). As he refers to his Locana in this work, it was composed later.

Nānyadeva

A work called Bharata-bhāṣya (also Bharata-vārttika in some of its colophons) by Nānyadeva or Nānyapati is available in a unique MS (221 folios) in the BORI collection. The author is called Mithileśvara (king of Mithilā) in one of its verses, while the colophons describe him as Mahāsāmantādhipati. The work is unknown to Abhinavagupta who was earlier in date and who is utilised in it but rarely mentioned by name. Nānyadeva is known as the founder of the Karṇā-

1 Vol. i, p. 208.
2 BORI Cat. of MSS, xii, no. 111 of 1869-70, pp. 377-83. The work also goes by the name Sarasvatī-kṛdayālaṅkāra. Dr. C. P. Desai of Tarapur, Thana, Bombay, is understood to be editing the work for Khairagarh Music University, M. P.
țaka dynasty of Mithilā who ruled from 1097 to 1147 A.D\textsuperscript{1}, The author mentions another work of his called Grantha-
mahārṇava.

Although it is called a Bhāṣya, it is not a direct commentary on Bharata's text. It was ambitiously planned in four Aṃśas, each devoted to one of the four kinds of Abhinaya; but the extant portion, itself extensive, deals only with one kind, namely, Vācika, and relates chiefly to ch. xxviii to xxxiii of the Nāṭya-śāstra, which deal with music. The MS, though old, is defective, wanting in ch. v, xvi and xvii (the total number of promised chapters being seventeen). Bharata is profusely quoted, but other old authorities like Nārada, Śatātapa, Dattila, Kāśyapa (also Bṛhat-Kāśyapa and Vṛddha-Kāśyapa), Mataṅga, Bṛhad-deśi, Nandi-mata, Yaṣṭika (otherwise unknown), Kirtidhara, and Viśākhila are frequently cited. Śāṅgadeva appears to be the only author who cites Nānyadeva.
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CHAPTER III
FROM BHĀMAHA TO ĀNANDAVARDHANA

BHĀMAHA

The earliest citation of Bhāmaḥa in later Alamkāra literature is to be found in two passages in Ānandavardhana’s Vṛtti on the Dhvanyālokā (pp. 39, 207); and at p. 236 Ānandavardhana quotes anonymously Bhāmaḥa iii. 27. The next interesting reference occurs in the commentary of Pratīhāren-durāja, who informs us (p. 13) that his author Udbhāṭa composed a work, presumably a commentary on Bhāmaḥa which is described as Bhāmaḥa-vivaraṇa. This statement is confirmed by Abhinavagupta (Locana pp. 10, 140, 159, vivaraṇakṛt) and Hemachandra (Comm. pp. 17, 110); while Ruyyaka cites the commentary generally as bhāmaḥiya uthbhaṭa-lakṣaṇa (p. 183) and Samudrabandha describes it as kāvyālaṃkāra-vivṛti (p. 89). There are also numerous passages in Udbhāṭa’s independent work, Kāvyālaṃkāra-samgraha, which unmistakably copy some of the definitions of poetic figures directly from Bhāmaḥa, and do not hesitate to repeat the very language of the earlier work.¹

Vāmana, Udbhāṭa’s contemporary, also appears to betray an acquaintance with Bhāmaḥa’s text.² Bhāmaḥa, for

---

¹ See, for instance, the definitions of the figures rasavat, atiśayokti, sasāṃdeha, sahokti, apahnuti, utpreksā, yathāsaṃkhyā, aprastuta-praśamsā paryayokta, ākṣepa, vibhāvanā, virodha and bhāvika.—Bhāmaḥa is quoted extensively by Abhinavagupta and other later writers.

² Bhāmaḥa’s work called Bhāmaḥa-laṃkāra (but Kāvyālaṃkāra is the first verse) consists of six Paricchedas or chapters and about 400 verses. The topics covered are: I. Purposes of Kāvyā, its definition and divisions from different points of view; Sargabandha, Kathā and Ākhyāyikā; reference to Vaidarbha and Gauḍa modes;
instance, defines the figure Upamā (ii. 30) as viruddhenopamānenena......upameyasya yat sāmyan guṇa-leśena sopamā; and Vāmana seems to paraphrase this definition in the concise form of a Sūtra: upamānenopameyasya guṇa-leśataḥ sāmyam upamā (iv. 2. 1). Again, speaking of effective implication (atiśayavān arthaḥ) to be found in Upamā, Bhāmaha lays down (ii. 50):

\[ \text{yasyātiśayavān arthaḥ kathāṃ so'sambhavo mahaḥ/} \\
\text{istam cātiśayārthatvam upamotprekṣayor yathā/} \]

Reading together Vāmana iv. 2. 20 and 21 (anupapattir asambhavaḥ and na viruddhoʿtiśayaḥ), we find that Vāmana is apparently repeating the same view; and in his Vṛtti on the first Sūtra, he adds upamāyām atiśayasyeṣṭatvāt, making it clear in the next Sūtra that an effective implication (atiśaya), which is contradictory, should be avoided. Vāmana also reproduces anonymously a verse of an unknown poet whose name is given by Bhāmaha (ii. 46) with the same verse as Śākhavardhana. Such repetition of views in more or less standardised phraseology in a technical treatise, or the quotation of the same illustrative verse in a similar context need not be taken as conclusive; but Vāmana, in his Vṛtti on v. 2. 38, actually though not accurately, quotes a part of a verse from Bhāmaha ii. 27, and comments on the peculiar usage of the word bhaṅguram employed therein.

some Doṣas pertaining generally to the Kāyya. II-III. The three Guṇas (Mādhurya, Prasāda and Ojas); treatment of Alamkāras which ends with ch. iii (for a list of the poetic figures see vol. ii. ch. ii(i)). IV. Eleven Doṣas, with illustrations. V. Eleven Doṣas again which arise from a faulty Pratijñā, Hetu or Drṣṭanta, VI. Sauśabdya or grammatical correctness (elaborated later by Vāmana in fifth Adhikarpa of his work).

1 Cf Bharata xvi. 41.

2 The verse is quoted with Bhāmaha’s name in Jayamaṅgala on Bhaṭṭī x. 21; anonymously in the Vakrokti- juvita (along with other verses from Bhāmaha) and in Lacana p. 40 anonymously.
This will justify us in placing Bhāmaha chronologically before Udbhāta and Vāmana who, as we shall see, flourished in the last quarter of the 8th century A. D., and will give us one terminus to the date of Bhāmaha.

With regard to the other terminus, controversy has been keen and busy. Pathak finds in the mention of a nyāsakāra in Bhāmaha vi. 36 a clear reference to the Buddhist Jinendra-buddhi, author of a commentary (ed. Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi 1913, 1919-25) on the Kāśikā, and comes to the conclusion that "as the nyāsakāra (meaning Jinendra) lived about 700 A. D., Bhāmaha must be assigned to the 8th century". 1 Against this K. P. Trivedi has demonstrated 2 that the allusion to the opinion of the nyāsakāra cannot be taken as an unmistakable reference to Jinendrabuddhi's views, and that the existence of some other nyāsakāras is also made probable by the citations of Mādhava, as well as by a punning passage in Bāṇa's Harṣa-carita. 3 Jacobi 4 has joined issue by adding a doubt on the correctness of the date assigned by Pathak to Jinendrabuddhi who, on the authority of Kielhorn, was probably later than Haradatta (d. 878 A. D.).

No fresh light is thrown on the question by the conjecture 5 that Bhāmaha in i. 42 refers to the Megha-dūta by his condemnation of the poetical device of employing clouds, among other things, as messengers; nor by Pathak's other equally fanciful supposition that Māgha ii. 86b refers to Bhāmaha

1 IA xli p. 232 ff. at p. 235, see also JBRAS xxiii pp. 25-26.
2 IA xlii pp. 204 f, and at pp. 260-1
3 kṛta-guru-paçonvāsāḥ (ed N S. P. p. 96), explained by Samkara as kṛte'bhavasto guru-pade duśbodha-sabde nyāso vṛttir vivarano yaiḥ.
4 Sb. der Preuss. Akad xxiv (1922), pp 210-11.
t. 16. Nothing, again, is gained by the controversy over the question whether Bhāmaha, the son of Rakrilagomin and worshipper of Sārva, was a Buddhist, as indicated by the opening and closing verses of his work. Jacobi however, has shewn that Bhāmaha has made considerable use of the teachings of Buddhist philosophers in ch. v, and that the upper limit to Bhāmaha's date should be determined with reference to that of Buddhist Dharmakirti, some of whose philosophical doctrines Bhāmaha has utilised even to the repetition of Darmakirti's actual phraseology. Dharmakirti is placed by Jacobi between the sojourn in India of Yuan Chwang and Yi-ting respectively (630-643 and 673-695 A.D.), as he is not known to the former, while the latter refers to him among those of late years. The upper limit, therefore, of Bhāmaha's date should be fixed at the third quarter of the 7th century A.D. Sāntarakṣita in his Tattva-samgraha (ed. GOS, 1926, p. 219, verses 912-14), who is said to have flourished about 705-762 A.D., cites three verses of Bhāmaha (vi. 17-19) criticising the Buddhist Apoha-vāda. This would also go to establish that Bhāmaha cannot be placed much later than the seventh century.

