COMMENTATORS ON MAMAṬA

Someśvara

His commentary is called Kāvyādarśa¹ (also Samketa). He describes himself as son of Bhaṭṭa Devaka of Bharadvāja-gotra. Jhalakikara thinks that he was a native of Kanauj from his decided partiality for that country. But his reference to the Pratyabhijñā School of Kashmir might indicate that he was Kashmirian. Peterson² and following him Aufrecht³, identify him with Someśvara, author of Kirti-kaumudi and Surathotsava, and place him in the first half of the 13th century. But this is doubtful, because his Someśvara is known as son of Kuṃāra. R. C. Parikh would assign the commentary to a period between 1150 and 1160 A.D. Our Someśvara cites Bhāmaha, Rudraṭa, Mukula, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, Bhaṭṭa Tauta, Kuntaka (quoted pp. 135, 152, 302), Vakroktijīvita-kāra (p. 36), Ācārya Bhartṛmitra (p. 16), Candrikā-kāra (p. 55) and Yāyāvariya (p. 224). He is cited in his turn by a very late commentator Kamalākara⁴.


Vācaspati Miśra

Nothing is known of him or his commentary, but he is cited by Candīdāsa (as prācīna p. 131), by Viśvanātha on Mammaṭa, and by Bhīmasena. He is to be distinguished from Vācaspati Miśra, author of the Bhāmatī, who is probably older than Mammaṭa; for in the list he gives of his own works at the end of the Bhāmatī, he does not refer to any commentary on Mammaṭa. Sivaprasad Bhattacharya (OL Baroda, iii pp. 359-63) states that Vācaspati Miśra belonged to Mithila and lived near about 1200 A.D. But our Vācaspati:

¹ The two entries Kāvyaprakāśa-ṭīkā and Kāvyādarśa in Aaurecht i 737b should be one, as both refer to this comm.
² v, pp. lxxxiv
³ i, 102a, 717b.
⁴ In the Bhau Daji collection (see Cat. of BRAS p. 45) a MS of Someśvara’s comm. states that it was copied from another MS dated in Sāmvat 1283. Hence the comm. appears to be older than 1227 A.D.
is probably not the Maithili legist who wrote Ācāra-cintāmaṇī, Vivāda-cintāmaṇī and other works (see Aufrecht i. 559-60).

Śrīdhara

With the title Sāṃdhī-vigrahika, cited by Caṇḍīdāsa (pp. 29, 59, 62, 117), and by Viśvanātha on Mammaṭa. Śrīdhara’s commentary is called Viveka. A MS the Viveka was copied in Mithila in 1405 A. D. (Sastri, Cat. ASB MSS vi, p. cclxxi). Śrīdhara’s date would be about first quarter of the 13th century B.C. As in the colophon to this MS the author is described as Tarkācārya Thakkura, he probably belonged to Mithila.


Caṇḍīdāsa

His commentary, called Dīpikā, was written at the instance of his friend Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa. The India Office MS of his work is written in Bengali characters, and he is cited mostly by Oriya, Maithili and Benares writers (e.g. Govinda in his Pradīpa pp. 24, 36, 202, 274, Narasiṃha Thakkura, Kamalākara, Vaidyanātha in his Udāharaṇa-candrikā, Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa in his Prabhā, and Viśveśvara in his Alamkāra-kaustubha pp. 125, 166). He is not identical1 with Caṇḍīdāsa, the younger brother of the grand-father of Viśvanātha, author of the Sāhitya-darpaṇa. He appears to have flourished before or about 1300 A.D. He is also cited by Viśvanātha, son of Trimaladeva (q. v.), in a Kashmirian MS dated 1602 A.D. Caṇḍīdāsa mentions a Dhvani-siddhānta-grantha by himself. He also quotes a work

---

1 See H. P. Sastri, Cat. ASB MSS, vi, p. cclxvi, for some curious information of Caṇḍīdāsa, author of Dīpikā. He belonged to Bengal (born in the Mukha-kula). The family lived at Ketugrāma, four miles west of Udbhāraṇapura on the Ganges. According to Sastri, the period of Caṇḍīdāsa’s literary activity was in the middle of the 15th century or earlier.—The other Caṇḍīdāsa belonged to Orissa.
called Sāhitya-hṛdaya-darpāṇa, which may be Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka’s lost Hṛdaya-darpāṇa.


Viśvanātha

Author of the commentary 6Darpaṇa. He is identical with Viśvanātha (q. v.), author of the Sāhitya-darpāṇa, which is referred to in this commentary as his own. First half of the 14th century.

Extract in Jhalakikara’s introd.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla

Known as Lauhitya Bhāṭṭa Gopāla Sūri The name of his commentary is Sāhitya cūḍāmaṇi, which is cited several times in Kāma-dhenu on Vāmana (ed. Benares, pp. 4, 8, 33). If he is the same as Gopāla Bhaṭṭa cited by Kumārasvāmin (p 93), he should be earlier than the 15th century. K. P. Trivedi however, thinks that this Gopāla Bhaṭṭa of Kumārasvāmin is the same as wrote a comm. or Rasa-mañjarī. He will be identical, thus, with Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, son of Harivamśa Bhaṭṭa Drāvida, who wrote commentaries on Rudra’s Śrīgārātilaka (p. 95 above) and Bhāṇudatta’s Rasa-mañjarī (q. v.)


Bhāskara

Wrote Sāhitya-dipikā commentary. He is cited by Śrīvatsalaṅghana, Govinda Ṭhakkura (p. 21), Ravi (Peterson iii, p. 20), Narasimha Ṭhakkura, Bhīmasena, and Ratnakaṇṭha (Peterson ii, p. 17). Narasimha calls him Lāṭa Bhāskara Miśra. He is earlier than the end of the 15th century, being cited by Govinda (Kāvyā-pradīpa pp. 25, 204, 308, 329). The commentary is also called Kāvyālaṃkāra-rahasya nibandha.

Extract in Mitra 1681.
Paramānanda Cakravartin

His commentary is entitled Vistārikā. He refers to Miśra, Dipikārt (Jayanta Bhaṭṭa?) and Viśvanātha; and he must be later than Vidyānātha, whose Pratāparudrīya is cited by him. He is himself cited by Kamalākara, Narasimha Ṭhakkura, Vaidyanātha (Udāharuna can3), Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa,Ānanda and Ratnakaṇṭha. The earliest citation is probably by Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa in his Rasa-pradīpa (p. 20) in 1583 A.D. Probably a Naiyāyiκa of Bengal. He mentions his guru Īśāna Nyāyācārya and appears to refer in a punning verse1 to the Tattva-cintāmaṇi of Gaṅgeśopādhyāya. Jhalakikara thinks that the cakravarti-lakṣaṇa, found in the fourteen gādādhari lakṣaṇas, was formulated by him. Paramānanda, from his citations, cannot be earlier than the second half of the 14th century; and he probably flourished before the 16th century2, at the end of which Gadādhara flourished. He must be distinguished from Šrīvidyā-Cakravartin, apparently a South Indian writer, who commented on Ruyyaka (q. v.) as well as on Mammaṭa, and who is also cited under the common designation of Cakravartin. Paramānanda also wrote a commentary on the Naṣadha (IOC vii p. 1438).


Śrīvidyā-Cakravartin

His commentary, entitled Saṃpradāya-prakāśini refers to a commentary by himself on Ruyyaka. See under Ruyyaka for further information on this commentator.

Edition. Trivandrum Skt. Series 1926, 1930, along with the comm. of Bhaṭṭa Gopāla mentioned above.

1 andhā dośāndhakāreṣu ke vā na syur vipaścitaḥ/ nāhaṁ tu dṛṣṭi-vikalo dhṛtas cintāmaniḥ saḍā

2 H. P Sastri (Catalogue ASB, vi, p. ccxxix) states Paramānanda flourished before Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa (beginning of the 17th century,) who cites from his work, as we have noted above.
Govinda Ṭhakkura

His well-known commentary is called "Pradīpa". Govinda also wrote an "Udāharana-dipikā, apparently the same as "Sloka-dipikā" ² in Stein (pp xxviii 60, 269), cited by Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa. This is supplementary to the larger exegetical work, being a commentary on the illustrative verses of the text. The "Pradīpa has been commented on by Vaidyanātha Tatsat ("Prabhā and Udāharana-candrikā) and Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa ("Uddyota). Govinda was a native of Mithila, born in the family of Ravikara, eldest son of Keśava and Sonodevi, elder brother of poet Śrī-harṣa who is not, however, as Peterson supposes, the author of the Naiṣadha². In addition to this information about himself, Govinda tells us that he learnt kavya and sāhitya from his elder step brother Rucikara. His exact date is not known, but Govinda refers to Viśvanātha as arvācīna, quoting the latter's criticism of Mammata's definition of poetry, as well as the latter's own definition of the same, without actually naming him or his Sāhitya-darpaṇa. Govinda, therefore, is probably later than the middle of the 14th century. On the other hand, he is earlier than the last quarter of the 16th century, being quoted in Prabhākara's Rasa-pradīpa which was composed in 1583 A.D. Narasiṃha Thakkura, who flourished later, but not much later, than 1612 A.D. (having himself quoted Kamalākara), is supposed, on the authority of the family genealogy, to be fifth in descent from

1 The full name of the commentary is Kavyaprakāśa-pradīpa, simplified generally as Kavya-pradīpa; so Peterson's speculation on the name (1, 27) is idle trifling.

2 The second verse of this work refers to his Kavya-pradīpa.

3 His brother's verse is cited in ch. x (p. 355) as mad-brāṭuḥ śrīharṣavya, but the Naiṣadha is cited by name in the same chapter (p. 351) with uti naiṣadha-darśanāt. He laments, in one of the concluding verses, the death of this brother Śrī-harṣa, in which however he does not mention him, as he could have done, as the poet of the Naiṣadha.
Govinda. This will roughly place Govinda towards the end of the 15th century.


Jayarāma Nyāya-pañcānana

His commentary is called Tilaka or Jayarāmi. The commentary called Rahasya-dīpikā by Jayarāma, entered in some catalogues, appears to be an alternative name. He seems to be identical with the author of the Nyāya-siddhānta-mālā, the Padārtha-mañimāla, and of commentaries on the Nyāya-kusumānjali and on the Tattvacintāmanī-didhiti, which works indicate that he was a Nātyāyīka. He is described as pupil of Rāmacandra (or Rāmabhadra) Bhaṭṭācārya Sārvabhauma and guru of Janārdana Vyāsa. He is cited by Śrīvatsalāṇchana and Bhimasena, but the only writer who appears to quote him extensively is Viśvesvara (as Nyāya-pancānana) in his Alamī. kaus. pp. 11, 23, 106, 127, 161, 162, 172, 263, 327. Jayarāma was certainly later than Raghunātha Śiromāni (beginning of the 16th century), on whose Tattva-cintāmanī-didhiti he commented, but earlier than the beginning of the 18th century, the date of Bhimasena. A more precise dating is possible because the date of Jayarāma’s Nyāya-siddhānta-mālā is given as Saṃvat 1750 (=1694 A.D.). He is said to have been patronised by Rāja Rāmakṛṣṇa of Krishnagar (Bengal). See S. C. Vidyabhusan, Indian Logic, Calcutta 1921, pp.477f.

Extract in Peterson ii, p. 107 and Mitra 1447.

1 See introd. to N. S. P. ed of the Pradipa; also the Pandit xiii, p. 74f.
Srīvatsalāñchana1 Bhātīcārya and Subuddhi Miśra

Srīvatsa’s commentary is called Sāra bodhini. It is mentioned by Hall2 and attributed to “Maheśvara, otherwise called Srīvatsalāñchana.” Maheśvara or Māheśvara appears to be another name of Subuddhi Miśra who, Aufrecht notes,3 wrote a commentary on Vāmana called Sāhitya-sarvasva; but Subuddhi also appears to be cited as a commentator on Mammaṭa by Narasimha Ṭhakkura, Vaidyanātha (Udāharana-cana4), Bhīmasena and Ratnakaṇṭha. The two are probably different persons, as Bhīmasena and Ratnakaṇṭha cite separately both Srīvatsa and Subuddhi Miśra. Srīvatsa is also the author of an independent work called Kāvyaparīkṣā4, which deals in five Ullāsas with the general characteristics of poetry and follows in the main the teachings of Mammaṭa. This work may not be identical with Tattvaparīkṣā (or more fully Sabdārtha-Tattvaparīkṣā) by Subuddhi Miśra (perhaps the name of his commentary on Mammaṭa, cited by Ratnakaṇṭha and entered5 by Kielhorn in Central Prov. Cat. p. 100)

1 Also called Srīvatsa-sarman, Srīvatsa-varman or simply Vatsavarman.
2 Introd. Vāsavadattā p. 54.
3 Aufrecht’s description (ABod 208a; IOC, iii, 1130/566, p 321) of Subuddhi-miśra as Subuddhimiśra-maheśvara, as well as Hall’s statement, makes one think that the term is not maheśvara but māheśvara, which is often, as in the cases of Abhinavagupta and Vidyādhara, applied as an appellation of a Śaiva writer. This is thus a surname of both writers, which might have led to their doubtful identification.
4 Aufrecht i. 778b, ii. 19b; IOC, iii, p. 342 (MS dated 1550 A.D.). The five chapters of this work correspond in the following way to those of Mammaṭa. (i) Sabdārtha-nirṇaya=M 1-3 (ii) Kāvyā-bheda=M 4-5 (iii) doṣa-nirṇaya=M 7 (iv) Guna-nirūpaṇa=M 8-9 (v) Alamkāra=M 10. With a few exceptions it gives the Kārikās as well as the illustrations of Mammaṭa with appropriate observations on them. It is thus in effect a commentary on portions of Mammaṭa’s work. It has been printed by the Mithila Institute, Darbhanga 1956.
5 See Peterson ii, p. 17 where both Subuddhi’s comm. and Tattvaparīkṣā are mentioned.
It is mentioned as a Comm. on Kav. pr. in H. P. Sastri Cat. ASB MSS, vi, no. 4839/3515, pp. 417-18. Two other works, Kāvyāṃraṭa1 and Rāmodaya-nāṭaka, are also ascribed to Śrīvatsa. A work called Siddhānta ratna-mālā (a refutation of the Dvaita view of Vedānta) is noticed in Madras Cat. Trm I, B. 362, and is said to have been composed by Śrīvatsalāṇchana Śarman, son of Viśūdhavajācārya. As Śrīvatsa cites Viḍyānātha, he cannot be earlier than the 14th century; on the other hand, he is earlier than the 17th century, having been quoted by Kamalākara (1612 A.D.) and Jagannātha (p. 39). It appears also that the Sāra-bodhini in many places expands or condenses Paramāṇanda’s Vīstārikā. The colophon to the BORI MS of Sāra-bodhini (no. 107. Cat. xii p. 115) informs us that Śrīvatsalāṇchana Bhāṭṭācārya’s father was Śrīvīṣṇu Bhāṭṭācārya Cakravartin.

MSS. Extract in Madras Catalogue xxii, 12827; also BORI MS Cat. xii, no. 54, pp. 56-57 (extract) of Kāvyā-parīkṣā.

Panḍitarāja

This commentator, cited by Ratnakaṇṭha, is probably identical with Raghunandana Rāya, disciple of the legislator Maheśa Ṭhānakkura (See Jha’s transl. of Kāv. prak., introd. p. ix). He should not be confounded with Jagannātha Panḍitarāja.

