limit is given by Rājaśekhara’s quotation (p. 14) from Vāmana i. 2 1-3, and his reference to the Vāmaniyās, which indicates that by end of the 9th century Vāmana had a respectable number of followers going by his name. We learn also from Abhinavagupta (Locana, p. 37) that Vāmana was probably known, in the middle of the 9th century, to Ānandavardhana who, however, never directly cites Vāmana but seems to refer, in a manner not to be mistaken, to the latter’s Riti theory in his Vṛtti on iii. 52. Like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhāsa, Vāmana probably lived before the Dhvani-theory, under Ānandavardhana, came into prominence; and Pratihārendurāja, who professes a great reverence for Vāmana’s views, expressly states (p. 81), while discussing ālāṅkāra-dhvani, that in such cases Vāmana has employed the term vakrokti (iv. 3. 8). We will not be wrong, therefore, if we fix the lower limit of Vāmana’s date at the middle of the 9th century.

Subandhu, the term Nāṭya-dhāraṇī signifying that the entire drama was developed by a series of acts within acts.

1 The Locana quotes from Vāmana at pp. 8, 10, 180, also Ablunarā-bhāvanī vol. i. p. 288 (= Vāmana i 3 30-31)—Vāmana quotes (iv. 3 10 uhhu yadi yomni) from Māgha iii 8; also Vāmana v. 2. 9 = Māgha i. 25. The words vā bhūta-pindasya cited as un-grammatical in v. 2. 28 occurs in Pratihārī-vāgandhavijñāna iv 3, and the verse saracchāsaṅka-variṇena cited in iv 3 25, occurs in Svapna-vāsavadatta iv. 7.

2 Even supposing with Jacobi that Vāmana was contemporaneous with the anonymous Dhvanikāra, he cannot yet be shown to have been influenced in any way by the opinions of that school. The remarks of Ruśyaka (p. 7) and Jayaratha apparently support the trend of Pratihārendurāja’s opinion, and Jayaratha expressly says, with reference to these old writers, that they were unaware of the views of the Dhvani-kāra (dhvani-kāra-mataṁ ebhīr na āṣṭam, p. 3), the Dhvani-kāra being, in Jayaratha’s opinion, the same as Ānandavardhana himself.

3 Cappeller’s thesis propounded (in Vāmana’s Stilregeln pp. iii f; also pref. to his ed. pp. vii f) that Vāmana should be placed later than 1000 A.D. is disproved entirely by the quotations given above. Cf. Pischel, op cit. pp. 23 f. The mention of Kāvirāja need not, as Pischel shows, of itself place Vāmana as late as 1000 A.D.
These considerations make it probable that Vāmana lived between the middle of the 8th and the middle of the 9th century, at about 800 A.D., and justify Bühler's identification, in deference to Kahaṇa iv 497 and "the tradition of Kashmirian Pandits", of our Vāmana with the Vāmana who was a minister of Jayāpiḍa of Kashmir (779-813 A.D.). This conclusion makes Udbhaṭa and Vāmana contemporaries and rivals; and the way in which Rājaśekhara, Hemacandra and Jayaratha refer to the two rival schools of Vāmanīyas and Audbhavaśa lends colour to such a supposition.

The Vṛtti (with illustration) on the Sūtras, called Kavi-priyā, is composed, as its maṅgala-śloka indicates, by Vāmana himself (cf iv. 3. 33). This is confirmed by the fact that later writers ascribe both parts of the work to Vāmana. The illustrations, as he himself informs us, are both svīya and parākiya (iv. 3, 33). Vāmana's work, after the sūtra-style, is divided into five Adhikaraṇas, each of which is divided again into Adhyāyas. The first and fourth Adhikaraṇa have three Adhyāyas, the rest two each, the total number of Adhyāyas being twelve. The subject-matter of the Adhikaraṇas is indicated by their naming: (i) Śārīra (ii) Doṣa-darśana (iii) Guṇa-vivecana (iv) Ālaṃkārika and (v) Prāyogika. The last Adhyāya deals with Śabda-śuddhi or grammatical correctness as an aspect of Prāyogika. The number of Ālaṃkāras defined and illustrated is thirty-six.

1 E.g. Pratihāreṇḍurāja (p. 17, 76, 81, 84); Locana (p. 37).
and vaidarbhi; and Vāmana himself cites from unknown expositors of the past, e.g. in his Vṛtti on I. 2. 11, 12-13; 3. 15. 29, 32; II. 1, 18; 2. 19; III. 1. 2, 9, 25; 2. 15; IV. 1, 7. etc. with atra lokāḥ or tathā cāhuḥ. While Daṇḍin supplies an important link between these unknown authors and Vāmana, we find the theory in its completely self-conscious form in the latter. But it appears to have languished after Ānandavardhana came into the field, in spite of the fact that Vāmana’s influence apparently created a school known in later times as the Vāmaniya.

**MAṆGALA**

To this school probably belonged Maṅgala, who must have been a comparatively early writer, having been cited by Rājaśekhara (pp. 11, 14, 16, 20). Maṅgala, we are told by Hemacandra (Comm. p. 195), agrees with Bharata in his definition of Ojas, and maintains with Vāmana that Daṇḍin is not right in emphasising it in the gauḍī rīti, inasmuch as it is common to all the Ritis.¹ This is all we hear about this writer, but it would indicate that in his views he leaned towards the system of Vāmana who was probably his predeessor. A poet Maṅgala is quoted in the Sadukti-karṇāmya.

(3)

**COMMENTATORS ON VĀMANA**

The existing commentaries on Vāmana are mostly late, and are therefore hardly acceptable to a critical and historical student. The Kāma-dhenu by the South Indian, Gopendra Tippa Bhūpāla, who was governor under Devarāya II (1423-46 A. D.) of the Vijayanagara dynasty, is a lucid exposition of the text, and its popularity is indicated by its frequent publication in India.

¹ Cf Māṇikyacandra (Saṅketa, Mysore ed. p. 292).
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Commentaries. (1) Kāma-dhenu by Gopendra (or Govinda) Tippa (or Tirpurahara as he himself renders the name, introd. v. 8) Bhūpāla, about whom see above. He cites, among numerous other authors, Vidyādharā, Vidyānātha, Bhaṭṭa Gopāla (the commentator on Mammaṭa ?). Ghaṇṭāpatha (apparently of Mallinātha) and Dharmadāsa Sūrī’s Vidagdha-mukha-mandana (on ii. 2. 21). He is thus later than the 14th century. He cites a work called Kavi-gajākuśa. Ed. with the text in Grantha-pradarśinī 1895; in the Benares Sansk. Series and in the Srivani-vilasa Press, etc. Our references are by pages to the Benares Ed. (2) Sāhitya-sarvasva by Maheśvara (IOC 566; ABod 207b). See Śrīvatsalāṇchana (under Commentators on Mammaṭa below). (3) A Commentary by Sahadeva quoted in the notes to the Gaekwad edition (Baroda) of Kāvyamīmāṃśā p. 5.

RUDRAṬA AND RUDRABHAṬTA

(1)

The lower limit of Rudraṭa’s date is furnished by the citation of Rudraṭa by name and reference to his kāku-vakrokti figure (ii. 16) by Rājaśekhara (p. 31) at the end of the
9th and beginning of the 10th century. This conclusion is supported by two considerations. Vallabhadeva who, as we shall presently see, flourished in the first half of the 10th century, quotes Rudraṭa by name in his commentary on Māgha (ed. Kashi Sansk. Series 1929, ii. 44) and mentions (on iv. 21) that he himself also composed a commentary on Rudraṭa's treatise on Alamkāra, where he had discussed in detail the points in question; while in the same commentary Hultsch notes numerous references, mostly anonymous, to Rudraṭa. Again, Pratīhārendurāja, about the same time, quotes anonymously (pp 42, 49) Rudraṭa's Kārikā-verses vii. 35 and xii. 4, as well as cites (p. 43) the illustrative stanza in Rudraṭa vii. 36. Abhinavagupta also quotes anonymously (Locana, p. 45) a Kārikā-verse of Rudraṭa's (vii. 38). This sets aside altogether the conjectural date, viz. the second half of the 11th century, assigned by Bühler, as well as his revised date, viz. the middle of the 10th century, which Peterson first put forward.

The upper limit cannot be so definitely settled; but it seems probable that Rudraṭa was younger than Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana, with regard to whose date his own time is to be settled. We need not go so far as to hold with Jacobī that Rudraṭa derived his idea of vakrokti from Ratnākara's well known poem Vakrokti-pāñcāśikā, and therefore was

1 See Hultsch's pref. to his edition of Megha-dūta with Vallabhā's comm., London 1911, p. x-xi. These references are not all found in the printed text. This Vallabhadeva must be distinguished from the compiler of the Subhāṣṭi who bears the same name.

2 Cf Pischel in GgA, 1885, p. 764. Other quotations by Pratīhārendurāja are: p 11=R viii. 40; p. 31=R viii. 89; p. 34=R viii. 95. Also Dhanika on iv. 35=R xii. 4.


4 IĀ xii. 30.

5 Peterson i (Detailed Report 1883) p. 14; also introd. to Subhāṣṭi p. 105. Their arguments are based on the date of Nami-sādhau's commentary on Rudraṭa, which is now known to be dated in 1069 A.D. See below on Nami-sādhau.
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later than Ratnākara, son of Amṛtabhānu, who lived under Bṛhaspati and Avantivarman of Kashmir; but it is clear that if this new idea of vakrokti did not originate with Ratnākara or even with Rudraṭa, it was defined for the first time by the latter and illustrated by the former as a particular poetic figure. This verbal figure is described as resting on śleṣa (paronomasia) or kāku (intonation) and is based on a deliberate misunderstanding of one’s words for the purpose of making a clever retort (Rudraṭa ii. 14-17). Bhāmaha (ii. 85), on the other hand, had taken vakrokti, not as a particular poetic figure, but as a certain strikingness of expression which characterises all poetic figures; while Daṇḍin had limited the range of vakrokti and made it a collective name for all poetic figures with the exception of svabhāvakta (ii. 362 and comm. thereon). Vāmana was the first to regard vakrokti as a special poetic figure (arthālaṃkāra), but he too used the expression in a more or less general sense to denote a particular mode of metaphorical expression based on lakṣaṇa or transferred sense (iv. 3. 8)\(^1\) From this it appears that (1) the term vakrokti travelled through all these writings from a very broad sense as the distinguishing characteristic of all poetic figures to the precise and narrow signification of a specific verbal poetic figure in Rudraṭa’s definition; a definition which, however, unquestionably established itself in all later writers (except in Kuntaka who developed his idea directly from Bhāmaha); (2) the order of development points apparently to the conclusion that Rudraṭa was probably later than Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana; for in his time the broader and older connotation of vakrokti was out of date, and it came to be looked upon as a defined species of sabdālaṃkāra; and (3) its illustration by Ratnākara indicates its existence, independently of Rudraṭa, in the 9th century A. D. These indications make it probable, apart from a detailed examination of Rudraṭa’s other theories in relation to those of

\(^1\) Cf. Jacobi in ZDMG lxxiv, p. 130f.
Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana, that the substance of Rudraṭa's teaching was probably later than that of these older writers. If this conclusion is accepted, then Rudraṭa should be placed after Vāmana, who is the latest member of this group; and this gives us the upper limit to his date.

It seems probable, that Rudraṭa should be placed between the first quarter of the 9th century and its end; for he appears to be unknown to Ānandavardhana. It will not be wrong if we accept the most plausible date assigned to him by Pischel, viz. the middle of the 9th century.

The date makes him a contemporary of Ānandavardhana, who never cites or refers to Rudraṭa, as he does to other well-known predecessors, and by whom this peculiar ālāṅkārika connotation of vakrokti, if known, was not apparently recognised.

Rudraṭa's Kāvyālaṅkāra consists of 16 Adhyāyas and 734 Kārikās in Āryā metre (excepting the concluding verses) and comprehends almost all the topics of Poetics. This enumeration excludes 14 Kārikās after xii. 40 (dealing with eight kinds of Nāyikā) which are declared to be interpolated passages.

What is said here about Rudraṭa does not apply to Rudra or Rudrabhaṭṭa, although Pischel, Weber, Aufrecht and

1 Pref. to Śṛng. tile pp. 12, 26.
2 The suggestion of Jacobi that Rudraṭa, whose name implies that he was a Kashmirian, was a contemporary of Śaṅkaravarman of Kashmir, successor of Avāntivarman, does not make any essential difference to our conclusion, although it is not certain that the example of vakrokti given by Rudraṭa in ii. 15 was at all prompted by Ratnakara, whose work contains similar raillerys between Śiva and Gaṇeṣa.
3 For summary of topics in Rudraṭa's work see vol. ii. ch. ii (3) below.
4 Pref. to Śṛng. tile; ZDMG xliii. 1898, pp. 266-304, 425.
5 Ind. Stud. xvi.
6 ZDMG xxvii pp. 80-1, xxxvi p. 376; Cat. Bod. 209b; Cat. Cat. pp. 528b, 530a.
Bühler\(^1\) take the two authors to be identical. The identity is declared doubtful by Peterson\(^2\) and is not admitted by Durgaprasada\(^3\) and Trivedi\(^4\). Finally, Jacobi has set at rest this controversy by showing elaborately, from an examination of their respective texts, that these two writers were in all probability different persons\(^5\).

From v. 12-14 of the Kāvyālaṅkāra of Rudrāṭa, as interpreted by Nami-sādhu, it appears that Rudrāṭa, also called Śatānanda, was son of Bhaṭṭa Vāmukha and a follower of the Sāma-veda. Rudrabhaṭṭa's genealogy or personal history is unknown. But much has been made of the apparent similarity of the two names. The last verse\(^6\) of the Srñgāra-tilaka, however, expressly gives the name of its author as Rudra, with which description most of the MSS agree\(^7\); while both Nami-sādhu and Vallabha call the author of the Kāvyālaṅkāra by the name of Rudrāṭa. The two authors belong, again, apparently to two different religious persuasions, Rudra being a worshipper of Śiva, and Rudrāṭa omitting a reference to this deity and mentioning instead Bhavānī and Murāri (besides the usual Gaṇeṣa).

3 Footnote to the ed. of Srñg. til. p. 1.
4 Notes to his ed. of Ekāvali p. 3.
5 WZKM ii, 1888, pp. 151-56; ZDMG xlii pp. 425 f.
6 The last verse, however, is not found in some MSS.
7 With the curious exception of a Kashmirian MS in Sāradā characters (Bühler's Kashmir Rep. no. 264) where the name in given as Rudrāṭa. This unique testimony raises a legitimate suspicion, but it can be explained as a piece of not unnatural confusion made by a Kashmirian scribe, to whom the more famous name of Rudrāṭa must have been more familiar. The same remark applies to the India office MS no. 1131 (Cat. vii, p. 321) and the South Indian MS in Madras Cat. xxii (1918) no. 12955, in which, however, the last verse gives the name as Rudra. This evidence, however, of colophons of MSS is not decisive; and it is well known that even later anthologies and writers of note make a similar confusion between the two authors.
Taking the works themselves, Rudraṭa’s text of sixteen chapters covers a much larger ground than Rudra’s much shorter work of three chapters, and presents a distinctly different outlook. Rudraṭa puts a greater emphasis on the kāvyaśāstra or poetic figures which supply, as Nami-sādhu points out, the name of the work itself, and which absorb its eleven chapters, leaving only five concluding chapters for a brief supplementary treatment of Rasa, the cognate topic of nāyaka-nāyikā and the general problems of poetry. The keystone of Rudra’s system, on the other hand, is the idea of Rasa, having special reference to śṛṅgāra (ch. i. and ii) with just a summary description of the other Rāsas (ch. iii); and the chief value of his smaller text consists in his minute poetical treatment of the theme of śṛṅgāra-rasa and nāyaka-nāyikā. It will appear, therefore, that while Rudraṭa’s scope and method are more ambitiously theoretical and comprehensive, Rudrabhaṭṭa merely singles out a part of the whole subject, and not troubling himself about definitions and rules (which appear almost word for word as they are in Rudraṭa) gives us, in his apt and finely composed illustrative verses, a practical poetical manual on the subject of love and other sentiments. Jacobi, therefore, rightly remarks that “Rudraṭa appears as an original teacher of poetics, while Rudra, at his best an original poet, follows, as an expounder of his śāstra, the common herd.”

With regard to the common topics, there is however, a general agreement, even to minute details, which has misled some scholars to attribute the two works to the same author. But beneath this general agreement, the two works reveal many points of difference which affect some of the fundamental conceptions of their respective authors. Taking, for instance, their treatment of Rasa, we find that while Rudra (i. 9) follows the general tradition, prevailing from Udbhata’s time, of mentioning nine Rāsas, Rudraṭa adds one more, viz. préyas (xii. 3), treating them in an order somewhat different from that followed by Rudra. Rudra enumerates and dis-
cusses at some length the bhāvas (i. 10-19), which are summarily referred to by Rudraṭa in one verse only (xii. 4). A similar difference will be noted in the treatment of ṛttis, of which Rudra (i. 12) mentions, after Bharata (xx. 24f), the usual four (viz. kaiśikī, ārabhaṭī, sāṭtvatī and bhāraṭī), originally taken as styles of dramatic composition but borrowed here apparently with a similar purpose from dramaturgy to poetry (cf Bharata loc. cit. 21). Rudraṭa, on the other hand, speaks (ii. 19f), after Udbhāṭa,1 of five ṛttis (viz. madhurā, praudhā, paruṣā, lalitā and bhadrā), which have nothing to do with the above four, but being comprised under alliteration (anuprāsa) refer primarily to suitable sound-adjustment by special arrangement of letters. With regard to the cognate topic of nāyaka-nāyikā, similar material discrepancies can be detected. While Rudra describes at some length the eight conventional avasthās (conditions or situations) of the nāyikā (i. 131-32), Rudraṭa mentions only four (viz., abhisārikā, khaṇḍitā, svādhīna-patikā and prośita-patikā, xii. 41f), although to make up for this unwonted divergence there is in some MSS a long passage (between xii. 40 and 41), describing the usual eight conditions but irreconcilable to its context, and rightly stigmatised by Rudraṭa’s editor as interpolated. The third class of heroine, again, viz., the courtesan (veṣyā). appears to be favoured by Rudra (i. 120-30), while Rudraṭa dismisses her in two verses only (xii. 39-40) with an apparent note of condemnation. The tenfold state of a lover, beginning with desire and ending in death, is mentioned in passing by Rudraṭa (xiv. 4-5), but Rudra defines and illustrates each of these states in detail (ii. 6-30). While the trespasses in love, according to Rudra (ii. 53), depend on time (kāla), place (deśa) and circumstances (prasaṅga), Rudraṭa thinks (xiv. 18) that a fourth condition, viz. the person concerned (pātra) should be added.