We can therefore, place Bhāmaha approximately in the period between the last quarter of the 7th and the middle of

1 But see Daṇḍin 10; Vāmana i. 1. 1 (177tt); Rudraṭa ii. 1 and Ānandavardhana p. 5, for the same idea of sabda and artha as constituents of poetry

2 On this controversy, see JRAS 1905, pp. 535 f; JRAS, 1908, pp. 543f, Trivedi introd. to Pratāparudra; Haricand op. cit. p. 71; Pathak in IA 1912, p. 235.

3 op. cit pp. 211-12. G. Tucci (Bhāmaha and Diṇṅa in IA, June 1930) is of opinion that Bhāmaha's logical theories allude to Diṇṅa, and not to Dharmakirti who was posterior to Bhāmaha.

8th century. As it is probable that he might have been a younger contemporary of Dharmakirti's and also presumably lived some time before his commentator Udbhata, it would not be wrong if we place him towards the end of the 7th and the commencement of the 8th century A.D.

(2)

We have already discussed the relation which Bharata's treatment of Alamkaras might have borne to Bhamaha's much fuller and later disquisition. What we find in Bharata constitutes the earliest speculation on the subject that we possess; but Bhamaha himself tells us that he had predecessors whose works he apparently utilised. While referring to these predecessors (or contemporaries) generally as anya, aparé or kecit, Bhamaha cites twice by name one Medhavin in ii. 40, 88. One of these passages is referred to by Nami-sadhu on Rudrata xi. 24, where (as well as in two other places on i. 2, ii. 2) the full name is given as Medhavirudra, which form also occurs in Rajasekhar (p. 12). This writer was thus earlier than Bhamaha but probably later than Bharata.

Bhamaha's work is divided into six chapters with a total of about 400 verses (mostly in Anustubh) (see above p. 46.

1 i. 13, 24; ii. 4, 57; iii. 4; iv. 12 etc.
2 i. 14, 31; ii. 6, 8; iii. 4; iv. 6 etc.
3 ii. 2, 37, 93; iii. 54 etc. He also cites one Rama Sarman in ii. 19, but from ii. 58 this author appears to be a poet; the name of his work is given as Acyutottara. The Raja Mitra cited in ii. 45 appears from iii. 10 to be a Kavya. Besides Nyasa (vi. 36), Panini (vi. 62-63) and Kanabhaksa (v. 17), we have mention of Sakavardhana (ii. 47) and a work called Asmaka-vaamsa. These citations are not of much use for chronological purposes.

4 Raja Sekhara couples Medhavirudra's name with that of Kumradasa and adds the information that he was a born-blind poet. The name does not constitute the names of two different poets, Medhavin and Rudra, as some writers suggest, nor need we take it on the late authority of the Trikamita-asha as a name of Kalandasa.—Hultsch (ed. Megha-duta p. xi) states that Vallabhadra in his comm. (xi. 6) cites Medhavirudra, but this is not found in the printed text.
it is smaller in extent than Daṇḍin’s work (about 660 verses). At one time it was believed, on the indication given by the Jayamaṅgalā on Bhaṭṭi, that the Alamkāra-chapters in that Kāvyā, especially canto x, was meant to illustrate the rhetorical teachings of Bhāmaha in particular; but the date now assigned to Bhāmaha will readjust his relation to Bhaṭṭi in a new light. Bhaṭṭi tells us in xxii. 35 that he composed his poem in Valabhi ruled over by Śrīdharasena. It appears that no less than four Śrīdharasenas ruled at Valabhi roughly between 500 and 650 A.D., of whom the last flourished, as his latest grant shows, in 651 A.D. Bhaṭṭi, therefore, at the latest, lived in the first half of the 7th century; and if, as his editor concludes, he may be assigned to the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century, he was certainly older than Bhāmaha by almost a century. Bhāmaha probably knew his work and therefore remarked, while dismissing verbal juggleries like prahelikā (ii. 20):

kāvyāṃ api yadimāṇī vyākhyā-gamyāmi śāstravat /
utsavaḥ sudhiyāṃ eva hanta durmedhaso hatāḥ//,

with a pointed reference to Bhaṭṭi’s self-boasting in xxii. 34. 5,

vyākhyā-gamyam idam kāvyam utsavaḥ sudhiyām alam/,
hatā durmedhasaś cāsmin vidvat-priyatayā mayā//.

The treatment of Alamkāras in Bhaṭṭi may, therefore, be

1 Jacobi in ZDMG lxiv, p. 130f.
2 The three cantos of this Kāvyā (x-xii) comprising what is called Prasanna-kāṇḍa are supposed to illustrate matters concerning Poetics. Thus, canto x (75 verses) illustrates Alamkāras, xi (47 verses) Mādhurya Guna and xii (87 verses) the figure Bhāvika which is called a Prabandha-guṇa. The Bhaṭṭi-kāvyā consists of 22 cantos, chiefly illustrating rules of Sanskrit Grammar.
3 kāvyam idam vihitam mavā valabhyaṃ / śrīdharasena- narendra-pālitāyāṃ. The Jayamaṅgalā reads śrīdhara-sūnu-narendra in the second line, but this cannot be supported in view of the fact that we do not hear of any prince of the name Narendra, son of Śrīdhara, in the list of Valabhi princes known to us. Maṇḍinātha and Bharatamallika do not comment on this verse.
presumed to supply one of the missing links in the history of rhetorical speculations anterior to Bhāmaha. A remarkable coincidence of treatment, which probably started the theory of Bhāṭṭi’s appropriation of Bhāmaha’s teachings, is at once noticeable not only in the order, number and presumed naming and characterization of different poetic figures; but a detailed examination will at the same time show that beneath this general agreement there are enough discrepancies which will indicate that neither of them follows scrupulously the views of the other. The agreement apparently shows that the two authors were not chronologically distant from each other by such a considerable length of time as might betoken a material difference in the number, order or definition of the poetic figures; while the discrepancies may be reasonably explained as indicating that they did not probably draw from the same source.

The special object of the particular canto in Bhāṭṭi being that of illustrating the various forms of poetic figures prevalent in his time, we may presume that it was probably based on a particular treatise on Alṃkāra to which the poet generally adheres. He is said to have mentioned in all 38 such independent figures, along with 39 sub-species of some individual figures. He does not himself give the names of these figures, but they are indicated by the Jayamaṅgalā, as well as in some MSS which apparently preserve the traditional nomenclature1. These, with one trifling exception (udāra=udāta), correspond to the particular names given to them in Bhāmaha. As to the order or sequence of treatment, a comparative table will show that Bhāmaha gives the first 23 figures (up to viśesokti) in the same order as in

1 The commentators, however, differ among themselves in the naming of the poetic figures in several stanzas.—The Jayamaṅgalā is printed in the NSP ed. of the Kavya (1887), while the commentary of Mallinātha is given in the BSS ed. (in 2 vols. 1898). The commentary of Bharatanālika along with Jayamaṅgalā has been edited in 2 vols, Calcutta 1871-73.
Bhaṭṭi with the exception of the pairs, rūpaka, and dipaka, arthāntara-nyāsa and ākṣepa, which are given in an inverse order. The rest of the figures appear with a slightly different arrangement, because Bhāmaha admits aprastuta-praśaṁsā omitted by Bhaṭṭi, and adopts a somewhat different order in mentioning the five figures here treated in common, until we come to virodha. From here, again, the order is the same, excepting that Bhāmaha mentions bhāvika (which is separately illustrated in another canto by Bhaṭṭi), while Bhaṭṭi admits an unknown figure nipuṇa, and adds hetu and vārtā which are expressly rejected by Bhāmaha. As the exposition of Jayamaṇḍalā shows, Bhaṭṭi generally follows the definitions of Bhāmaha where the figures are common (even in the cases of subspecies of these figures\(^1\)), with only a few exceptions.