Stein pp. 60, 269, extract given MS no. 1164 (Aufrecht i. 19a) Stein’s MS of this work goes up to Ullāsa ii only and quotes no authorities except the Miśras and Pratyabhijñākāra. Jha’s MS appears to have been copied in 1637 A.D.

Ravi and Ratnapāṇi

Ravi is the author of the Madhumati commentary, the last verse of which tells us that he had a beloved daughter named Madhumati, after whom the commentary was baptised. He also informs us that he was son of Gaurī and Manodhara,

---

1 Autrecht 1 103a, ii 20a.
alias Ratnapāñi, and grandson of Acyuta, who was a minister of Śivasiṃha or Śivasiddha of Mithila (about the middle of the 15th century. IOC iv p. 875f). Ratnapāñi or Manodhara also wrote a commentary or Mammaṭa, called Kāvyā-darpaṇa¹, which is cited by his son and on which the latter’s commentary itself seems to have been based. The father and the son are cited by Bhīmasena, while Kamalākara and Narasiṃha cite the Madhumatīkāra.

Extract in Peterson iii, p 332f; Madras Cat. xxii, nos. 12822-23.

Maheśvara

With the title Nyāyālaṃkāra. His commentary is called Ādarta, or Bhāvārtha-cintāmaṇi. He is a Bengal writer, who also composed a commentary on the Dāyabhāga. As he is cited by Vaidyānātha he should be placed before the middle of the 17th century, and it is probable that he flourished about the commencement of that century.


Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa

He is better known as a legist, and wrote a large number of works on Smṛti and Mīmāṃsā. He was a Mahāratta Brahman of Benares, son of Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa and Umā, younger brother of Diśakara Bhaṭṭa, and grandson of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa and great-grandson of Rāmeśvara Bhaṭṭa². Ananta Bhaṭṭa, who wrote the Rāma-kalpadruma at the request of Gariba

1 See Peterson iii, App. p. 332 where extract is given (esp. sl. 5). A MS of this work, called Kāvyā-darpaṇa or Kāvyaprakāśa-darpaṇa is noticed in Mitra 3169, and the author’s name given as Manodhara.

2 For Kamalākara’s place in the Bhaṭṭa family of Benares, see the pedigree given in V. N. Mandlik’s ed. of Vyavahāra-mayūkha p. lxxvi. See also Bhandarkar, Rep. 1883-84, pp. 50-1. He is also the author of numerous works on Mīmāṃsā and Smṛti, some of which he mentions at the end of his comm. (see Aufrecht i. 80). It is said that his descendants still live in Benares.
dāsa, minister of Rājā Rājāsimaḥ, was his son. Kamalākara’s date is known from the fact that he dates his well known Nirṇaya-sindhu in Samvat 1668=1612 A.D. He also wrote a poem called Rāma-kautuka in 4 cantos.

Edition. By Papa Sastri, Benares 1866. This comm. is described with extract in IOC ii, no. 1143/361, p. 327.

Rājānaka Ānanda

His commentary is called "Nidarśana or Śitikaṇṭha-vibodhana 1. Hall (Vāsavadattā p. 16) is mistaken in attributing this work to Śitikaṇṭha and taking it as dedicated to Ānanda. The colophon, as well as the first verse2, of this commentary accounts probably for Hall’s mistake; but the author himself explains that the commentary is so named from the fact that an attempt is made in it to interpret Mammaṭa’s text as having, besides its ālāmārīka meaning, a mystical sense relating to Śitikaṇṭha or Śiva. Mammaṭa himself might have been a Kashmirian Śaiva; but this leaves no doubt that Ānanda was one, although it is doubtful whether the text lends itself to such an interpretation. The date is given in the colophon as 1665 A.D., although Hall thinks that this is the date in which the MS of the work was copied. Stein remarks: “Ānanda, who composed his commentary in 1665 A.D. is still well remembered in the tradition of Kashmirian Pañḍits as the contemporary and friend of Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha”.

1 The colophon, as quoted by Bühler (Kashmir Rep. p. 69 fn), says: iti śrīmad-rājānakānvaya-śilakena rājānakāṇandakena viracitāṃ kavya-prakāśa-nidarśanam. But elsewhere in the Jammu MS @ Stein, it says: iti śrī-kāvyā-darsane śitikaṇṭha-vibodhane kavyoddāsa-darsanam prathamam, col. to ch. i. It seems that the real name of the comm. is "Nidarśana as Peterson thinks, Śitikaṇṭha-vibodhana being an alternative or descriptive name arising from the second meaning relating to Śitikaṇṭha or Śiva which the commentary finds in the text.


3 Jammu Cat. p. xxvii fn. The date is given in Kali era 4766.
one of whose known dates is 1648 A.D. Ānanda, therefore, may be assigned to the second and third quarters of the 17th century. Ānanda also appears to have written a commentary on the Naiṣadha.

Extract in Peterson (i. 74); also in Stein, Jammu Catalogue p. xxvii.

Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha

His commentary is called Sāra-samuccaya which, as its title indicates and the author confesses, was composed by a compilation from “the principal commentaries of Jayanta and others.” He cites, therefore, some of the well-known commentaries before his time. 1 among which we find the Śāhitya-dipikā (of Bhāskara), Sāra-bodhinī (of Śrivatsa), the commentaries of Subuddhi Miśra and Paṇḍitarāja, the Viṣṭārikā (of Paramānanda), the Pradīpa (of Govinda), and two other works Tattva-parīkṣā and Rasa-ratna-dipikā. This is the same Ratnakaṇṭha as copied the codex archetypus of the Rāja-taraṅgiṇī, mentioned by Stein (introd. p. vii f) and also transcribed MSS of the “Samketa of Ruyyaka in 1648, of Rāyamukuṭa’s commentary on Amara in 1655, and of Trilocanādāsa’s Kātantra-paṇḍikā in 1673 A.D. He is identical with Ratnakaṇṭha, who was the son of Śamkaraṇaṭha and grandson of Ananta-kavi of the Dhaumyāyana family and who wrote a Stuti-kusumāṅjali-ṭīkā (called Śiṣya-hiti) in 1681 A.D., and a Yudhīśhṭhira-vijaya-kāvyā-ṭīkā in 1672 A.D. (Aufrecht i. 489b; Stein, loc. cit). These dates range from 1648 to 1681 A.D., during which apparently the literary activity of Ratnakaṇṭha falls.

Extract in Peterson, Report ii. p. 129 (also ii. 16f), which gives a list of authors quoted; BORI MS no. 113 (Cat. xii. p. 121).

Narasimha Ṭhakkura

His commentary is called Narasimha maṇiśā. He belonged to the same family as Govinda Ṭhakkura and was fifth in

1 The list of authors cited by him is given in Peterson, Report ii p. 17f.
descent from him. The latest writer he cites seems to be the Madhumati-kara (Ravi) and Kamalakara, and he is cited in his turn by Bhimasena with the title nyāya-vidyā-vāgīśa. Between 1620-1700 A.D.

MSS. Aufrecht i. 101b, ii. 19b.

**Vaidyanātha Tatsat**

He wrote two commentaries: (1) the *Prabhā* on the *Pradīpa* of Govinda and (2) the *Udāharana-candrikā* on the illustrative verses of the *Kāvya-prakāśa*. The date of the latter work is given in the concluding verse as Saṃvat 1740=1684 A.D.¹ He also wrote *Alaṃkāra-candrikā* commentary on Appayya's *Kavalayānanda* (q. v.). He is different from Vaidyanātha, the Maithili grammarian, son of Mahādeva and Veṇi and pupil of Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa; for our Vaidyanātha is known as son of Rāmacandra (or Rāmabuddha) Bhaṭṭa and grandson of Viṭṭhala Bhaṭṭa of the Tatsat family, and is referred to by Nāgoji himself. Our Vaidyanātha cites Caṇḍidāsa, Subuddhi Miśra, the Dipikākṛt (Govinda's *Udāharana-dipikā*), Cakravartin and Maheśa, and is cited by Bhimasena. He is probably not the same as Vaidyanātha Pāyagunḍa who wrote commentaries on the *Candrāloka* of Jayadeva and the *Paribhāṣendu-śekhara* of Nāgoji (ed. Anandasrama, Puona 1913).


**Bhīmasena Dīkṣita**

His commentary is called *Sudhā-sāgara* or *Sudhodadhi*.² It is dated in Saṃvat 1779=1723 A.D.³ He was a Kanauj

---

¹ The date is given in the *IOC MSS Cat*. iii, p. 322, no. 1151.
² The form *Sukhodadhi* given in Peterson's extract (i, p. 94) should be *Sudhodadhi*.
³ Peterson Report i, p. 94.
Brahman who describes himself as son of Śivānanda and grandson of Muralidhara; his genealogy being given thus: Gaṅgādāsa—Vireśvara—Muralidhara—Śivānanda—Bhīmasena. He is also the author of two independent works, called Alaṁkāra-sūrodhāra and Kuvalayānanda-khaṇḍana\(^1\), the latter apparently directed against Appayya’s work of the same name, and both referred to in his commentary on Mammaṭa. The last work was composed at Jodhpur while Ajitasimha (1680-1725 A.D.) was still reigning. Bhīmasena also wrote a commentary on the Rattāvalī\(^2\). He cites a large number of commentators, such as Caṅdidāsa, Bhāskara, Acyuta, Ratnapāṇi, Ravi, Jayarāma Paṅcānana, Vācasapati Miśra, Cakravartin, Ruci Miśra, Murāri Miśra, Pakṣadhara Upādhyāya, Devanātha Tarkapaṅcānana, Śrīvatsalāṇchana, Govinda and Narasimha Thakkura, Maheśa or Maheśvara, and Vaidyanātha.


Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Know, simply as Vidyābhūṣaṇa. His work, dignified with the name of “a vṛtti on Bharata’s sūtra” (so he calls Mammaṭa’s Kārikās\(^3\)), is named the Sāhitya-kaumudi, on which he himself writes a tīppaṇa, called Krṣṇānandini. It has the same arrangement and subject-matter as those of the Kāvyā-prakāśa, but it adds an eleventh chapter on some extra Alaṅkāras of Sabda and Artha. A work called Kāvyā-kustubha in 9 Prabhās is noticed and attributed to one Vidyābhūṣaṇa (in Stein pp. 59, 268) who appears to be a

---

1 The work is also called Alaṁkāra-sāra-sthitī, a MS of which is noticed in Mitra 4084 (Aufrecht ii. 23a). A very incorrect and at places illegible MS of this work exists in the BORI (Cat. xii, no. 156, pp. 179-80, which gives a list of its citations). See also H. P. Sastri, Cat. ASE MSS, vi, no. 4895/3147, p. 456.
2 Aufrecht i. 492.
3 See above pp. 152f.
Vaiśṇava and probably the same as our author (see pref. to Kāvyamālā ed. of the Sāhitya-kaumudī and Aufrecht i 101a, ii. 19b, 193b, iii. 22b); for this work see below under Minor Writers. Baladeva was a pupil of Rādhāmodara-dāsa (concluding verse of Sah. k. and its commentary) and Gopāladāsa (alias Rasikānanda, commentary on sl. 1), and the Guru of Uddhava-dāsa. He was a Vaiśṇava and follower of Caitanya, and wrote various Vaiśṇava works. Though belonging to Orissa he was a champion of the later phase of Bengal Vaiśṇavisin, and attempted a rapprochement between Madhvaism and Caitanyaism; see on this S K. De, Vaiśṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal, Calcutta 1942, pp. 11-12. Apart from his commentary mentioned above, his most notable works are Govinda-bhāṣya on the Vedānta-sūtra and Prameya-ratnāvali. He is said to have been a contemporary of Jayasiṃha of Jaypur, who flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. Aufrecht notes that his commentary on the Utkalikā-vallarī was written in 1765 A.D. A pun in the first verse of his Sāhitya-kaumudī refers, as he himself explains in the tippana, to Gajapati Pratāparudra of Utkala or Orissa.


Nāgoji or Nāgese Bhaṭṭa

He wrote two commentaries called Laghu- and Brhat-Uddyota on Pradīpa. Also author of a Udāharanā-dīpikā or pradīpa on the illustrations in the text (Stein, pp. xxvii, 268). He belongs to the first quarter of the 18 h century. He also wrote a commentary on Jagannātha (q.v.), from whom he was removed by two generations, and other works. See below under Jagannātha.

*Udāharaṇa-dīpikā*, Aufrecht ii. 19b (extract in Stein pp. 268-69, called *Pradīpa*).

(2)

We give below the names of the some of the less known commentators on Mammaṭa (alphabetically):

(1) Kalādhara. Wrote *Kārikāvalī*, which appears to be a synopsis of the Kārikās. *KBod* 501.

(2) Kalyāṇa Upādhyāya. Name of comm. unknown, mentioned by Jha in his introd. to his trans. of *Kāv. prak.* p. ix.


(4) Kṛṣṇa Sarman. *Rasa-prakāśa*. HPS iii no. 58 (extract; ends with the 5th chapter); *Cat. ASB MSS*, vi, no. 4842/6581, pp. 419-20 (a fragment of only 20 leaves, containing the first and second chapters).

(5) Kṛṣṇamitrācārya, son of Rāmanātha and grandson of Devidatta: a Naiyāyika, for whose works see Aufrecht i. 121b. *Ṭikā*. Aufrecht i. 101b.

(6) Gadādhara Cakravartin Bhaṭṭācārya. *Ṭikā*. *Mitra* 1527; *SCC* vii 13. Gadādhara is well known for his commentary on Raghunātha Śiromaṇi’s *Tattva-cintāmaṇi-dīdhiti*, one of the standard works on Navya Nyāya of Bengal. He was a pupil of Harirāma Tarkālaṃkāra and flourished at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century.


(8) Gokulanātha Upādhyāya, the Maithili Smārta. *Ṭikā*, mentioned in Jha *op. cit.* p. ix. See chapter on Minor Writers below.

(9) Gopinātha. Comm. *Sumano-manohara*. Auibrecht i. 101b. He also wrote a comm. on Viśvanātha’s *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* (*q.v.*). End of the 17th century.

"Rahasya-prakāśa. Aufrecht i. 101b (Mitra 1651). MS written by his pupil in Śaka 1579 = 1657 A.D. He is different from Jagadīśa Tarkālaṃkāra, the famous Naiyāyika who was a pupil of Bhavānanda and (Rāmabhadrā) Sārvabhauma of Nava-
dvipa (Bengal).

(11) Janārdana Vībudha, pupil of Ananta. Comm. "Śloka dipikā. Aufrecht i. 101b, ii. 19b (Stein 61, incomplete). He also wrote commentaries on the Raghu and Vṛtta-ratnākara. He should be distinguished from the better known Janārdana Vyāsa, son of Bābuji Vyāsa and grandson of Viṭṭhala Vyāsa and pupil of Jayarāma Nyāya-
pañcānana (see above p. 164).


(13) Devanātha Tarkapañcānana. Comm. Kavya-
kaumudī written in Saṃvat 1717 (=1661). BORI MSS Cat. xii, p. 81. Described as son of Govinda. Cited by Kamalākara and Bhīmasena. Bharata Mallika on Bhaṭṭi x. 73 quotes one Devanātha. Our Devanātha appears to be a logician of Bengal who upheld the views of Mammaṭa against the adverse criticism of Viśvanātha, See Madras Trm II, C. 1570 for extracts, and II, A, 819. See Mitra 1447 where mention is made of an Ekaṣṭyalaṃkāra-prakāśa which quotes Deva-
nātha and Jayarāma as its sources.