1 Udbhāṭa mentions only three ṛttis in connexion with anuprāsa, viz. paruṣā, upaṇḍārīkā and grāmyā (i. 4-7).
All these indications make it highly probable that Rudraṭa and Rudra were two different persons; but if this is so, how are we to explain the fact most of the verses in the Śṛṅgāra-tilaka are, but for their difference in metre (anusūbh and āryā respectively) identical almost word for word with the corresponding verses in the Kāvyālaṃkāra? This point has been emphasised with some plausibility by the advocates of the identity of the two writers. But it should be noticed that this extraordinary verbal coincidence does not extend beyond those verses which give the rules and definitions; for the illustrative stanzas in the Śṛṅgāra-tilaka, composed in a variety of metres, and forming a distinctive feature of this more poetical work, do not occur in the Kāvyālaṃkāra at all. It is not unusual to find similar treatment and terminology in technical treatises, abounding in standardised and conventional rules and definitions; but this is not enough to explain this extraordinary plagiarism tempered, it is true, by the presence of highly poetical and presumably original\(^1\) stanzas composed to illustrate these dry rules and definitions. Nor is this explanation, which is based on the supposed identity of the two writers, at all free from considerable doubt in view of the discrepancies noted above. The real explanation probably lies in the supposition that Rudra, apparently a later writer and chiefly a poet, and never pretending to be an original teacher of Poetics, found in these ready-made rules of Rudraṭa enough poetic possibilities, as well as an opportunity of displaying his own poetic powers, and proceeded forthwith to furnish the missing poetic illustrations.\(^2\) As he did not apparently aspire to write an original

---

1 Some illustrative stanzas in the Śṛṅg. til. are taken from earlier works like the Amaru-sataka.

2 These chapters in Rudraṭa are purely expository, and are not fully illustrated as the preceding chapters are. One may be led to suppose that Rudraṭa himself composed the Śṛṅgāra-tilaka to supply this deficiency, but this hypothesis does not sufficiently explain the divergence of views on the points noted above, which apparently indicates that the task of supplementing could not have been under-
thesis on the topics concerned, he did not trouble to alter the wording of the fixed canons and made only enough changes to suit the metre. While Rudra is concerned directly with rules and prescriptions, Rudra is more practical in his object and treatment and intends his treatise on love apparently to serve as a psychologico-poetical guide to the gay science, furnishing it, as he does, with an elaborate analysis of the various moods and sentiments, which belong to the province of Erotics as well as Poetics.

taken by himself but by some other author, who held some views different from his own. It cannot be argued that chapters xii-xvi in question, which contain this deficiency, is a later addition by some other hand, on the ground that the closing verse of ch. xi reads like the end of the work itself; for a similar remark applies to the closing verses of chapters iii, iv and v.

1 The quotations from these two writers in later literature are unfortunately mostly anonymous, and do not materially help us in deciding this question. Among the very few cases where the author's name is cited along with his verses, Mammaṭa himself a Kashmirian, correctly refers (ad ix. 8a) the verse sphuṭam arthālāṃkāram to Rudra (iv. 32). Samudrabandha (p. 6) and Hemacandra (p. 286 Comm.) refer rightly to Rudra vii. 38-40 and vii. 27 respectively. Ruyyaka, while discussing Rudra's views does not refer to his treatment of the Rasas at all. On the other hand, Baladeva Vidyabhūṣaṇa (p. 35) cites vāṇatā durlabhatvatam from Śṛṅgāra-til. (ii. 41), and correctly refers to the author as Rudra. Vallabhadeva in his anthology cites a number of verses from the Kāvyālambkāra (421=ii. 17; 730=iii. 57; 1387=vi. 10; 1667=ii. 30; 2047=vi. 71; 2061=vi. 33; 2234=vi. 41; 2409=vi. 32), and with two exceptions, gives the name of the author correctly as Rudra. Similarly, Sārṅgadhara quotes eight verses from the Śṛṅgāra-til. (3409=ii. 95; 3567=ii. 35; 3568=ii. 81; 3679=ii. 107; 3578=ii. 12; 3579=ii. 50; 3675=ii. 51; 3754=ii. 30), and with two exceptions, again, refers them correctly to Rudra. The two exceptions of Sārṅgadhara (viz. 3773 and 3788) are wrongly attributed to Rudra; but Vallabhadeva quotes the very same verses (2234 and 1667), and correcting the mistake refers them rightly to Rudra. Vallabhadeva's two exceptions (2247 and 3122) cannot be found in Rudra to whom they are attributed, nor in Rudra. Jñāna attributes 21 verses to Rudra, of which 5 cannot be traced in his work. Of these, kīṃ gaurī mām occurs in Rudrā ii. 16; ambā ṣete'ra occurs
Rudrābhāṣṭṭa's date is uncertain; but as Hemacandra (p. 110) is the oldest writer to quote anonymously and criticise his maṅgala-verse (i. 1), we should place him between Rudraṭa and Hemacandra, i.e. later than the 9th century but earlier, probably not much earlier, than the 12th. One verse, however, of Rudra, which cannot be traced in his Śrīgārātillaka, is quoted by Dhanika (iv. 60, ed. NSP 1917. p. 103); and if this Rudra is the same as our author, he should be placed before the end of the 10th century.  

(4)

COMMENTATORS ON RUDRAṬA

Vallabhadeva

Vallabhadeva's commentary on Rudraṭālāmākāra, referred to by himself in his commentary on Māgha (on iv. 21, vi. 28) is the earliest known commentary on Rudraṭa and is still to be recovered. Vallabhadeva, who bore the surname of Paramārathaka-cihna and who describes himself as son of Rājānaka Ānandadeva, is a well-known commentator on several standard poetical works, including those of Kalidāsa, Māgha, Mayūra and Ratnākara. He was apparently a Kashmirian and probably belonged to the first half of the 10th century; for his grandson Kayyaṭa, son of Candraṭītya, wrote a commentary on Ānandavardhana's Devīsataka in

in Kavi. vacana-samoc.; 505 = Subhāṣṭi 2247 (attributed to Rudraṭa) = Sadukti-karṇā ii. 73 (attributed to Bhaṭṭa); ekākini yad abalā is attributed wrongly to Rudra (as in the Paddhati 3773) but correctly assigned by Vallabhadeva to Rudraṭa. Hemacandra quotes anonymously three verses from Rudra (i. 1 = p. 110; i. 44 = p. 304; i. 68 = p. 305).

1 Dhanika also quotes anonymously from Rudraṭa (xii. 4) in his comm. on iv. 35, ed. N.S.P. Cf. Rudrabhaṭṭa i. 16.
2 From the closing verse of the comm. on Vakrokti-paṇcāṣṭikā Ānandadeva seems to have held some high appointment in Kashmir (colophon in Kavyamālā Guchhaka i, p. 114: Mitra z, no. 4064).
3 See footnote to the ed. of Vakrokti-paṇcāṣṭikā in Kavyamālā,
977-78 A.D., during the reign of Bhimagupta of Kashmir (977-82 A.D.). Vallabha's preceptor was Prakāśavarṣa who, Hultsch thinks, is perhaps identical with the poet Prakāśavarṣa, who is quoted in Subhaśītāvali and Sāṅgadhara-paddhati and who wrote a commentary on Bhāravi (Aufrecht i. 347). Our author must be distinguished from Vallabhadeva, the compiler of the anthology Subhaśītāvali, who is assigned by Aufrecht to the 16th century. From Hultsch's list of Vallabha's quotations in his commentary on Māgha it is interesting to note that he cites Medhāvirudra, Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Bhaṭṭi and the Viṣamabāṇa-lilā (apparently the Prakrit poem of Ānandavardhana).

Nami-sādhu

After Vallabhadeva, comes Nami (known as Nami-sādhu or Nami-paṇḍita), who is described as a Śveta-bhikṣu, indicating that he was a Śvetāmbara Jaina. He describes himself as "the bee that sucked honey from the lotus-feet of Śrī-śālibhadra Sūri, the ornament of the gačcha of the city of Thārāpadra". We know that Jinaḥhadra Sūri, who was a pupil of Śālibhadra, wrote in Saṃvat 1204=1148 A.D. Śālibhadra is also referred to as Śrī-śāli-sūri in another work of Nami's called Saḍāvasyaaka-fikā, of which the date is given in the work itself as Saṃvat 1122=1065 A.D. In one of the concluding verses of his commentary on Rudraṭa, Nami states that his commentary was composed in Saṃvat 1125=1069 A.D. Among writers on Poetics


1 Bühler (Kunst Poesie p. 71) thinks that anthologist Vallabhadeva flourished between 1400 and 1350 A.D. The date now requires revision, for this anthology is quoted directly (with the names of the work and author) by Vandyaghaṭṭiya Sarvānanda in 1160 A.D. in his commentary on the Amara-kośa. See on this question S. K. De in JRAS, 1927, pp. 471-91 and BSOS, v, pt. i, p. 27f; v, pt. iii, p. 499f.

2 Peterson i p. 68

3 Peterson iii p. 13.

4 pāśca-vinsāti-samyuktair etādāśa-samāśāyaiḥ vikramāś same-
cited by Nami on Rudraṭa, we find the names of Bharata (p. 150, 156, 164), Medhāvirudra (pp. 2, 9, 145), Bhāmaha (p. 2, 116), Daṇḍin (pp. 2, 5, 169), Vāmana (pp. 11, 100, 116). Udbhāta (pp. 69, 82, 150) and the Arjuna-carita by Ānandavardhana. He also cites Tilaka-māṇjarī (on xvi. 3) apparently of Dhanapāla, and one Jayadeva on prosody (on i. 18, 20). ¹ It is interesting to note that Nami quotes a Prakrit verse from one Hari (ii. 10), presumably a writer on Poetics, which mentions eight Vṛttis instead of five of Rudraṭa.

Āśādhara

Peterson (ii, p. 85) brought to our notice another Jaina commentator on Rudraṭa, called Āśādhara, son of Sallakṣaṇa and Ratni. He was a Jaina teacher who lived till Samvat 1296=1240 A.D. He should be distinguished from Āśādhara, son of Rāmaji Bhaṭṭa, a very late writer who composed a commentary on Appayya’s Kuvālayānanda². In the Praśasti at the end of his Dharmāṃḍa, Āśādhara’s personal history is given. He belonged to the Vyāghreravāla family and was son of Sallakṣaṇa (or Lakṣaṇa) and Ratni. He was born in the fortress of Maṇḍalakara situated in the country round the Śākambhari (Sambhar) Lake. He had by his wife Sarasvatī a son named Chāhaḍa, who was a favourite of Arjunavarman of

¹ For this author see H. D. Velankar, Jayadāman, Bombay 1949. This Jayadeva and his Chandah-sāstra are also cited by Abhinavagupta in his comm. on Bharata. For his date (before 950 A.D.) see P. K. Gode in Poona Orientalist, pp. 33-38 (reprinted in his Studies in Indian Lit. Hist. 1, pp. 138-43).

² The two are confused by Aufrecht i. 54b and, following him by Harichand Sastri p. 18; but Aufrecht expresses doubt about their identity.
Mālava (first quarter of the 13th century). After the invasion of Sāhibadina, king of the Turuṣkas (apparently Shāhābu-d-din Ghūr, Sultan of Delhi, who vanquished Prthurāja in 1193 A.D.), Āśādhara emigrated to Mālava and lived in Dhārā, where he learned the doctrines of Jaina faith and Jinendra-vyākaraṇa from Paṇḍita Mahāvīra, pupil of Dharasena. Āśādhara was reputed for his learning, being praised by the sage Udayasena, by the poet Vihlaṇa (sic) who is not the Kashmirian poet Biblaṇa who lived about 1070–90 A.D., but minister of Vijayavarman king of the Vindhyas, and by the great yatī Madanakirti. He wrote more than 15 works, of which he gives a list, referring also to his commentary on Rudraṭa\(^1\). His \textit{Trīṣṭi-smṛṭi-sāstra}, which gives stories of 63 great men mentioned in the Jaina Purāṇas, was composed in 1236 A.D.\(^2\)

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

\textit{Rudraṭa}


\textit{Nami-sādhu}

Edition. Kāvyamālā 2, 1886, 1909, with the text (see above).

\textit{Āśādhara}

Mss. Aufrecht i 103a, 779a.

No MS of Vallabhadeva’s commentary on Rudraṭa is known.

\textit{Rudrabhāṭṭa}


\(^1\) Peterson ii p. 85 and fn.; Bhandarkar Rep. 1883-84, pp. 103-4.

\(^2\) Aufrecht i 54b. Winternitz (\textit{Geschichte}, ii, p. 354, fn 5) assigns 1228-1244 A.D. as the date of Āśādhara’s literary activity. See also Kielhorn in \textit{EI} ix. 1908, p. 107f.
Commentary. Rasa-taraṅgiṇī by Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, son of Harivamśa Bhaṭṭa Drāviḍa. See under Commentators on Mammaṭa and Bhānudatta, below. Mentioned in Kāvyamālā ed. of the text (p. 111). He calls his author Rudra. If the Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, cited by Kumārasvāmin, be the same person, then he is earlier than the beginning of the 15th century. As Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, appears to be a South Indian writer, this conjecture is probable. Oppert’s entry of Vana-taraṅgiṇī (īi 2711, 1787) on Rudraṭa is apparently a mistake for this work, and the name Rudraṭa is a confusion for Rudra.

THE WRITER ON ALAMKĀRA IN THE VIŚNU-
DHARMOTTARA AND AGNI-PURĀNA

The Viṣṇu-dharmottara

The Viṣṇu-dharmottara1, counted as an Upapurāṇa, is one of the later Purānic works of an encyclopaedic character which, in the course of its rapid treatment of multifarious subjects, devotes a few chapters to the topics of dancing (Nṛṭta), singing (Gīta) and music (Ātodya). Poetics (Alamkāra), Dramaturgy (Nāṭya) and allied subjects. The work consists of three Kāṇḍas of more than eight hundred chapters, the distribution and number of chapters in each Kāṇḍa being as follows: i—ch. 269; ii—ch. 183; iii—ch. 355. We are concerned here only with a few chapters of Kāṇḍa iii, which begins with what is called Cītra-
śūtra or the art of painting and proceeds to the allied topics of dancing, singing and music. Ch. 14-15 of this Kāṇḍa is devoted generally to some topics of Poetics. They name and define 17 kinds of poetic figures (alammkāras), which are: Anuprāsa, Yamaka (two types Samdaṣṭa and Samudga distinguished), Rūpaka, Vyatireka, Śleṣa, Uttarapokṣa, Arthāntara-nyāsa, Upa-
nyāsa (probably a kind of Vyājokti), Vibhāvanā, Atiṣayokti, Svabhāvokti (or according to some MSS Vārta), Yathā-saṁkh-

1 For a detailed account of the content of this huge compilation, chapter by chapter, see R. C. Hazra, Studies in the Upapurāṇas, i, Calcutta 1958, pp. 147-218.
ya, Viśeṣokti, Virodha, Nindā-stuti, Nidarśana and Ananvaya. In this list may be included Upamā which, however, is not explicitly mentioned or defined. In some of these verses reference is made to older authorities (purātana or purāṇa). Ch. 15 speaks of Kāvyā and distinguishes it from Śāstra and Itibāṣa. The Mahākāvyā is then defined and characterised: it should contain nine Rasas, namely, Śrāgāra, Hāsya, Karuṇa, Raudra, Vīra, Bhayānaka, Bibhasta, Adbhuta and Śānta; there should be description of towns, countries etc; it should have a Nāyaka and Pratināyaka, but it should not describe death of the Nāyaka. Ch. 16 names, defines and classifies Prahelikās. Ch. 17-31, based mostly on Bharata’s Nāṭya-śāstra, deal generally with dramaturgy. The Rūpakas are classified into 12 varieties, namely, Nāṭaka, Nāṭikā, Prakaraṇa, Prakaraṇī, Utsṛṣṭikāṅka, Bhāṇa, Samavākāra, Iḥāṃga, Vyāyoga, Vithi, Dīma and Prahasana. Eight types of Nāyikās are distinguished, namely, Vāsaka-sajjā, Viṃbotkaṇṭhitā, Svādhīna-bhartṛkā, Kalaḥānta-rītā, Khanḍitā, Vipraladbhā, Proṣita-bhartṛkā and Abhisārīkā. Ch. 18-19 deal with the different kinds of vocal (Gīta) and instrumental (Ātodya) music, appropriate to the nine Rasas. Ch. 20-29 define Nāṭya, classify Nṛtta, deal generally with the construction of the stage and its attendant religious rites and describe the four modes of Abhinaya, namely, Āṅgika, Sāttvika, Vācika and Āhārya. Ch. 30 deals in 28 verses with the nine Rasas (including Śānta) and their mode of delineation. Ch. 31 describes 49 Bhāvas, including Nirveda.

This brief résumé will give a rough idea of the topics included in the 28 chapters of the Upapurāṇa on Alāṃkāra, Nāṭya and allied subjects. But the section is essentially a rapid compilation and presents no definite system. The date of the Upapurāṇa, however, must be early. It is later certainly than Bharata’s Nāṭya-śāstra which is used as a source, but it is earlier probably than Bhaṭṭi and the works of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, who enumerate a much larger number of poetic figures. Its internal evidence as a whole indicates that it cannot be
earlier than 400 A.D. and later than 500 A.D. It was composed either in Kashmir or in the northernmost part of the Panjab; but its date is too early for any reference, direct or indirect, to the Kashmirian Dhvani school.¹

The Agni-purāṇa

The writer on Ālamkāra in the Agni-purāṇa (chs. 336-346) attempts to treat the subject of Poetics in what may be described roughly as an eclectic fashion, but the account is much fuller and more systematic. It appears to follow at the same time a tradition which is distinct from and probably older than that of the Kashmirian school of Ānandavardhana, although the work itself may not have been old. The date of this apocryphal work, which is counted as one of eighteen Mahāpurāṇas is uncertain;² but there is enough evidence to show that the Alamkāra-section in it is chiefly a compilation by a writer, who was himself no great theorist but who wanted to collect together and present a workable epitome, conforming in essentials to the teachings of no particular system, yet gathering its material from all sources. This is apparent not only from its independent, if somewhat loosely joined and uncritical treatment, but also from the presence of verses culled from Bharata, Bhāmaha, Danḍin and probably other old unknown writers.³ Bharata is cited by name in Agni 339. 6, and a large part of its treatment of nāṭya, nṛtya, abhinaya and rasa follows Bharata’s exposition, even to the literal

¹ On the question of the date and provenance of the Upapurāṇa see R. C. Hazra, op cit. pp. 205-12.

² The present Agni-purāṇa is said (IHQ, xii, pp. 683-89) to be a recast of an earlier and original Agni-p. which is the text described by the Matsya-p. and Skanda-p. and quoted by some Dharma-sāstra writers.