These exceptions, though few, are yet significant. They refer in particular to the figures yamaka (of which Bhaṭṭi mentions 20, while Bhāmaha only 5 subspecies), upamā (where the treatment of subspecies is slightly divergent), rūpaka (of which the four subspecies of Bhaṭṭi do not correspond to the two of Bhāmaha), aprastuta-praśaṁsā omitted by Bhaṭṭi, and nipuṇa omitted by Bhāmaha. At the same time, Bhāmaha mentions but rejects praheḷikā, hetu, sūkṣma, leśa and vārtā, of which Bhaṭṭi admits only hetu (probably as an afterthought) and vārtā. Bhaṭṭi does not recognise svabhāvokti, which is mentioned but apparently disfavoured by

\(^1\) e.g. the figure ākṣepa, of which the two subdivisions uktaviśaya and vakṣyānta-viśaya are found in both Bhāmaha and Bhaṭṭi, they being unaware of the different interpretation of Vāmana and the somewhat fine differentiations of Daṇḍin. The same remark applies to dipaka and its three subspecies, which do not agree with the exposition of Bharata, Daṇḍin or Vāmana. Cf also the three subspecies of śeṣa viz. sahokti-śli, upamā-śli, and hetu-śli, illustrated by Bhaṭṭi and mentioned by Bhāmaha in iii. 17, although later writers, like Daṇḍin and Udbhaṭa, speak of śeṣa as coming with many other figures. Pratīhāryendurāja distinctly alludes (p. 47) to this division admitted by Bhāmaha: bhāmaha hi “taṭ sahoktyupamā-hetu-nirdeśa trividham yathā” iii śiśasya-trāvidhyam āha.
Bhāmaha. It is possible that Bhaṭṭi’s original ended naturally with āsis, as Bhāmaha’s work itself does; but he tacked on hetu and nipuṇa¹ as two supplementary figures popular in his time. The bhāvika, which both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin call a prabandha-guṇa, is said to have been illustrated by Bhaṭṭi in a separate canto (xii), entitled bhāvikatva-pradarśana. But by far the greatest divergence is noticeable in the treatment of the subspecies of yamaka, rūpaka and upamā. No two writers are indeed agreed with regard to the treatment and classification of yamaka, and Bhaṭṭi on this point is scarcely in agreement with any of the known writers on the subject, such as Bharata, Daṇḍin Rudraṭa, the author of the Agni-purāṇa and Bhoja among earlier authorities. Probably he is drawing upon some old author whose work is not known to us.² In the classification of rūpaka, which Bhāmaha subdivides into samasta-vastu-vidyā and ekadesa-vivarti, Bhaṭṭi seems to follow a different tradition which mentions four subspecies, respectively

1 This figure is included in udāra or udāta by Jayamāṅgalā, while Bharatamallika and Mallinātha take it as an illustration of preyas on the authority of Daṇḍin and Devānātha (the latter probably a commentator on Mammaṭa having the same name).

2 The names of some of these subspecies of yamaka are now lost but for the naming of them in Bhaṭṭi, and later authors speak in altogether different terminology. Some of these are apparently preserved in Bharata, who mentions as many as ten subspecies, but in most cases they are differently defined. For instance, the samudga of Bhaṭṭi may be the same figure as defined by Bharata, but the yukpāda of Bhaṭṭi x. 2 is called vikrānta by Bharata and is known as sandasta in Rudrāta. Similarly the pādānta illustrated in x. 3 is called āmrēśita in Bharata; while cakravāla of Bharata is different from the figure so named in Bhaṭṭi and seems to coincide with the kāṇci of the latter, the kāṇci of Bharata being an altogether different subspecies. It appears that names like vṛnta, mithuna, or vipatha cannot be traced in any of the existing works, but some of the kinds illustrated by Bhaṭṭi under these strange names may be found under different designations in other writers later than Bhaṭṭi. In naming these in Bhaṭṭi, the Jayamāṅgalā is probably following a tradition or an authority entirely unknown to us.
designated kamalaka (viśiṣṭopamā-yukta). avataṃsaka (śesārthānvavasita or khaṇḍa-rūpaka), artha-rūpaka and lalāmaka (anvarthopamā-yukta). In the subspecies of upamā, Bhaṭṭi illustrates upamā with iva and yathā (in common with Bhāmaha); and his luptopamā and taddhitopamā probably correspond to some extent to samāsopamā and upamā with vat mentioned by Bhāmaha. But Bhaṭṭi does not illustrate prativastūpamā of Bhāmaha nor does he refer to nindo, praśaṃso, ācikhyāso and mālo, criticised by Bhāmaha but recognised by Daṇḍin. At the same time, Bhaṭṭi’s saho and sumo have nothing directly corresponding to them in Bhāmaha.

It will be clear from this brief exposition that, leaving aside the subspecies, there is a general agreement between the treatments of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha with regard to the independent poetic figures. It may be noted that Bhāmaha agrees with Bhaṭṭi in taking ananvaya, sasāṃdeha, upamā-rūpaka and utprekṣāvayava as self-standing figures, while Daṇḍin includes the first two in the sub-species of upamā, and the last two in those of rūpaka and utprekṣā respectively. Bhāmaha also agrees with Bhaṭṭi in rejecting prahelikā, sūkṣma and leśa; but vārtā and hetu, also similarly rejected by Bhāmaha, are admitted by Bhaṭṭi. Daṇḍin expressly recognises all these, excepting vārtā in place of which he probably admits the more comprehensive svabhāvokti, which

1 mentioned in Vāgbhāṣālaṇḍāra iv. 66.
2 Bharata (xvi. 49-50) mentions nindo and praśaṃso, while his kalpito probably corresponds to ācikhyāso. The kalpito is admitted by Vāmana (iv. 2. 2) but apparently defined in a different sense.
3 See also H. R. Dīvekar in JRAS, 1929, pp. 825-41 for a comparison and contrast of treatment made respectively by Bhāmaha and Bhaṭṭi.

Daṇḍin is followed in this view by all later writers, except Vāmana, who still regards these as independent figures. It seems, therefore, that Vāmana vi. 3. 33 is a criticism of Daṇḍin ii. 358, and not vice versa, as Peterson supposed.
is disfavoured by Bhāmaha and not illustrated by Bhaṭṭi. The most material discrepancy with reference to independent figures occurs in the remarkable omission in Bhaṭṭi of aprastuta-prāsanisā (which, like svabhāvokti, is a recognised figure in later times) and in the occurrence of nipuṇa unknown in later literature. Coming to the subspecies, however, the discrepancies are more striking. Admitting that some of the fine differentiations, as in the case of Daṇḍin’s innumerable subvarieties of independent figures, may have been invented by the ingenuity of the theorist himself, this argument does not seem to apply very well to Bhaṭṭi, who was himself no theorist but only professed to illustrate the poetic figures popular in his time and presumably based his treatment on some standard treatise. The conclusion, therefore, is likely that Bhaṭṭi made use of a text unknown to Bhāmaha but not materially differing from Bhāmaha’s own sources; and that the interval between these two authors did not witness much change in the discussion of poetic figures, except what is apparent in the simplification of the treatment of yamaka and rūpaka, in the dropping of a figure like nipuṇa and adding an important figure or an important sub-figure like aprastuta-prāsanisā or prativastupamā respectively. The progress is not so remarkable as that indicated by the enormous stride made in the interval between Bharata who mentions only four independent figures, and Bhaṭṭi, who mentions thirty-eight.¹

¹ Although the name Bhāmaha is not a common one in Sanskrit, it attaches itself (besides two verses in Subhāṣitavalī 1644-1645 that are also found in our text ii.92, iii.21) to a commentator on Vararuci’s Prakṛta-prakāśa, who is probably a different author. The Kāmadhenu comm. on Vāmana also cites several verses from a treatise apparently on the kalās by Bhāmaha (p. 29, ed. Benares); but as our Bhāmaha, as well as his Bhāmahalāmākāra (p. 39), is also cited in several places in the same commentary, it is possible that these verses occurred in some lost chapter of his work where he mentioned the names of the kalās (atra kalānām uddeśaḥ kṛto bhāmahena preceding the verses cited). Nārāyaṇa in his commentary
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Commentary. The only known comm. is Bhāmaha-vivaraṇa by Udbhaṭa, which is now lost. See above p. 46.

DAṆḌIN

( 1 )

The date of Daṇḍin, author of the Kāvyādarśa, is one of the most difficult problems in the chronology of Alamkāra literature. Ānandavardhana does not directly cite him, as he cites Bhāmaha, and the earliest mention of Daṇḍin’s name occurs in Pratīhārendurāja (p. 26). Daṇḍin’s own work gives us hardly any clue. His references to the Bṛhatkathā written in bhūta-bhāṣā (i. 38), or to the Setu-bandha known to him in māhārāṣtrī Prakrit (i. 34) throw little light on the question; and no definite chronological conclusion is deducible from the verses ii. 278-79, which express, under the form of the figure preyas, the supreme gratification of a certain king, Rājarman (or Rātavarman), on the occasion of his obtaining the much-coveted beatific vision of his adored deity.¹ The solution proposed to the on the Vṛttā-ratāṅkara (pp. 5-6) quotes long passages from Bhāmaha which, if authentic, indicate that Bhāmaha might have written also on Metrics.