(14) Narasimha Sūri. son of Timmaji Mantrin and grandson of Raṅgaprabhu. Comm. Rju-vṛtti on Kārikās only. Aufrecht ii. 19b; Madras Trm B 381.

(16) Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita, son of Raṅganātha Dīkṣita and brother of Bālakṛṣṇa. Raṅganātha’s commentary on the Vikramorvaśī was finished in 1656 A. D. Hence the date of our author is the end of the 17th century. "Ṭikā. Aufrecht i. 101b (see also 292a: AFI p. 155)

(17) Bhānucandra. "Ṭikā. Aufrecht i. 101b. Also wrote a commentary on the Daśa-kumāra.

(18) Bhavadeva, son of Kṛṣṇadeva of Mithila and pupil of Bhavadeva Ṭhakkura. Comm. Lilā. Aufrecht i: 20a ; Madras Cat. 12824-25 (extract). Also wrote a commentary on the Vedānta-sūtra (IOC 1428). According to the final verse in this commentary the author lived in the reign of Shah Jahan and composed his commentary at Patna in Śaka 1571 =1649 A. D.


(21) Raghudeva. Comm. "Kārikārtha-prakāśikā. Aufrecht ii. 20a (up to the end nearly of Ullāsa ii)

(22) Ratneśvara. Name of Comm. unknown, but referred to by himself in his comm. on Bhoja (cf. ABod 209a).

(23) Rāghava. Wrote an Avacūṛi Ṭippana, mentioned in Jhalakikara p. 36.


(25) Rāmacandra. Wrote a Kāvyaprakāśa-sāra, which is apparently a summary exposition of the substance of the text. Aufrecht i. 102b.

(26) Rāmanātha Vidyāvācaspati, a Bengal commentator who wrote the comm. "Rahasya-prakāśa. Aufrecht i 102a. His commentary on Bhavadeva’s
Śaṃskāra-paddhati was composed in 1623 A.D. (see Aufrecht i. 516a).

(27) Rāmakṛṣṇa. Comm. Bhāvārtha or Kavi-nandīnī (or śabdāntikā). Aufrecht i. 102a, ii. 20a: also ii. 16b.

(28) Vijayānanda. Wrote a śaṅkaraṭīkā. Deccan Coll. Cat. p. 44. The age of the MS is given as 1683 A.D.

(29) Vidyāsāgara, apparently the title of some commentator. Cited by Śrīvatsalāṅchana. One Vidyāsāgara wrote a Kalā-dīpikā-ṭīkā on Bhaṭṭī, and is cited by Bharata Mallika (on x. 73), and by Rāmanātha on Amara-kośa. S. P. Bhattacharya (introd. to ed. Śrīdhara’s comm. p. xxx) is inclined to take this commentator on Mammaṭa as Puḍḍārīka Vidyāsāgara who flourished in the early decades of the 15th century. He is said to have written comm. also on Daṇḍin and Vāmāna.


(31) Śivanārāyaṇa Dāsa Sarasvatīkṛṣṇabharaṇa, son of Durgādāsa. Comm. Dīpikā. Weber i, no. 819; Aufrecht i. 102a. He wrote at the beginning of the 17th century. For his other works, see Aufrecht i. 649b.


(33) Siddhicandra Gaṇi, Kāvyaprakāśa-khaṇḍana in ten Ullāsas, edited by Rasiklal C. Parikh from the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay 1953. The writer is a notable Jaina monk and author (b. 1587-88 A.D.) in the time of Akbar and Jahangir and a contemporary of Jagannātha. His method, as he himself tells us, is anuvāda-pūrvaka khaṇḍana, i.e. first exposition and then criticism,
although all his criticisms are not justified. Siddhicandra appears also to have written a Brhati Tikā on the Kāvya-prakāśa. While Hemacandra would accept Mammaṭa's work as the standard, Siddhicandra was perhaps one of the 'Navyas', like Jagannātha, who indicates an attempt to set up a new school of poetic theories. For information about the author and his works see Introd. to ed. mentioned.—MS entitled Kāvyuprakāśa-khaṇḍana or Kāvyāṁṛta-taraṅgini noticed by Mitra 2674 goes up to the 7th Ullāsa; it appears to be a different work.

Besides these, there are numerous commentaries, either anonymous or with the name of the author missing, some which are entered in Aufricht i. 101b, 778b, ii. 20a, 193b. This illustrates the saying of Maheśvara, one of the commentators: kāvya-prakāśasya kṛtā gṛhe gṛhe/śikā tathāpy esa tathaiva durgamaḥ!
CHAPTER VII
FROM RUYYAKA TO VIDYĀNĀTHA

RUYYAKA

( 1 )

Ruyyaka, who also bore the name of Rucaka and had the Kashmirian title of Rājānaka prefixed to his name, was son of Rājānaka Tilaka who, Jayaratna informs us (pp. 115, 124, 205), wrote a commentary or critique on Udbhata called Udbhata-viveka or Udbhata-vicāra.

The Alamkāra-sarvasva, by which Ruyyaka is chiefly known, consists of two parts, viz. Sūtra and Vṛtti; but the question has been raised whether the authorship of the two parts should be attributed to the same writer. The Nirmay Sagar Press edition of the text, published under the above title, admits Ruyyaka’s authorship of both the Sūtra and the Vṛtti, a view which is accepted by his earliest commentator

1 rājānaka-rucakāpaṇāmnālaṃkārasarvasva-kṛtah (kṛtāh), col. to Pischel’s ed of Sahādaya-līlā; cf ed. of the same in Kāvyamālā Gucchashva v (1908), reading of MS kha. This name is given in some of the MSS of his larger work (e.g. col. to the N.S.P. and Trivandrum eds. of the text; in Mitra IX. p. 117), as well as by Kumārasvāmin (pp 393, 396, 425, 448), Appāyya Dikṣita (Citr. mīm. p. 72), Rāghavabhāṭṭa on Sākuntalā (pp. 161, 179, 193), and Śrīvidyā-Crkavartin, one of Ruyyaka’s commentators (Madras Cat. xii, p. 8609). Bühler (Kashmir Rep. no. 247, p. xvi) and Peterson (ii p. 13f) also found this name in connexion with Ruyyaka’s Saṁketa comm. on Māmaṭa. That the form Ruyyaka is the more authentic is testified to by his pupil Maṅkhaka (Śrikaṇṭha-c. xxi. 30: see below)

2 rājānaka-tilakātmaya col. to Pischel’s ed. of the Sahādaya-līlā. Ruyyaka’s father was thus, like himself, a writer on Poetics and a follower of Udbhata. See above p. 76-77. Tilaka is mentioned and quoted (one verse) by Someśvara in his comm. on Māmaṭa (ed. Parikh, p. 295, on Ullāsa x. 106)
Jayaratha, who refers to the author as *granthakṛt* with respect to both the Śūtra and Vṛtti portions. The invocatory verse to the Vṛtti in this edition reads in the second line

\[
niñālaṃkāra-sūtrāṇāṃ vṛttyā tātparyam ucyate
\]

so that the Śūtra is avowedly referred to as his own by the Vṛttikāra. Some doubt, however, has been thrown on this view by the discovery of a different reading of this line in some of the South Indian MSS, which introduce a grave variant in the phrase *niñālaṃkāra-sūtrāṇām* by changing it into *guṇvalaṃkāra-sūtrāṇām*. There is also, at the end of the Vṛtti in these MSS an additional verse, which gives the name of the Vṛtti (and not of the text which is called *Alaṃkāra-sūtra*) as *Alaṃkāra-sarvasva*, and the name of the author of the Vṛtti as Mañkhuka or Mañkhaka, who is described as a *sāmdhivigrahika* to the king of Kashmir. This forms the reading of the text (based on three MSS), which is published in the Trivandrum Series, as well as of MSS noticed by Burnell,\(^4\) Winternitz\(^5\) and in the Madras Catalogue\(^6\). This view is supported by Samudrabandha, a South Indian commentator, who flourished at the end of 13th century and whose text is printed in the Trivandrum edition: for the Vṛtti, the subject of his commentary, is known to him by the name of *Alaṃkāra sarvasva* and its author as Mañkhaka, while the original work of Ruyyaka is called *Alaṃkāra-sūtra*.

---

1 pp. 19, 20, 55, 57, 67, 72, 83, 87 etc.
2 Same reading in *ABod* 210a. where Ruppaka is å, mistake or a variant (Buhler *op. cit.* p. 68) for Ruuyaka; Mitra ix p. 117.—All the Jammū MSS have *niñālaṃkāra*\(^3\).
3 iiti mañkhuko vitene kāśmīra-kṣitipa-sāmdhivigrahikaḥ/ sukavi-mukhālaṃkāraṃ tad idam alaṃkāra-sarvasvam//
4 *Tanjore Cat.* p. 54a.
5 *Cat. of South Ind. MSS in the RAS*, p. 208; cf Jacob in *IRAS*, 1897, p. 283f.
6 xii, pp. 8606-7. The question is discussed at some length in Harichand Sastri, *op. cit.* p. 105f.
We are thus confronted with two distinct traditions, embodied in these two different views and prevailing in the North and South of India respectively, with regard to the authorship of the Vṛtti, there being no dispute as to Ruuyaka’s authorship of the Śūtra-text itself. So far as we can judge, the North Indian tradition, obtaining in Kashmir, to which place both Ruuyaka and Maṅkhaka belonged, seems to be the authentic one; for the South Indian tradition is not uniform in this respect and does not always distinguish between the author of the Śūtra and the Vṛtti respectively. Thus, Appayya Dīkṣita, a noted South Indian writer, refers\(^1\) to Ruuyaka or Rucaka as the author of the work as a whole, which is called the Alamkāra-sarvasva, attributing to him both the Śūtra and the Vṛtti; and Appayya is in agreement, in this respect, with Mallinātha\(^2\), Kumārasvāmin\(^3\), and Jagannātha\(^4\). On the other hand, the testimony of Jayaratha, himself a Kashmirian, cannot be very well superseded by what the much later commentator Samudrabandha says in conformity to a tradition which itself is not unanimous. It is also significant that while Ruuyaka (and even Jayaratha) is quoted and discussed extensively by later writers on Poetics, Maṅkhaka is not cited as a writer on the subject except once by Appayya in his Citra-mīmāṁsā (p. 10).

\[\text{(2)}\]

This tradition of Maṅkhaka’s collaboration with Ruuyaka would not perhaps have arisen, had not Maṅkhaka, as the

1 Citr. mīm. p. 14, 15, 54, 72, 84, 90, 94, 98; Kuvalay. p. 41, 89, 92, 96, 184.
3 Ratnāpana pp. 393 (=Alam. sar. vṛtti p. 58), 425 (=ibid, p. 133). 448 (=ibid, p. 144); p. 341 (=ibid, śūtra p. 20) p. 452 (=ibid, p. 156).
4 Rasagaṅgādhara has numerous references, but see pp. 163 and and 200, where both the Śūtra and Vṛtti are quoted under the citation Alamkāra-sarvasva. See also pp. 251, 342-43, 352, 482. Also Rāghavabhaṭṭa on Śakuntalā p. 161 (=Alam. sarv. vṛtti p. 64), p. 179 (=ibid, p. 75), p. 193 (=ibid, p. 127).
tradition says, been in fact a pupil of Ruuyaka.\textsuperscript{1} Rājānaka Maṅkha or Maṅkhuka, son of Viśvāvarta and grandson of Manmatha, is well known as the Kashmirian author of Śrikanṭha-carita (ed. Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab. NSP. Bombay 1887) which was written, according to Bühler,\textsuperscript{2} between 1135 and 1145 A.D. Maṅkhaka’s brother Alamkāra (or Laṅkaka, xxv. 15, 37f) was a minister (v. 62, xxv. 43, 61) under Sussala, and Jayasimha of Kashmir (1129-1150 A.D.), and another brother Śrīgāra held a high office (bṛhat-tantrapati) under Sussala, whom he assisted in his war against Hastadeva. Maṅkhaka tells us how after composing his poem he submitted it, at the house of his brother Alamkāra, to an assembly of learned scholars and officials, among whom he describes Ruuyaka as his own preceptor (xxv. 30, 135). This also explains how Ruuyaka’s own work contains five verses from Maṅkhaka’s poem\textsuperscript{3} cited as illustrations; for it is not unlikely that the Guru should in this way quote his worthy disciple. As the latest date of Maṅkhaka’s poem is given as 1145 A.D., we may presume that Ruuyaka’s Alamkāra-sarvasva, which quotes it, was composed a little later. Again, Maṅikyacandra’s Samketa (on Mammaṭa) which was composed in 1159-60 A.D. quotes the Alamkāra-sarvasva. We can, therefore, fix Ruuyaka’s literary career in the second and third quarters of the 12th century\textsuperscript{4}.

\textsuperscript{1} This fact, as well as what Jayaratha says about corruptions and additions to the text of the Alamkāra-sarvasva, would perhaps explain how the tradition of Maṅkhaka’s collaboration began.

\textsuperscript{2} op. cit. p. 50f; extract App. pp. cix f. See also Rāja-tarang. viii. 3354.

\textsuperscript{3} See Jacob in JRAS, 1897, p. 283 for these verses (ii. 49, iv. 79. v. 23, vi. 16, x. 10).

\textsuperscript{4} Jacob (op. cit. p. 283) points out that Ruuyaka (p 93) quotes Rāja-tarangini iv. 441 (asamāpta-jigīṣasya), which work was not completed till about 1150 A. D. in the reign of Jayasimha. This verse, however, occurs an an anonymous quotation in Abhinava’s Comm. on Bharata (ch. vi, vol. i, p. 305). It should be borne in mind that Jayaratha
In this work, composed in the Sūtra-vṛtti style Ruyyuka concerns himself only with poetic figures. After dealing with Punar-uktavadābhaśa, Anuprāsa (Cheka-, Vṛtti- and Lāṭa-). Yamaka and Citra ne goes on to discuss 75 figures of Artha beginning with Upamā. He gives two altogether new figures Vikalpa (p. 159) and Vicitra (p. 133-34). His work is mostly drawn upon by later writers like Viśvanātha, Vidyānātha and Appayya Dikṣita. Ruyyaka quotes the Kāvya-prakāśa in many places (p. 107 on Paryāyokta; p. 102 = KP iv, p. 128; p. 183 definition of Bhāvika), and the definitions of Citra, Kāvyaliṅga, Vyājokti, Uttara, Milita and Samādhi are given as they occur in Mammata’s work.

(3)

The works of Ruyyaka are numerous, of which three only have been printed:

(1) Kāvya-prakāśa-saṃketa, a commentary on Mammata’s text, referred to as Ruyyaka’s by Jayaratha p. 102, and by Ratnakaṇṭha (Peterson ii. pp. 17, 19 as Brhat-saṃketa). For ed. see above p. 156.

(2) Alaṃkāra-maṇjarī, referred to by himself at p 15. Not mentioned by Jayaratha as Ruyyaka’s. P. V. Kane doubts if it is a work by Ruyyaka.

(3) Sāhitya-mimāṃsa, referred to by himself at p. 61, also by Jayaratha p. 126. It is cited without the author’s name in Vidyānātha p. 11 (Cf ABod 210a). Burnell mentions an anonymous metrical Sāhitya-mimāṃsa (p. 58a), with prose Vṛtti in eight Prakaraṇas. This is apparently the Sāhityo-mimāṃsa published in the Trivandrum Skt. Series in 1934.¹ The MS sources contain large gaps and lacunae, and the name of the author is not given either at the beginning or at the

---

¹ See above p. 144.
end. A résumé of this work has been given by P. V. Kane (HSP, pp. 269-72), who believes it to be a work of Ruyyaka. It is noteworthy, however, that it speaks not of Vyañjanā, but of Tātparya-vṛtti as leading to the realisation of Rasa, a view which fundamentally differs from that of Ruyyaka who declares distinctly (p. 13): asti tāvad vyāṅgya-niṣṭho vyāpārah. It shows some influence of the Śrīgāra-prakāśa of Bhoja. V. Raghavan (pp. 99-100) doubts if it is the work of Ruyyaka.