³ Thus, the verse abhidheyena saṃbandhit (Agni 344. 11-12), which is also cited anonymously by Mammaṭa (Śabda-vyāpā p. 8) and in the Kāma-dhenu on Vāmana iv. 3. 8, is attributed to one Bhartṛmitra by Mukula (p. 17). The verse is not traceable in Bhartṛhari. Bhartṛmitra is cited also by Someśvara in his comm. on Mammaṭa (p. 16).
borrowing and paraphrase of some of his well known verses. Thus, \textit{Agni} 337. 11-12= Bharata xxii. 28-29; \textit{Agni} 338. 12= Bharata vi. 36; \textit{Agni} 338. 7-8= Bharata vi. 39; \textit{Agni} 342. 15-17= Bharata xvii. 62-65. The definition of poetry (\textit{Agni} 336. 6) and of poetic figure (\textit{Agni} 341. 17) are copied literally from Daṇḍin i. 10 and ii. 1 respectively. Cf also \textit{Agni} 336. 13= Daṇḍin i. 29= Bhāmaha i. 27; \textit{Agni} 336. 23, 25, 26= Daṇḍin i. 12, 15, 17= Bhāmaha i. 20. This will be enough to indicate not only the general nature of the work, but also the probability that these chapters of the Purāṇa were compiled later than Daṇḍin.\(^1\) Two verses again (\textit{apāre kāvyā-saṃsāre} and \textit{śṛṅgāri cet kaviḥ}) occur in \textit{Agni} 338. 10-11 and in the \textit{Dhva-nyāloka} of Ānandavardhana (p. 222), who flourished in the middle of the 9th century.\(^2\) As the authorship of one of these verses (\textit{śṛṅgāri cet kaviḥ}) is ascribed expressly by Abhinavagupta to Ānandavardhana himself (\textit{Abh. Bh.} ed. GOS. i. p. 295) we can assume that the \textit{Agni} borrowed this verse from the \textit{Dhva-nyāloka}. We cannot draw any definite inference from the \textit{Agni}-purāṇa’s omission of a direct reference to Vāmana’s teachings, but the definition of the term \textit{vakrokti} bears some resemblance (341. 33) to Rudraṭa’s novel characterisation of the same figure (ii. 14-16).\(^3\) On the other hand, this section of the \textit{Agni}-purāṇa (like the Alamkāra section of the \textit{Viṣṇu-dharmottara} is not cited as an authority in the sphere of Poetics (if we except Bhoja’s anonymous appropria-

\(^1\) Some of the definitions of poetic figures given by the \textit{Agni} (E.g. Rūpaka, Utprekṣī, Viśeṣoktu, Viṣhūvanā, Ākṣepa, Aprastutasamsā, Samāsoktu and Paryāyokta) occur in almost identical language in Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha.

\(^2\) As the tradition of opinion embodied in the \textit{Agni}-purāṇa appears to have been followed and further developed by Bhoja in his \textit{Sarasvati-kā}, its date is presumably earlier than the 11th century. It is not suggested that Bhoja built up his elaborate system on the confused verses of the \textit{Agni}, but the tradition of opinion is not essentially different. On a post-Bhoja date see \textit{HfQ} x. pp. 767-79.

\(^3\) This point need not be emphasised: for this idea of \textit{vakrokti} was prevalent, as Ratnākara’s poem shows, in the 9th century.
tions) until we come to the time of Viśvanātha (14th century) who quotes Agni 336. 3-4 (= i. 2) and 337. 7. Whatever may be the date of the Purāṇa as a whole, which is a kind of an ambitious cyclopaedia, incorporating sections on various departments of knowledge, we may, from what has been said, be justified in assigning the Alamkāra-section to a period later than the middle of the 9th century.\(^1\) The concept of dhvani is casually included in the figure ākṣepa,\(^2\) after the manner of most old authors, who flourished before that theory came into prominence.\(^3\)

With regard to the content of the Alamkāra-section, the arrangement of chapters and topics are as follows. Ch. 336 defines and classifies Kāvyā. Ch. 337 deals with the topics of Dramaturgy (12 kinds of Rūpaka and Uparūpaka, 5 Arthaprakṛtis and 5 Saṃchhis). Ch. 338 considers the Rasas (with Sthāyi-bhāva, Vibhāva and Anubhāva), the types of Nāyaka-Nāyikā and their qualities. Ch. 339 speaks of four Ritis (Pāncāli, Gauḍī, Vaidarbhi and Laṭi) and four Vṛttis (Bhāratī, Sāttvati, Kāśikī and Ārabhaṭi). Ch. 340 is devoted to dancing. Ch. 341 is concerned with four kinds of Abhinaya (Śāttvika, Vācika, Āṅgika and Āhārya). Ch. 342 defines and classifies Śabdālamkāras, including seven varieties of Citra and sixteen kinds of Prahelikā. Ch. 343 deals with Arthālamkāras; Ch. 344 with what are called Śabdārthālamkāras (but it

---

\(^1\) P V. Kane (Hist. of Dharmaśāstra i, pp. 170-73) gives c. 900 A.D. as the date of the Smṛti-chapters; to the Alamkāra-section he assigns the same date. Also see IHQ xii. p. 689-90.

\(^2\) The word dhvani is also used in the opening verse of this section (336 1; cf. Bhoja i. 1); but apparently it alludes to the grammatical word, which reveals the spēota and which is indicated by the same term in the Vākyapadiya. Bhoja makes the same omission; but of course he was more fully aware of the views of Ānandavardhana and his followers. The Purāṇa was probably aware of the Dhvani-theory as propounded by Ānandavardhana (one of whose verses is appropriated), but it did not apparently subscribe to it.

\(^3\) Cf Ruyvaka op. 3f.
includes Ākṣepa, Samāsokti and Paryāyokta). Ch. 345-46 are devoted to Guṇas and Doṣas.
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CHAPTER IV

THE DHVANIKĀRA AND ĀNANDAVARDHANA

Ānandavardhana has been assigned by Bühler and Jacobi to the middle of the ninth century, on the strength of Rāja- taraṅgini v. 34, which makes him one of the ornaments of the court of Avantivarman (855-84 A. D.) We are pretty certain of the time of Abhinavagupta. Ānandavardhana’s commentator; for, as he himself states, his Bhāti Vṛtti on the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā was written in 1015 A. D., while his Krama-stotra was composed in 990-991 A.D. and his Bhairava-stotra or Īśvara-stotra in 992-93. From Abhinavagupta’s remarks at the end of his *Locana commentary on Uddyotas i and iii of the Dhvanyāloka, it appears that the study of this famous work was traditional in his family, and that his own commentary was composed as a rejoinder to another, called the Candrikā (p. 60), written by one of his predecessors in the same gotra4; and four times in his *Locana (pp. 123, 174, 185, 215) he discusses or controverts the views of this earlier commentator, who is specifically referred to as the Candrikā-kāra at pp. 178 and 185.2 This should certainly allow some generations to lie between Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, and negative completely Pischel’s contention that in three passages Abhinavagupta speaks of Ānandavardhana as one of his teachers. These passages occur at pp. 37, 183, and 214 of the printed text, but a perusal of them with re-

1 candrikā-kāraś tu paśhitam.... ity alam pūrva-vamśyaiḥ saha vivādena babhunā, p. 185; ity alam nija-pūrvajā-saṅgrahaiḥ sākam vivādena, p. 123, etc.—The Candrikā-kāra is also cited by Someśvara (p. 55) in his comm. on Mammaṭa.

2 This Candrikā is also referred to in a punning verse at the beginning of Mahimabhaṭṭa’s Vyaktil-viveka (i. 5): dhvani-vartmany ati-gahane skhalitaṁ vānīyāṁ pade pade sulabham/rabhasena yat pra-vṛttaḥ prakāśakaṁ candrikādy adṛṣṭaiva, on which the commentator remarks: candrikā āyotsna dhvani-viṣaraṇa-grantho’pi (p. 1).
ference to their context will show that the honorific word

guru, if it at all refers to Ānandavardhana, must refer to him,
not literally but figuratively, as paramparā-guru, whose work
was held in esteem in his family¹; or (which is more likely)
the reference is to one or other of Abhinavagupta’s teachers,
such as Bhaṭṭa Tauta or Bhaṭṭendurāśa, the former of whom
is cited as asmad-upādhyāyāḥ or asmad-guravāḥ very often in
Abhinava’s commentary on Bharata. Again, Kayyaṭa states
that he wrote his commentary on Ānandavardhana’s Devī-
śataka (ed. Kāvyamālā, Gučhaka ix) at about 977 A.D., so
that by the end of the tenth century Ānandavardhana was well
enough established in fame to have two such learned com-
mentators. Finally, Rājaśekhara, who lived about the end
of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century, mentions
and cites Ānandavardhana by name in his Kāvyā mīmāṃsā
(p. 16), and this should certainly clear up any doubt as to the
authenticity of the date assigned by KahLaṇa and accepted by
Buhler and Jacobi.

( 2 )

The celebrated work on Poetics known as Dhvanyāloka
(also called Kāvyāloka or Sahādayāloka),² of which or a part
of which Ānandavardhana is reputed to be the author, may
be distinguished into two parts, viz. (1) the Kārikā, consisting
of verses and treating of dhvani, and (2) the Vṛtti, or ex-
position, generally in prose with illustrative verses, of the
Kārikā. Now the question has been raised whether the Kārikā
and the Vṛtti are of the same authorship or should be attri-
buted to different authors.

¹ Jacobi, WZKM iv, pp 237-38.
Abhinavagupta, who is followed in this respect by several later writers on Poetics, carefully distinguishes between the Kārikākāra and the Vṛttikāra, by directly opposing them, and also by using the term vṛtti-grantha in contradistinction to the kārikā¹. In three of these passages (pp. 123, 130-1; ch. iv p. 29) Abhinavagupta expressly tries to reconcile the conflicting views expressed by the Kārikākāra and the Vṛttikāra.

Bühler² first drew attention to this point; and Jacobi³, relying on Abhinavagupta’s testimony, put forward the suggestion that the Dhvanikāra, the supposed author of the Kārikā, was a different and older writer who should be distinguished from Ānandavardhana, the author of the Vṛtti. In support of this, it has been pointed out that one does not find complete agreement of opinion between the two parts of the work, although the one is an exposition of the other. On the other hand, it seems that the system as given in its bare outline by the Kārikākāra in his concise verses has been considerably expanded, revised, and modified by the Vṛttikāra; and many problems not discussed or even hinted at by the former are elaborately treated of by the latter. In one place, for instance (p. 123), Abhinavagupta clearly points out that the classification of dhvani according to vastu, alamkāra, and rasādi is not expressly taught in any Kārikā; while in another place in ch. iv. Abhinavagupta states that the question as to the source of the endless variety of artha in poetry is mentioned by the Vṛtti-

¹ pp. 1, 59-60, 71, 78, 85, 104, 123, 130-1; ch iv pp. 25, 29, 37, 38, 39, 40 in JDL., ix, 1923, Calcutta University. One of these passages from Locana on p. 123 would imply that the earlier commentator, the Candrikākāra, probably made a similar distinction between the Kārikākāra and the Vṛttikāra. For these passages collected together, see S. K. De in the BSOS i., pt. 4, p. 3 (reprinted in S. K. De, Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics, Calcutta 1959. pp. 80-90, where the whole question is discussed) and Harichand Sastri op. cit. pp. 86-87.


³ ZDMG, 1902, p. 405f.
kāra but not touched upon by the Kārikākāra. Indeed, it seems that Ānandavardhana in his classical Vṛtti attempted to build up a more or less complete system of Poetics upon the loosely joined ideas and materials supplied by the brief Kārikā; and his success was probably so marvellous that in course of time the Kārikākāra receded to the background, completely overshadowed by the more important figure of his formidable expounder; and people considered as the Dhvanikāra not the author of the few memorial verses but the commentator Ānandavardhana himself, who for the first time fixed the theory in its present form. The term “Dhvanikāra” itself came gradually to be used in the generic sense of “the creator of the Dhvani School”, and therefore indiscriminately applied by later writers to Ānandavardhana, who might not have been the founder of the system, but who came to receive that credit for having first victoriously introduced it in the struggle of the schools.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in the apocryphal verse ascribed to Rājaśekhara in Jahlana, Ānandavardhana is regarded as the founder of the dhvani-theory. Similarly, Samudrabandha (p. 4), passing in review the five schools of Poetics before Ruyyaka, mentions Ānandavardhana as the founder of the fifth or last Dhvani School. This would also explain the two groups of apparently puzzling citations from the Dhvanyāloka met with in the works of later writers, in which they either confuse or identify Ānandavardhana with the Dhvanikāra. On the one hand, we have several Kārikās cited under the name of Ānandavardhana, while on the other, several passages which occur in the Vṛtti are given under the name of the Dhvanikāra. This confusion was so complete in later writers that even in the latter part of the eleventh century Mahimabhaṭṭa, who professed to demolish the new theory by his fierce onslaught in the Vyakti-viveka, quotes from the Kārikā and the Vṛtti indiscriminately under the generic appellation of the Dhvanikāra. In the same way Kṣemendra, in the last quarter of the eleventh century, and Hemacandra,
in the first quarter of the twelfth, make Ānandavardhana responsible for Kārikās iii. 24 and i. 4 respectively, while still later writers like Jayaratha, Viśvanātha, Govinda and Kumārasvāmin regard Ānandavardhana himself as the Dhvanikāra, to whom the the Kārikā, as well as the Vṛtti, is indiscriminately attributed\(^1\). Mammaṭa, generally a careful writer, distinguishes Ānandavardhana from the writer of the Kārikās, whom he styles dhvanikāra or dhvanikṛt (pp. 213 and 214), but in one place (p. 445) he apparently falls into confusion and ascribes to the Dhvanikāra a verse which undoubtedly belongs to the Vṛtti. The question, however, of the differentiation of the Kārikākāra and Vṛttikāra cannot yet be taken as finally settled.

(\(^3\))

If the Dhvanikāra, however, is distinguished from Ānandavardhana, the question naturally arises—who was this Dhvanikāra, and what date should be assigned to him? Abhinavagupta does not give us any information on this point. Jacobi, in the learned introduction to his translation of the Dvanyāloka, poses the question very ably without, however, furnishing a precise solution. Sovani’s hypothesis\(^2\) that the name of the unknown Kārikākāra was Sahādaya, is hardly convincing; for his grounds for this presumption are that (1) one of the alternative names of the work itself is

1 Kṣemendra, Aucitya-vicūra, p. 134 = Dvanyāloko iii. 24; Hemacandra, Comm. p. 26 = Vallabhadeva, Subhāṣ* 157 = Dvanyāloko i. 4; Govinda Thakkura, p. 16 = Dvanyāloko p. 221; Viśvanātha, p. 114 = Dvanyāloka, p. 130; Jayaratha, p. 119 = Dvanyāloka p. 111; Kumārasvāmin, p. 64 = Dvanyāloko iiii. 3. Rājaśekhara (p. 15) in his only quotation from Ānandavardhana really cites a Parikara-loka of the Vṛtti at p. 137. Kuntaka, on the other hand, quoting the Prakrit verse tālā jāamiti (Dhv. p. 62), which is Ānandavardhana’s own (from his lost Viśamahāṇa-līlā), appears to designate Ānandavardhana as the Dhvanikāra (see introd. to Vakrokti-jīvita, 2nd ed. p. xi).

Sahṛdayāloka and that (2) the use of the words sahṛdaya and kavi-sahṛdaya at the end of chapter iv of the Dhvanyāloka and in the beginning of Abhinavagupta’s commentary is significantly corroborative. It is well known, however, that the word sahṛdaya (lit. a man with a heart) is used in innumerable places in Alamkāra literature, as in the verses in question, to designate a man of taste, a judge of literary beauty, a connoisseur of Rasa. Ānandavardhana himself discusses sahṛdayatva at some length in his Vṛtti (p 160), and Abhinavagupta arrives at a concise definition of a sahṛdaya thus (p. 11): yeśāṁ kāvyānusālanaṁ-bhāya-vaśad viśadibhūte mano-mukure varṇanīya-tanmayi-bhavana-yogyatā, te hṛdaya-saṃvādabhājaḥ sahṛdayāḥ, a definition which became so much standardized that Hemacandra does not scruple to copy it literally (Comm. p. 3) ¹

In the absence of materials it is very difficult to decide the question finally. Jacobi maintains, on the indication of a passage in Abhinava, that this unknown Dhvanikāra was a contemporary of Manoratha, who is placed by Rāja-tarāṅgini (iv. 497 and 671) in the reign of Jayāpiḍa and his successor Lalitāpiḍa i.e. at the third quarter of the eighth and the first quarter of the ninth century (about 780-813 A.D.); but there are difficulties which seriously stand in the way of our arriving at a definite decision on this point. While discussing the various theories which deny the existence of dhvani, Ānandavardhana quotes a verse anonymously with the remark: tathā cānyena kṛta evātra ślokaḥ, upon which Abhinavagupta in his gloss remarks: tathā cānyena iti. grantḥ-akṛt-samāna-kūla-bhāvinā manoratha-nāmnā kavinā. If we suppose that by granthakṛt Abhinavagupta means Ānandavardhana, then Manoratha, who is thus made a contemporary of the latter, lives in the middle or second part of the ninth century, i.e. somewhat

¹ Mammaṭa begins his work (p. 10) with a reference to kavi and sahṛdaya, who are etymologically distinguished by Vidyādāra (p. 21); and both Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha declare that the sahṛdaya alone can have a true perception of Rasa in poetry.
later than the date assigned to him by Kahlaṇa, presuming of course that both the Manorathas are identical persons. If, on the other hand, we suppose that _granthakṛt_ refers, as Jacobi conjectures, to the anonymous Dhvanikāra, we are confronted with the fresh difficulty that by the term _granthakṛt_ Abhinavagupta invariably means Ānandavardhana (pp. 12, 37, 90, etc.). To remove this difficulty we must suppose either (1) that Kahlaṇa is wrong, as Pischel argues, in assigning Manoratha to the reign of Jayāpiḍa and Lalitāpiḍa, (2) that the two Manorathas were not identical persons, or (3) that Abhinavagupta himself has confused the Kārikākāra with the Vṛttikāra in a manner not usual with him. As there are no definite means of deciding any one of these equally plausible propositions, the conjecture that the original Dhvanikāra was a contemporary of the Manoratha of Kahlaṇa cannot be taken to have been definitely proved.¹

(4)

It seems, on the other hand, that the Kārikās date back to an earlier time than the first quarter of the ninth century, in which the Dhvanikāra is placed by Jacobi as a contemporary of Manoratha. The allusion to Manoratha and the apparent discrepancy in Kahlaṇa's statement need not trouble us, nor need we challenge the otherwise trustworthy testimony of Abhinavagupta; for it is quite reasonable to suppose that the Manoratha under discussion is perhaps a poet who was, Abhinavagupta says, contemporaneous with Ānandavardhana, and therefore quite a different person from the well known Manoratha of Kahlaṇa. This is perhaps a much simpler explanation than straining the word _granthakṛt_ to mean the Kārikākāra in the face of Abhinavagupta's own distinct indication to the contrary; and in this way we are not affected in the least by Kahlaṇa's Manoratha, with whom we have nothing to do. If, on the other hand, we place the

¹ T. R. Chintamani in _JOR_ ii (1928), pp. 44-47 tries to reconcile the discrepancies.
Dhvanikāra in the time of Kahaṇa's Manoratha, this would leave only a bare margin of one or two generations between the Kārikākāra and the Vṛttikāra, which does not seem to be enough to make room for a period of scholastic exposition of the subject. But undoubted traces of such activity are preserved to us in the few memorial verses—parikāra-ślokas (pp. 34, 130, 137, 147, 163), saṃgraha-ślokas (pp. 87, 223), saṃkṣepa-ślokas (pp. 44, 74, 243)—incorporated by Ānandavardhana in his Vṛtti which itself, therefore, is not likely to be the first of its kind. These Ślokas are a sort of recapitulation-stanzas which are adduced by the Vṛttikāra from unknown sources, sometimes to explain the meaning of the Kārikās, but more often to amplify and supplement them. But at the same time we need not suppose a very long intervening period between the original dogmatic formulator of a theory and its first thoughtful expounder; for it is not necessary that a system should always require a long stretch of time in forming itself. The phenomenon is not unusual that if a literary or intellectual movement is already afoot and is, at it were, in an effervescent state, a few generations, or at most a century, are enough to bring it to the inevitable culmination, or at least to some preliminary completion. If we suppose that a system of dhvani had been in existence at a very early period, we should expect to find, as we do find to a certain extent in the case of the Rasa-theory, its influence working, at least indirectly, on the earlier writers who preceded Ānandavardhana, although this argument in itself does not carry with it a decisive force. It may be admitted, on the other hand, that the Dhvanikāra apparently shows himself conversant with some theories of rasa, rīti and alaṃkāra. But this neither proves nor disproves his own antiquity or that of his system, for there is no evidence to show that he was aware of the particular views of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin or Vāmana who championed these theories; nor are these writers to be taken, like the Dhvanikāra himself, as the absolute founders of the systems they individually
represent. It only goes to establish that the theory, enunciated by the Dhvanikāra, might have existed side by side with these systems, as we find them in the extant works; for it could not have been much later, inasmuch as such a supposition would bring it too near the time of Ānandavardhana himself. If the Dhvanikāra was contemporaneous with Dāndin or Vāmana, he may be placed at most a century earlier than his commentator in the first half of the 8th century.