¹ Rājarman is conjectured by some (Rangacharya’s preface p.
prahelikā in iii. 114 (also cf. iii. 112) by Taruṇavācaspati and other commentators that it refers to the Pallava kings of Kānci¹ only supports the Tamil tradition that Daṇḍin was probably a South Indian author. The allusion to Daṇḍin i. 1, again, in a verse attributed by Sārgadharā (no. 180) to Vījjā or Vījjakā (whose date is unknown but who is tentatively supposed by some to be Vijayā, wife of Candrāditya and daughter-in-law of Pulakeshin II, about 659 A.D.),² implies merely a pleasant raillery at the expense of Daṇḍin by some later boastful poetess.

The only definite terminus to Daṇḍin’s date is obtained from references in South Indian vernacular works on Alamkāra, belonging in all probability to the 9th century A.D., which cite him as an established authority. The Sinhalese treatise Siya-bas-lakara, which Barnett thinks cannot “in any case be later than the 9th century A.D.”³ cites Daṇḍin in v. 2 as one of its authorities. The Kanarese work Kavirāja-mārga (in three chapters), attributed to the Rāṣṭrakūta prince Amoghavarṣa Nṛpatuṅga (who flourished in the first half of

¹; also Agashe’s preface to Daśakumāra ed. B. S. S. pp. lxii f) to be Rājasinīhavarman, otherwise known as Narasīhavarman II of Kānci (end of the 7th century), one of whose birudas (viz. kālakāla which is also a name of Śiva) Daṇḍin is supposed to have alluded to in iii. 50; while iii. 25 is presumed to imply a pun referring to the royal token (mahāvarāha) of Cālukya Pulakeshin II. But the passage under discussion looks like a reference to a legendary rather than a contemporary prince; and, as Pischel suggested, the entire verse 278 may have been taken directly from a work referring to his story. Cf Jacobi op. cit. p. 214.

1 The phrase aṣṭa-varṇa occurring in the prahelikā is also found, as G. K. Sankara points out, in the Mamandur Inscription of Mahendravarman I. Premachandra on Dandin interprets punḍraka instead of pellava in the verse, which fact indicates that it is capable of a different interpretation.—There are references to Kāverī, Cola and Kaliṅga in iv. 43-44.

2 See Agashe op. cit. pp. lix f.

3 JRAI, 1905, p. 841. The work has been edited by Hendrick Jayatilaka, Colombo 1892.
the 9th century), gives six verses1 which are exact translations of corresponding verses in Daṇḍin. Pathak, in the introduction to his edition (1898) of this work (p. 19), further adds that in ch. iii most of the verses “are either translations or adaptations from the Kāvyādarśa,” and that there are also convincing indications of Daṇḍin’s “influence on other parts of the work” as well.

This will give us the 9th century as the lower limit to Daṇḍin’s work, a conclusion which may also be established by showing that Daṇḍin was probably earlier than Vāmana, who may be assigned to the beginning of the same period. We need not enter into this point in detail here, but there are several unmistakable indications which show that Vāmana’s work betrays a further progress in the elaboration of some of the fundamental ideas which are dealt with by Daṇḍin. The stress which Daṇḍin puts on the theory of Riti (which he calls Mārga) is carried to its furthest extreme by Vāmana, who elevates Riti to the rank of the very essence of poetry. While Daṇḍin mentions two types of Mārga, Vāmana adds an intermediate third Riti; and from Mammaṭa ix. 4 we learn that Vāmana was the first to suggest this threefold division.2 Again, while Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin apparently engage in a controversy over the classification of Kāvyā into Kathā and Akhyāyikā, Vāmana peremptorily brushes aside all discussion and refers the curious reader to the works of “others.”3 Daṇḍin is also anxious to show, in the course of a long digression, that the word īva is indicative of utpreksā (which figure itself is admitted by Bhāmaha ii. 88 only in

1 viz., those defining asādhūranopama, asaihbhavopamā, amasayākṣepa, viserokti, netu and asaiyokti respectively.
2 It is noteworthy also that Daṇḍin is unaware of the more or less technical term riti, made so familiar by Vāmana, but uses the almost synonymous expression mārga, also used by Vāmana in iii. 1. 12.
3 yac ca kathākhyāyikā mahākāvyam iti tallakṣaṇam ca nātva hṛdayaṅgamam ity upaksītam āsambhīḥ, tad anyto grāhyam, on 1. 3. 32.
deference to the views of Medhāvin); but to Vāmana (iv. 3. 9, vr̥tti) it is already an established fact. Such instances can be easily multiplied, but what is given here will be enough to indicate Daṇḍin’s priority to Vāmana,¹ and fix the lower limit of his date at the end of the 8th and the commencement of the 9th century².

¹ It is supposed by Kiellhorn (with whom Peterson in his pre to Daśakumāra agrees) that Daṇḍin ii. 51, in which some of the upamā-doṣas are justified, is directed against Vāmana iv. 2. 8f., implying thereby that Daṇḍin is later than Vāmana. But if we take the texts of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana together on this point, we can only make out the following facts. Bhāmaha, in accordance with the opinion of Medhāvin, brings forward (ii. 39-40) seven upamā-doṣas, viz., deficiency (ḥīnatva), impossibility (asaṁbhava), disparity of gender (linga-bheda), disparity of number (vacana-bheda), contrariety (viparyaya), excess (adhikātva) and non-similitude (asāḍṛśya.) Daṇḍin, tacitly assuming these, only remarks about two pairs of them (viz. disparity of gender and number, excess and deficiency) that they do not necessarily disturb comparison if they do not wound the cultivated sensibility. In this he is substantially following Bhāmaha, who says generally that the upamāya cannot in every respect be similar to the upamāna (ii. 43), a dictum which is implicitly accepted by most later writers, who define upamā as bhedābheda-pradhāne upamā. Therefore, deficiency etc. become faults only when they disturb the sense of appreciation of the man of taste. Vāmana, on the other hand, mentions six upamā-doṣas instead of seven, including viparyaya in adhikātva and hīnatva (iv. 2. 11 vr̥tti) with the final pointed remark: ata evāśmākaṃ māte saḥ doṣāḥ. It appears, therefore, that Daṇḍin ii. 51f. is a link in the chain between Bhāmaha ii. 39f. and Vāmana iv. 2. 8f.

² Pischel’s argument (pref. to Śrīg. til.) that Daṇḍin is identical with the author of Mṛchakatika on the ground that Daṇḍin ii. 362 (st. limpattra, ed. Bibl. Indica) occurs also in that drama (ed. N.S.P. 1916, i. 34) lands us, apart from other objections, in the absurdity of identifying Daṇḍin with Bhāṣa as well, inasmuch as the same verse is also found in the so-called Bhāṣa-damasa, Cārudatta (i. 19) and Bālavakāra (i. 15). The attribution, again, of the same verse in Śrīgadadhara 3603 and Vallabhādeva 1890 to Bhartṛmeṣṭha and Vikramādiya further discredits Pischel’s theory. The occurrence of the verse in Daṇḍin ii. 226 with an introductory iti (cf Premachandra’s remarks
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The upper limit is not so easy to settle. Peterson, following Maheśacandra Nyāyaratna, points out¹ that Daṇḍin ii. 197 is a reminiscence of a passage in Bāna’s Kādambari p. 102, l. 16. (ed. BSS), and Jacobi is inclined to accept this view, Bāna lived about 606-647 A.D. in the reign of king Harṣa, whose biographer he was. Jacobi also points out a resemblance between Daṇḍin ii. 302 and Māgha ii. 4. Pathak, again, remarks² that Daṇḍin’s threefold classification of karman into nirvariya, vikārya and prāpya (ii. 240) is taken from Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapadiya iii. 45f. Bhartṛhari, according to Yi-tsing died about 651 A.D., while Māgha probably belonged to the second half to the 7th century³. Thus Bāna, Bhartṛhari

on this point) only shows that Dandin did not disdain to borrow well-known verses for purposes of illustration and criticism, as he himself admits in a general way in i. 2. It should also be noted that in the Bibl. Indica ed. of the text, the verse is given twice (1) as a half-verse quotation in ii. 226 and (2) in full ii. 362. But this reading, on which apparently Pischel’s theory was based, is doubtful, and is contrary to readings in other MSS. In the Tibetan version of the text (JRAS. 1903), as well as in the Madras edition, the verse occurs only once as a half-verse quotation in ii. 226, the full verse being omitted in the text and given in the Madras ed. only in the accompanying commentary. Pischel is hardly accurate in stating that Pratīṭārendu attributes this verse to Daṇḍin; for the commentator, in the course of his discussion on utprekṣā simply says (p. 26) that Daṇḍin has already discussed at great length that the verse limāṭva is an illustration of utprekṣā containing utiṣaya.

¹ Pref. to Daśakumāra, new ed. 1919, p. ix. Other such reminiscences are presumed in Daṇḍin i. 45 (= Sakuntalā i. 20, ed. M. Williams; Cf. JRAS, 1905 p. 841f), ii. 286 (=Raghu viii. 57), ii. 129 (=Sakuntalā i. 26) etc. Tarunācāspati is of opinion (on i. 2) that Daṇḍin consulted the usages of poets like Kālidāsa. See other parallel passages collected together by Agashe (preface to Daśakumāra, pp. liv f).