(4) Alamkārānusārinī, cited by Jayaratha as Ruyyaka’s (pp. 36, 57, 58 and 60). This work is supposed by Peterson¹, and following him by Aufrecht² and Jacobi³, to be a commentary on Jahaṇa’s Somapāla-vilāsa. As Jayaratha’s citations indicate, it discussed some of the poetic figures in that composition, but there is nothing in these citations to show that it was in fact a commentary on Jahaṇa’s Somapāla-vilāsa. The poet Jahaṇa is described in Maṅkhaka’s Śrīkaṇṭha-carita (xxv. 75); and Somapāla, king of Rājapurī (near Kashmir), whose life Jahaṇa appears to have recorded, is known from the Rāja-taraṅginī (viii, 621f) to have made war against Kashmirian Sussala. It is clear that this poet, who must have flourished in the first half of the 12th century, should be distinguished from Bhagadatta Jahaṇadeva, the compiler of the Sūkti muktāvali, who lived in the second half of the 13th century, but to whom Aufrecht (i. 203a) wrongly attributes the Somapāla-vilāsa itself.

(5) A commentary on Mahimabhaṭṭa’s Vyakti-viveka, referred to by Jayaratha as Vyaktiviveka-vicāra (p. 13). This has been identified with the anonymous commentary published with Mahimabhaṭṭa’s work in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series: for, although the author’s name does not appear in the published text of that commentary, which is called simply "Vyākhyāna.

1 Report ii, p. 17; introd. to Subhāṣa, p. 106; Actes du 6me Congrès p. 364. It is so described by Ratnakaṇṭha in his comment on Stuti-kusumānjali.
2 Cat. Cat. i. 32b.
the anonymous commentator refers in it to his other works, the Sāhitya-mīmāṃsā (p. 32) and Harṣacarita-vārttika (p. 44. 50), which we know to be two works of Ruyyaka referred to by himself in his Alamkāra-sarvasva and mentioned by Jayaratha. He refers in this work also to the Candraśī (on the Dhvanyāloka), Čāvya-kautuka (p. 13), Harṣadayādaraṇa (pp. 1, 13), and Kuntaka's Vakrakī-jīvita (pp. 16, 32, 36, 44).

(6) Nāṭaka-mīmāṃsā referred to as his own in the above commentary on Mahimabhaṭṭa (p. 32).

(7) Harṣacarita-vārttika referred to as his own in Alamkāra-sarvasva p. 61 and in Vyaktiveka-vyākhyāna p. 44, 50.

(8) Sahrdayā-līlā, edited in the Čāvya-śāla Guccchaka 5, as well as by Pischel (Kiel 1886, along with Rudra's Śṛṅgāra-tilaka). The work consists of four Ulekhās: (i) Guṇa, describing the ten excellences (Ṛūpa, Varna, Prabhā etc.) of a woman (ii) Alamkāra, speaking of ornaments of gold, pearls etc., unguents, flowers worn by a woman (iii) Jīvita, dealing with youth which is the essence of womanly charm, and (iv) Parikarā, treating of the paraphernalia of beauty.

(9) Alamkāra-vārttika, cited as Ruyyaka’s by Jayaratha p. 71.

(10) Śrīkanta-stava cited as madīya in Alamkāra-sarvasva p. 19.

( 4 )

THE COMMENTATORS ON RUYYAKA

Alaka (or Alata?)

This commentator is referred to by Ratnakaṭha in his own commentary on Mammaṭa1, the name given being Rāja- naṅka Alaka. We have seen that the identification of Mammaṭa2's continuator Alaka. Alata or Allaṭa with this commentator is open to doubt2, and nothing more can be said on the subject until his commentary is recovered.

2 See above p. 149f.
Jayarattha

His commentary is called Alaṃkāra-vimarśīṇī. He informs us that his father's name was Śṛṅgāra, and his patron was king Rājarāja. From his commentary 'Viveka on the Tantrā-loka of Abhinavagupta, we learn that the full name of his father was Śṛṅgārarathatha, who had two sons named Jayarattha and Jayadrathatha. He also tells us that he was a pupil of Śaṅkhadhara and Śiva. Jayarattha's pedigree is given at some length in his 'Viveka, and we learn that his great-grandfather's brother was Śivaraththa, who was a minister of king Ucchala of Kashmir (1101-1111 A.D.). As four generations intervene between the minister of Ucchala and Jayarattha, Bühler thinks that the latter lived in the beginning of the 13th century. Jacobī supports this conclusion and attempts to arrive at greater precision by identifying Jayarattha's (and his father's) patron king Rājarāja with Rājadeva who is mentioned by Jonarāja in 2 Rāja-taraṅgīṇī v. 79-91, and who lived in 1203-1226 A.D.

The citations in Jayarattha are numerous, and include the names of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Udbhata, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, the Dhvanikāra (=Ānandavardhana), the Vakroktijivita-kāra, Abhinavagupta, the Vyaktiviveka-kāra, Bhoja and Mammaṭa.

1 The Kashmirian MSS of the Alaṃkāra-vimarśīṇī examined by Bühler vacillate between these two names as the name of our author; and Peterson's MS of Ratnakaṭha's Sāra-samuccaya reads Jayadratha (ii p. 17), which is accepted by Auffreht, although the published texts of the 'Vimarśīṇī, as well as the 'Viveka, have Jayarattha, which Bühler himself considers (op cit. p. 68) to be the correct name of the author of the two commentaries, the other being that of his brother - Jayadratha wrote a Kāvya in 32 cantos, named Hara-carita-vināmaṇi (ed. NSP, Bombay 1897).

2 v. 22; see the extract given in Bühler op. cit. App. pp. ch. f. This Śivaratha is mentioned in Rāja-taraṅgī v. 111.

3 Jacob (JRAS, 1897, p. 283) came to the conclusion that Jayarattha must be placed later than the end of 12th century, for he quotes (p. 64) from the Prthvirāja-vijaya, a poem dealing with Prthvirāja of Delhi who fell in 1193 A. D. (cf Bühler, op. cit. p. 62).
Besides citing his own author’s other works and Rājānaka Tilaka’s work on Udbhāta, Jayaratha also mentions some other works on Alāṅkāra unknown to us, viz. *Alāṅkāra-sūtra* (p. 150), *Alāṅkāra-bhāṣya* (pp. 35, 46, 83, 138, 173) and *Alāṅkāra-sāra* (pp. 88, 97, 171, 172, 184), as well as an *Alāṅkāra-vārttika* (p. 71) ascribed to Ruuyaka. The *Alāṅkāra-bhāṣya* is also cited by Jagannātha (pp. 239, 365); while a work bearing the name *Alāṅkāra-sāra* is mentioned in Kielhorn’s list¹ and in Peterson iii, App. p. 393; but this is probably a later work attributed to Bālakṛṣṇa Pāyaguṇḍa who also wrote a commentary on Appayya’s *Citra-mīmāṁsā* (q. v.) and was thus later than the end of the 16th century². The *Vimārśinī* is, in its turn, cited extensively by Jagannātha (pp. 325, 327, 352, 380, 387, 414, 418). chiefly because Appayya, against whom Jagannātha’s attacks are primarily directed, follows Ruuyaka and Jayaratha pretty slavishly.

Jayaratha appears also to have written another work on Poetics called *Alāṅkāro-dāharaṇa,*³ in the concluding verse of which he refers to *Vimārśinī.* It appears from the résumé of the work given in Mitra 2442 that it was chiefly meant to adduce illustrations to Ruuyaka’s text, which the limited scope of his *Vimārśinī* did not allow him to do properly.

**Samudrabandha**

Samudrabandha flourished, as he himself tells us, in the time of Rāvivarman, *alias* Saṃgrāmādhīra, king of Kolamba (Quilon) in the Kerala country (Malabar), and there are numerous illustrative verses in the commentary itself, which sing the praise of this king⁴. This king was born in 1266-67 A.D.

---

¹ Kielhorn’s List 18; see also Aufrecht i. 32b.

² But see Pischel in *GgA,* 1885, p 765, *contra* Jacob in *ZDMG* xlii 293.

³ See *Jammu Cat.* no. 806, p. 59.

⁴ e. g. pp. 48, 58, 76, 133, 149 (*kolambādhīpati*) etc. For Rāvivarman and Samudrabandha, see K. Kunjunni Raja, *op. cit.* pp. 211-13.
and crowned himself as king of Malabar on the banks of the Vegavati in 1312-13 A.D.; so that Samudrabandha may be taken to have flourished towards the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century.

The citations from earlier authors are not so numerous in Samudrabandha, but he shows his familiarity with Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, the Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana, Bhāṭa Nāyaka, the Vakroktijivita-kāra, Mahimabhaṭṭa, Bhoja and Mammaṭa. He also cites Udbhata’s vṛtti, presumably on Bhāmaha’s Kāvyālāmkāra. He refers to the explanation of other commentators of the Alamkāra-sarvasva (pp. 55, 96, 145, 239) and discusses readings (p. 57).

Śrīvidyā-Cakravartin

A commentary, called "Samjīvanī or Alamkāra-samjīvanī on Ruıyaka is cited by Mallinātha1 and Kumārasvāmin2. Appayya3 and Viśveśvara4. They apparently refer to the author of this commentary by citing Cakravartin; for the two verses5, cited by them, are attributed to this commentator by Kumārasvāmin, whose other references show that Cakravartin wrote a "Samjīvanī commentary on the Alamkāra-sarvasva. This Cakravartin, who is to be distinguished from Paramānanda Cakravartin, appears to be identical with Śrīvidyā-Cakravartin, two MSS of whose commentary on Ruıyaka, called "Samjīvanī, are noticed in the Madras Catalogue6. This commentary refers to and is referred to by the same

1 pp. 31, 57, 221. 237, 324.
3 Citr. mīm. pp. 7, 74.
4 Alam. kaust. p. 11.
5 as cited above = Ratnāpana p. 378.
6 xit. no. 12799-12800, pp. 8609-10. Jacobi wrongly conjectured Alaka to be the author of this "Samjīvanī (ZDMG lxii, p. 292).
author's *Sampradāya-prakāśini* Brhatī Tilā on Mammaṭā, and both the commentaries are mentioned together at the close of the former work thus:

kāvyaprakāśelāṃkārasarvasve ca vipaścitām/
atyādaro jagaty asmin, vyākhyātam ubhayam tataḥ/| |

which indicates the popularity of the works of Mammaṭā and Ruyyaka in later times. Śrīvidyā-Cakravartin calls his author Rucaka. He refers to Viśvanātha as saṃdhivigrāhika. He is evidently a South Indian writer, belonging to the Śaiva Sampradāya or Śaiva sect². The reference by Mallinātha should place him chronologically earlier than the end of the 14th century. He appears to have flourished in the court of Vira Vallāla III (Hoysala) in the beginning of the 14th century (V. Raghavan in *ABORI* xiv, 1933, p. 256). A Rasa-mīmāṃsā³ is also ascribed to Vidyā-Cakravartin, as well as a Bharata-saṃgraha on Dramaturgy and Rasa (*ABORI*, xiv 1933, p. 257).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Ālaṃkāra-sarvasva**


1 *ibid*, no. 12826-28, p. 8627, Burnell 55a. Ed. Trivandrum Skt. Series 1926; see above p. 162. He also wrote a *Laghu-Tilā* prior to his writing of the *Brhatī Tilā* in which this comm. is referred to. Only one of these commentaries has been published in the Trivandrum ed.

2 The *Sampradāya-mata* or *Sāmpradāyikas* are quoted by Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa in his *Rasa-pradīpa* (before 1583 A. D.) at pp. 11, 13, 32.

3 See V. Raghavan in *ABORI*, xvi, 1934-35, p. 140. It is mentioned by Vidyā-Cakravartin himself in his comm. on Ruyyaka (*rasa-mīmāṃsā-yām vistaraḥ*), but it is not clear whether it is a separate work.
HEMACANDRA

Commentaries. (1) Alamkāra-vimarṣinī of Jayaratha, ed. with text in Nir. Sag. Press, as above, 1893. On MSS of Alamkārodāharana see Aufrecht i. 32a, 773a, ii. 6b; WBod 1157. (2) *Vṛtti of Samudrabandha, ed. with text in Trivandrum Sank. Series 1915, as above. (3) *Sāmījīvanī of Śrīvidyā-Cakravartin. Madras Cat. xxii, 12799-12800; Aufrecht i. 32b. Not yet published.

Sahṛdaya-lilā


Comm. on the Vyakti-viveka


HEMACANDRA AND THE VĀGBHAṬAS

( 1 )

The versatile and voluminous Jaina writer Hemacandra directed his many-sided activity to the field of Sanskrit Poetics as well, and wrote a Kāvyānuśāsana with its Vṛtti named Alamkāra-cūḍāmanī and a gloss called Viveka, basing it chiefly on Mammaṭa’s work, but appropriating his materials from various sources. While as a textbook it hardly super-

1 He appropriates, for instance, long passages, without acknowledgment, from Rājaśekhara, Abhinavagupta, the Vakroktijīvita-kāra, Mammaṭa and others. A passage in Abhinava-bhārati on Bharata ch. iv is copied (Hemacandra pp. 57-66) almost literally with only a general acknowledgment at conclusion: iti śrīmān abhinavaguptācāryaḥ, etam matam evāsmaḥbhir upajīvitam veditavyam (p. 66). In the Vṛtti, again, at p. 83, his remarks on the sthāyi-bhāva (pp. 83-84) are copied from the same source. His extensive appropriation from Rājaśekhara has been already alluded to; see p 118 above. At p. 316 he calls himself a follower of Bharata’s views (bharata-matānusāri). His dependence on earlier works is so close as to amount at times to almost slavish imitation or plagiarism.
edes the Kāvya-prakāśa, it is, like most of Hemacandra’s other productions, more or less an industrious compilation, displaying its author’s encyclopaedic erudition, but hardly constituting an original contribution to the subject.

About Hemacandra and his time, we know perhaps more than we do with regard to other writers on Poetics, and the biographical and other details will be found collected together in Bühler’s erudite little pamphlet on this author. Hemacandra was born at Dhunduka or Dhandhukā (in Ahmedabad) on the full-moon night of the month of Kārttika in the Samvat year 1145=1088 A.D. of humble Bania parents, named Cāciga and Pāhini. He was originally named Caṅgadeva. He was initiated as a Jaina monk in Samvat 1150=1093 A.D., taking the name of Somānanda. He was a pupil of Devacandra of Vajra-śākhā, author of the Sthānaka-vṛtti and the Sāntinātha-carita. He became a sūri or ācārya in Samvat 1166=1109 A.D. changing his name, again, into Hemacandra. He spent the greater part of his life, as the acknowledged head of the Jaina community at Anahilla-pattana, under the patronage of Jayasimha Siddharāja (1094-1143 A.D.) and his successor Kumārapāla of Gujarat (1143-1172 A.D.) dying shortly before the latter is Samvat 1229=1172 A.D. at the ripe old age of 84 years. He wrote most of his works at the request of his patrons, of whom he converted Kumārapāla into Jainism in Samvat 1216=1160 A.D.