( 5 )

If Ānandavardhana gave the final authoritative shape to the dhvani-theory (only the details of which were worked out by Abhinavagupta and others), the anonymous Dhvanikāra was not its absolute creator. This is made clear by the first Kārikā, which tells us that the theory was already taught by earlier thinkers, and that it existed even at the time of the Dhvanikāra himself in various forms, handed down, as Ānandavardhana explains, in unbroken tradition (paramparayā yah samāmnātah), although it may not have been explained, as Abhinava adds in his gloss, in particular books (avicchinnena pravāhena tuir etad uktam, vināpi viśiṣṭa-pustakeṣu vivekanād ity abhiprāyah, p. 3). This implies without doubt that the school existed from a very early time, but some unknown writer gathered together, summed up, and fixed the theory in a form which obtained considerable literary esteem for his work and the honoured but somewhat vague appellation of the Dhvanikāra for himself. But his name and fame, in course of time, were eclipsed by those of his great Vṛttikāra who succeeded in establishing the theory for all time and to whom posterity began to ascribe, not altogether undeservedly, all the honours of his predecessor, so that one of the latest writers on Ālaṃkāra, Kumārasvāmin (p. 288), glorifies him with the curious but significant epithet—Dhvanyācārya.

( 6 )

Very little is known of Ānandavardhan's personal history. The colophon at the end of ch. iii of his work in the India
Office MS calls him nonopādhyāyātmaja, while the colophon to ch. iv gives the form jonopādhyāya. Of these two forms of the name of his father, the former seems to be correct, for referring to Ānandavardhana's Devī-śataka, Hemacandra (Comm. p.225) cities its author as nona-sutah śrīmad-ānandavardhana-nāmā. Kayyaṭa also, commenting on the last punning verse of the same work, refers to the author as the son of Noṇa, and mentions his two works, the Viṣamabāna-līlā and Arjuna-carita, supposed to have been punningly alluded to in that verse. Both these works are cited in Ānandavardhana's Vṛtti, by Abhinavagupta (pp. 152, 176, 222), by Hema- candra (pp. 15, 213); and the first work appears to be a Prakrit poem. Ānandavardhana himself refers to another work of his own at p. 233, on which Abhinava adds the gloss: granthāntara iti viṇiścaya-ṃśīkāyāṃ dharmottamāyāṃ yā vivṛtir amunā granthakṛtā kṛtā This is apparently a work called Dharmottama a commentary on the (Pramāṇa-) viṇiścaya of Dharmakirti. Abhinava in Locana iv (p. 31) refers to another work of Ānandavardhana's called Tattvāloka, in which the latter is said to have discussed, among other things, the relation between kāvya-naya and śāstra-naya.

(7)

ABHINAVAGUPTA

Abhinavagupta's fame rests chiefly on his philosophical works on Kashmir Śaivism, but he appears also to have attained a considerable reputation in the realm of Poetics by his two remarkable commentaries on Bharata and on Ānandavardhana, called respectively Abhinava-bhāratī and Kāvyāloka-locana. Since the Locana is cited several times by name, it seems to have been written before the other commentary. He also cites in his Locana (p. 179, also p. 29) another commentary (vivarana) of his own, now lost, on the Kāvya-kautuka by one of his teachers (asmad-upādhyāya) Bhaṭṭa Tauta. Nothing is
known of this Bhaṭṭa Tauta (also called Bhaṭṭa Toṭa); but it appears from its fourth introductory verse that Abhinava’s commentary on Bharata was inspired by this teacher, who is cited there very frequently, just as his Locana was inspired by his other teacher Bhaṭṭendurāja. The exact scope and extent of Tauta’s lost work is not known, but from Abhinavagupta’s reference (pp. 187, 275, 310) it appears to have dealt with the theories of poetry in general and Rasa in particular, and explained some relevant passages from the Nāṭya-
śāstra.¹

The Kāvya-kautuka is also referred to in the anonymous commentary on the Vyakti-viveka (p. 13); and Hemacandra (p. 316) quotes three verses from Bhaṭṭa Tauta in his text and reproduces (p. 59) in his commentary (appropriating the passage directly from Abhinava on Bharata) an opinion of this teacher in connexion with the theory of Rasa. Kṣemendra in his Aucitya-vicāra (under śī. 35) attributes to Tauta a fragment of a verse which is given in full but anonymously by Hemacandra (p. 3)². Tauta is quoted also by Māṇikyacandra (at p. 5), by Śrīdhara and by Caṇḍidāsa in their respective commentaries on Mammāṭa.

Bhaṭṭa Tauta, together with Bhaṭṭendurāja, who is extravagantly praised in the Locana and whose relation to Abhinava we have already discussed, were probably his preceptors in Kāvya and Alāṃkāra. His references to his instructors in philosophy, like Siddhacela¹, Lakṣmaṇagupta and others, in his philosophical works possess no interest for us; but it may be noted that Abinava, in his Pratyabhijñā-vimarśinī Laghu-vṛtti refers to Utpala as his parama-guru, the teacher

¹ See above under commentators on Bharata p 33, 101. Someśvara (Comm. on Mammāṭa p. 55) appears to have seen the work, as well as Abhinava’s comm. on it (ṭac ca Bhaṭṭa-Totena Kāvyakautuka, Abhinavaguptas ca tad-vṛttau nirṇātan) ² This verse is ascribed, perhaps wrongly, to Māmaha (or Bhaṭṭa?) in Kāma-dhenu on Vāmana, p 4. ed. Benares. ³ Cited in Locana, concluding verses.
of his teacher. This description of Utpala (see above p. 33) is repeated in his Locana (p. 30), where Abhinava discusses the term pratyabhijña, used in the text (i. 8), and refers to what is said on this point by Utpala. This Utpala is well known in the history of Kashmir Śaivism as the author of the Īṣvara-pratyabhijña (on whose Sūtra and Vṛtti Abhinava wrote a Laghu Vṛtti and a Brhati Vṛtti respectively), and is assigned by Bühler (op. cit p. 79) to the first half of the 10th century. From what Abhinava himself says in his numerous works on Kashmir Śaivism, we may indicate the line of spiritual succession (guru-parampara) thus: Somānanda—Utpala—Lakṣmanagupta—Abhinavagupta; Somānanda being probably a pupil of Vasugupta who is taken as the earliest founder of the Pratyabhijña-śāstra. The guru-parampara in his study of the Tantras may be given thus: Sumatinātha—Somadeva—Śambhunātha—Abhinavagupta.

In the concluding portion of his Parātrimśikā-vivarana, Abhinava gives us an interesting personal and genealogical account, in which he tells us that he was son of Kāśmiraka Cukkula1 and grandson of Varāhagupta, and had a brother named Manorathagupta. Abhinava’s date is easily gathered from his relation to Utpala and Ānandavardhana, as well as from his own dating of some of his works. As we have mentioned above, his Krama-stotra was composed in 990-91 A.D. and his Bhairava- or Īṣvara-stotra in 992-93 A.D., while his Brhati Vṛtti on Utpala’s Pratyabhijña bears the date 1015 A.D. We can therefore, place him with certainty at the last quarter of the 10th and the first quarter of the 11th century2.

1 Bühler’s MS has kāśmiraka viculaka (op. cit. p. clv) as well as “cukkula” (p. clvii), the real name appears to have been Narasimhagupta, while his mother’s name was Vimalā.
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CHAPTER V
FROM RĀJAŚEKHARA TO MAHIMABHATṬA

RĀJAŚEKHARA

( 1 )

Rājaśekhara, son of mahāmantrin Durduka or Duhika and Śilāvatī¹ and great-grandson of the poet Akālajalada of the Yāyāvara family, is better known as a poet and dramatist than as a writer on Poetics. In his Bāla-rāmāyaṇa i. 12, Rājaśekhara describes himself as the author of six works which must have existed even before this presumably early production of his.² It is not known whether his other three well known dramas belong to this period, but it appears that he probably composed more than six works. Hemacandra (Comm. p. 335) cites a work of Rājaśekhara's, entitled Hara-vilāsa, as an example of a poem which bears the name of its author (sva-nāmāṅktā), and quotes two verses from the same (Comm. pp. 334-335); from which Ujjvaladatta also (ii. 28) gives a half-verse. In the Kāvyā-mimāṃsā, again (xvii p. 98), there is a reference to another work of his own, called Bhuvana-kośa, for information on general geography.³ Ujjvaladatta (ii. 76) also quotes a line from Rājaśekhara on the synonyms

1 Bāla-rāmā° ad i. 7, 13; Bāla-bhā° ad i. 8; Viddha-śāla° ad i. 5. Rājaśekhara calls himself a Kavirāja (Karpūra-maṇī° i. 9; Viddha-śāla i. 5), which is, according to Kav. mīm., the seventh, out of the ten stages, of poetic skill, one degree higher than that of a mahākuṭī.

2 In Karpūra-maṇī° i. 9 we are told that Rājaśekhara began his career as a bāla-kavī, so called apparently from his two works Bāla-rāmā° and Bāla-bhā°. While in this Prakrit drama, as well as in Viddha-śāla°, he appears to have attained the distinction of a Kavirāja.

3 Kane (HSP, p 207-8) believes that the Bhuvana-kośa was not a separate work but formed a part of the Kav. mīm.
of Śiva, which, if not occurring in the Hara-vilāsa, was probably taken from an unknown lexicon by him.

In the two anthologies of Vallabhadeva and Śāṅgadhara, we get a considerable number of verses ascribed to Rāja-śekhara. Of these, about 24 have been identified by Sten Konow in Rājaśekhara’s four plays, but about 10 have not yet been traced in any of his known works, nor are they to be found in his Kāvya-mīmāṃsā. These untraced verses, including most of the memorial verses on poets, probably belong to another and younger Rājaśekhara.

There can be hardly any doubt that the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā should be ascribed to the dramatist Rājaśekhara, although it is not mentioned in these enumerations of Rājaśekhara’s works. Our author gives his own name at the end of the first chapter of this work as yāyāvariya Rājaśekhara, which agrees with the description given in the dramas and which makes later writers cite our author simply as yāyāvara. The opinions of the yāyāvara family, to which he belonged and in which


2 This other Rājaśekhara may or may not be the Jaina Rāja-śekhara, author of the Prabandha-kōsa (1348 A.D.). Rice 282 mentions a work called Karpūra-rasa-maṇjarī by Bālakavi, which apparently refers to Rājaśekhara and his well known Prakrit drama, and not to any work on Alankāra.

3 Aufreht (ABod 135a) that the Kāv mīm. is cited by name by Śāṅkara in his commentary on Sakuntalā.

4 Bāla-bhā i. 6 13; Viddha-tāla i. 5; and Dhanapūla in Tilaka-maṇi ed. Kāvyamāla 85, 1903, sl. 33, and Māṇikyacandra in Samketa comm. (ed. Mysore) p. 308 Also Hemaśandra (p. 235) and Someśvara (ed. Jodhpur 1959, p. 224, vāyāvariya). Nārāyaṇa Dīksita on Viddha-tāla. i. 5 quotes Devala to show that vāyūvara means a kind of a householder (dvividho grhaṣṭhaḥ, vāyūvaraḥ kātināḥ ca; see Mitākṣarā on Yājñīya i. 128) according to which vāyūvara means a particular class of Brahmans who lead a plain life and do not accept gifts etc Rājaśekhara’s wife came from Kṣatriya family, but Anuloma marriage was permitted. See Kane, Hist of Dhamma-śāstra ii. pp. 641-42.
were born poets and scholars like Surānanda,² Akālajalada,³ Tarala⁴ and Kavirāja, are cited frequently by him under the general designation yāyāvariya,⁴ as well as under the individual names of these famous members of the family who are enumerated in the Bāla-rāmāyana i. 13 and elsewhere. He also quotes with respect the views of his wife Avantisundari of the Cāhuāna family (pp. 20, 46, 57), for whose pleasure, we know, he wrote his Karpūra-mañjari (i. 11) and who seems to have been an accomplished authoress. The present work does not also omit a display the author's love for Prakrit dialects (pp. 34, 51) as well as his knowledge of geography (ch. xvii), of which he gives ample evidence in Act x of the Bāla-rāmāyana. These and other details, on which we need not dwell any further, show that our Rājaśekhara is no other than the well known dramatist.⁵

( 2 )

The published text of the Kavya-mimansa in eighteen chapters is apparently the first part of a projected extensive volume, of which a general summary or scheme is given in

1 An ornament of the country of the Cedis (cedi-maṇḍala-nanda, Jalhaṇa's Sūkta-muktāvali 88-89, p. 47). His patron Raṇavigrha is supposed by Bhandarkar (Report, 1887-91, p. xix) to have been the brother-in-law of Kṛṣṇa II of the Rāṣṭrakūta dynasty, whose dates range from 875 to 911 A.D. Quoted also in Kāv. mim. p. 75.

2 Rājaśekhara's great-grandfather. This is not his real name but sobriquet derived from the expression in Sr. Paddhati 777 = Sābhāṣṭ 843 (dākṣinātya). Famous for his poetical jems. Some of which were plagiarised by Kādambarirāma (Jalhaṇa Sūkta-muktāvali*83-84 (p. 46). Called mahārāṣṭra-cudāmanu in Bāla-rāmā i. 13; also see Viddhasāla* i. 5.

3 Cited by Jalhaṇa. Author of a work, called probably Suvanta-bandha.

4 pp 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 35, 42, 43, 46, 50, 56, 58, 61, 62, 63, 78, 90, 91, 94, 99, 100.

5 See S. K. De, Hist of Kavya Lit. ch. viii for Rājaśekhara and his dramas.—In Korp. m. (on i. 6) he describes himself as sarva-bhūsācatura. As a poet he claims that in his former births he was Valmīki, Mentha and Bhavabhūti!
the first chapter; this fact is also indicated by occasional remarks (like rītayās tiras tās tu purastāt p. 10 and tam aupaiṣadike vakṣyamah p. 11) relating to topics to be dealt with in other succeeding parts. If the complete work, as projected, consisted of eighteen adhikaranaś, we have now only one part surviving on the preliminary topic of kavi-rahasya alone. Keśava Misra (pp. 32, 67) quotes three verses from an Alamkāra work by Rājaśekhara, which, if they belong to our author, were apparently taken, as their contents indicate, from some lost chapters on ubhayālaṃkārika and vainodika respectively.

The popularity of the Kāvyamīmāṃsā with later writers is indicated by the extensive use made of it by Kṣemendra, Bhoja, Hemacandra and the younger Vāgbhaṭa. Hemacandra, for instance, literally copies long passages from chs. viii, ix, xiii-xviii; while Vāgbhaṭa borrows the same (as well as other) portions either directly from the same source or indirectly through Hemacandra.

Rājaśekhara himself is indebted to many old writers and cites directly the opinions of Medhāvirudra (p. 12), Udbhāṭa and Audbhāṭas (pp. 22, 44), Vāmana and Vāmanīyas (pp. 14, 20), Rudrāṭa (p. 31), Maṅgala (pp. 11, 14, 16, 20) and Ānanda (p 16), besides unnamed authors who are cited under the general designation acārya. We also find the name of Āparājīti. One Aparajita is quoted in Subhāṣītāvalī 1024, and mentioned as a contemporary poet and author of Mrgāṅka-lekhā-kathā in Karpūra-maṇjarī, ad 1.8. Rājaśekhara also

1 Cf. introd. to Kāv. mīm. p. xvii-xviii.
2 A comparative table is given of these wholesale borrowings at the end of the notes in the Gaekwad ed. of the text.
4 One Aparajita-raksita is quoted in Kavindra-vacana but as his name implies he was probably a Buddhist, and is possibly not identical with Rājaśekhara's contemporary Āparajīti. V. Raghavan (JOR. vi. p. 170) thinks that this Āparajīti of Rājaśekhara is none else than Lollaṭa. See above p. 37, for 1.
mentions Surānanda, one of his ancestors, his wife Avantisundari, Pālyakīrti (p. 46), Śyāmadeva (pp. 11, 13, 17) and Vākpatirāja (p. 62), all of whom, as the citations show, seem to have expressed some opinion on the topics under discussion.

( 3 )

The date of Rājaśekhara has been settled with some exactitude. We learn from his four extant plays⁴ that his ancestors lived in Mahārāṣṭra, and he himself spent much of his life in the midland as a teacher (upādhyāya) to a king named Mahendrapāla (otherwise known as Nirbhaya or Nibbhaya); Rājaśekhara was also patronised by his son and successor Mahipāla.⁵ We also understand that one of his plays, the Bāla-bhārata, was performed at a place called Mahodaya, for which he shows a partiality also in his Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (p. 94). Fleet has shown⁶ that this Mahipāla should be identified with the Mahipāla of Asni inscription, dated 917 A.D., and he agrees with Pischel⁷ that Mahodaya is another name for Kānyakubja or Kanauj, with which place this king, as well as Mahendrapāla, is connected in the

1 A Sanskrit verse of Avantisundari is quoted in Kav. mūm. p 46; but no work of hers has come down to us. Hemacandra in his Desī-mūma-mūlā quotes three Prakrit verses of Avantisundari (i 81 and 1. 157).