² IA xlii, 1912 p. 237.

³ See Kielhorn in GN, 1906. p. 143-46. Cf Māgha ii. 83 where he shows himself fully conversant with Poetics: also ii. 8, 86, 87.
and Māgha probably all belong the same age and flourished in the first half or the middle of the 7th century.

These evidences, although suggestive, do not in their nature appear to be decisive; and we are ultimately thrown upon the question of Daṇḍin's relation to Bhāmaha, which might support these evidences and with reference to which indeed the chronology of Daṇḍin should be settled. If Bhāmaha's priority to Daṇḍin can be definitely established, then we arrive with this at a more or less satisfactory limit to the date of the latter. The question is, no doubt, beset with many difficulties; but so far as a comparative study of their respective texts indicates, the presumption is strong in favour of Bhāmaha's priority; because, while Daṇḍin criticises Bhāmaha's innovations, Bhāmaha apparently never does so in cases of Daṇḍin's innovations which are indeed much more numerous. The materials for such a critical study (apart from a consideration of their general theories) consist of several passage, occurring in their respective texts, which are either (1) identical or very similar in phraseology, or (2) so closely related to each other that the one author appears to be criticising the other. As the question has already engaged a great deal of controversy¹, which has thrashed out almost all the details we will here discuss it very briefly. As instances of the first group of passages, we may cite Bh i. 20ab and D i. 7cd; Bh. i. 17cd and D i. 29ab (definition of Mahākāvya); Bh ii. 66ab and D ii. 4cd (enumeration of certain Alamkāras);

xiii. 69, xiv. 50, xix. 37, xx. 44 (where he refers to Bharata)—On Māgha's date, see S. K. De, Hist. Skt. Lit. Calcutta 1942, pp. 88-89 and references contained therein.

Bh ii. 87ab and D ii. 244ab (illustration of Vārtā) ; Bh iii. 1ab and D ii. 5cd (enumeration of certain Alāmkāras) ; Bh iii. 53 and D iii. 363 (the figure Bhāvika) ; Bh iii. 5 and D ii. 276 (illustration of Preyas) ; Bh iv. 1-2 and D iv. 2-3 (enumeration of Dośas) ; Bh iv. 8ab and D iv. 5ab (definition of Apārtha). The verbal coincidence in these passages is so striking that there can be no doubt that it should be taken as something more than merely accidental. It does not, however, preclude the possibility of their being taken from a common source, or being standardised definitions or enumerations common enough in such technical treatises.

The second group of passages, also betraying enough verbal similarity, is more interesting and important; because they certainly express contradictory views of their respective authors, if not actually meant as direct mutual criticism. In two of these passages, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin are, each in his turn, rejecting an illustration which is adduced by the other, but both citing the illustration in question in exactly identical phraseology. Thus, Bhāmaha cites and rejects (ii. 87), after the figure hetu, the illustration gato'stam arko bhātindur yānti vāsāya paksinah, characterising it as bad poetry, to which, he says, some writers give the name of vārtā. Daṇḍin does not mention vārtā, but approvingly cites (ii. 244) the same half-verse under the figure hetu, pointedly remarking that the illustration under discussion is good. Similarly, the half-verse himāpahāmitra-dharair is given as an instance of the fault avācaka by Bhāmaha (i. 41), but Daṇḍin gives the verse in full in a different context (iii. 120) as an example of a variety of pruhelikā; Bhāmaha apparently condemning it as faulty, while Daṇḍin taking it as a piece of ingenious construction. Taking the examples in their contexts as quoted from a common source, the passages apparently indicate that Daṇḍin is not in agreement with Bhāmaha (who condemns these) but expressly justifies their propriety.

A closer contact of views and similarity of expression are to be found in those passages in this group, which relate to
(1) the discussion of the comparative merits of the gauḍya and vaidarbha mārgas (Bh i. 31-35 and Di. 40 f) (2) the distinction between prose kathā and akhyāyikā (Bh i. 25f and Di. 23f), and (3) the enumeration of the ten dosas (Bh iv. 1-2 and Di. iv. 2-4); and those who maintain Daṇḍin’s priority to Bhāmaha hold that in these cases the latter is undoubtedly criticising the former. In the first of these instances, Bhāmaha’s remarks merely show that he is more or less indifferent to the literary value of Mārga or Rīti as modes of composition, and laughs at the distinction which some writers make between gauḍa and vaidarbha types, himself giving preference, if any, to the former. In his opinion, as he says in the next verse (i. 36), what is important in poetry is not Rīti but Vakrokti. It appears that the view which Bhāmaha is criticising was traditional or referred to as a matter of common controversy, as he himself says in this connexion: gatānugatika-nyāyān nānākhyeyam amedhasām. Jacobi points out that the Gauḍa Mārga, long before Daṇḍin, could never establish for itself a good reputation, and Bāṇa had already condemned it as aksara-dambara (Harṣa-carita i. 7). Daṇḍin, on the other hand, attaches great importance to Rīti in poetry which under the name mārga, occupies a considerable part of his treatment; but he acknowledges, in spite of his own distinguishing of two such extreme types as gauḍa and vaidarbha, that there are other intermediate modes finely differentiated (i. 40), and that the types admitted by him are not capable of exact definition (i 101f), although he himself prefers the vaidarbha. It may also be added that Bhāmaha is unaware of the peculiar analysis of mārga given by Daṇḍin with reference to the ten essential guṇas, but he mentions casually (and not in connexion with Rīti) only three guṇas which may be admitted in all good composition. The respective characterisation, again, of the two Ritis has hardly any point of contact, and Bhāmaha’s remarks, if supposed to be levelled against Daṇḍin in particular, are certainly off the mark; for each of them approaches the
subject from the standpoints of entirely different schools of opinion.

Similar remarks apply to the other two cases, in which one hardly finds any direct reference by Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin does not accept as characteristic or essential those marks of distinction between a Kathā and an Ākhyāyikā which Bhāmaha enumerates, and apparently quotes in this connexion the half-verse i. 29ab from Bhāmaha i. 27cd. The distinction, denied by Daṇḍin, is admitted (along with Bhāmaha) by earlier as well as later writers; for Bāṇa designates his Harṣa-carita as an ākhyāyikā and his Kādambarī as a kathā, and some such distinction is also implied by the Amara-kośa. With regard to the other passages which enumerate the Doṣas, it appears that Bhāmaha, following the traditional recounting of ten orthodox Doṣas (cf Bharata xvi. 84) mentions the same number of Doṣas, but adds that pratijñā-hetu-drṣṭānta-hīnātva is not desirable in poetry (iv. 2). At the same time, this eleventh defect is interesting to him from the standpoint of logical exposition, and he deals with it in v. 1f, apparently considering that defective logic is also to be looked upon generally as a notable flaw in a composition. Daṇḍin enumerates the same ten Doṣas (iv. 2-3) in exactly similar phraseology, and conservatively maintains the view (iv. 4) that the so-called eleventh fault is difficult to judge and unprofitable to discuss.

1 This point will be discussed in detail below in vol. ii.
2 See Taruṇavācaspati's remarks on Daṇḍin i. 25.
3 The definitions, however, do not agree. See Jacoby op. cit. p. 222f.
4 For Bhāmaha's exposition of logic in relation to other philosophical writers see K. B. Pathak in ABORI, xii. pp. 372-87.
5 Emphasis is also put on some verbal resemblance between Bh i. 22 and D i. 21-22. In these passages, however, the standpoints of the two theorists are quite distinct, although they use somewhat similar phrases. Bhāmaha here expresses his disapproval of a disastrous ending, perhaps in conformity with a similar conventional prohibition in the drama. Daṇḍin, on the other hand, takes the ultimate triumph of the hero for granted, and does not trouble him-
From the above discussion, the conclusion is very probable that Daṇḍin was familiar with the text of Bhāmaha whom, as a notable predecessor expressing contrary views, he could hardly ignore. On this point we have the almost unanimous testimony of Daṇḍin's commentators¹, who expressly state that in most of these disputed passages Daṇḍin controverts the earlier opinions of Bhāmaha. It will not be necessary, therefore, to enter here into the details of their respective theories, which not only indicate some fundamental and important differences, as one should expect in writers belonging to two different schools of opinion, but also the fact that Daṇḍin, in dealing with most of the topics, has gone into greater details and finer distinctions, apparently betokening that in his age the study was more advanced and fraught with greater complexity than in that of Bhāmaha².