Hemacandra wrote voluminous works on many branches of Sanskrit learning, such as grammar (Siddha-hemacandra, Sabdānuśāsana, Liṅgānuśāsana, Dhātu-pārayaṇa and Uṇādi-sūtra), prosody (Chandonusūsana), lexicon (Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi, Anekārtha-saṅgraha, Nighaṇṭu-śeṣa, and Deśi-nāma-mālā), besides works on Jaina Sastra. His stupendous learning justifies his sobriquet Kalikā-Sarvajña. His Kāvyānuśā-

---

1 Ueber das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemacandra, Wien 1889 · trs. into English by Manilal Patel in the Singhi Jaina Series 1936. See also Jacob in Ency. of Religion and Ethics, vi. 591.
sana in eight Adhyāyas has the merit of comprehending all
topics of Poetics, including a brief reference to Dramaturgy.
In spite of occasional differences Hemacandra borrows freely
from Bharata, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa
and Rājaśekhara. Its want of any striking originality perhaps
stood on the way of its being accepted as an authoritative
work. It exercised little influence on later writers and is
scarcely ever quoted. It is written in the form of Sūtra and
Vṛtti. ¹

( 2 )

There are two Vāgbhaṭās in Sanskrit Poetics who must be
distinguished from each other, viz. Vāgbhaṭa, author of the
Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra (here cited as Vāgbhaṭa I) and Vāgbhaṭa,
author of the Kāvyānuśāsana and its Vṛtti, Alāṃkāra-tilaka
(here cited as Vāgbhaṭa II). Eggeling² falls into the error
of confounding the two and assigning both the works to
the same author. From the Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra iv. 148, we learn
that the Jaina name in the Prakrit form of the author is
Bāhaḍa and that he was son of Soma. From the Kāvyānuśā-
sana and its commentary, on the other hand, we learn that
its author was son of Nemikumāra and Mahā-(mahī?-)devi or Vasundharā; while his native town, called Rāhaḍapura
from the shrine of a deity of that name, is mentioned, as
well as described in a verse by the author himself.

¹ Except, as P. V. Kane notes (HSP, p. 278), by Raināpaṇa pp. 46,
75, 224, 233, 259, 299.
² For summary of the topics of Hemacandra’s Kāvyānuśāsana see
below vol. ii, ch. vii (6).
³ IOC iii, pp. 330-1.
⁴ So also in Jnānavardhana, Simhadeva and Kṣemahamsa-ganū’s
comms. on this verse.
⁵ p. 1 vṛtti, and the concluding verse.
⁶ p. 1 vṛtti.
⁷ IOC iii, p. 332. In the Nir. Sag. Press edition of the work, this
verse is also given at p. 10, but the words asmābhīr uktam, preceding
it in the India Office MS, are wanting.
Vāgbhaṭa II also appears to cite Vāgbhaṭa I as one of his authorities. Both the Vāgbhaṭas, however, quote from the poet Vāgbhaṭa, author of the Nemi-nirvāṇa. Vāgbhaṭa II citing the poem by name frequently for the purpose of illustrating the characteristics of a good poem (e.g. p. 16). Vāgbhaṭa I may or may not be identical with the poet of the Nemi-nirvāṇa; but Vāgbhaṭa II should be distinguished from both. We must also distinguish the medical writer Vāgbhaṭa, son of Siṃhagupta.

Vāgbhaṭa I seems to have been contemporaneous with Hemacandra, and lived under Cālukya Jayasiṃha Siddharāja of Aṇahilla-pattana, who flourished from 1094 to 1143 A.D. We have references to this king and his capital in iv. 45, 76, 81, 85 and 132, and he is described as son of king Karnaḍeva. Both Jinavardhana Sūri and Siṃhadeva Gaṇi in their commentaries explain that the prince referred to is Jayasiṃha, son of Karnaḍeva, of Aṇahilla-pāṭaka. It also appears from what Siṃhadeva Gaṇi on iv. 148 says that Vāgbhaṭa was probably a mahāmātya of the said prince, a statement which is supported by the description given of our author in Prabhācandra Sūri’s Prabhāvaka-carita (p. 205),

1 ii, p. 31: iti daṇḍi-vāmana-vāgbhāṭādi-praṇītā daśa kavya-guṇāḥ, vayaṃ tu mādhuryaujaḥ-prasāda-lakṣaṇāḥs trīneva guṇāṁ manyāmahi.

2 The verses quoted in Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra from the Nemi-nirvāṇa are given by Jacob, op. cit. p. 309.

3 Winternitz thinks (Geschichte der Ind. Lit. ii, p. 338 fn 1; iii, p. 22 fn 1, also iii, p. 64) that Vāgbhaṭa I is the same as the poet of the Nemi-nirvāṇa.—Jahalaṇa ascribes the verse anālocaṇa premṇaḥ to one Vāgbhaṭa, but it does not occur in any of these Vāgbhaṭas. It occurs, however, in Amaru 80. It is cited anonymously by Vallabhadeva 1170; while in the Sadukti-karnaṃṭa it is attributed to Rājaśekhara, and in Kavindra-vacana 372 to the poetess Viṣṇuṣṭambā.

4 And not Jayasiṃha of Kashmir, as Harichand (p. 49) erroneously gives it.

5 Second half of the 13th century, see Buhler’s Hemacandra note 1; also Vāgbhaṭālaṃ (ed. Kāvyamālā 1916) p. 1-2 fn.
from which we also learn that Vāgbhaṭa was living in 1123 A.D. and also in 1157 A.D. Vāgbhaṭa’s literary activity, therefore, may be assigned roughly to the first half of the 12th century.

The Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra, consisting of five Paricchedas, covers in 260 verses most of the topics of Poetics, but excludes Dramaturgy. Although it claims a large number of commentaries, it is a small compilation of no superior merit. It speaks of ten Guṇas instead of three of Mammaṭa and Hemacandra, and only two Rītas, namely Vaidarbha and Gauḍiya. Weber’s Berlin MS no. 1718 adds a sixth chapter; see also Burnell, Cat. Tanjore MSS, p. 576.

Vāgbhaṭa II appears to be a later writer. His reference to Vāgbhaṭa I and considerable borrowing from Hemacandra give us one limit to his date. The other terminus¹ is unknown; for the Jaina authors (excepting Hemacandra) are rarely quoted by later writers on the subject. He may have been earlier than Deveśvara, whose borrowings, however, are not conclusive enough for any chronological inference. Vāgbhaṭa II himself cites two of his own works, viz. Rśabhadeva-carita (p. 15, called a mahākāvya) and Chandonuśāsana (p. 20); but of these nothing is known. In two illustrative verses there are references to two princes called Mūlarāja (p. 45) and Vibhākara (p. 44). This Vibhākara is unknown, but Mūlarāja appears to be the same as the founder of the Cālukya dynasty at Aṇahilla-pattana (= Anhilvāḍ) in Gujarat². A MS of Kāvyānuśāsana (Eggeling, Ind. Office Cat. no. 1157) is dated in Saṃvat 1515 (= 1458-59 A.D.). Vāgbhaṭa II probably flourished in the 14th century.

Like Hemacandra’s work of the same name, the Kāvyānu-

¹ Harichand Sastri (op. cit. p. 49) places him in the 13th century, but he does not state the grounds of his opinion.

² Peterson notes (iii, App. p. 124) a reference in the puṣpikā of a MS of Hemacandra’s Tṛiśaṭi-śalāka-puruṣa to one Nemikutumāra, who flourished in Saṃvat 1295, and he queries whether this Nemikutumāra was our Vāgbhaṭa’s father (iv, p. lxxi).
śāsana of Vāgbhaṭa II is written in the form of Sūtra and a running commentary; but it is a much smaller work of five Adhyāyas. It covers most topics of Poetics but there is no treatment of dramaturgy. It speaks, however, of three Guṇas and three Rītis after Mammaṭa. The name and definition of poetic figures in these Jaina writers differ in some cases from those of orthodox authors. They do not exceed 40 in number, but Vāgbhaṭa II gives nearly 70 poetic figures.

( 3 )

No commentaries on Hemacandra and Vāgbhaṭa II is known, but the Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra¹ of Vāgbhaṭa I appears to have been fortunate in this respect. Of the commentators on this work, whose names are noted below, Jinavardhana Sūri and Śimhadeva Gaṇi are better known, and their commentaries have been published. Jinavardhana was pupil of Jinarāja Sūri and was a priest of Kharatara-gaccha from about 1405 to 1419 A.D.². In some catalogues (e.g. Mitra 2814), his name is given as Ādinātha.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hemacandra


Vāgbhaṭa I

Editions. Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra (1) ed. by A. Borooah, Calcutta

1 The published text of this work contains five chapters, which is also the number in the Bodleian, Stein, Madras and India Office MSS; but Weber’s MS (no. 1718) adds a sixth chapter, which appears to deal with the figure yamaka.

2 Klatt in IA xi p. 249; Bhandarkar, Rep. 1882-3, p. 25; IOC iii, no. 1156 and 2656a.

Commentaries. (1) by Jinaardhana Sūri, who was a priest of Kharatara-gaccha from about 1405 to 1419. Ed. with the text in Granthamālā iii, as noted above. Ādinātha in Mitra 2814 (Aufrecht i. 559a) is the same as Jinaardhana. A MS copied in Saṃvat 1610 =1553-54 A.D. (Cat. MSS BORI xii, p. 323).

(2) By Simhadeva Gañi, ed. NSP, Bombay, as noted. In ALeip MS no. 824, p. 269, the commentary is called Cūrṇi. But this name is not found in Jammu MS no. 1231, p. 274.

(3) By Samayasundara, pupil of Sakalacandra, who was a pupil of Jinaacandra. His comm. was composed in Ahmedabad for Harirāma in 1636 A. D. See Peterson iv, p. cxxvi. Also wrote a comm. on Raghu.

(4) By Rājahāmsa Upādhyāya, pupil of Jinatilaka Sūri who was a pupil of Jinaprabha Sūri of Kharatara-gaccha. The MS noticed by Bhandarkar (Rep. 1883-84, pp. 156, 279) was copied in Saṃvat 1486=1430 A.D. See P. K. Gode’s note in Calcutta Orient. Journal ii, pp. 312-14, in which he gives 2nd half of 14th century (between 1350 and 1400 A. D.) as the probable date of this commentary.


(6) Vivaraṇa of Gañesa, son of Anantabhaṭṭa and disciple of Bhāskara. Aufrecht i. 559a. 794a ; IOC iii, no. 1155/702b, p. 330. A MS copied in 1713 A.D.

(7) Āvacūrī. Author’s name unknown. Aufrecht ii. 132a, iii. 118b.

(8) Jhāna-pramodikā of Vācanācārya Jhānapramoda-gañi.

**Vāgbhata II**


**JAYADEVA**

(1)

Jayadeva, author of the popular text-book *Candrāloka*, is otherwise known as Piṭūṣavarṣa (i. 2)\(^1\). He himself gives us the names of his parents as Mahādeva and Sumitṛā (i. 16). The name Jayadeva, however, is borne by our author in common with many other Sanskrit writers. Of the fifteen or more different persons, mentioned by Aufrecht, as bearing the same name, it seems likely that our author is identical with the poet who wrote the well-known drama called the *Prasanna-rāghava*; for in the prologue to that drama there are two verses (i. 14-15) which inform us that the dramatist was also son of Mahādeva of the Kauṇḍinya-gotra and Sumitṛā, a coincidence of names which does not seem to be accidental. Aufrecht, however, identifies\(^2\) our author with Jayadeva who composed the well-known lyric named *Gita-govinda*; but apart from all arguments derived from the style and poetic genius of the two writers, which possess few kindred excellences, the fact that the author of the lyric, in one of his

1 Also in a verse given at the end in some MSS, e.g. Peterson ii, p. 109, *Madras Cat.* xxii, p. 8656: *piṭūṣavarṣa-prabhavam candrālokaṃ manoharam* etc. Also the verse *jayanti yājñika-śrīman-mahādevāṅgajanmanah/ sūkti-piṭūṣa-varsasya jayadeva-kaver girah*, commented on in the *Saradāgama* and the *Rākāgama* commns. These verses are wanting in the Calcutta ed. The *Rākāgama* comm. of Gāgabhaṭṭa expressly states: *Jayadevasyaiva piṭūṣavarṣa iti nāmāntaram.*

2 *ZDMG* xxvii, p. 30.
concluding verses,\(^1\) tells us that he was son of Bhojadeva and Rāmādevī (or Vāmādevī or Rādhādevī, according to other readings) stands seriously against the proposed identification. The identity of Jayadeva with the logician Pakṣadhara, also called Jayadeva, is equally doubtful, and Aufricht mentions the two names separately. The name Pakṣadhara, no doubt, was a mere title given to the logician from the circumstance of his having been able to maintain by subtle reasoning whatever side of a question he undertook to defend; but the argument for his identity with our Jayadeva, relied on by Hall\(^2\), that Jayadeva in his drama refers (i. 18) to his knowledge of pramāṇa, befitting a logician, is hardly convincing and sufficient\(^4\).

(2)

The date of Jayadeva yet remains unsettled. There is hardly any doubt, however, that he should be placed earlier than Keśava Miśra, who cites (p. 47) the verse kadali kadali from the Prasanna-rāghava (i. 37). As Keśava flourished in the middle of the 16th century, we may safely assign Jayadeva to a period earlier than that. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the Śaradāgama commentary on the Candra-loka, was composed by Pradyotana Bhaṭṭa in 1583 A.D.\(^4\), under the patronage of a Bundella prince, named Vīrabhadra, of the Vaghela dynasty, who himself wrote a commentary on Vāt-

\(^1\) xii, p. 171, ed. N. S. P. 1917. It is not commented upon by Kumbha in his Rasika-priyā comm., but Śaṅkara, in his Rasa-maṇjari comm. says: adhunā pitr-mātr-nāma nibadhnan prāthayate sajanān (ed N. S. P. loc cit). The same in the colophon in Bühler’s MSS (Kashmir Rep. p. 46), where read Rāmādevi for Rāmadeva.

\(^2\) Introd. to Sāmkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya (Bibl. Ind Calcutta 19.56), pp. 62 63. Keith (Indian Logic p. 33f) appears to accept the identification.

\(^3\) Jayadeva, author of a manual on Erotics, called Ruti-maṇjari in 60 verses (ed. in Haeberlin and by Pavolini in Giornale della Soc. Asiat. Italiana, 1904 pp. 371f) is probably a different and later writer.

\(^4\) AF] no. 467 (51) p. 158; ALeip no. 820, p. 268.
śyāyana (called *Kandarpa-cūḍāmaṇi*) in Samvat 1633=1577 A.D.\(^1\) We may push this limit to the date of Jayadeva’s work back to the beginning of the 14th century, because some verses from the *Prasanna-rāghava* (i. 19 and 33)\(^2\) are quoted in *Śrāṅgadhara-paddhati* (164 and 3520), compiled in 1363 A.D.; while Śiṅgabhūpāla, whose date has been fixed at 1330 A.D., cites the drama itself in his *Rasāṃḍava-sudhākara* (pp. 258, 277). This gives us one terminus to the date of Jayadeva in the first quarter of the 14th century\(^4\).