2 This Vākpatirāja (Bapai-rāa) is apparently the author of the Gaṅgavaho (middle of the 8th century; Kahlana iv., 144) and must be distinguished from Muñja-vākpatirāja, the 7th Parāmāra king of Mālava, who reigned from 947 to 995 A.D. See below under Dhanañjaya.

3 Viddha-sūla⁸ i. 6; Bāla-rāmā⁹ i. 5; Bāla-bhāra¹⁰ i. 7, 11; Kar-pāra-mañj¹¹ i. 5, 9.

4 Bāla-bhāra¹² i. 9.

5 IA xvi. 175-78.

6 GgA, 1883, pp. 1217f.

7 Cf. Bāla-rāmā x ad 87, 89, 90. Rājaśekhara’s partiality for Mahodaya is also apparent in our text at pp. 8, 94.
Siyadoni inscription\(^1\). It has also been shown by Aufrecht\(^2\) and Pischel\(^3\) that Mahendrapāla, whose dates appear to be 903-07 A.D. from Kielhorn's summing up of the names of the four sovereigns of Kanauj as presented by the Siyadoni inscription, went also by the biruda of Nirbhara or Ṇirbhaya (Nibbhara or Nibbhaya in the Prakrit form), a fact of which Fleet seems to have been unaware.\(^4\) Rājaśekhara appears to have become at some time of his life a protégé of Yuvarāja who has been identified with Yuvarāja I Kayūravarṣa, the Kalacuri ruler of Triṣupi (in the kingdom of Cedi), where the poet's relative Surānanda had migrated. From these evidences, it is clear that Rājaśekhara must have flourished in the beginning of the 10th century, and probably also lived towards the end of the 9th. This is also supported by the fact that the latest writers quoted by Rājaśekhara are the Kashmirian Ratnākara and Ānandavardhana, who belong to the middle or second half of the 9th century, while the earliest writer to mention Rājaśekhara appears to be the Jaina Somadeva, whose Yaśastilaka is dated 960 A.D.\(^5\) About the same time Abhinavagupta (in his Comm. on Bharata) expressly mentions Karpūra-maṅjarī as a Saṭṭaka, as well as Bāla-rāmāyaṇa. In the Anthologies Rājaśekhara is extensively quoted from the 12th century onward.\(^6\)

1 EI i. 170 f. 2 ZDMG xxvii (on Śāṅgadhara-Paddati). 3 *op. cit.* p. 1221. 4 Fleet further shows (*op. cit.* p. 175f) that this Mahendrapāla must not be taken, as Peterson and Durgaprasada are inclined to take him, to be identical with the feudatory Mahendrapāla, whose inscription from Dighwa-Dubauli, dated 761-62 A.D., he has edited in IA xv. 105, and who is distinct from the pupil of Rājaśekhara. 5 For other details about Rājaśekhara see Sten Konow's edition of *Karpūra-maṅjanī* (Harvard Orient. Series 4, 1901). 175f, which gives a full bibliography.—It is difficult to summarise the diverse and somewhat diffuse contents of the *Kāvyā-mīmāṃsā*, but a general résumé will be found below in vol. ii. ch. ix (3). A good summary will be found also in Kane, *op. cit* pp. 199-201. 6 See F. W. Thomas, introd. to *Kavindra-vacana*, where most of these citations are collected together.
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Edition. With introd. and notes by C. D. Dalal in Gaekwad Orient. Series, Baroda 1916. The text has been printed with his own Comm, by Narayan Sastri Khiste in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares 1931; again, by Madhusudana Misra with his own Comm. and Hindi trs. in the same series 1931, 1932. Our references are to the Baroda ed.—Translated into French by Nadine Stchoupak and Louis Renou, Paris 1946.

DHANANJAYA AND DHANIKA

(1)

The date of Dhanañjaya may be taken as approximately settled at the last quarter of the 10th century A. D. The author informs us (iv. 80) that he was son of Viṣṇu and that he flourished in the circle of distinguished literary men surrounding king Muñja, who himself seems to have been a man of taste and learning, as well as a patron of letters. We should not, with Peterson¹, confound this Muñja, better known as Muñja-vākpatirāja, with Vākpatirāja (or Bappai-rāa), the author of Gaudavaho, who lived in the first half of the 8th century under king Yasovarman of Kanauj and is referred to by Kahlana (iv. 144) and Rājaśekhara. Our Muñja appears to be the seventh ruler of the Paramāra dynasty of Mālava, who, as his own inscriptions record², came to the throne in 974 A.D., succeeding his father Harṣadeva Siyaka, and reigned till about 995 A.D., when he was defeated, imprisoned and executed, as the Cālukya inscriptions attest³, by Cālukya

1 introd. to Subhā, A pos. p. 115.

2 Arch. Survey Western Ind. iii. 100 = IA vi. 48-51; IA xiv. 159-60. See Bühler, Das Navasāhasūka-carita (transl. in IA xxxvi. pp. 149-172), 1888, p. 116f.

3 IA xii. 270, xvi. 18, 23, xxi. 167-68; EIr ii. 212 f. All the references (regarding Muñja’s date) are collected together in Haas’s introd. to his ed. of the Daśa-rūpaka (q. v.).
Tailapa II. Besides being known as Vākpatirāja¹, owing perhaps to the fact that he was himself a poet, he had several other birudas, such as Amoghavārsha, Prthvī-vallabha, and Śrī-vallabha; and one of his inscriptions calls him Utpalarāja²; a fact, overlooked by the editors of the Kāvyamālā Series (Gucchaka i, p. 131), made them confound him with Utpala, the Śaiva philosopher of Kashmir, who was Abhinavagupta’s para-ma-guru. This ruler is mentioned by Śaṁbhu³, as well as by Padmagupta⁴, as ‘a friend of poets’ (kavi-bāṇdhava or kavi-mitra); and Bhoja, his nephew and successor, appears to have inherited these traits of his character.

(2)

The Daśa-rūpaka of Dhanañjaya, in its treatment of Dramaturgy, is apparently based on the time-honoured authority of Bharata; but as Bharata’s huge compendium, both from the practical as well as theoretical point of view, is discursive and lumbersome with its load of histrionic and other matters, Dhanañjaya attempts to sift the mass of details, and, limiting himself only to Dramaturgy, restates the general principles in the form of a practical, condensed and systematic manual. These features of the new contribution ap-

¹ Dhanaka quotes (on iv. 54-55) one of Muñja’s verses twice, citing him in the first instance as Muñja and in the other case as Vākpatirāja-deva; while Dhanapala in his Tilaka-maṇjarī uses both the names with respect to the same person. One of Muñja’s descendants, Arjunavarman, who ruled in the beginning of the 13th century, reproduces one of Muñja’s stanzas, with the remark that it was composed by one of his ancestors “Muñja, whose other name was Vākpatirāja” (Comm. on Amaru-śataka, ed. Kāvyamālā 1916, p. 23). This verse is attributed to Muñja also by Jahlanā p. 199.

² Kaśemendra quotes verses from Muñja in his three works (Aucit. vic. under 61. 16; Kavi-kaṇṭhā under ii. 1; Suvrītta-til. under ii. 6) referring to him as Utpalarāja. See also Śāṅkadhara (126 vākpatirājasya; 1017 utpalarājasya), Vallabhadeva (3414 śrīharsadevāt-maṇa-vākpatirājasya), and Jahlanā pp. 63 and 199 (Śrī-muñjasya).

³ Rājendra-karṇa-pūra, 61 17, 36.

⁴ Navasāhasānka² i. 7, 8; ii. 93.
parently obtained for it such reputation and currency that in course of time it seems to have superseded not only all other treatises on the subject but also the basic work of Bharata himself. Viśvanātha, for instance, refers now and then to Bharata and gives one or two (mostly conventional) quotations from Nāṭya-śāstra; but in the main he bases his treatment of dramaturgic topics on Dhananājaya; while Vidyānātha admits, in the nāṭaka-prakaraṇa of his own work, his indebtedness to the latter, with the remark esā prakriyā daśarūpokta-rity anusāreṇa (p. 131).

The Daśa-rūpaka, consisting of four chapters called Prakāsas, deals almost entirely with the topics of dramaturgy, but the fourth and last Prakāśa contains a treatment of the theory of Rasa. The first Prakāśa distinguishes Nṛtya, defines the five Artha-prakṛtis and the Samādhis (with their Aṅgas), and concludes with definitions of Viṣkambhaka, Praveśaka and other dramatic devices. The second Prakāśa is devoted to the topic of Nāyaka and Nāyika, their characteristics, their adjuncts, and considers the four dramatic Vṛttis and their Aṅgas. The third Prakāśa is concerned with the Prologue and other requisites of the ten kinds of Rūpaka. In the fourth Prakāśa we have an exposition of its peculiar theory of Rasa in which, not the relation of Vyaṅgya-vyañjaka but that of Bhāvyabhāvaka is posited, after Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, between Rasa and Kāvyā.

Dhanika, also described as son of Viṣṇu, and author of the Avaloka commentary on Dhananājaya’s work, was probably one of Dhananājaya’s numerous illustrious contemporaries; for he may be assigned to the same period. Dhanika quotes from Padmagupta (also known as Parimala)\(^1\), who wrote about 995 A.D., as well as from Muṇja, and is quoted in his turn by Bhoja in his Sarasvati-kāṇṭhābharaṇa in the first half of the

\(^1\) on ii. 37b = Navasāhasānka\(^o\) vi. 42.
11th century. He is also described in one of the MSS\(^1\) as holding the office of *mahāsādhyapāla* under king Utpalarāja, who is apparently our Muñja-vākpati, the patron of Dhanañjaya. The suggestion that the author and the commentator of *Daśa-rūpaka* are one and the same person, chiefly on the ground of the apparent similarity of names and identity of patronymic, as well as the inadvertant attribution of a verse of Dhanañjaya’s to Dhanika in some later works like the *Sāṅhītya darpaṇa* (ad vi. 64a=*Daśa-rūpaka* iii. 29), need not be seriously considered.\(^2\) Jacobi, however, supports this suggestion\(^3\) by pointing out that there is no separate *maṅgalā-caraṇa* to the commentary. This hypothesis, however, cannot altogether get rid of the fact that Dhanañjaya and Dhanika are indeed distinguished by some later writers. For instance, Vidyānātha, in his numerous references to the *Daśa-rūpaka*, cites the Kārikā-verses and never from the commentary,\(^4\) although his commentator, Kumārasvāmin, falls in one place\(^5\) (p. 29) into the error of attributing one of Dhanañjaya’s

\(^1\) Wilson, *Select Specimens*, 3rd ed. I, xx, xxi, endorsed by Hall p. 3 notes. It is curious to note that Dhanika (on iv. 23, ed. Parab) quotes *nidrārdha*\(^6\) which occurs in the *Caura-paṅcaśikā* (ed. Solf no. 36) attributed to Bihlana, but this anonymous quotation (which also occurs in Kuntaka) does not of itself place Dhanika later than the middle of the 11th century, the date of Bihlana; for the authenticity of the verse is not beyond question, as it is attributed to Kalāśaka in *Subhāṣ*\(^7\) 1280 and Jahlaṇa p. 152, and Bihlana’s authorship is open to question. It is not safe, therefore, to base any chronological conclusion on this quotation. Haas has not noticed the verse at all.

\(^2\) Haas (Pref. to ed. *Daśa-rūpaka* xxxiv) is inaccurate in stating that there is in the commentary “a number of indications of a difference of authorship,” and in support of this he cites ii. 20b-21a, iii. 32b, iv 43c. Jacobi elaborately shows (*GgA*, 1913, pp. 304f) that Haas has entirely misunderstood these passages.

\(^3\) *Op cit.* p. 303. Also Lévi in *JA*, 1886, p. 221.

\(^4\) p. 46. 101, 102, 104, 105, 114, 124, 131, 219, 221, 228.

\(^5\) In other passages the citation appears to be correct, pp. 47,
verses (ii. 23b) to Dhanika. It may also be urged that a maṅgala-verse to the Avaloka, occurring in one of the MSS, is rejected by Hall as spurious, chiefly on the ground that its style is "too pedestrian for so ornate a stylist as Dhanika" (p. 4 note). This 'pedestrian' stanza is apparently the same as that which occurs at the outset of Aufrecht's Bodleian MS, noticed by him in his Bod. Cat. 203a. On the other hand, the absence of the maṅgala-verse need not in itself be taken as decisive; for while Mammaṭa has no separate maṅgala-verse to his Vṛtti, we find them in Vāmana and Ruuyaka. Śāṅgadhara in his anthology attributes to Dhanika several verses (3417 and 3973) which the latter gives as his own in his commentary (on iv. 3a and ii. 10a). If, therefore, we suppose, as it is more likely, that the author and the commentator were not identical, then Dhanika may be taken as a brother of Dhanaṅjaya (a supposition which explains the apparent similarity of names and identity of patronymic), who collaborated in the production of the work² by writing the commentary.

From the Avaloka we learn that its author composed poems in Sanskrit and in Prakrit, and also wrote a treatise, entitled Kāvyamār (on iv. 35; seven verses quoted) which alluded to the Dhvanyāloka and apparently dealt with the general topics of Poetics.

For other less known commentaries on Daśa-rūpaka, see Bibliography given below.³

128, 130, 221, 233. 235, 259. Ranganātha on Vikamor (about 1656 A.D.; ed. N. S. P. 1914 p. 31) falls into the same mistake. Mallinātha on Kumāra i. 4 and Śiśu viii. 11 quotes Daśa-rūpaka correctly (ii 36b and ii 24a).

1 This supposition does not militate against the passage (on iv. 33), referred to by Jacobi, in which the commentator intimately identifies himself with the author saying asmabhūṃ niṣidnyate, meaning that the prohibition is made both by his author and himself.

2 For later dramaturgic works, e.g. Vasanta-ājiva of Kumūragiri, see under Minor Writers below ch. x.
BIUROGRAPHY

Dhanañjaya


Dhanika

Editions. Printed in Hall’s and Parab’s editions, with the text. Dhanika’s Kavya-nirnaya is probably lost.

Other Commentaries on Dhanañjaya and Dhanika

(1) Comm. by Nrisihhabhata. MS in Govt. Orient MSS Library, Madras (see BSOS, iv. 1926, p. 280). It is really a Laghu-Tikā on Dhanika’s Comm. (Dasurūpasya yā vyākhyā Dhanikena samāhitā tasya Bhāttā-Nrisimhena laghu-tikā vidhiyate). It is interesting to note from this verse that Dhanika is mentioned as a commentator on Daśa-rūpaka, thus recording the tradition that the commentator Dhanika was different from Dhanañjaya, author of the Daśa-rūpaka. Bhāṭṭa Nrisimha also commented on Bhoja’s Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharana.

(2) Tika by Devapani (cited by Raṅganatha on Vikramorvasiyu ed. N. S. P. 1904, pp. 6, 31; cf AFL 444 and ABod 135b). No MSS discovered. This is the author who is wrongly called Pani by Wilson (Select Specimens) and Aufrecht. Being anterior to Raṅganatha, his date should be earlier than 1656 A.D. Raṅganatha also refers to a Sāhasāṅkīva-tikā in the same context (p. 31).
(3) "Paddhati by Kuravirāma (MS in Hultsch 554; only three pages) is not a commentary on the Daśa-rūpaka, as Hultsch's entry would imply. It is an independent work on Dramaturgy consisting of 110 verses. See Madras Trm II, A, 820 (c). Kuravirāma is a modern but fertile South Indian commentator who lived at the court of Zemindars of Kārvetinagaram in North Arcot District, and wrote comm. also on two well known poems, Campū-bhurata of Anantabhaṭṭa and Viśvagunādarśa of Veṅkaṭa. He mentions in his comm. on the last-named poem a commentary by himself on Appayya's Kuvalay", as well on Dhanaṅjaya. See Hultsch i, p. xi.

(4) Comm. by Bahurūpa Miśra, for an account of which see V. Raghavan in JOR, Madras, viii, pp. 321-34. As Bahurūpa quotes from Bhoja’s Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa and Śūradātanaya’s Bhāva-prakāśana he must be later than 1250 A.D.

KUNTAKA

(1)

Kuntaka is better known in Alāmākāra literature under the descriptive designation of the Vakrokti-jīvita-kāra¹ from the peculiar name of his work 'vakoqi-jīvita, which itself is so called because of its central theory that vakrokti is the 'soul' or essence of poetry. The work had been known only through quotations and references until it was edited from two imperfect MSS by the present writer.

Kuntaka's date² is fixed approximately by his quotsior from the dramatist Rājaśekhara, on the one hand, and by

¹ Ruuyaka, ed Kāvymalā p 8. with Jayaratha (also pp 12, 150 e, f) and Samudrabandha thereon (p. 4); Viśvanātha ed. Durgaprasa p. 14; Kāma-dhenu on Vāmana I. 1, ed. Benares p. 6, etc.
² This question has been dealt with in detail in the introd. to S K. De's editio princeps of the Vakrokti-jīvita, and is only briefly referred to here.
Mahimabhaṭṭa’s citation of Kuntaka and his work, on the other. Mahimabhaṭṭa flourished, as we shall see, towards the end of the 11th century. We may, therefore, place Kuntaka between the middle of the 10th and the middle of the 11th. As this date falls in with the known dates of Abhinavagupta (whose latest date is 1015 A.D.), we may take Kuntaka as a contemporary of this commentator on Ānandavardhana. Although Abhinava refers to various views about vakrokti held before his time, it is remarkable that he never alludes to the Vakrokti-jīvita-kāra who, as his title rājānaka indicates, was probably a Kashmirian, and whose work, if written before Abhinava’s time, ought not to have been, from its important nature and content, thus entirely ignored by a rival theorist.

(2)

The first two and a part of the third chapter of the work, which have been published, give a general outline of Kuntaka’s main theory; but it is not known how many chapters his original treatise comprised. The fourth chapter in the Madras MS, however, which breaks off without completing the work, may be presumed to have formed its natural conclusion, inasmuch as it deals with the last variety of vakratā enumerated by the author. The running prose Vṛtti, accompanying the Kārikā-ślokas, and forming an integral part of the work itself, appears to have been composed by Kuntaka himself; for not only the commentator expressly identifies himself with the author, but the citations of later writers\(^1\) indicate that the Kārikās should be taken en bloc with the Vṛtti. Besides quotations from Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Anaṅgaharṣa (author of the Tāpusa-vatsarāja), Hāla, Bāna, Māgha, Bhāravi, Bhallaṭa, Amaru, Mayūra, Śrīharṣa, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, Rājaśekhara, Kuntaka mentions by name Sarvasena, Mañjīra, Māyurāja, and the Udāṭta-rāgnava.