¹ see about the admittedly forbidden tragic ending He appears to express the view that it is artistically more effective if the rival of the hero is set forth at the outset in all his glory and then his downfall is secured through the superior virtue of the hero himself. One does not also find any point in Bhāmaha ii. 37-38, which criticises the classification of the figure upamā into many subvarieties (like mindo², praśamso² and ācakhrāsa²) but which is taken by some to imply an attack on Daṇḍin's elaborate subdivision of the same figure. The tri-prakārāvatam cannot possibly refer to Daṇḍin, who mentions not three but thirty-two subvarieties. while, nidno², praśamso² etc. are also mentioned by Bharata.

² c. g. Taruṇavācaspati on i. 23-24, 29; ii. 235, 237, 358; iv. 4 etc., Harinātha on i. 15 (cited in ABod 206b), Vādījaughāla on i. 21.

₂ See, for instance, their respective views on rīti, guna and doṣa on alamkāra (which last element Daṇḍin does not distinguish fundamentally from gunas, ii. 3.), on vakrokti (Bh ii 85 and D ii. 362), their respective order of treatment of alamkāras (which Bhāmaha deals with in successive groups, while Daṇḍin's thirty-five independent poetic figures are given as if they are well recognised): Daṇḍin's minute and fine differentiation of infinite sub-species of individual figures; their respective treatment of yamaka, upamā, utprekṣā, ananvaṇya and sasamdeha, upamā-rūpaka and utprekṣāvaya (which last four Daṇḍin does not accept as independent figures) etc. These points will be discussed in detail in the next volume.
If this conclusion of Bhāmaha’s probable priority is accepted, then we get his date as the upper limit to that of Daṇḍin, the lower limit being, as already discussed, the same as that of Bhāmaha, namely the date of Udbhata’s contemporary, Vāmana. Daṇḍin, therefore, flourished probably in the first half of the 8th century.¹

(3)

There cannot be any doubt that Daṇḍin, like Bhāmaha, must have been indebted to his predecessors; and if he does not mention any one of them by name, he gives enough evidence of his having utilised their works, including that of Bhāmaha. Daṇḍin, however, makes a general acknowledgment in i. 2, and refers to the opinions of “others” and of “learned men” (e.g. i. 9, 10; ii. 2, 7, 9, 54; iii. 106); while he makes no secret of his having “observed” and probably borrowed his illustrations from earlier poets, to whom reference² is made in i. 30, 100; ii. 65, 223, 225, 363; iv 7, 32, 42, 57. The Hṛdayaṅgama commentary on i. 2 mentions in particular two authors, named Kāśyapa and Vararuci (vi. 2; ii. 7), whose works Daṇḍin is supposed to have utilised. Similarly in Vādujaṅghāla’s Srutānupālini commentary Kāśyapa, Brahmādatta and Nandiśvāmin are spoken of as Daṇḍin’s predecessors. These may be mythical or traditional names; but Kāśyapa is also mentioned by another admirer of Daṇḍin’s who composed the Sinhalese rhetorical work already referred to. He is known to Abhinavagupta as a Muni who preceded Bharata, and his opinion on Rāgas is cited in Abhinavabhārati. Kallinātha on Saṃgīta-ratnākara (ii. 2. 31) quotes

¹ The question whether our Daṇḍin is identical with Daṇḍin, author of Daṭakumāra-carita, does not concern us here; on this see S. K. De, History of Sansk. Lit. Calcutta 1947, pp. 207-9. Of his personal history nothing is known, unless we hold that the two Daṇḍins are identical and are prepared to accept the Avantisundari-kathā (ed. M. R. Kavi, Madras 1924) as a work of Daṇḍin. See S. K. De, Aspects of Skt. Lit., Calcutta 1959, pp. 296-306.

² See this point discussed in Agashe op cit. pp. liii f.
three verses of Kāśyapa. and among old authorities on music he is mentioned by Nānyadeva (11th-12th century) who mentions also Brhat-Kāśyapa and Vṛddha-Kāśyapa. The Pañca-sāyaka, on the other hand, cites him (iv. 19) as an authority on Erotics, and the Agni-purāṇa as an authority on Metrics. One Kāśyapa is cited by Pāṇini in viii. 4. 67, and a grammarian Kāśyapa, as Aufrecht notes, is quoted by Mādhava.

Pischel¹ has already negatived the suggestions of Premachandra Tarkavagish². Peterson³ and Jacobi⁴ that Daṇḍin in i. 12 refers by the word chando-viciti to a treatise of his own, so named, on the subject of prosody. The word, however as indicated by Daṇḍin himself in the same verse, by his reference to it as sā vidyā, does not necessarily mean any particular treatise but the science of prosody in general⁵; for which, in addition to the references given by Pischel, one need only cite Kauṭilya’s Artha-śāstra (i. 3.1) and Āpastamba Dharmasūtra ii. 4. 8, where the word chando-viciti occurs; also Rājaśekhara p. 6 and Hemacandra, Comm. p. 5. In iv. 49, again, Daṇḍin refers to a kalā-śāstra, which Peterson takes to be a clear reference to another work of Daṇḍin’s; but the reference is more likely to an additional or supplementary chapter to his Kāvyādarśa, as Taranāvācaspati suggests (p. 282). It is noteworthy that the Kāmadhenu commentary on Vāmana similarly quotes from a lost work or chapter of Bhāmaha’s on the kalās⁶.

Daṇḍin’s Kāvyādarśa consists three Paricchedas or chapters (four in M. Rangacharya’s ed.) and about 660 verses. The topics comprehended are: I. Definition and division of Kāvyā; the two Mārgas (Vaidarbha and Gauḍa) and ten Guṇas

1 Pref. to Srng. til. p. 14 f.
2 On Daṇḍin i. 12
3 Introd. to Daśakumāra p. ix-x.
5 See P. V. Kane in IA, 1911, p. 177.
6 See above p. 57 footnote.
pertaining to them; the essential requirements of a good poet (Pratibhā, Śrūta and Abhiyoga). II. Definition of Ālakāra, and enumeration and description of 35 Arthālaṃkāras viz. svabhāvokti, upamā, rūpaka, dipaka, avṛtti, ākṣepa, arthāntara-nyāsa, vyatireka, vidhāvanā, samāsokti, atiśayokti, utprekṣā, hetu, sūkṣma, leśa or lava, yathāsamkhya or krama, preyas, rasavat, urjasvi, paryāyokta, samāhita, udātta, apahnuti, śleṣa, visēṣokti, tulyayogitā, virodha, aprastuta-praśaṃsā, vyājokti, nidarśanā, sahokti, parivrṛtti, āśiḥ, saṃkīrṇa and bhāvika. III. Elaborate treatment of Śabdālaṃkāras, namely yamaka, citra-bandha and 16 varieties of prahelikā; ten Doṣas (in ch. iv in Rangacharya’s ed.).

(4)

Commentators On Daṇḍin

The commentaries on Daṇḍin, as the following Bibliography will show, are numerous. Most of these are comparatively modern, excepting perhaps that of Tarunavācaspati as well as the anonymous commentary called Ṣrdayaṅgama, both printed in the Madras edition. With this exception, they are hardly useful for an historical or critical study of Daṇḍin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Commentaries. (1) by Taruṅavācaspati, Madras Cat. xii, 12834. Printed as noted above. It appears to be an old comm. But as it cites (on i. 40) Bhoja ii. 28, as well Daśarūpaka i. 8 (in comm. on i. 31), it cannot be placed very early. This commentary also refers (on i. 30) to a poet Hastimalla who may be the Jaina Hastimallasena who wrote dramas and poems. Keśava Bhaṭṭāraka, son of Taruṅavācaspati, was Guru of Mahārājādhirāja Rāmanātha (the Hoysala Vīra Rāmanātha) who came to the throne in 1255 A.D. See V. Raghavan in JOR, xiii. at p. 305. So Taruṅavācaspati’s date would be the end of the 12th and first half of the 13th century. In the colophon to some MSS he is called ‘Sādhu’.

(2) Hṛdayaṅgama by an anonymous author. Madras Cat. 12833. Printed as above (ch. i-ii only). The comments on Daṇḍin ii. 284, 286, 288, 289-91 are quoted verbatim but anonymously by Bhoja in his Śṛṇgāra-prakāśa (ch. xi).

(3) Mārjanā by Harinātha, son of Viśvadhara and younger brother of Keśava. ABod 206b; Peterson vi p 30 (extract). MS in BORI (Catalogue xii, no. 124) copied in Saṃvat 1746—1690 A.D. Hārinātha also wrote a comm. on Bhoja’s Sarasvatī-k. He must be later than Keśava Miśra whose work on Alāmkāra he cites.

(4) Muktiāvalī by Narasimha-sūri, son of Gadādhara and grandson of Kṛṣṇa-saṁran. Mitra 2394 (Aufrecht i. 102b).
(5) Candrikā by Trīśaraṇatathābhīma. Mentioned in Hall’s Index, p. 63.

(6) Rasika-raňjanī by Viśvanātha. Oppert 4112 (Aufrechte i, 103a).