The other terminus is given by the inference that Jayadeva is later than Ruuyaka; for in his *Candrāloka* he directly adopts some of the original definitions of poetic figures given for the first time by Ruuyaka. The figure Vīkalpa, for instance, which (as both Ruuyaka himself and Jayaratha inform us)\(^4\) was invented and defined for the first time by Ruuyaka,


2 Other verses quoted are ii. 22 (=3557), vii. 59 (=3626), vii. 60 (=3631).

3 Paranjpe and Panse in their edition (Poona 1894) of the drama *Prasanna-rāghava* (p. xiii f) seek to identify Jayadeva with the logician Pakṣadhara Jayadeva and assign him to a period between 1500 and 1577 A.D. So also Peterson in introd. to *Subhāṣ* p. 37f. Cf also Eggeling *IOC* ii, pp. 332f. Winternitz (Geschichte der Ind. Lit. iii, p. 26. fn 3) thinks that Jayadeva could not have written long before Appayya. But all these scholars appear to have overlooked this quotation in Śrāṅgadhara. No chronological conclusion is inferable from Jayadeva’s mention of the poet Cora; for Bühler’s identification of this poet with Bihlaṇa is not free from doubt (see Solf, Die Kashmir Recension der Pañcāśikā, Kiel 1886, p. xxii f; also see on the question S. K. De, Hist. of Skt. Lit., Calcutta 1947, pp. 368-69). Nor should stress be laid on the fact that verses from the *Prasanna-rāghava* occur in the *Mahānāṭaka*; for the date of the latter, as well as its proper text, cannot be taken to have been satisfactorily settled (see Lévi ii, p. 48; Sten Konow, Ind. Drama pp. 88-9). Jayadeva himself, as a rhetorician, is quoted by very late writers like Appayya, Keśava and Bhīmasena.

4 Cf Jacobi in *ZDMG* lxii, p. 600, note 1. Ruuyaka says expressly
is literally copied by Jayadeva (v. 112). We cannot, therefore, place Jayadeva, who upholds the views peculiar to Ruyyaka as well as Mammaṭa, earlier than the second half of the 12th century.

Jayadeva, therefore, should be assigned to the period between the last quarter of the 12th century and the first quarter of the 14th, a closer approximation than which is not possible at present; but perhaps we may tentatively place him in the first half of the 13th century.

( 3 )

The Candrāloka is a general treatise on Poetics in ten chapters (called mayūkhas) and about 350 verses, written in the Anuṣṭubh metre. The Calcutta edition of the text, published in 1874¹, enumerates the following divisions: (1) Vāgvicāra ( śl. 16). (2) Doṣa-nirūpaṇa ( śl. 44½). (3) Lakṣaṇa-nirūpaṇa ( śl. 11). (4) Guṇa-nirūpaṇa, given as ten in number ( śl. 12). (5) Alāmāra-nirūpaṇa, consisting of Śabdālāmākāras ( śl. 10), Alāmākārānukramaṇiṇikā ( śl. 16) and Arthālāmākāras ( śl. 174). (6) Rasādi-nirūpaṇa ( śl. 24), incidentally dealing with three Rītis and five Vṛttis. (7) Dvani-nirūpaṇa ( śl. 18). (8) Guṇībhuṭa-vaṇgya ( śl. 10). (9) Laksṇa-nirūpaṇa ( śl. 15). (10) Abhidhā-nirūpaṇa ( śl. 4). This arrangement is substantially followed in the Leipzig MS 819 (which contains only five mayūkhas) and correspond closely with the arrangement mentioned by Gaṅgādhara in his commentary (p. 9) on Appayya’s Kuvalayāṇanda, where the chapters are given thus: 1. Śabda-mayūkha. 2. Doṣa-mayūkha. 3. Laksṇa-mayūkha. 4. Guṇa-

with regard to this figure: pūrvair akṛta-viveko’tra darśita ity avaganta-vyam, upon which Jayaratha remarks: anenaśya granthakṛd-upaṇa-tvam eva darśitam (p. 159). Also the figure Vicitra (Ruyyaka p. 133= Jayadeva v. 82).

¹ The Calcutta edition (by Jivananda) of 1906 substantially keeps to this arrangement and numbering of verses in the different chapters. The work contains about 300 verses, but the numbering differs to some extent in the different editions. The author gives his own illustrations.

It will be seen from this that the section on Arthālaṃkāra in chapter v is the most considerable part of the work, which appears to have become, to the exclusion of the rest of the work, a popular manual of poetic figures. It was specially adapted for this purpose by Appayya Dīkṣita’s Kuvalayānanda, which bodily incorporates the Kārikās of this section (with only slight modification), himself only writing the running prose commentary and adding a few supplementary figures. This work of Appayya’s, therefore, may be regarded, in a sense, as a commentary on the Arthālaṃkāra-chapter of the Candrāloka. Appayya himself indicates his indebtedness in one of the prefatory verses² by saying that the definition-stanzas of the Candrāloka are borrowed in his own work, but there are a few modifications and additions³ of his own. He also explains in the concluding verse how his work came to be called Kuvalayānanda (lit. ‘delight of lotuses’) from the Candrāloka (lit. ‘the sight or light of the moon’):

\[
\text{candrāloko vijyatām, šaradāgama-sambhavaḥ/}
\text{ḥṛdyāḥ kuvalayānando yat-prasādād abhūd ayam.}
\]

which, apart from the obvious pun involved, praises the Candrāloka, the cause of its commentary called Šaradāgama, from the contact of both of which the charming Kuvalayānanda originated. This Šaradāgama commentary obviously

¹ The text as commented upon by Pradyotana Bhaṭṭa, Gāgābhaṭṭa and Vaidyanātha (Madras Cat. xi, 12876-78) contains ten mayūkhas. MSS. of the complete text noticed also in Mitra ii p. 177, v p. 103, ix p 184 · Peterson ii 109.

² yeṣām candrāloko drṣyante lakṣya-laksanā-ślokaḥ/ prāyas ta eva, teṣām itaresāṁ tvabhīnavā vīcacyante.

³ The differences of reading in the Kārikās are noted in Halasynatha Sastrī’s ed. of Kuvalayānanda (with the Rasika-rañjanī of Gangādhara), Kumbhakonum 1892.
refers to the commentary of the same name on the *Candrāloka*, composed by Pradyotana Bhaṭṭa in 1583 A. D.¹.

But on account of the wholesale appropriation of this chapter of Jayadeva’s work, the title *Candrāloka* appears to have been frequently applied to the Arthālaṃkāra-section of the work² alone, as well as to Appayya’s *Kuvalayānanda*³ itself. Thus, the India Office MS 2656, Weber 1721 and Madras MSS 12871-74 constitute in reality the Arthālaṃkāra-section of the *Candrāloka*, embodied in the *Kuvalayānanda*, and not the whole text, but they are entitled *Candrāloka*. Appayya’s work does not end with the hundred or 108 poetic figures⁴ dealt with by Jayadeva, but it adds a supplementary chapter on a few additional figures. In some texts of the

¹ Vaidyanātha, apparently ignorant of the existence of the *Saradāgama* commentary, interprets (ed. N. S. P. 1917 p. 188) the phrase *saradāgama-sambhah* as referring to some previous original of the *Candrāloka* itself. An instance of similar ignorance on the part of the commentator is given by the story of Āśādhara in his comm. on the *Kuvalayā* (p 86) that Appayya composed the *Candrāloka* itself at the request of the king of Venukaṭaṅgirī, and later on wrote his *Kuvalayā* on its basis. Gāṅḍādhara, a more reliable commentator on Appayya’s work (who tells us that Appayya was the Guru of a brother of his grandfather) interprets the phrase correctly as: *atra candrāloka-nāma granthah saradāgama-nāmnā rīkā-granthena sambhava utpatthih* (p 283). The supposition (*ṣūr* ii, pp. 66-9) that Appayya’s utilisation of Jayadeva’s work was resented by the latter, who is said to have made a veiled reference to this fact in the prologue to the *Prasanna-rāghava* (where the stage-manager alludes to the stealing of his name) is disproved by the fact that Appayya lived long after Jayadeva.

² Cf. Gāṅḍāhara on *Kuvalayā* p. 9: *candrāloko’ṛthālaṃkārātmakac eva, na tvany a iti keśāmed brahamah.*

³ Thus, Regnault (*Rhetorique Sanskrite* p. 375) speaks of the *Candrāloka* as being composed of 151 ślokas, dealing with the definition and illustration of poetic figures, which description applies to the *Kuvalayā*.

⁴ This is not the largest number of poetic figures enumerated and defined in works on Alāmkāra. Māmata defines 61, Ruyyaka 75 Arthālaṃkāras; but Sobhākaramitra gives 109. Appayya Dīkṣita 115 Alāmkāras, which go on multiplying!
Candrāloka this appears to have been erroneously included. A considerable confusion is also noticeable in the different MSS of Jayadeva's and Appayya's works as to the arrangement of the three opening verses, as well as with regard to the total number of Ślokas contained in the Arthālaṃkāra-section. The verse paraspara-tapaḥ-sampat occurs in most accepted texts of this section of the Candrāloka, but it is not intelligible why Jayadeva should add this benedictory verse in a chapter, which occurs in the middle of the book. Gaṅgādhara pointedly remarks that this verse is not Jayadeva's but was composed by Appayya himself as prefatory to his own work.

( 4 )

THE COMMENTATORS ON JAYADEVA

Of the commentators on the Candrāloka, mention has already been made of Pradyotana Bhaṭṭa (alias Padmanābha Miśra) and his commentary, called Candrāloka prakāśa Śaradāgama. He is described as son of Miśra Balabhadra, and his patron's name is given as Vīrabhadra (or 'rudra)-deva, son of Rāmacandra and grandson of Vīrabhānu, king of Ayodhya, of the Vaghela (Vandella) family. His commentary is dated in 1583 A.D.; while his patron lived in the second half of the 16th century, as we find Vīrabhadra's commentary (called Kandarpa-cūḍāmani) on Vātsyāyana is dated in 1577 A.D. Vīrabhadra is said to have murdered Abul Fazl at the instigation of Prince Selim His Court-pandit

1 Gaṅgādhara op. cit. p. 9: "tathā paraspara-tapahaṃsampat" iti candrāloka-nāndi-sloka ity api bhrama eva; pañcamamayükhe śadā-laṃkārān nirūpya "upamā yatra sādṛśya" ityādina arthālaṃkāra-prastāve nāṇḍyā evābhāvat. The same remark applies apparently to the second verse alaṃkāraḥ bālānam and to v. 174 which alludes to "Veṇkaṭa-prabhu", for they appear to be Appayya's additions. Cf IOC iii, pp. 333-34 for a discussion of this point.

2 The Madras MS reads vandella, but the Florentine MS (AFl p. 158) has vāghela.
Mitra Miśra wrote the Viramitrodaya, in which he mentions his patron's name.

There is another commentary called Ramā\(^1\) written by Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa, who is probably not identical with Vaidyanātha Tatsat, the commentator on Govinda's Kāvyaprādīpa and Appayya's Kuvalayānanda, although the two writers are taken as identical in most catalogues. The colophon to their commentaries distinctly make out their respective family-names as Pāyaguṇḍa and Tatsat; while in one of the introductory verses of the Ramā our Vaidyanātha distinctly calls himself Pāyaguṇḍa which is a well-known Mahārāṣṭra surname; but he does not give his own genealogy. He appears to have written a commentary called Gadā on Nāgoji's Paribhāṣendu-śekhara; he must, therefore, be later than the beginning of the 18th century.

There is another less known commentary, called Rākāgama or "Sudhā, composed by Gāgābhaṭṭa, alias Viśveśvara, son of Dinakara (or Dīvākara) Bhaṭṭa, who was a Mīmāṃsaka. Viśveśvara, who also wrote a number of Mīmāṃsā and Smṛti works (Aufrecht i. 587b), was a great-great-grandson of Rāmeśvara, nephew of the well-known Mīmāṃsaka Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, whose date is the first quarter of the 17th century\(^1\). Viśveśvara, therefore, is a comparatively modern writer who probably flourished in the beginning of the

---

1 The name of his commentary is often given, through a confusion, as Harilocana-candrikā (Aufrecht i. 182a), which itself appears as a mistaken name for the Alamkāra-candrikā comm. of Vaidyanātha Tatsat on Kuvalayānanda; the mistake arising from the word harilocana-candrikā occurring in the benedictory verse to the latter commentary, as well as from this confusion between the commentators on Jayadeva and Appayya respectively. The benedictory verse runs thus: anucintya mahālaksmin harilocana-candrikāṃ kurve kuvalayānanda-sad-a'ṃkāracāndrikām. See under Appayya Dīvīśita for the commentary. To Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍe, however, is ascribed a Laghu Kuvalayānanda (BORI MS Cat. xii, no. 287, pp. 342-43).

2 See above p. 167. The genealogy is given thus: Rāmeśvara →Nārāyaṇa→Rāmakṛṣṇa→Dinakara→Viśveśvara.
18th century, and should not be confused with Viśveśvara author of the Alamkāra-kaustubha (q. v.).

Two other little known commentaries are mentioned below.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


**MSS.** Madras Cat. xii, 12860 (which contains the verses of the Candrāloka with Kuvalay*), 12871-73. Most of the MS mentioned in other catalogues (see Aufrecht), however, contain the Arthālaṃkāra-section and not the whole text, see above p. 201-2. The Alamkāra-śutaka of Jayadeva in Oppert ii, 2763 is a descriptive name perhaps of this section
of the Candrāloka. The Alamkāra-saṅgraha in Mitra 1612 is in reality this Arthālaṃkāra-section.


VIDYAḌHARA

(1)

The date of Vidyādhara, author of the Ekāvali1 has been fixed with sufficient approximation by K. P. Trivedi and R. G. Bhandarkar2. The latest writer quoted and mentioned by Vidyadhara is Ruyyaka (p. 150); and this gives us one

1 Aufrecht (i. 75) mentions three different works called Ekāvali, which appear to be the same work. The first and the third are undoubtedly identical and refer to our Ekāvali, but the second is described by Burnell 54a (cf. Oppert ii, 3605) as composed by Mahāmāheśvara Kavi. This, however, appears to be a title of Vidyādhara himself, and is apparently the source of the confusion of our Vidyādhara with Aṅkūnagavgupta who also bore the same title (see Weber ii, no. 1723). The colophon in the Madras MS (Madras Cat. xii, p. 8611) reads: iti śrīmātadhi-viśveśvarasya kaver vidyādharyasya kṛtvekāvalīnāmy alamkāraśāstre etc. The first verse quoted in Burnell is the same as found in all the texts of our Ekāvali. The commentary Taralā noticed by Weber (loc. cit.) is apparently the same as Taralā of Mallinātha. The Keli-rahasya on Erotics is ascribed to Vidyādhara by Aufrecht, but the colophon gives the author's name as Vaidya Vidyādhara.

2 Introd to the text in B. S. S. ed. and Bhandarkar Rep, 1887-91, p lxvi f.
terminus to his date at the middle of the 12th century. This conclusion is apparently supported by Vidyādhara's mention (p. 19) of Śriharṣa, author of the Naiṣadha, who lived very probably in the 12th century; but Vidyādhara's allusion in the same context to the poet Harīhara, who is said by him to have obtained amazing wealth from a prince Arjuna (presumably the ruler of Mālava of that name), puts this terminus a little lower at the first quarter of the 13th century. The Ekāvali, in its turn, is quoted by Śiṅgabhūpāla, whose date is fixed at 1330 A.D.; while Mallinātha, at the end of the 14th century, commented upon it. The internal evidence of the text, therefore, assigns it to a period between the first quarter of the 13th and the first quarter of the 14th century.