\(^1\) Comm. to Vyakti-vivka p. 16; Kāma-dhenu on Vāmana p. 6, etc.
and quotes from Bhāmāna, Rudraṭa and the Dhvanikāra (= Anandavardhana). The work stands unique for its exposition of the theory of vakrokti, which is apparently developed on the lines indicated by Bhāmaha,\(^1\) as well as for its analysis of a poetic figure on its basis, which is implicitly accepted by all writers from Ruuyaka to Jagannātha.\(^2\)

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Edition. By S. K. De, in the Calcutta Oriental Series, 1st ed. from a single MS 1923; 2nd revised and enlarged ed. is based on two MSS (from Madras and Jesalmere respectively), containing Unmeṣas i, ii and a part of Unmeṣa iii, with a résumé of the unedited portion of Unmeṣa iii and iv. and an introduction. Calcutta Orient. Ser. 1928.

**KŠEMENDRA**

(1)

The industrious Kashmirian polygrapher Kšemendra, with the surname Vyāsadāsa, is notable in Sanskrit Poetics for his two interesting treatises, Aucitya-vicāra-carcā and Kavi-kaṇṭhābharanā. He refers to another work of his,\(^3\) devoted to the treatment of poetic figures, entitled Kavi-karnikā.

Kšemendra himself gives us an indication of his date. The concluding verses of his two works, as well as of his Suvṛtta-tilaka (ed. Kāvymālā Guḍchaka 2, 1886), state that he wrote in the reign of king Ananta of Kāśmīr, while the colophon to his Samaya-mātrkā tells us that it was finished

\(^1\) For an exposition see S. K. De's Introd. to the 2nd ed. of Kuntaka's work. Generally speaking, Kuntaka's Vakrokti signifies a mode of expression, differing from and transcending the ordinary mode of speech, and resulting in a characteristic charmingness (vaicītrya or vicchittī), and depends on the imaginative activity of the poet (kavi-pratibhā-nirvartitāvā).

\(^2\) See Jacobi, Ueber Begriff und Wesen der poetischen Figuren in GN 1908.

\(^3\) In Aucit. vic. 61 2.
in the reign of the same king in 1050 A.D. His *Daśāvatāra-carita*, on the other hand, is dated by himself in 1066 A.D., in the reign of Kalasa, son and successor of Ananta. Ananta reigned from 1028 to 1063 A.D. crowning his son Kalasa in 1063. Bühler⁴ is right, therefore, in fixing the period of Kṣemendra’s literary activity in the second and third quarters of the 11th century.⁵

( 2 )

Peterson proposed⁶, against the opinion of Bühler, who appears to have left the question open, the identification of Kṣemendra with Kṣemarāja, the Śaiva philosopher of Kashmir, who was a pupil of Abhinavagupta, and who wrote, among numerous other works, a commentary on the Śiva-sūtra and on Abhinavagupta’s Paramārtha-sāra. Stein supports this identification, but Peterson himself appears to admit later on⁷ that his own theory is doubtful. In his *Aucitya-vicāra*, Kṣemendra pays homage to Acyuta or Viṣṇu; but we know that he was, like his father, a Śaiva in his youth but was converted afterwards into Vaiṣṇavism, as he himself indicates, by Somācārya. This fact, as well as chronology, does not stand in the way of the proposed identification, but there

1 *Kashmir Rep.* p. 46.

2 Dhanika, who lived towards the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century, appears to quote (on i. 61) two verses which occur in some MSS of Kṣemendra’s *Bṛhatkatha-mañjari* (ii. 216, 217), and this fact apparently militates against this conclusion of Kṣemendra’s date; but we know that the *Bṛhatkatha-mañjari* was composed about 1037 A.D., and as the four lines in question occur in one of the MSS only, it is generally admitted now, for this and other reasons, that they are later interpolations. Kṣemendra (*Aucit. vic. ad śl. 11. 16, 20*) quotes Parimala (otherwise known as Padmāgupta) who was a contemporary of Dhanaṇḍa and Dhanika.

3 i (*Detailed Report*), 1883, p. 11, 85 and Bühler in *IA* xiii, 1884, p. 29. Bühler really proposed the identification of Kṣemarāja, author of *Sāmba-pañcākikā*, with Kṣemendra who wrote *Spanda-saṃdoha*, but distinguished both from the poet Kṣemendra Vyāsādāsa (see *Kashmir Rep.* p. 81 and fn).

4 iv p. xxiii.
is no direct evidence to support it. Kṣemendra describes himself as son of Prakāśendra and grandson of Sindhu, and the name of his preceptor is given as Gaṅgaka. He was also father of Somendra, and preceptor of Udayasimha and rājaputra Lakṣaṇāditya. We know nothing, on the other hand, of Kṣemarāja’s genealogy or personal history. But we are told at the end of the Brhatkathā-mañjari that Kṣemendra learnt sāhitya from Abhinavagupta, while Kṣemarāja at the end of his Svacchandoddyota (as well as in the colophon to his Stava-cintāmanī) is described as śiṣya of the same great philosopher. It is worth noting, however, that while Kṣemendra’s surname Vyāsadāsa is given in all his works (with the exception of his Kalā-vilāsa), it does not occur in any of Kṣemarāja’s philosophical treatises. Kṣemendra has taken care to let us know a great deal about himself, but Kṣemarāja always hides his light under a bushel and is apparently free from this trace of natural vanity. The question, therefore, cannot be taken as definitely settled, and can be satisfactorily solved when, as Bühler long ago pointed out, the name of Kṣemarāja’s father is found.

A list of Kṣemendra’s numerous works is given below.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. Aucitya-vicāra-carcā


1 Concluding verse of the Daśāvatāra.

2 Aucit. vic. under śl. 39. He quotes also Bhaṭṭa Tauta. Among other citations we find Bhatta Bhallaṭa, Gauḍa-kumbhakāra and Kunteśvara-dautya of Kāludāsa.

3 Kavi-kavyā under v. i (pp. 138.139). Of his pupil Udayasimha Kṣemendra quotes Lalitābhidhāna-mahākavya.

4 Bühler op. cit. App. ii p. clxxix (extract).

5 Three stanzas are attributed to Vyāsadāsa in Subhās (460, 1658, 3039).

6 IA xiii, loc. cit.

7 For a brief résumé of Kṣemendra’s two works, see below vol. ii, ch. ix (i); on his didactic and satiric works see S. K. De, Hist. of Sāṃsk. Lit., Calcutta 1947, pp. 404-10.
references are to the former. Also ed. Chowkhamba Sansk. Series, Benares 1933. For an account of the work, see Peterson in *IBRAS* xvi pp. 167-180, where all the quotations in the work are collected together and discussed.

**b. Kavi-kaṇṭhābharaṇa**

Editions. (1) Kāvyamālā Gucchaka iv, 1887, 1899 (2) Chowkhamba Sansk. Series, Benares 1933. A monograph on the work with analysis and German translation by J. Schönberg, Wien 1884 (in *Sb. der Wiener Akad.*).

There is no trace of Kṣemendra's *Kavi-karṇikā*.

*The Works of Kṣemendra.* A list of the works of Kṣemendra, published and unpublished, is given here. Those which are quoted in *Aucitya-vicāra*, *Kavi-kaṇṭhābharaṇa* and *Suṣrūṭta-tilaka* are marked respectively with the signs (A), (K) and (S).


RHOJA

(1)

The earliest writer on Poetics who quotes Bhoja seems to be Hemacandra who flourished, as we shall see, in the first half of the 12th century; while Vardhamāna, who however did not write till 1140 A.D., mentions Bhoja in the second verse of his Gaṇa ratna, the Vṛtti on which explains this Bhoja as the author of the Sarvasvati-kanṭhābharana. The latest writer quoted by Bhoja appears to be Rājaśekhara.

1 p. 295 Comm., besides anonymous quotations.
2 From Karpūra-maṇī, Dīla-kha, and Viddhaśāla. See Sten...
whose latest date is the beginning of the 10th century, although some verses from the Caura-pañcāśikā (no. 12 ed. Bohlen), attributed to Bihlanā, occur in the Sarasvatī-kṛt (ad i. 152). Bhoja appears also to refer in one verse (ad i. 71, p. 22) to Muñja, apparently Muñja-vākpatirāja of Mālava. Jacob is misleading in putting down the name of Nami-sādhu (who did not write his commentary on Rudrāṭa till 1069 A.D.) in the list of authors quoted by Bhoja; for the verses in question, though found in Nami, are not Nami’s own but really quoted by him from previous authors. Bhoja also quotes about sixteen times several verses occurring in Daśa-rūpaka and its commentary, which belong to the time of Muñja, i.e. the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century. The internal evidence of the text, therefore, places the author of the Sarasvatī-kṛt in the period between the

Konow’s ed. of Karpūra-mañjī pp. 198 f., for the quotations; also Jacob JRAS, 1897, p. 304f.

1 We have not based any chronological inference on this, because Bihlanā’s authorship of the work is not beyond question, and Solf tries to demonstrate the existence of a poet called Cora or Caura, whose date is not known.

2 op. cit. p. 304.

3 For instance, the verse ayam padmāsanāsīna (Bhoja ad i. 51, p. 15) is found, no doubt, in Nami on xi. 24, but it is really a quotation, along with several other verses in the same context, from Bhāmaha ii. 55. Similarly the two verses sa marutā and sa pītavāṣā, quoted by Bhāmaha himself (ii. 41, 58) from some previous authors (one of whose names is given as Rāmāśarman) occur in Bhoja anonymously (ad i. 121 pp. 43, 44) but they are also quoted by Nami in the same context. There is no reason to suppose that Bhoja took these verses from Nami’s Comm. instead of going directly to Bhāmaha, from whom he quotes several other verses directly (e.g. ākroṭan nāhvyayān, Bhoja ad iii. 8, p. 144 = Bhāmaha ii. 94; Bhāmaha ii. 92 = Bhoja ad iv. 51, p. 226 = Subhāṣī 1645 bhāmahaśyā). Similar remarks apply to the other supposed quotations given by Jacob, whose mistake is probably due to the fact that Bhāmaha’s text was not available to him.

4 One verse under Daśa-rūpaka iv. 66 (lakṣmī-payodhārotṣaṇgā-) which Dhanika quotes as his own (yathā mamaiva) is quoted by Bhoja as example of Anyekti (S. K. iv).
second and the fourth quarters of the 11th century; and this date fits in easily with the known date of the ninth Paramāra ruler Bhoja of Dhārā, one of the well-known princes of the 11th century, noted for his patronage of letters, the two may be taken to have been reasonably identified. Our Bhoja is frequently cited in later Alamkāra literature as Bhojarāja, and sometimes simply as rājan\textsuperscript{1} which designation, like that of muni applied to Bharata, seems to mark him out par excellence in this literature.

( 2 )

Kahlaṇa states (vii. 259)\textsuperscript{2} that king Bhoja of Dhārā was the true friend of poets; and it is possible that he had himself literary predilections. He was son and successor of Sindhu-rāja and nephew of Muṇja-vākpatirāja who was also, as we have seen, a great patron of letters. The date of Bhoja is well known from his own and other inscriptions\textsuperscript{3}. Alberuni\textsuperscript{4} mentions him as still reigning in 1030 A.D., while the date Śaka 964 = 1042 A.D. is given by the Rājamṛgāṅka which is attributed to Bhoja. We know also that he fought with Cālukya Jayasimha III between 1011 and 1019 A.D., and with the latter’s successor Someśvara (1042-1066 A.D.) who, according to Bihlaṇa, took Dhārā by storm and forced Bhoja to flee. Bihlaṇa himself speaks of Bhoja as of a contemporary whom he did not visit though he might have done so\textsuperscript{5}. In

\textsuperscript{1} e.g. Vidyādhara pp. 98, 150, 192, 287, 304, and Mallinātha pp. 287, 304 etc.
\textsuperscript{2} sa ca bhoja-narendraś ca dānotkarṣena viśrutau/sūrī tasmin kṣaṇe tulyāṁ dvāvāstāṁ kavi-bāṇdhavau.
\textsuperscript{3} IA vi, p. 53f (Ujjain Plate, 1021-22 A.D.; El i, p. 230-33; El ix, p. 182 (Banswara Plate, 1020 A.D.; El xvui, p. 320 (Betma Plate, 1020 A.D.); the Sarasvati Image Inscription in the Br. Museum (Rupam, 1924, p. 18; 1033 A.D.); Tilakwada Copper plate (Proc. of the 1st Orient. Conf. p. 319; 1047 A.D.) etc.
\textsuperscript{5} Bühler’s ed. Vikramśaṅka* p. 23 fn; also text xviii. 96.
Kahlaṇa’s assertion, referred to above, with respect to Bhoja and Kṣitirāja, the phrase *tasmin kṣane* is taken by Bühler to refer to the period when, after the nominal coronation of Kalasa in 1062 A.D., Kṣitirāja became a sāṃnyāsin and sometimes visited king Ananta in order to console him. If this interpretation is correct, we get a limit to Bhoja’s date at 1062 A.D. A copper-plate of his successor Jayśimha¹, however, is dated 1055 A.D., and throws doubt on Bühler’s conjecture. All this, however, will justify us in fixing Bhoja’s date with great probability between 1010 and 1055 A.D.; i.e., roughly covering a part of the first and whole of the second quarter of the 11th century, and he may have lived into the third quarter of the same century. The exact dates of his accession and death are unknown; but it seems that he died after long illness, in the midst of wars with Bhīma, king of Gujarat and with Kalacuri Karṇa, king of Tripuri².

( 3 )

Besides his well-known *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharanā*, Bhoja appears also to have written a work called *Śrīgāra-prakāśa*³, a MS of which exists in the Government Oriental MSS Library, Madras⁴. It is composed in 36 *prakāśas*, and is described as the largest known work in Sanskrit Poetics. It deals with both Poetics and Dramaturgy. The first eight

---

1 *El* iii, pp. 46-50 (Mandhata Plate).
2 *Prabandha-cintāmani* of Merutuṅga, Tawney’s trs. p. 4.
3 This work is mentioned by Vidyādhaṇa p. 98; by Kumārasvāmin p. 114, 221; by Rājamukūṭa and Sarvāṇanda on Amara; by Hemādri on *Raghu* etc.
5 The whole of ch. xxvi is missing, as also the end of ch. xxv and beginning of ch. xxvii, besides smaller gaps.
chapters are devoted to the quasi-grammatical question relating to word and its sense as the means of expression, and the theory of \(vr̥tti\). The ninth and the tenth chapters describe the blemishes and excellences of expression (\(doṣa\) and \(guna\)); while the eleventh and twelfth chapters deal respectively with the Mahākāvya and the drama. The next twenty-four chapters treat exclusively of the Rasas, of which the \(Śr̥ṅgāra\) or love in its various aspects (in relation to the four Puruṣārthas, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa) is maintained, in the light of his novel theory of one Rasa of Ahaṃkāra-Abhimāna-Śr̥ṅgāra, to be the principal and essential; and the work derives its name from Bhoja's theory that Śr̥ṅgāra is the only one Rasa admissible¹. As in the Sarvasvati-\(kō\), this work, in the manner of a cyclopaedic compilation, gives a large number of quotations to illustrate the rules and principles laid down. Śāradātanaya's \(Bhāva-prakāśana\), which deals with the same subject, constitutes really a summary of the important chapters of Bhoja.

( 4 )

The Sarvasvati-\(kaṇṭhābharaṇa\), consisting of five Paricchedas, is not a very original work, but consists chiefly of a patient compilation in an encyclopaedic manner from earlier treatises, especially from Daṇḍin, from whom he takes, according to the calculation of Jacob², no less than 164 illustrations. From the index of citations given by Jacob, we find that Vāmana is quoted 22 times, Rudrata 19 times, the \(Dhvanyāloka\) more than 10 times (six of the \(kārikās\) being reproduced), while it is curious to note that Bhoja makes a good use

1 Cf Vidyādharā ṛājā tu śr̥ṅgāram ekaṁ eva śr̥ṅgāra-prakāṣe rasam uraricakāra p. 98; Kumārasvāmin p. 221 śr̥ṅgāra eka eva rasa iti śr̥ṅgāra-prakāśa-kārah. For a brief résumé of the work see below under vol. ii, ch. 6.—Bhoja in four chapters (xviii-xxi) deals with what he calls Dharma-śr̥ṅgāra, Artha-śr̥ṅgāra, Kāma-śr̥ṅgāra and Mokṣa-śr̥ṅgāra. But he devotes 16 chapters (xxii-xxvi) entirely to what may be called Laukika Śr̥ṅgāra in its Saṃbhoga and Vipralambha aspects.

2 loc. cit.
of Bhaṭṭi's illustrations of the figure yamaka and its numerous subspecies. After dealing with general topics of Poetics, the work speaks somewhat symmetrically of 16 Doṣas respectively of Pada, Vākya and Vākyārtha, and 24 Guṇas respectively of Śabda and Vākyārtha. In the second and third chapter 24 Šabdālaṃkāras and Arthālaṃkāras respectively are defined and illustrated. In the fourth chapter 24 Šabdārthālaṃkāras are similarly dealt with. It is noteworthy that the Rītis, mentioned as six in number, are regarded as Šabdārthālaṃkāras. In the fifth chapter we have a treatment of Rasas, Bhāvas, Nāyaka-nāyikā, the five Saṃdhis, and four Vṛttis, etc. While the chief value of Bhoja's work consists in its abundant wealth of illustrations and examples, numbering more than 1500, to every rule and prescription, it is nevertheless interesting as embodying, in the main, a tradition of opinion, which is also represented in the Agni-purāṇa, but which in many respects stands apart from the orthodox Kashmirian school.

Bhoja is credited with having composed more than 80 works, most of which are voluminous. His work on Grammar (ed. Madras Univ. 1937; also ed. Trivandrum Skt. Series, with Hṛdayahārini Comm. of Nārāyaṇa Daṇḍanātha. 1935-48) is also called Sarasvati-kaṇṭhābharaṇa.

(5 )

The commentators on Bhoja, as noted below, are numerous, but they are not of much importance. Ratnėśvara's commentary has been published several times together with the text, but so far only three chapters of it have been printed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. Sarasvati kaṇṭhābharaṇa

Editions. (1) by A. Borcoah, Calcutta 1884. (2) by Viresvara Sastri, Benares 1888 (chs. iv and v). (3) by Jivananda Vidyasagar with Comm. of Ratnēśvara (on. chs. i iii), Calcutta 1894. (4) by Kedarnath Durgaprasad and Vasudev L. Panshikar, Nirmaya Sagar Press, with Comm.
of Ratnesvara (on i-iii) and of Jagaddhara (on iv). Bombay 1925, 1934. Our references are to ed. Boorah 1884.