(8) Śrutiñupālinī by Vādijañghāla (or ʿghaṅghala). Printed as noted above. Stein pp. 61, xxviii, extract no. 1179. The Report of Peripatetic Party of Madras MSS Lib. 1917-19 mentions an acquisition of this comm. for the Library. MS in BORI, Cat. xii, no. 125. The comm. mentions Kāśyapa, Brahmadatta and Nandisyāmin as predecessors of Daṇḍin.

(9) Comm. by Bhagiratha. Aufrechte i. 102b.

(10) Comm. by Vṛjyānanda. MS in BORI, Cat. xii, no. 123 (incomplete).

(11) Vaimalaya-vidhāyinī by Mallinātha, son of Jagannātha. Aufrechte ii. 20a. This is perhaps the same Mallinātha as is referred to by Viśveśvara in Alāṃkāra, p. 69 as a commentator on Kāvyādāraśa; and he should be distinguished from the better known Kolācala Mallinātha.

(12) Comm. (incomplete) by Tribhuvanacandra, otherwise called Vādisimha, a Jaina. HPS iii, no. 57.

(13) Comm. by Yāmura or Yāmuneya. MSS in BORI, Cat. xii, no. 126. It is probably a South Indian work which divides the Kāvyādāraśa into 4 chapters, as in Madras ed. of Rangacharya.

(14) Ratnaśrī by Ratnaśrijāna. Ed. as described above. The author was a Ceylonese monk who wrote under the patronage of some Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, named Tuṅga, under the overlordship of Rājayapāla of Gauḍa and Magadha (c. 908 A.D.). Authors quoted, besides Āśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa, are Māṭṛceṭa, Āryaśūra, Kohala. Rāma-saṁman. Medhāvīrūdra, Kambala, Harivṛddha, Bhāmaha, Bhar-
tṛṣṇeṣṭha, Guṇādhyā, Cāndra vyākaraṇa, Mallanāga, and Dharmakirti.

(15) Anonymus Comms. in Mitra 297, Oppert 7903; SCC vii 21. A comm. by Dharmavacspati in Oppert 2581 is probably a mistake for Taruṇavacspati. Regnaud (Rhetorique, p. 367 fn) also mentions a commentary by Vācaspati and refers to Taylor ii 501; which work probably refers also to this commentary.

UDBHAṬA

(1)

Udbhata, who wrote a commentary named Bhāmaha-vivaraṇa or "vivṛti" on Bhāmaha, as well as utilised the latter’s work² in his Kāvyālaṃkāra-saṃgraha, certainly lived before the final exposition of the Dhvani-theory by Ānanda-vardhana³ who, in the middle of the 9th century, actually cites Bhaṭṭa Udbhata twice at pp. 96, 108. Udbhata’s name indicates that he was probably a Kashmirian. Kahlaṇa (iv. 495) mentions a certain Bhaṭṭa Udbhata who was a sabhāpati of king Jayāpiḍa of Kashmir (about 779-813 A.D.); and Bühler, to whom we owe the discovery of Udbhata’s work in Kashmir, identifies him with the author of the Kāvyālaṃkāra-saṃgraha (or "sāra-saṃgraha"). Accepting this identification,

1 The Bhāmuha-vivaraṇa is frequently mentioned and cited by later writers; e.g. Abhinavagupta in his Locuna (p. 10, 40, 134, 159), Hemachandra (Comm. p. 17, 110), Māṇikyacandra (Saṃketa, ed. Mysore p. 289), Samudrabandha (on Alam. sarvasva, p. 89). Pratīhāṛadarūja (p. 13) etc.

2 Udbhata seems to have taken over almost verbatim from Bhāmaha the definitions of ākṣera, vibhāvanā, atisayokta, kathāsāmkhya, utprekṣā puryāvokta, apalinuti, virodha, aprastuta-praśāmsā sahokti, sasamdecha and ananvaya. The poetic figures are enumerated almost in the same order as that of Bhāmaha. But Udbhata omits a few Alāṃkāras defined by Bhāmaha (e.g. vamaka, upamā-rūpaka, utpreksāvayava) and adds a few not defined by the latter (e.g. punar-uktavad-ābhūsa, kāyaliṅga, dṛṣṭānta and saṃkara).

3 Cf the opinions of Pratīhāṛendarūja (p. 79), Ruyyaka and Jayaratha (p. 3) and Jaganātha (pp. 414-5).

4 Kashmir Rep p. 65.
we should, however, place the most flourishing period of Udbhaṭa’s activity, as Jacobi points out, in the first part of Jayāpiḍa’s rather long reign; because this sovereign in the latter part of his career appears to have alienated the Brahmins by his oppression of the people. Udbhaṭa, therefore, should be assigned to the end of the 8th century, and he may have lived into the beginning of the 9th.

Besides the lost Bhāmaha-vivaraṇa, Pratīhārendurāja tells us (p. 15) that Udbhaṭa wrote a poem, called Kumāra-saṁbhava, from which are taken most of the illustrations in the text.

We have already mentioned above that Udbhaṭa probably wrote also a commentary on Bharata’s Nāṭya-śāstra, but it is no longer available. The followers of Udbhaṭa or the Audbhavas are mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Bharata.

Udbhaṭa’s Kāvyālāṁkāra-saṁgraha consists of six chapters (called Vargas), contains 75 Kārikās in Anuṣṭubh with 95 illustrations, and deals with 41 Ālaṁkāras. Some verses are assigned to Udbhaṭa in the Subhāṣīti-vāli 498, 1463, 3453, of which no. 498 is a well-known gnomic stanza found also in such collections as the Cāṇakya-sataka. Although closely following Bhāmaha in the treatment of Ālaṁkāras, Udbhaṭa has certain views peculiar to himself, which are either absent in Bhāmaha or in which he differs from his predecessor. For instance, Bhāmaha speaks of three kinds of Śleṣa while Udbhaṭa mentions two kinds, and the basis of classification is different; Udbhaṭa’s three Vṛttis, on which the classification of Anuprāsa proceeds, are absent in Bhāmaha.

(2)

MUKULA AND PRATĪHĀRENDRĀJA

Pratīhārendurāja, Udbhaṭa’s commentator, was, as he himself tells us, a native of Koṅkana and a pupil of Mukula.

1 For more instances see P. V. Kane, HSP, pp. 127-28.—For a résumé of the topics covered by Udbhaṭa’s work see vol ii ch. ii(2).
Mukula is known to us as the author of Abhidhā-vṛtti-mātrkā, a work on the grammatico-rhetorical question of Abhidhā and Lakṣaṇa, consisting of 15 Kārikās with Vṛtti. From the last verse of this work we learn that the author's father was Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa who lived, according to Kahaṇa v. 66, in the reign of Avantivarman of Kashmir (855-884 A.D.) and was, therefore, a contemporary of Ratnākara ar.d Ānandavardhana. Accepting Kahaṇa's statement, Mukula should be placed roughly towards the end of the 9th century and the beginning of the 10th. His pupil Pratihārendurāja, therefore, belongs approximately to the first half of the 10th century. In his commentary on Udbhāṭa called "Laghu vṛtti, Pratihārendu quotes from Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, the Dhvanyāloka and Rudraṭa, actually naming most of them and appears to be fairly familiar with the Dhvani-theory, as explained by Ānandavardhana, to which, however, he does not subscribe.

Peterson appears to suggest the identification of Pratihārendurāja with Bhaṭṭendurāja, whom Abhinavagupta refers to as asmad-upādhyāya in his Locana (pp. 25, 43, 116, 160, 207, 223) as well as in his commentary on Bharata, where this teacher is quoted sometimes simply as upādhyāya. At the commencement and close of his Locana, Abhinavagupta indicates his immense indebtedness to this teacher, and in one place (p. 160) we find in his praise the somewhat grandiloquent epithet vidvat-kavi-sahrdaya-cakravartin; which together with the fact that Abhinava also indicates that he learnt Kāvyā from Bhaṭṭendurāja will go to support the conjecture

1 Bührer op. cit. pp. 66, 78
2 Cf. Pischel, Pref. to Śṛṅgul. p. 12.
3 Introd. to Subhāṣ, p. 11, but contra in Aufrecht i 59a. Banhatti's more recent advocacy of identity is hardly based on substantial and convincing reasons. The only instance where the two Indurājas are confused or identified occurs in Samudrabandha p. 132; but this is no strong evidence.
that this preceptor was apparently well versed in both the theory and practice of poetry. Although chronology does not stand in the way, there are several reasons which might induce one to distinguish the two Indurājas. From Abhinava’s commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā¹, we learn that Bhaṭṭendu was son of Śribhūṭirāja and grandson of Saucuka of the Kātyāyana gotra; but of Pratihārendu’s genealogy or personal history we know nothing, except that he was a Kauñkaṇa and a pupil of Mukula.² Bhaṭṭendu appears chiefly as a poet who wrote, as Abhinava’s quotations show, in Sanskrit and Prakrit, and whose verses apparently supplied a ready source of apt poetic illustrations to his pupil’s works, probably inspired by himself. If some of his opinions on Rasa and allied topics are quoted by Abhinava in his commentary on Bharata, they bear no kinship to Pratihārendu’s views, as expressed in the latter’s commentary on Udbhata. Although the prefixes Bhaṭṭa and Pratihāra, being mere honorific titles, need not make any serious difference, Abhinava’s citation of his teacher always as Bhaṭṭendurāja (and never as Pratihārendurāja) is somewhat remarkable; and in view of the fact that these two Indurājas were probably contemporaries, might this not indicate that Abhinava meant to imply a difference? The two writers are never confused even in later anthologies, for the poet it always designated Indurāja³ or Bhaṭṭendurāja. The conjecture, therefore, is not unlikely that Abhinava’s teacher may have been the poet Bhaṭṭendurāja, who is quoted under this designation in

¹ Buhler, op. cit. pp. 80 and clixii-viii.