This approximation has been considerably narrowed down to the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century by the identification of king Narasimha of Kaliṅga, panegyrised in the illustrative verses of the work, with either of the two Narasimhas of Kaliṅga, whose dates fall between 1282 and 1327. The patron of our author is described as one who crushed the pride of Hammīra (pp. 176, 177, 257, 260), who is probably the famous Cauhan prince, the hero of

1 See Buhler in JBRAS x. p. 31f, xi. p. 279f; K. T. Telang in IA ii, p. 71, iii 81f; Buhler, Rep. 1874-75, p. 8.
2 See Trivedi's note at p. 348.
3 Rasārnavasudhākara p. 107=Ekāv. i. 2. Cf ŚgŚ i, p. 7f. This verse occurs, however, as the third prāṣasti-śloka in the printed text of Bihlaṇa's Karṇa-sundari (ed. Kāvyamālā 7, 1895, p. 56).—Śiṅgabhūpāla refers to Vidyādhara and his Ekāvali expressly in the following terms: utkalādhipateḥ śrīgāra-rasābhumāñino narasimha-devasya cītam anuvartamāṇena vidyādharenā kavinā bādham abhyantarikṛto'si, evam khalu samarhitam ekāvalyām anena (ed. Triv. Skt. Ser. p. 206). K. P. Trivedi (Introd. p. xxiii) comes to the conclusion that Vidyādhara was patronised by Keśari-Narasimha (1282-1307 A.D.) or by Pratāpa-Narasimha (1307-1327).
4 As the author himself says (Śl. 7): karomi narasimhasya cātuślokan udāharan. In this respect the work resembles Pratāpa-rudrayasobhūṣaṇa of Vidyānātha, Raghunātha-bhūpāliya of Kṛṣṇa Yajvan and Alamkāra-maṃjūśa of Devasaṃkara.
Nayacandra Sūri's poem, who began his reign about 1283 A.D. and attempted a conquest of Southern countries. All this makes it probable that the \textit{Ekāvalī} was composed towards the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century.

Vidyādhara appears to have written a work on Erotics entitled \textit{Kali-rahasya}².

\begin{center}
(2)
\end{center}

\textit{Mallinātha}

The date of Mallinātha, author of the \textit{Taratā} commentary on the \textit{Ekāvalī}, has been fixed at the end of the 14th century by Bhandarkar and Trivedi³. He must have written his commentary after a certain time had elapsed from the composition of the original text; for from \textit{śl}. 6 it appears that the \textit{Ekāvalī} was not studied for some time because it had no commentaries. He is identical with Kolācala Mallinātha Sūri (Pedda Bhaṭṭa) who is the well-known scholiast and commentator on the five standard Mahākavyas of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Bhaṭṭi, Śrīharṣa and Māgha, in some of which he quotes from the \textit{Ekāvalī} itself.

The \textit{Ekāvalī}, consisting of Kārikā and Vṛtti in eight Unmešas, utilises the works of Mammaṭa and Ruuyaka in its treatment of poetic figures in the last two chapters (vii-viii). After a general discussion of the definition of Kāvyā in ch. i it deals in ch. ii with the three Vṛttis, namely, Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā and Vyaḍjanā. Ch. iii and iv are devoted to Dhvani, and ch. v-vi deal with three Guṇas, three Rītis, and the Doṣas. The illustrative verses are all composed by Vidyādhara himself and consist of panegyrics of the author's patron Narasimha of Utkala.

1 See ed. Kirtane v. 56. also p. 27; Bhandarkar \textit{op. cit.} p. lxvii f.
2 Aufrecht i. 537 b.
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Edition, ed. K. P. Trivedi in the Bombay Sansk. Series 63, 1903, with the Taralā of Mallinātha and introd. and notes. There is another comm. by Prabhākara (b. 1564 A.D.), son of Mādhavabhaṭṭa and grandson of Rāmeśvara Bhaṭṭa.

VIDYĀNĀTHA

(1)

The latest writer that Vidyānātha cites is Ruyyāka (pp. 291, 334), whose lost work Sāhitya-mīmāṃsā is also apparently referred to at p. 11. Vidyānātha, in his turn, is quoted extensively but anonymously for definitions of poetic figures by Mallinātha in the latter's many commentaries on the different Kāvyas.

This gives us the same broad limits to his date as to that of Vidyādhara; and other considerations make it probable that he was contemporaneous with the latter. The Pratāparudra-yaśo-bhūṣana of Vidyānātha was written, like the Ekaśālī, with the obvious object of panegyrising the king whose name it bears on its title. All the illustrative verses in the work eulogise the same king (also called Vīrarudra or Rudra), who is described as the son of Mahādeva and Muniṃūḍi or Mummāḍambā (pp. 12, 13, 16, 17, 133); and a short drama, named Pratāparudra-kalyāṇa after him, is introduced in the third chapter to illustrate the characteristics of a drama, discussed in the work itself. He is described as a Kākatiya king whose capital was Ekaśālī-nagara in the Tṛṅgga or Andhra country, and who is said to have vanquished, among other kings, the princes of the Yādava family. All these and

1 For the quotations, see Trivedi's introd. to the text p. ix.
2 Separately entered by Aufrecht i. 349a and published in the Granthamālā vol. i.
3 so called, as the Ratnāpana explains (p. 10, also Ratnasāna p. 485) from the goddess Kākati he worshipped.
other details have led K. P. Trivedi to identify Vidyānātha’s patron with Pratāparudra the seventh Kākatya king of Ekaśīla or Warangal, whose inscriptions date between 1298 and 1317 A.D.¹, and who is placed by Sewell between 1295 and 1323 A.D., and by Sesagiri Sastri between 1268 and 1319 A.D.² The Yādava king referred to, therefore, seems to be Rāmacandra, sixth ruler of the Yādavas of Devagiri, whose dates are 1271 to 1309 A.D.³ We may, therefore, assign Vidyānātha approximately to the end of the 13th and beginning of the 14th century. It has been suggested that the author's real name was Agastya Panḍita, and Vidyānātha was his title.

Vidyānātha’s work, like the Ekāvali, consists of Kārikā and Vṛtti with illustrative verses in praise of the author’s patron. In nine Prakaraṇas it deals respectively with the topics of Nāyaka, Kāvyā, Nāṭaka, Rasa, Doṣa, Guṇa, Śadālaṅkāra, Arthālaṅkāra and Miśrālaṅkāra. In the third Prakaraṇa, as we have already noted, it illustrates the requirement for a Nāṭāka by a model drama. Its treatment is based mainly on Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka, Bharata and Dhanaṅjaya, but it is more comprehensive than the Ekāvali inasmuch as it includes Dramaturgy.

( 2 )

Kumārasvāmin

Vidyānātha’s commentator Kumārasvāmin describes himself as the son of Kolācala Mallinātha⁴, the well-known

¹ Eggeling (IOC iii, p. 338) gives the dates 1268 and 1319.
² See Trivedi, introd. pp. xvi-xxii. The correct dates appear to be 1298 and 1323 A. D.
³ Bhandarkar, Early Hist. p. 92.
⁴ Nārāyaṇa, who describes himself as a descendant of Kumārasvāmin, gives the genealogy of his ancestors in his comm. on Campūrāmāyaṇa (Madras Catalogue xxii, Kāvyā p. 8212) thus: Mallinātha—Kapardin—Mallinātha Pedubhatṭa—Kumārasvāmin. He speaks of Pedubhatṭa as a Mahāmahopādhyāya, a commentator on Naiṣadha and as having been bathed in gold by Sarvajña (Śingabhūpāla?).
commentator and author of Taralā on the Ekāvalī. He may, therefore, be placed in the beginning of the 15th century. The title of his commentary Ratnāpana (wrongly called Ratnārapaṇa by Eggeling op. cit. p. 338b, following Burnell 36b) signifies, as he himself explains, a market-place where are sold jewels of poetic sentiments, collected together by Vidyānātha, after they have been fashioned on the grindstone furnished by the merits of the hero.

The quotations in the Ratnāpana are numerous and include, besides other well-known names, the Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa of Bhoja, the Ekāvalī, the Sāhitya darpaṇa (p. 245). Cakravartin and his Saṃjīvanī commentary on Ruyyaka, Śiṅgabhūpāla and his Rasārṇava-sudhākara, the author's own father Mallinātha and brother Peddayārya, Bhattachopaṇa and Narahari Sūri. There are numerous references to a work on Rasa, called Bhāva-prakāśa, which is now known to be a work of Śāradātanaya (q.v.). Mention is also made of Vasantarājiya Nāṭya-sāstra, its author Vasantarāja being apparently king Kumāragiri (q.v.) of the same name, who was a patron of Kāṭayavema. A Kavikalpadruma-kāra is also cited at p. 170, but this is a work on grammar (dhātu-pāṭha) by Vopadeva. We know nothing of the Nāṭaka-prakāśa cited at p. 113. On Alamkāra-sudhānīdhi cited on p. 44, see below under Appayya Dīkṣita who also quotes the same work. The Rasa-nirūpana may be by Narahari Sūri, and the Sāhitya-cintāmaṇi is probably the work of the same name composed by Viranārayaṇa (q.v.).

There is another incomplete commentary, called Ratnāsāṇa, included in the Bombay edition of the text. From the colophon of a MS of this work (Madras Trm, II, C, 1923), it appears to have been composed by Tirumalācārya, son of Rāmānujacārya of Śukavaṭa family and disciple of Vātsyāya Rāmānujacārya. He is said to have lived in Rāmatirtha near Koṭipalli in the Godāvari district.

1 For these authors, see chapter on Minor Writers below.
VIDYANATHA
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CHAPTER VIII
FROM VIŚVANĀTHA TO JAGANNĀTHA

VIŚVANĀTHA

(1)

Viśvanātha never cites Ruyyaka and Mammaṭa by name; but, like Vidyādharā and Vidyānātha, he draws very considerably upon the works of both. He adopts, for instance, the definitions of the figures upameyopama and bhṛntimaṭ directly from Ruyyaka, and admits the two figures vikalpa and vicitra which, both Ruyyaka and Jayartha inform us, were inventions of Ruyyaka's.1 It is quite possible, as P.V. Kane holds, that the censorious glancing on Mammaṭa's text, reproved by Viśvanātha (ad ii. 14, p. 57), refers in particular to Ruyyaka's Saṁketa commentary where the latter criticises Mammaṭa on the particular point under discussion. But a surer indication of Viśvanātha's acquaintance with Ruyyaka's works is given by his quotation of the verse bhujāṅga-kundali-vyakta at p. 445 (ad x. 2), which Ruyyaka himself cites (p. 19) as his own from the Śrikanṭha-stava. Viśvanātha quotes two other writers who, in all probability, belong to this century, namely, Jayadeva, author of the Gīta-govinda,2 and

1 For other instances, where Viśvanātha is following or criticizing Ruyyaka, see P. V. Kane's ed. of the text in the introd. and notes.
2 The verse hrddi viśa-latā quoted by Viśvanātha at p 506 (ad x. 39) occurs in the Gīta-govinda, ed. N. S. P. iii. 11, p. 58. It is also ascribed to Jayadeva by Sārṇagadharā (no. 3460) and Vallabhadeva (no. 1314). Jayadeva is quoted in the Sadukti-karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharā and therefore must be placed before 1206 A.D. Buhler and Peterson assign (Kashmir Rep. p. 64 and Subhāsa p. 38) 1116 A.D. as the date of Jayadeva, while Haraprasad Sastri gives the date 1175 A.D. (Notices, 2nd. Ser. 1, p. xxxviii). Jayadeva, however, is said to have been cited by Cāndkāvī, who wrote his epic on Pṛthvirāja of Delhi towards the end of the 12th century (but see WZKM vii, p. 189; JBRAS xi, p. 283). Viśvanātha
Śrīharṣa, author of the Naiṣadha. Viśvanātha also quotes a verse kadali kadali (ad iv. 3) from Prasanna-rāghava (i. 37) of Jayadeva. Again, the Rāja-taraṅgiṇī iv. 441 is quoted in our text at p. 529, under x. 57a (possibly indirectly through Ruuyaka p. 93); but this work of Kahlana’s was not completed till the middle of the 12th century. All this will roughly fix one terminus to the date of Viśvanātha, who cannot thus be placed earlier than the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century.

The other more or less terminal date is given by the date of a MS of the Sāhitya-darpana, discovered by Stein at Jammu, which was written in Saṃvat 1440 = 1384 A.D. This certainly negates the date (viz. the middle of the 15th century) assigned by Weber, Eggeling and Harichand Sastri, the last of whom makes the unfortunate mistake of identifying Cāṇḍīdāsa, referred to as a relative by Viśvanātha, with Cāṇḍīdāsa, the Bengali poet of the 15th century. It may be noted that Kumārasvāmin, at the beginning of the 15th century, names and quotes (pp. 245, 248) the Sāhitya-darpana (iii. 146a, 147 and 150).

All this raises the most likely presumption that Viśvanātha should be assigned to a period ranging roughly from 1200 to 1350 A.D. This approximation can be considerably narrowed down if we can draw any chronological inference from a verse in the Sāhitya-darpana (ad iv. 14, p. 232) which refers to a Muhammadan king named Allāvadiṇa. This

also refers to Laṭaka-melaka (p. 176, ad iii. 212) of Saṅkhadhara, which also belongs to this century.

1 P. 526, ad x. 54 (hanumadādyai)=Naịṣadha ix. 122b p. 520, ad. x. 50 (dhanyāsi vaidarbhī)=ibid iii. 116. For the date of Śrīharṣa see S. K. De, Hist. of Sansk. Lit. pp. 325-26.

2 Jammu Cat. p. 64, no. 349.

3 Hist. of Sansk. Lit. p 231 (Eng. trans. 1904).

4 IOC iii, p. 337. 5 op. cit. p. 115.

6 saṃdhau sarvasva-haraṇam vigrahe prāṇa-nigrahaḥ/ai(l)avadina- nṛpatau na saṃdhir na ca vigrahaḥ.
Allavadina or Alavadina 1 may probably be Sultan 2 Ala-ud-din Khalji, whose army invaded the Deccan and seized Warangal. Even if we suppose that the verse in question was composed in the life-time of that Sultan, who died in 1316 A.D., the Sāhitya-darpaṇa may be presumed to have been composed at a date not earlier than 1300 A.D. At any rate, if this historical deduction is permissible, we may assign Viśvanātha to a period between 1300 and 1350 A.D., or roughly in the first half of the 14th century 3.

Viśvanātha describes himself as the son of Mahākavi Candraśekhara (p. 583, concluding verses) who appears, like his son, to have been a poet and scholar 4, as well as a high official 5 in the court of some king, probably king of Kaliṅga. Nārāyaṇa, who appears to have written also on some topics of Poetics, is either his grandfather or great-great-grandfather; for in his commentary on the Kāvya-prakāśa, Viśvanātha speaks of Nārāyaṇa as asmat-pitāmaha. While in his Sāhitya-darpaṇa (p. 73, ad iii. 4a), the same person is called asmat-vṛddhapitāmaha. Caṇḍīdāsa, who appears to be different from the Bengal author of the Dīpikā commentary on Mammaṭa, is also quoted. 6 He should not be confused with Viśvanātha's relative.

1 We find both these forms of the name in two inscriptions, see JASB xlii, p 108 and Bhavanagar inscription 114 = Prācīna-lekha-mālā ii. 28. In Ģaṛṣākītu's Dātu-pātha this king is referred to as Allavadi (Bhandarkar Rep. 1882-83, p. 43).