Commentaries. (1) Ratna-darpaṇa by Miśra Ratnesvara. Ed. with the text by Jivananda, Calcutta 1894; ed. Benares and ed. NSP, as above. The nominal author Rāmasimha-deva, mentioned in the introductory stanza 2, is apparently the author's patron. In the colophon, the author's name is given as Miśra Ratnesvara; and in Benares ed. of the text, the commentary is said to have been written at the command of Rāmasimha-deva (of Tirhut?). In the Catalogues, the work is sometimes inaccurately given as by Rāmasimha-deva. The author refers to a comm. on the Kāv. prak. by himself. Only the first three chapters of this Ratna-darpaṇa have been published in the editions noted; and both the Madras and Bodleian MSS contain these chapters only. Ratnesvara appears to have flourished in the 14th century A.D. (2) Mārjanā by Ḥarināthā, mentioned by himself in his Comm. on Daṇḍin (A Bod 206b). See above p. 70. (3) Duśkara-citra-prakāśikā by Lakṣmīnātha Bhaṭṭa. He may be identical with Lakṣmīnātha who, according to Kielhorn Report 1880 81 p. 71, wrote his Piṅgala-pradīpa in 1601 A.D. Kielhorn's MS of this latter work appears to have been copied in 1660, while Burnell's (Piṅgalārtha-dīpikā pp. 53b, 175b) in 1632 A.D. (4) Tikā by Jagadhara, son of Ratnadharma and Damayantī. Extract given in Ulwar Cat. 1086 and Stein p. 275. The printed portion of the Comm. in the NSP ed. is on the 4th chapter. This work is probably earlier than the 17th century but later than the 14th (see Bhandarkar, Pref. to Mālati mādhava pp. xviii-xxi). Jagadharma's genealogy is given thus: Caṇḍeśvara→Vedeśvara (or Vedadhara)→Rāmadhara (Rāmeśvara)→Gadādhara→Vidyādhara→Ratnadharma→Jagadhara. He wrote several commentaries (Aufrecht i. 195) e.g. on the Megha-dīta, Vāsavadattā, Veṣṭi-saṃhāra, Mālati-mādhava etc. MS in
Stein (p. 276) is dated Śaka 1521 = 1460 A.D. (5) Comm. by Harikṛṣṇa Vyāsa. SCB 34.

b. Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa

The only known MS is in the Government Oriental MSS Library, Madras, mentioned in their Report quoted above. The work has not yet been published except in parts; see above p. 136.


MAHIMABHAṬṬA

(1)

Rājānaka Mahiman, Mahimaka or Mahimabhaṭṭa, who is cited generally as the Vyaktiviveka-kāra from the name of his work, was, as indicated by his title, probably a Kashmirian writer, who describes himself as son of Śrī-Dhairya and disciple of mahākavi Śyāmala. He informs us at the outset of his work (i. 3) that his principal object is to consider the views of the Dhvanikāra; and as in the course of his discourse he examines the text of the Dhvanyāloka, quoting

1 Viśvanātha, ed. Durgaprasad, NSP., 1915, p. 18, 249; Mallinātha on Kīrāta iii. 21; Ruuyaka, ed. NSP., p. 12; Keśava Miśra p. 80-81; Jagannātha p. 13 etc. Keśava mentions his name as Mahiman.
from the Kārikā and the Vṛtti with a minuteness which cannot be mistaken, we may infer with certainty that he was later than Ānandavardhana. It is also probable that Mahimabhaṭṭa was later than Ānandavardhana’s commentator, Abhinavagupta; for in some places he betrays an acquaintance with the latter’s work. At p. 19, for instance, Mahimabhaṭṭa quotes directly a long passage from the Locana (p. 33), and shows himself alive to the point involved in Abhinava’s discussion by criticising it. The passage refers to Dhvanyāloka i. 13 where the Dhvanikāra uses the verb vyaṅktaḥ in the dual number with the express purpose, as Abhinava explains, of indicating a duality of sense. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka appears to have taken exception to this use of the dual number, upon which Abhinava concludes by remarking: tena yad bhaṭṭa-nāyakena dvi-vacanam dūṣitaṃ tad gaja-nimīilikayaiva. Mahimabhaṭṭa, referring to this discussion, quotes anonymously the remarks of Abhinava (not only the aboveline but the whole passage), with the statement: kecid vimāninah...yad āhus tad bhrānti-mūlam (p. 19). The terms of reference apparently indicate, as Narasimha Iyengar rightly points out, that Mahimabhaṭṭa is here referring clearly to Abhinava as a theorist of a rival system who, if not contemporaneous, could not have flourished long before his own time. It should be noted that Mahimabhaṭṭa quotes and criticises (p. 28) certain views set forth by Kuntaka in his Vakrokti-jīvita (i. 7-8) and attempts to show that Vakrokti, like Dhvani, is to be included under Anumāna. He also quotes from Rājaśekhara’s Bāla-rāmāyaṇa (pp. 40, 50) and Viddhaśālabhaṇḍājī (p. 85). This gives us one terminus to Mahimabhaṭṭa’s date. On the other hand, Ruyyaka who, as we shall see, flourished in the first half of the 12th century and probably also wrote the anonymous commentary on Mahimabhaṭṭa (printed in the Trivandrum edition of the text), is the

1 Cf Jayaratha p. 12; dhvanikārāntarabhāvi vyaktivivekakāra iti, the Dhvanikāra being, to Jayaratha, Ānandavardhana himself.

2 JRAS, 1908, pp. 65f.
earliest writer to quote and criticise Mahimabhaṭṭa.\footnote{1} We may, therefore, assign Mahimabhaṭṭa to the period between Abhinava and Ruyyaka, i.e. later than the first quarter of the 11th but earlier than the first quarter of the 12th century, and approximately fix his date towards the last half or the end of the 11th century. This date will be in harmony with the probable date of Śyāmala, who is mentioned by Mahimabhaṭṭa as his preceptor, if this Śyāmala is the same poet as is quoted by Kṣemendra.\footnote{2}

( 2 )

It is difficult to determine what relation Mahimabhaṭṭa bore to Śaṅkuka who was also, like Mahimabhaṭṭa, an \textit{anumitivādin}\footnote{3} in his theory of Rasa, for Śaṅkuka’s work has not yet been recovered. Our author claims for himself originality

1 Iyengar (\textit{op. cit.}) and Harichand (\textit{op. cit.} p. 105) think that Mahimabhaṭṭa is “quoted or criticised” by Mammaṭa; but, as Kāv. \textit{prak. v}, p. 252 (B. S. S. 1917) shows, Mammaṭa does not at all cite Mahimabhaṭṭa or his work, but only criticises an \textit{anumāna}-theory which tries to explain the concept of \textit{dhvani} by means of inference. No chronological conclusion can be based on this; for Anandavarḍhana also refers to a similar theory long before Mahimabhaṭṭa wrote.

2 \textit{Aucit. vic. ad śl. 16} ; \textit{Suvṛtta. til. ad ii. 31}. Also \textit{Subhāṣi} 2292, Kṣemendra’s Śyāmala appears to be identical with Śyāmilaka, who wrote the Bhāṇa entitled \textit{Pāda-tāḍitaka} (ed. Ramakrishna Kavi and Ramanatha Sastri, Madras 1922); for the verses, attributed to Śyāmala in the two works of Kṣemendra noted above, occur as śl. 33 and 125 respectively in the printed text of the Bhāṇa. The colophon describes the author of the Bhāṇa as son of Viśveśvaradatta and an \textit{udicya} (northerner), which makes it probable that he is the Kashmirian Śyāmala, Śyāmalaka or Śyāmilaka, also cited by Abhinavagupta. Both Abhinava and Kuntaka quote anonymously verses from this Bhāṇa. The verse ascribed to Śyāmalaka in the \textit{Subhāṣi} (prāyaścittam mṛgyayate yah priyā-pāda-tāḍitah/kṣālaniyam śiras tasya kāntā-gaṇḍuṣa-siddhubhiḥ) refers unmistakably to this Bhāṇa and the second line occurs in a slightly modified form in the Bhāṇa itself (\textit{ad śl. 132}). Rājaśekhara cites a Śyāmadeva (pp. 11, 13, 17).

3 He is so called by Mallinātha (\textit{Ṭaralā} p. 85) and Kumārasvāmin (p. 219).
of treatment and freedom from slavish imitation, and his omission of all references to his predecessor need not, therefore, appear strange. The only testimony of Rāmacarana, an 18th century Bengal commentator on Viśvanātha, need not be seriously considered; but it is probable that the theory developed by Mahima did not originate in himself. Ānanda-vardhana refutes at some length some theory of anumāna (pp. 201f) which attempted to explain that the suggested sense posited by the dhvani-theory, can be arrived at by the process of logical inference. Mahimabhaṭṭa himself gives Antarā-ślokas or Antarāyās (besides Saṃgraha-ślokas summarising a discussion), which add to the discussion and are probably adduced from external sources, indicating previous exposition of similar topics by other writers. Thus, Mahimabhaṭṭa probably worked out systematically some such thesis (anticipated, it may be, by Ānanda-vardhana), as a direct rejoinder to Ānanda’s classical exposition; but there is no evidence to connect him with the theory accredited to Śaṅkuka by Abhinavagupta and others.

The Vyakti-viveka, consisting of three Vimarśas, is essentially a vigorous piece of polemic writing, which does not propose to set forth any new theory or system, but whose only object is to demolish the theory of Dhvani by shewing that the so-called function of Vyañjanā posited by Ānanda-vardhana is nothing more than the already recognised process of Anumāna or logical inference. In the first Vimarśa he states and amplifies his own position by criticizing the definition of Dhvani. In the second Vimarśa he considers the question of Aucitya, relating to Śabda and Artha. In the third Vimarśa about forty examples are cited from the Dhvanyā-loka and shewn to be really cases of Anumāna and not of Vyañjanā.

1 He says, for instance, that he has written his work without looking into Candrika and Darpana, which apparently had the same object in view as the demolition of the dhvani-theory (i. 4, 5).
3 Mahimabhaṭṭa’s views will be considered in detail below in vol. ii.
From the Vyakti-viveka itself (p. 108) we learn that Mahimabhaṭṭa also wrote a work entitled Tattvokti-kośa, where he is said to have discussed what he calls pratibhātattva¹, in connexion with the poetic conception of an idea.

Mahimabhaṭṭa’s work which recognised the new concept of dhvani, but tried to explain it by the established process of anumāna (and not by the separate function of vyañjanā explained by Ānandavardhana), never found any recognition in the hands of later theorists, most of whom became partisans of the latter. Even his commentator does not appear to possess much sympathy for his somewhat extreme view,² and Mahimabhaṭṭa is rather unique in having no followers in later literature.

The commentator referred to has been identified with some reason³ with Ruuyaka, who has another commentary on Mammaṭa to his credit, as well as several independent works on Alaṃkāra. We shall deal with him hereafter as an independent writer on Alaṃkāra.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


¹ Cf Jacobi Sb. der Preuss. Akad. xxiv. 225 fn.
² Mahimabhaṭṭa’s views are vigorously criticised by Ruuyaka (Alaṃṣarvasva, pp. 12f), and Viśvanātha (Sāhitya-darpaṇa, p. 248f).
³ For the arguments summarised see Kane, HSP, p. 245.
CHAPTER VI

MAMMATA AND ALLAṬA

(1)

A great deal of uncertainty exists with regard to the exact date of Mammaṭa whose name,\(^1\) as well as the title rājānaka, indicates that he was probably a Kashmirian. The story relied upon by Hall\(^2\) and Weber\(^3\) that Mammaṭa was the maternal uncle of the author of Naiṣadha may be relegated to the region of fantastic fables which often gather round celebrated names. The lower limit of Mammaṭa's date, however, may be fixed with reference to one dated MS\(^4\) and two commentaries on the Kāvyā prakāśa, of which the date can be ascertained. The commentary of Māṇikyacandra is expressly dated in Śaṃvat 1216=1159-60 A.D. The exact

---

\(^1\) Aufricht (i. 432) notes that Mammaṭa's original name was Mahimabhaṭṭa on the mistaken authority of Keśava Miśra's erroneous citation (p. 80-81). The passage in which Keśava cites Mahimabhaṭṭa clearly refers not to Mammaṭa but to Mahimabhaṭṭa, author of the Vyakti-viveka, mentioned in the same context. The verse anaucityād rīte, however, which is thus quoted and attributed to Mahimabhaṭṭa occurs originally in the Vṛttī of the Dhvanyāloka (p. 145) from which apparently it is also cited in the Vyakti-viveka (pp. 31, 114) with a sa evāha, along with many other verses similarly quoted from the same text. Keśava might have taken the verse directly from Vyakti-viveka's citation, without knowing the original source, and wrongly attributed it to Mahimabhaṭṭa himself. It does not occur at all in the Kāv. prak. Aufricht's suggestion, therefore, that Mammaṭa is a corruption of the name Mahimabhaṭṭa, like his other supposition that the name Rudrabhaṭṭa yields Rudraṭa, is unwarranted. Cf Peterson ii p. 19.

\(^2\) Introd. to Vāsavadattā p. 55.

\(^3\) Hist. of Sansk. Lit. (Eng. trans, 2nd ed.), p. 232 fn.

\(^4\) A Jesalmere Jaina Bhandar MS of Kāv. prak. appears to have been copied in Saṃvat 1215 Āśvina 14 (=1158 A.D. Oct. 8) at Anahilapāṭaka while Kumārapāla was still ruling. It is noteworthy that the
date of Ruuyaka’s commentary is not known, but we know from other sources that Ruuyaka flourished in the second and third quarters of the 12th century. The earliest dated MS from Jesalmer appears to have been copied in 1158 A.D. Mammaṭa, therefore, cannot be placed later than the beginning of the 12th century.¹

The other limit cannot be settled so satisfactorily. It has been maintained that Mammaṭa in one verse (bhoja-nṛpatēs tat-tvāga-līlāyītam under x. 26b ; B. S. S. ed. 1917, p. 684) eulogises Bhoja with whom he may be presumed to have been contemporaneous. This is sought to be supported by

colophon states that it is the joint work of Mammaṭa and Alaka (kṛte māmamāṭalakayoh). See P. K Gode in JOR, xvi, p. 46-53 (=his Studies in Ind. Lit. Hist. 1, p. 235f.)

¹ Jhalakikara maintains, on the authority of Paramānanda Cakravartin and Nāgoji on Mammaṭa, that Mammaṭa in several places criticises Ruuyaka, who therefore must be placed earlier than Mammaṭa. But the passages he cites do not support his contention. Thus, the verse rājati tāṭiyam (Kāv. prak. p. 758) is supposed to be directed against Ruuyaka p. 199. where the same verse is quoted in the same context. It appears, however, that Mammaṭa gives this verse as an instance of sabālanṭkāra-sāṃkara without any comment but with the simple statement "at here we have a commixture of yamaka and anulomapratilomacitra dependent on one another. Ruuyaka, on the other hand, citing the same verse and referring to the opinions of "other authors" comments on it at some length. He remarks that though the verse is given by some as an example of sabālanṭkāra-sāṃkara, such commixture of sabālanṭkāras, in his opinion, is not possible, and the example is faulty. The verse itself occurs in Ratnakara’s Hara-vijaya (v. 137). Jayaratha and Samudrabandha also remark in this connexion that the anonymous authors, referred to by Ruuyaka in his criticism, allude to “Mammaṭa and others.” Besides, Ruuyaka himself quotes (p. 102) Mammaṭa’s Kārikā iv. 15-16. Jayaratha expressly says that Ruuyaka wrote a commentary on Mammaṭa called Kāvyaprakāsasamketa (p. 102). In several other places, both Jayaratha and Samudrabandha point out that Ruuyaka is criticising Mammaṭa (e.g. Jayaratha pp 77, 102, 107, 150, 163, 199, 204: Samudrabandha pp. 23, 25, 119, 156, 243, 249, etc.).
the story, related by a very late commentator Bhīmasena,¹ that Mammaṭa was the son of Jayyaṭa and had two brothers Kayyaṭa and Uvvaṭa, of whom Uvvaṭa (or Uvaṭa) is taken to be the well known commentator on Vedic works, some of which, as he himself tells us, were composed in Avanti while Bhoja was still reigning (bhoje rājyaṁ pruśusai). It is suggested on this ground that Uvvaṭa was probably the medium of the quotation referred to above relating to his royal patron; or, assuming it to have been composed by Mammaṭa himself, it might have obtained for its author an introduction into the munificent court of Bhoja ². But this theory is untenable; for Uvvaṭa tells us that his father’s name was Vajraṭa and not Jayyaṭa; and it is not clear that the stanza in question, given anonymously as an instance of the figure udātta (which consists of a description of the wealth and prosperity of an exalted personage) was composed by Mammaṭa himself, who certainly borrows similar illustrative verses from various sources. All that this anonymous verse may be taken to establish is that its allusion to king Bhoja indicates that Mammaṭa was probably not earlier than Bhoja.

We may, therefore, place Mammaṭa between Ruuyyaka on the one hand and Bhoja on the other, if we may assume, on the authority of the commentators, the identity of this Bhoja with the Paramāra Bhoja of Dhārā, the reputed author of the Sārasvatī khaṇḍa. In other words, Mammaṭa probably belongs to the period between the middle of the 11th and the first quarter of the 12th century. Allowing two generations to intervene between him and Ruuyyaka, we may assign Mammaṭa’s literary activity roughly to the last quarter of the 11th century. Mammaṭa mentions Abhinavagupta who was still living in 1015 A.D. (see above), and quotes anonymously (under x. 131.

¹ Introd. to ed. Kāv-prak. in B.S.S (3rd. ed 1917) pp. 6-7 also extract in Peterson i. p 94.

² Ganganatha Jha in his introd. to his trans. of Kāv. prak. pp. vi-vii.
purāṇi yasyām) from Navasāhasāṅka-carita (canto i), which was composed about 1005 A. D.

Although well-known for his Kāvyapraṅkāśa, which helped to establish finally and exclusively the doctrines of the Kashmirian school of Ānandavardhana, Mammaṭa is also the author of a less known work entitled the Saḍa-vyāpāra-paricaya which, as its name implies, is a short dissertation on the expressive functions (Vṛtti) of words, a topic which he discusses also in the second Ullāsa of Kav. prāk. Mammaṭa, like most writers on Poetics, was also well-versed in the allied science of grammar, proficiency in which he also displays in the larger work.¹

On a summary examination of the contents of the Kāvyapraṅkāśa,² it will appear that the work is carefully planned and systematically worked out. Peterson, however, on the indication given in Rājānaka Ānandaś Nidārsana³ commentary, first called in question the unity of

1 A work on music called Saṃgīta-ratnāvalī is attributed to Mammaṭa by Gajapati Nārāyaṇapadeva in his Saṃgīta-Nārāyaṇa (see V. Raghavan in ABORI, xvi (1934-35), p. 131; and references therein).

2 The Kāvyapraṅkāśa, in ten Ullāsas, consists of Kārikā, Vṛtti and illustrations. The topics in brief are: I. Purpose, source and definition of Kāvyapraṅkāśa, and its division into Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama. II. Explanation of Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā and Vyaṅjanā, and subdivisions of Lakṣaṇā and Vyaṅjanā. III. Vyaṅjakatva of all kinds of senses. IV. Division of Dhvani into Avivakṣita-vācya and Vivakṣitānypara-vācya. Nature of Rasa. V. Guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya and its eight subdivisions. VI. Citra-kāvyapraṅkāśa VII. Doṣas of Pada, Vākya, Artha and of Rasa. How a Dosa may become charming. VIII. Distinction of Guṇa and Alamkāra. Only three Guṇas (Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda) admitted. Combination of letters conducive to Guṇas. IX. Figures of Sabda. Vakrokti (of Ślesa and Kāku), Anuprāsa (Cheka-, Vṛtti- and Lāta-), Yamaka and its varieties, Ślesa, Citra and Punar-uktavadābhāsa. Figures of Artha, enumerated and defined as 61.