² It is curious that Abhinava, who takes care to refer to most of his teachers and “teacher of teachers” (parama-guru) should have omitted a reference to Mukula, whose work, if he was a parama-guru, should have been important to him, as much as it dealt with the quasi-rhetorical question of the functions of word and its sense.

³ Two verses of Indurāja are cited at 287 and 306 (Kavi’s ed. of Nāṭya-śāstra.)
Kṣemendra's two works¹ as well as in the poetical anthologies⁹ of Śāṅgadharma, Vallabhadeva and Jahlana. The commentator Pratihārendurāja, on the other hand, was never known for his poetical pretensions, and was chiefly a writer on Poetics, who obviously belonged in his views to the older system of Udbhata and did not, as Abhinava did, believe in newly established doctrine of Dhvani, with which, however, he appears to be fully conversant. Referring to this new theory of Ānandavardhana, Pratihārendurāja states in one place (p. 79) that what is known as Dhvani and taken to be "the soul" of Poetry by some thinkers is included implicitly by his author Udbhata in the treatment of some of the poetic figures under discussion, and therefore need not be separately considered. Bhaṭṭendurāja, on the other hand, appears to have favoured the new theory of Dhvani; for Abhinavagupta (Locana p. 2) tells us that this teacher of his explained to him the Maṅgalaśloka of Ānanda's Vṛtti in the light of the Dhvani-theory. The standpoints of Pratihārendurāja and Abhinava are so divergent that it is difficult to admit any spiritual relationship between the two; for the former was in no way an adherent of the Dhvani-theory, of which Abhinava was a recognised advocate.

(3)

RĀJĀNAKA TILAKA

Jayaratha, commenting on Ruyyaka's (or Rucaka's) Alaṅkāra-sarvasvā, refers in more than one place (ed. NSP 1893, pp. 15, 124, 205) to an Udbhata-viveka or Udbhata-

1 Acart, vic. under sl. 25, 31; Suvṛttā-tila under sl. 2, 24, 29, 30.
2 Subhāṣītāvali 918. The verse parārthe yaḥ pīḷām, ascribed to Indurāja in the Paddhati of Śāṅgadharma (1052), is quoted anonymously twice by Ānandavardhana (pp. 53, 218), a fact which, however, is not decisive; because Abhinava's commentary is silent as to the authorship of this verse, which occurs in Bhallaṭa-satāka 56 and is ascribed to another poet Yaśas in the Subhāṣ 947. The Saduktikarvāmṛta attributes it to Vāṃpati, while Hemachandra (Comm. p. 257) and Jayaratha (p. 108) cite it anonymously.
vica\textipa{\textr}}a by R\textipa{\textj}\textipa{\textn}\textipa{\texta}n\textipa{\texta}ka Tilaka, and states that Ru\textipa{\texty}aka generally followed the views propounded by Tilaka. We know that a R\textipa{\textj}\textipa{\texta}n\textipa{\texta}ka Tilaka was Ru\textipa{\texty}aka's father. An anonymous commentary, entitled \textipa{\textv}iv\textipa{\textr}ti, has been published in the Ga\textipa{\textk}\textipa{\textw}d\textipa{\texta}'s Series (see below under Bibliography), along with the text of Udbh\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\texts} commented upon. It has been claimed by the editor of this publication that the \textipa{\textv}iv\textipa{\textr}ti is identical with the \textipa{\textv}iv\textipa{\texte}ka or \textipa{\textv}i\textipa{\textc}\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\textr}a cited by Jayaratha. Attention was drawn to this commentary in a notice of its unique MS, existing in the Madras Govt Oriental MS Library by the present writer, as well as by Banhatti about the same time in his edition of Udbh\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\texts}a's work. Banhatti is rather cautious in his discussion of the question of identity, but he appears to be inclined to the view that the \textipa{\textv}iv\textipa{\textr}ti is "evidently a distinct work from the \textipa{\textu}dbh\textipa{\texta}a-viveka or \textipa{\textv}i\textipa{\textc}\textipa{\texta} of R\textipa{\textj}\textipa{\texta}n\textipa{\texta}ka Tilaka mentioned by Jayaratha." The editor of the \textipa{\textv}iv\textipa{\textr}ti, however, makes an elaborate attempt to demonstrate that the \textipa{\textv}iv\textipa{\textr}ti cannot but be taken as the lost \textipa{\textv}ive\textipa{\texte}ka or \textipa{\textv}i\textipa{\textc}\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\textr}a of Tilaka. The evidence adduced is plausible indeed, but does not appear to be conclusive, and in the absence of more definite data it would be better to leave the question open. That this anonymous commentary is late is evidenced not only by its content but also by its citation of R\textipa{\textj}\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\texts}\textipa{\texte}kh\textipa{\texta}a's \textipa{\textv}id\textipa{\textd}h\textipa{\texth}s\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\textl}\textipa{\texta}-bha\textipa{\textn}i\textipa{\textk}\textipa{\texta}, as well as by its obvious appropriation of M\textipa{\textm}\textipa{\textm}\textipa{\texta}-\textipa{\textt}a\textipa{\texts}' standard work. Its value as an exegetical work cannot be placed too high.

\section*{BIBLIOGRAPHY}

\textipa{\textu}dbh\textipa{\texta}a

Editions. (1) Text ed. in Roman characters by G. A. Jacob in JRAS, 1897, pp. 829-53; (2) Text with Prati\textipa{\texth}\textipa{\textr}\textipa{\texte}r\textipa{\textd}ur\textipa{\texta}\textipa{\textj}\textipa{\texta}'s comm. by M. R. Telang. Nir. Sag. Press 1905, 1915 (this edition is useful for its comm., but some verses occurring

1 See a review by the present writer in JRAS, 1934, pp. 173-74.
2 In BSOS, iv, 1926, p. 279.
3 P. V. Kane (HSP p. 130) agrees with this view.
in the comm. are given mistakenly as Kārikā-verses); (3) ed. N. D. Banhatti, with the comm. of Pratihārendūrāja, Bombay Skt. Series, Poona 1925. Our references are to Telang's edition, unless otherwise indicated.

Commentaries. (i) comm. by Pratihārendūrāja (as printed in the above editions), (ii) an anonymous commentary called Vivṛti (ascribed by the editor to Rājānaka Tilaka), ed. K. S. Ramaswami Sastri. Gaekwad's Orient. Series 1931.

Mukula


Pratihārendūrāja

Edition. With the text of Udbhata as described above.

Rājānaka Tilaka

See above under Commentaries.

VĀMANA

(1)

The upper limit to Vāmana's date is given by his own quotations (IV. 3. 6 and i. 2. 12) from the Uttara-rāma-carita (i.38) and Mahāvīra-carita (i.54) of Bhavabhūti, who is known to have flourished under the patronage of Yaśovarman, king of Kanauj, in the first quarter of the 8th century1. The lower

1 Rāja-tarangī iv. 144; Bhandarkar, pref. to Mālati-mādhava pp. xiii; JBRAS xxii, p 92f, S P Pandit in prei to Gauḍavaho p. lxvii; WZKM ii 332f. Reference is made in an argument on an illustrative passage in the Vṛttī on iii. 2 2 to Subandhu (v., l. Vasubandhu) a minister of Candragupta. There has been a good deal of controversy over the identity of the king (bhūpati) who is said to have been a patron of Subandhu or Vasubandhu (see IA xl, 1911, p. 170f, 312; xli, 1912, p. 1, 15; IHQ i. p. 261) V. Raghavan (IHQ xix. 1943, pp. 70-72) has shown that it is unnecessary to suppose that Vāmana refers to Subandhu, the well known author of the prose Kathā Vāsavadātā. Vāmana is speaking of a minister named Subandhu of Candragupta Maurya and Bindusāra—whose draṇa is cited by Abhinavagupta as Vāsavadattā Nātya-dhārā of Mahākavi