3 The name of this comm. is Sitikaṇṭha-vibodhana as well as Kāvyapraṅkāśa-nidārsana.
the work, although his first erroneous impression\(^1\), corrected afterwards by himself\(^2\), was that the Kārikā-text was composed by Mammaṭa, while the running prose Vṛtti was added by some other hand. There is enough evidence now to show that Mammaṭa composed nearly the whole work (Kārikā and Vṛtti), and only a small portion of the last chapter, left incomplete by him, was completed by another author, whose name is given by Ānanda as Alaṭa or Alaka. That the fact of joint-authorship is skilfully concealed is supposed to be alluded to in the last verse, given in some of the MSS\(^3\), which apparently says that “this way of the learned, though different yet appearing identical, is not strange, for here the only cause is a properly constructed (plan of) combination.” This may be explained, no doubt, as meaning that the author here claims the credit of having skilfully removed, in his systematic work, all conflict of opinions held by different authors on Poetics; but most commentators agree in finding here a hint implying that the work left incomplete by Mammaṭa was completed by some other person, and the traces of joint-authorship are ingeniously obliterated. Māṇikyaacandra Sūri, one of the earliest commentators, comments on this verse; \(\text{atha cāyāṃ grantho'nyenārabduḥpareṇa ca samarthita iti dvikhaṇḍo'pi saṅghaṭanā-vaśād akhaṇḍāyate.}\) Ruṣyaka remarks in his Saṃkṣetra commentary: \(\text{eṣā grantho grantha-kriṇānena katham apy āṣamāptatvād apareṇa ca pūritāvaśeṣatvād dvikhaṇḍo'py akhaṇḍatayā yad avabhāṣate tatra saṃghaṭana-iva hetuḥ.}\) In this view Ruṣyaka is followed by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, Someśvara, Narahari Sarasvatiṭīrtha, Kamalākara, Ānanda, Jajñēśvara and other early as well as late commentators on Mammaṭa. Rājānaka Ānanda, however, is more

---

1 Rep. i p. 21 f.
2 Rep. ii p. 13 f. Cf Bühler in IA xii p. 30
3 \(\text{ity eṣa mārgo viduṣāṃ vibhinno/ pyabhinnā-rūpaḥ pratibhāṣate yat/ na tad vicitram yad amutra samyag/ vinirmitā saṃghaṭanaiva hetuḥ.}\)
explicit and quotes a traditional verse\(^1\) in his *Nidārśana* commentary to show that Mammaṭa composed the work up to the treatment of the figure *parikara* (x. 32), while the rest, consisting of a small portion of the concluding chapter, was completed by Alaka, Alaṭa or Allaṭa\(^2\).

This statement about the joint-authorship of the *Kāvya-prakāśa* receives confirmation from an independent source. Commenting on *Amaru-śataka* (ed Kāvyamālā 18, 1916, śl. 30), Arjunavarman, who flourished in the first quarter of the 13th century, quotes from the *Kāvya-prakāśa* under vii. 14 (the verse *prasāde varitavasă*\(^3\) cited therein) with the remark: *yathodāhṛtaṁ doṣa-nirṇayec mammaṭālakābhhyām.* In the same chapter on Doṣa in the *Kāvya-prakāśa*, Amaru 72 is quoted as instancing the fault technically known as *jugupsā-śīḷa* (vulgarity causing disgust), because the word *vāyu* in the verse is supposed to connote vulgar associations. Arjunavarman defends Amaru from this fastidious criticism with the pointed remark: *kim tu hlādukaṃja-vi-vara-labda-prasādau kāvyapraśāsa-kārau prāyena doṣa-dṛṣṭi. yenaivantiḥvidheṣvapi parumārthu-saḥrdyaṇanda-padeṣu sarasa-kavi-saṃdarbhēṣu doṣam eva sāksāt akurētām.* Both these passages, which mention the dual authorship of the *Kāvya-prakāśa*, refer in particular to ch. vii where the *doṣas* or faults of composition are discussed. Unless the remarks be taken to imply a general

---

1 *kṛtaḥ śrī-mammaṭācārīya-varyuyih parikarāvadyhīḥ/ probandhakṣaḥ pūritah ṣeṣo viḍhāyālaśa-("laka or "llaṭa-) surinā/.*

2 This is perhaps the reason why in some MSS of the work the colophon puts down the names of Mammaṭa and Allaṭa (ot Alaka) as the authors, e.g. Bodleian MS (Hultsch Collection 172), which is a Kashmirian MS in Śāradā characters, reads: *śi kāvyapraśāsābhīdhānaṁ kāvya-lakṣaṇam samāptam, kṛṣṭiḥ śrī-rājānaka-mammaṭākālakayoh.* Also Stein, *Jammu Cat.* MS no. 1145 (cf introd. p xiii f), 1173. See also colophon of an early MS mentioned above p. 145-46, fn. 4. The dual authorship of the *Kāv. prak.* is accepted by V. S. Sukthankar in *ZDMG*, xvi, p. 477-90.

3 This verse is ascribed to Candraka in Śāṅgadhara 3565.—On this question, see Kane in *IA*, 1911, p. 208.
reference to the fact of joint-authorship without particularly meaning collaboration of any special chapter, one may be led to the conclusion the Allaṭa (here mentioned as Alaka) had a hand not only in the 10th, as the tradition makes it out, but also in the 7th chapter.¹

( 3 )

Of the three forms of the name, Alaka, Alaṭa and Allaṭa, the last, which is given in Stein’s Jammu MS, seems to be the most authentic. The ta is a well-known suffix to Kashmirian names, and Stein says that “this form of the name is the only one known to the tradition of Kashmirian Pundits, to whom the double authorship of the Kāvya-prakāśa is otherwise perfectly familiar.”² But Alaka is as good a Kashmirian form of the name. This Allaṭa or Alaka is supposed to be the same as Rājānaka Alaka who wrote a commentary on Ruyyaka, and is quoted by Ratnakāṇṭha as such.³ If this identification, which was suggested by Peterson but disfavoured by Stein, is correct, then we must also ascribe to him the Viśama-padoddyota commentary⁴ on Ratnākara’s Hara-vijaya, where Alaka is described as son of Rājānaka Jayānaka. It appears strange, however, that Allaṭa the continuator of the Kāvya-prakāśa should also be the commentator of Ruyyaka, who in his turn commented on the same work. This will make the two writers commentators on each other’s text; and if this were so, we may naturally expect a reference to this fact

¹ H. R. Divekar in JRAS, 1927, holds that Mammaṭa composed only the Kārikās up to the figure Parīkara and that the remaining Kārikās and the whole of the Vṛtti were composed by Alaka. But his arguments are hardly convincing.

² See Jammu Cat. pp. xxiii f. Stein notes that the form Allaṭa of the name is “found also in the fine birch-bark codex of Kāvyaprakāśa-samketa written by Pandit Rājānaka Ratnakāṇṭha in the Saka year 1570 (A.D. 1648).”

³ Peterson ii p. 17f.

by Ruyyaka, who otherwise alludes to the dual authorship of the Kāvya prakāṣa, but does not mention the name of Allāta as the continuator.\(^1\)

( 4 )

A tradition, chiefly obtaining in Bengal, as we find it in Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa and Maheśvara Nyāyālaṃkāra, two very late Bengal commentators on the Kāvya-prakāṣa,\(^2\) imputes the authorship of the Kārikās (here called sūtras\(^3\)) to Bharata and the prose-Vṛtti to Mammaṭa, while Bharata himself is said to have drawn upon the Agni-purāṇa. While the last assertion about the Agni-purāṇa has no foundation in fact and is apparently prompted by the amiable but unhistorical imagination of late writers, which delights in exalting the antiquity of the Purāṇas, the suggestion of Bharata’s authorship of the Kārikās is too unauthentic and fanciful to be accepted. Mammaṭa’s authorship of the Kārikās has been

1 It is clear, however, that the combination of names in the colophon to a MS of the Kāv. prak. (containing, in the same codex the text and Ruyyaka’s *Samketa commentary), viz., iti śrimad-rājānakālāṭa-mammaṭa-rucaka-viracite nījagrantha-kāvyaprakāṣa-saṃkete prathamā ullāṣaḥ, should not lead us to think, as Peterson and Stein do, that the Kāv. prak. is a joint-compilation of Allāta, Mammaṭa and Rucaka (or Ruyyaka), but it only indicates the names of the authors of the original work (viz. Mammaṭa and Allāta) as well as the name of the author of the *Samketa commentary comprised in the codex.

2 Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s Sāhitya-kaumudi on Mammaṭa, ed. Kāvyamālā 63, 1897, p. 2, and comm. ; also comm. p. 1. and text p. 189 (Cf. Peterson ii p. 10ff.) ; Maheśvara’s comm. (ed. Jivananda, 1876) p. 1. This view is also endorsed by Jayarāma Pañcānana, another Bengal commentator on Mammaṭa (see Peterson ii pp. 21-22, 107).

3 The term sūtra should not mislead us into thinking that the work might have been originally composed in that form, upon which the later lūlā-verse were based ; for it is not unusual for the commentators to refer fo Mammaṭa’s kārikās themselves as sūtras ; e.g. *Pradīpa, ed. Kāvyamālā 1912, p. 378 sūtre vibhāga upalakṣaṇa-parah ; p. 384 sūtram copekalanatayā yoīyam ; *Prabhā p. 381 sūtrāśkarānumāraṇāḥ ; *Uddyota ed. Chandorkar, x p. 123.
declared by Hemacandra (Comm. p. 109 = Kāvyaprak. v. 1-2b) in the first quarter of the 12th century, as well as accepted by a succession of authors and commentators like Jayaratha, Vidyādhara, Mallinātha, Kumārasvāmin and Appayya. Vaidyanātha, commenting on "Pradīpa (i. 1), alludes to this tradition and rejects it expressly¹; and in this view most of Mammaṭa’s other commentators agree. Apart from this, the evidence of the text itself goes directly against such a hypothesis The Kārikās iv. 4-5 are expressly supported in the Vṛtti by a dictum of Bharata (vi. p. 87. ed. Grosset), and this implies a distinction between the author of the Kārikā and that of the Nāṭya-sāstra.² The Kārikā x. 8b, again, says mālā tu pūrvavat, implying from the context that the figure mālā-rūpaka follows the rule laid down for the figure mālopamā. which, however, is not taught in any of the previous Kārikās, but explained in the Vṛtti. This apparently indicates that the Kārikā and the Vṛtti form one block which should be attributed to one and the same author.³

The source of this tradition is probably the unquestioned reverence paid to the sage Bharata, but it may also be due to the fact that Mammaṭa himself has made a considerable use of Bharata’s Kārikās. Thus Bharata vi. 15, 17-21 = Mammaṭa iv. 6-11. Mammaṭa, however, has also made a similar use of Kārikās and illustrative verses of many of his predecessors. Thus, the Kārikā in Mammaṭa vii. 10 karṇāva-

² Cf Vaidyanātha on i. 1; granthakṛd iti mammaṭaḥhattākhyasya kārikākartur nirdesah.........bharata-samhitāyam kāśāncit kārikānām darṣanāt sa eva granthakṛd iti na yuktam; caturthe—"kāranāny atha kāryaṃ sahakāriṇī" (iv. 4) ityādi kārikārthe ‘tad uktam bharatena’ iti bharata-sammati-pradarṣanasyāsaṃgatītvāpaṭteḥ.
³ To the same effect Vaidyanātha commenting on this passage, ed. Kāvyamālā 1912. p. 329: etad eva sūtraṃ sūtra-vṛtti-kṛtār eva katuṃ, mālopamāḥ sūtra-vanuktāyā vṛttiḥ eva kathāt. Also cf other agreeing opinions quoted in Jhalakikara’s comm. ed. B.S.S. 1917, p. 599. See also S. K. De, Mālā tu pūrvavat in ABRIL, vi, 1925 (reprinted in Some Problems of Skt. Poetics, Calcutta 1959, p. 131f).
tāṅsādi-pade) appears as a samgraha śloka in Vāmana’s vṛtti on ii. 2. 19; while the definition of the figure ākṣepa in Mammaṭa x. 20 is taken from Bhūmaha ii. 67a and 68a, or Udbhāṭa ii. 2a and 3a as found quoted in Abhinava’s Locana p. 36. Again, Mammaṭa iv.1 and 3 are clearly paraphrases from the Dhvanyāloka ii. 1 and 3. Mammaṭa also makes a large use of Rudraṭa’s illustrations.¹

The Kāvyā-prakāśa, consisting of ten Ullāsas, traverses the whole field of Sanskrit Poetics (with the exception of dramaturgy) in only 143 Kārikās and about 620 illustrations derived from various sources. As it combines the merit of fulness with that of conciseness, it became one of the classic works of Sanskrit Poetics and Rhetoric which has always maintained a great authority and popularity throughout India. It sums up and explains in the succinct form of a brilliant text-book all the previous speculations on the subject, becoming in its turn the starting point of endless exegetic works and text-books. As such it occupies a unique position in the history of Sanskrit Ālaṃkāra literature.²
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The commentaries are discussed and enumerated in detail below.

b. Sabda-vyāpāra-paricaya

Edition. By M. R. Telang, N. S. P. Bombay 1916. The work is also called Sabda-vyāpāra-vicāra in a BORI MS noticed in Cat, xii, p. 343-44.

THE COMMENTATORS ON MAMMAṬA

( 1 )

There is hardly any other technical work in Sanskrit which has been so much commented upon as the Kāvyā-prakāśa, and no less than seventy different commentaries and glosses will be found noticed in the various reports, catalogues and journals relating to Sanskrit MSS. They count as their authors not only independent and notable writers on Poetics like Ruyyaka and Viśvanātha, but also men having other literary interests, like the Naiyāyika Jagadīśa and Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura, the grammarian Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, the Mimāṁsaka Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, the Vaiṣṇava Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, as well as the Tāntrika Gokulanātha. Very few of these commentaries have yet been printed. We mention here the more important and better known of these writers, noting their dates when known and supplying whatever information we can gather about them.

Rājānaka Ruyyaka or Rucaka

His commentary is called Saṃketa. He is identical with Ruyyaka (q. v.), author of the Alaṃkāra-sarvasva; middle of the 12th century.

Ed. Sivaprasad Bhattacharyya in Calcutta Oriental Journal
ii, 1935; also partly (on i, ii, iii and x) ed. S. S. Sukthankar, Bombay 1933, 1941.

Māṇikyacandra

His commentary is also called Soṅketa. It is dated in Saṃvat 1216=1159-60 A.D. Māṇikyacandra was a Jaina author of Gujarat, who belonged to the Koṭiṣṭha-gaṇa, Vajra-sākhā, Rājagaccha. The concluding verses of his commentary trace his spiritual genealogy to Śilabhadra, after whom came in succession Bharateśvara, Vairasvāmin (Vīra³), Nemicandra and Sāgarendu. Our author states that he was a pupil of Nemicandra, as well as of his successor Sāgarendu, who is identified by Peterson⁴ with the Sāgarendu who wrote out in the Saṃvat 1252 (=1196 A. D.) at Paṭṭana the first copy of the Amamasvāmi-carita. Our Māṇikyacandra seems to be identical with Māṇikya-
candra, author of Pārvanātha-carita, which is said to have been completed on the Dewali of Saṃvat 1276 (=1220 A.D.) in Devakūpa (Divbandar) by the sea (v. 36). In it the author gives a spiritual genealogy, traced up to Pradyumna Sūri and corresponding exactly to that given in the Soṅketa⁴. Māṇikya also appears to have written a Naḷāyaṇa or Kubera-purāṇa. Māṇikyacandra, mentioned in Merutūṅga’s Prabandha-
sīntāmaṇi as having flourished under Jayasimha of Gujarat, seems to be a different person.⁶

Edition with the text. (i) By Vasudeva Abhyankar, Anandasrama Press, Poona 1921; (ii) by R. Sharma Sastry, Mysore 1922.

1 Peterson iii, extr. p. 322, where the verse giving the date is incomplete, but it is given in full in Jhalakikāra’s introd. to Kāv. prak. p. 22.
2 iv, p. cxxviii.  
3 iii, App. p. 98.
4 See extract in Peterson iii, App. p. 157-63; also vi, p. xci. The verse  sat-tarkā-lalanā-vilāsa⁴, describing his preceptor Nemicandra, occurs in Pārvanātha-carita also, as in his Soṅketa. See extracts in Peterson iii, pp. 160 and 321.  
5 Peterson iii, App. p 357.
6 For a discussion of Māṇikyacandra’s date, see R. C. Parikh’s ed. of Somēśvara’s comm. pp. 12-13.
Narahari called Sarasvatī-tīrtha

His commentary is called Bāla-cittānurañjānī. He also refers to two works, Smṛti-darpaṇa and Tarka-ratna (with its Dīpikā commentary), written by himself. Aufrecht notes that Narahari is also the author of a commentary on the Megha-dīta, of which there is a copy in the Cambridge University Library; and Stein notes (p.67) a Kumārasambhavatīkā by Sarasvatītīrtha. His commentary on Mammaṭa states that he was born in Saṃvat 1298=1241-42 A.D., in Tribhuvanagiri in the Andhra country. He traces his own genealogy to Rāmeśvara of Vatsa-gotra, and describes himself as son of Mallinātha and Nāgammā and granson of Narasiṃha, son of Rāmeśvara. He had a brother named Nārāyana. When he became an ascetic, he took the name of Sarasvatītīrtha and composed his commentary at Benares1.

Edition. A part only (on i. ii, iii and x) in S. S. Sukthankar's edition of Kāvya prak. mentioned above, Bombay 1933. 1941; extract from MSS in Peterson i. 74 and IOC iii, pp. 325f.

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa

His commentary is called *Dīpikā or Jayanti. He gives its date as Saṃvat 1350=1294 A.D. He calls himself son of Bharadvāja who was the family-priest (purohita) to the chief minister of Śāṅgadeva of Gujarāt, the third Vāghelā sovereign who ruled at Paṭṭana during 1277-12972. Jayanta is quoted by Paramāṇanda Cakravartin and Ratnakaṇṭha (q.v.), and the latter states that his own commentary was based on the Jayanti. Our Jayanta Bhaṭṭa must be distinguished from Bhaṭṭa Jayanta or Jayantaka, father of Abhinanda the author of the Kādambari-kathā-sāra (ed. Kāvyamālā 11, 1888), who is an earlier author quoted by Abhinavagupta (p. 142) and who lived probably in the 9th century.

Extract in Bhandarkar Rep. 1883-84, App. 326.

1 Peterson i, pp. 251. 74.