2 The sanskritised form of this word suratrāṇa occurs at p. 509 (ad x. 42).


4 His verses are cited at pp. 58, 116, 170, 174, while his works, called Puṣpamālā and Bhāṣārṇava, are referred to at pp. 263 and 316 respectively.

5 Both are described as sāṃdhivigrāhika-mahāpātra.

6 Viśvanātha cites one Puruṣottama (p. 440, ad ix. 4a). A work
Viśvanātha appears to have written a number of works, besides his well-known Sāhitya-darpaṇa; for in it he himself refers to his own productions, namely:

1. Rāghava-vilāsa-kāvya (ad vi. 325a, p. 355).
3. Prabhāvati-parīśaya (ad vi. 182b, p. 320), also referred to in his commentary of Mammaṭa ch. vii.
4. Praśasti-ratnāvali in 16 languages, a karambhaka (ad vi. 337b, p. 358).
5. Candrakalā (ad vi 183a and 184, p. 320-1), a nāṭikā.

He also wrote a commentary called Kāvyaparakāśa-darpaṇa on Mammaṭa’s work; but this was probably composed after he had written his larger independent work on Poetics; for in it he himself refers, while commenting on lakṣaṇā (ch. ii) to the latter work¹. In the Sāhitya-darpaṇa itself he draws very considerably upon Mammaṭa; and although at the beginning of this work, he quotes and criticises at some length Mammaṭa’s definition of poetry, he distinctly reproves all irreverent criticism of this venerable writer, who is declared to be his own upajivyā (ad ii. 14. p. 57). In this commentary Visvanātha refers to a Narasimha-kāvya by himself ².

It is not clear on what grounds Weber and Eggeling³ state that the Sāhitya-darpaṇa was composed “on the banks of the Brahmaputra”, i.e. in Eastern Bengal. It appears on the contrary that Viśvanātha was probably a native of Kaliṅga which we may take at this date to have been co-extensive roughly with Orissa and Ganjam. In his commentary on called Kavitāvatāra is attributed to one Purusottama in Burnell ⁵4a — On Viśvanātha’s genealogy in relation to Nārāyana, Candidāsa and Candrasekhara see Sivarasad Bhattacharya Viśvanātha Kavitavatāra and his references in JOL, Baroda, iv (1954) pp. 35ff.

₁ eṣaṁ ca sūrasya lakṣaṇabhedaṁ iha dārśitāṁ udāhāram ṇama sāhitya-darpaṇette vagantarvaṁ. Also on figure anumōna (ch x): tad uktam mārkṣte sāhitya-darpaṇe.

₂ Anantadāsa in his comm. on Sāhitya-d. quotes a verse on p. with the words: yathā mama tāta-pādānāṁ vijaya-narasimhe.

₃ Cf also Macdonell, Sanāk. Lit. p. 434; SCC vii, no. 53, p. 33.
Mammaṭa, he explains certain expression with Oriya equivalents⁴; and speaking of his ancestor Nārāyaṇa, he refers to king Narasimha-deva of Kaliṅga (presumably Narasimha II. about 1279-1306), at whose court Nārāyaṇa vanquished one Dharmadatta⁵, who is also referred to in the Sāhitya-darpaṇa³ at pp. 73, 79. It is probably in praise of one of the Narasimhas of Kaliṅga that Viśvanātha’s lost poem Narasimha-vijaya was written.

(3)

Though not a work of much originality, the Sāhitya-darpaṇa gives in ten chapters a comprehensive treatment of all topics of Poetics including Dramaturgy. The distribution of topics in the different chapters is as follows: (i) Definition of poetry, (ii) Three Vṛttis of word and sense, (iii) Rasa, (iv) Dhvani and Guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya, (v) Establishment of Vyaṅjanā-vṛtti, (vi) Dramaturgy, (vii) Doṣa, (viii) Guṇa (three in number), (ix) Rītis enumerated as four, Vaidarbhi, Gauḍi, Pāncāli and Lāṭī, (x) Alamkāras. The treatment of Dramaturgy is based mostly on Daśa-rūpaka.

The commentaries on Viśvanātha are not so numerous or important as to deserve any special enumeration. Of the five commentaries mentioned below, that of Rāmacarakṣa Tarkavāgiśa, dated in Śaka 1622=1700 A.D., has been frequently printed with the text.

1 “vaipaṛītyam rucim kuru” iti pāṭhah, atra cintu-padam kāsmirādi-bhāṣāyām aśīlārtha-bodhakam, utkālādi-bhāṣāyām dhṛṣṭa-vāṇḍaka-drava iti, on Mammaṭa v, p. 238 (ed. Jhalakikara).
2 Cited also in the Rasa-pradīpa of Prabhākara, son of Bhaṭṭa Mādhava (Weber i. 823), in which the Sāhitya-darpaṇa is also quoted. Prabhākara’s work was composed in 1583 A.D. For Dharmadatta see Sivaprasad Bhattacharya in the article cited above, p. 360-62.
3 yad āhūḥ śṛi-kalinga-bhūmaṇḍalākhaṇḍala-mahārājādhirāja-śṛi-narasimha-sabhaṇyām dharmadattaṁ sthagayantāḥ sakala-sahṛdayagṛhiṣṭhi-gaṇīṭha-kavi-paṇḍitāmat-pitāmaha-brīman-nārāyaṇadāsa-pāḍah, etc.
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Editions. Published frequently, of which ed. (1) by Nathurama, Education Press, Calcutta 1828, and (2) by E. Röer in Bibl. Indica, Calcutta 1851, are notable. These editions do not contain the comm. of Rāmacaraṇa. Also eds. with Rāmacaraṇa’s comm. Vivṛti (i) by Chandicharan Smritibhusan, Calcutta B. S. 1318. (2) ed. Durgaprasad Dwiveda, Nir. Sag. Press, Bombay 1902, 1915, 1922. (3) by P. V Kane (ch. i, ii, x) with intro. and notes, Bombay first ed. 1910, 2nd. 1923 (with a Hist. of Skt. Poetics). 3rd ed. 1951 (revised and enlarged, but the commentary is not given). (4) by Karunakar Kavyatirtha, with comm. Vijñā-priyā of Maheśvara and Locana of Anantadāsa, Lahore 1938.—Translated into English by J. R. Ballantyne and P. D. Mitra, Bibl. Indica 1875. Our references are to the N. S. P. ed. of 1915 by Durgaprasad Dwiveda, unless otherwise specified.

Commentaries. (1) Locana by Anantadāsa, son of Viśvanātha, a MS of which is dated 1636 A.D. Aufrecht ii. 171a. An incomplete MS (no. 262, p 65) in Jammu Cut. Ed. as noted above. The commentator is described as son of Viśvanātha himself.

(2) Tippana by Mathurānātha Śukla, a voluminous writer, under whose name Aufrecht makes no less than 64 entries. Apparently the same person as Mathurānātha Śukla, a native of Pāṭaliputra in Mālava, who wrote at Benares in 1783 A. D. the Jyotih-siddhānta-sāra by order of prince Dalacandra (but see Aufrecht i. 422-23). One Mathurānātha was also author of a comm. on Kuvalayānanda, and may have been the same person. Aufrecht i. 715b.

(3) Vivṛti by Rāmacaraṇa Tarkavāgīśa, a native of Western Bengal. He was a Chattopadhyay Brahman; his home was at Rāyavāṭi in Burdwan district. He dates his commentary in 1700 A. D. Frequently printed with the text in Bengal editions. Also in N. S. P. ed. 1915, as noted above.
(4) "Prabhā by Gopinātha. Madras Trm C 712. Gopinātha is also the author of the Sumanomanoharā comm. on Mammaṭa. See above p. 173. He is probably identical with Gopinātha Kavirāja who composed, among other works, a commentary on the Raghu-vaṃśa in 1677 A.D. (see Aufrechte i. 163b).

(5) Vijñā-priyā by Maheśvara Bhaṭṭa, Ed. as noted above. This Maheśvara appears to be the same as Maheśvara Nyāyālaṃkāra who commented also on the Kāvyaprakāśa. Middle of the 17th century. See above p. 167.

KEŚAVA MIṢRA AND SAUḌDHODANI

(1)

Keśava himself tells us that he composed his Alamkāra-śekhara at the request of a ruling chief named Māṇikyacandra, son of Dharmacandra and grandson of Rāmacandra, who is said to have ruled near Dilhi (Dhilli) and defeated the king of Kābila (Kabul?). Eggeling¹ is obviously wrong in identifying him with Māṇikyacandra of Tirabhukti or Tirhut; while Buhler² did not go further than suggesting that this prince was not a Kashmirian but ruled or lived in Delhi just before the Muhammadan conquest. The patron of our author, however, appears to be Māṇikyacandra of Koṭ-kaṅgra, whose genealogy corresponds to that given by Keśava and whose date of accession, according to Cunningham³, is 1563 A.D. The literary activity of Keśava may, therefore, be fixed in the third quarter of the 16th century.

(2)

The Kārīkā-portion of the Alamkāra-śekhara, called Sūtra, is declared to have been based on, if not actually taken from, some lost work of an authority who is cited as bhagavān (or

¹ IOC no. 1197.
³ Arch. Survey v. 152f, at p. 160. (cf. JASB, 1907, p. 212).
mahārṣi p. 50) Šauddhodani⁴, Keśava himself apparently assuming the modest rôle of a commentator or interpreter in the running prose Vṛtti. The name Šauddhodani, apparently Buddhistic, is otherwise unknown in Alamkāra literature⁵. Whatever may be the original source of his work, Keśava shows himself conversant with the work of most of his predecessors, and quotes, among more recent writers, Rājaśekhara (pp. 32, 67), Bhoja (p. 7), Mahimabhaṭṭa, Mammaṭa, the Vāgbhāṭalaṃkāra, Devesvara and Jayadeva author of Candrāloka. He also quotes one Śripāda (pp. 4, 5, 6, 23, 27, 32, 72, 81), who may be his master Šauddhodani himself designated by this honorific term, as well as the author of a Kavi-kalpalatā who is described as a follower of this Śripāda⁶. This Kavi-kalpalatā-kāra, however, is neither Devesvara nor Arisimha and Amaracandra, whose works also bear a similar title. The passage cited by Keśava in this connexion (pp. 48-9, venyāḥ sarpaśi-bhrṅgūlyo) gives a list of more or less conventional words useful for the purpose of conveying a simile or metaphor. A comparison of an almost similar passage in Devesvara (p. 157f), who copies it directly from Arisimha and Amaracandra (pp. 135f), will show enough verbal discrepancy to indicate that neither of these sources constitutes the original from which Keśava quotes. A similar discrepancy is also noticeable in another passage of Keśava’s (ratnāṇi yatra tatrādrau pp. 55-6), which at first sight will seem to have been borrowed from Devesvara (p. 36f) who, however, copies it almost literally from Arisimha and Amaracandra

1 Mentioned in exalted terms as: alaṃkāra-vidvā-sūtrakūro bhagavān chauddhodanīḥ parame-kārunikaḥ (p. 2). The Alamkāra-sūtra of Šauddhodani is mentioned at pp. 2, 20.

2 This Šauddhodani should not be identified with the Šauddhodani mentioned in the mangala verse (where it apparently stands for the name of Buddha) of the Vidagdha-mukha-mandana of Dharmadāsa Sūri.

(p. 30f). At the same time, Keśava betrays otherwise an acquaintance with Deveśvara's text, from which he reproduces at least one long passage anonymously (n̄pe kīrti-pratāpājñā p. 57f = Deveśvara p. 26f), which Deveśvara himself probably adapted from Arisiṃha and Amaracandra (p. 27f) but it is curious that Keśava copies here the text of Deveśvara with its variations, rather than the original text of Arisiṃha Amara on this point.

Keśava cites one Śriharśa (p. 71) who may or may not be the same person mentioned by Prabhākara Bhāṣṭa (q. v.) as Śriharśa Miśra, or Harṣa (Śriharśa) who wrote a Vārttika on the Nāṭya-sāstra. The opinions of a writer called Govardhana are frequently cited by Keśava (pp. 17, 29, 37, 43, 49). There is also a reference to Jayadeva pāṇḍita-kavi (p. 17) in the court of an Utkāla-king. If this person is identical with the poet Jayadeva, who is said to have lived under Lakṣmaṇa-sena of Bengal and who also calls himself Jayadeva pāṇḍita-kavi in his Gita-govinda (xii, p. 171)¹, then it is likely that Govardhana, who is quoted immediately before this reference to Jayadeva, may be the poet of that name, who was Jayadeva's contemporary referred to in the beginning of the Gita-govinda.

Keśava, who is described in the colophon as a Nyāya-cārya, tells us that he had already composed seven abstruse treatises on the subject before he undertook the composition of his Alaṃkāra-śekhara. Two of these are apparently those which are mentioned in the text as his own under the citations Alaṃkāra-sarvasva (p. 9) and Vākya-ratna (p. 12) or Kāvya-ratna (p. 72). A Kāvya-ratna is mentioned in Oppert ii. 6237.

The Alaṃkāra-śekhara written in the form of Kārikā and Vṛtti, consists of eight chapters (called Ratnas) and 22 sections (called Marīcīs) with topics distributed as follow: i. Definition

¹ The verse unmīlan-madhu-gandha° of the Gita-govinda (ed. N. S. P. p. 29) is quoted anonymously by Keśava at p. 6, as an instance of the Gauḍī Rīti.
of Kāvya, etc. ii. Three Rītis (Vaidarbhi, Gauḍī and Māgadhī). Ukti, Mudrā with their varieties. iii. Three Vṛttis (Abhidhā etc). iv-vi. Eight Doṣas of Pada, twelve of Vākya and eight of Artha. vii-viii. Five Guṇas of Śabda (Saṃıkṣiptatva, Udāttatva, Prasāda, Ukti and Samādhī), four Guṇas of Artha (Bhāvikatva, Suśabdatva, Paryāyokti and Sudharmitā). ix. Cases when Doṣas become Guṇas. x-xii. Eight Alamkāras of Sabda and fourteen Alamkāras of Artha. Some of the names and definitions are different from those of orthodox writers. xiii-xvii. Devoted mostly to Kavi-sīkṣā topics—poetic convention, mode of describing different objects etc. xviii-xix. Certain verbal tricks, Samasyā-pūraṇa etc. xx. Nine Rasas, topics of Nāyaka-nāyikā, Bhāvas etc. xxi-xxi. Rasa-doṣas ; and letters favourable to each Rasa. It will be seen that although Keśava Miśra accepts Dhvani and Rasa and the general pattern of orthodox Poetics, he appears yet to follow a different tradition, especially in the treatment of Guṇa, Doṣa and Alamkāra. But the difference is not material ; for as noted above, he draws largely upon most of his well-known predecessors.
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APPAYYA DIKSITA

(1)

Appayya Diksita himself furnishes us with a clue to his date. He tells us at the end of his Kuvalayunanda that it was composed at the instance of a South Indian prince
named Veṅkaṭā. Aufrecht, and following him Eggeling identify this patron of Appayya with Veṅkaṭā of Vijayanagara (about 1535 A.D.), while Hultzsch shows that he was Veṅkaṭā I of Pennakonda, whose inscriptions range from Śaka 1508 to 1535 (=1586 to 1613 A.D.). On the other hand, in the colophon to his Śīvādityomani-dipikā (Hultzsch 1056), Appayya mentions as his patron a prince Cinna Bomma, son of Cinnavira and father of Luṅgama Nāyaka. The inscriptions of this chief of Velur (Vellore in the North Arcot district) are dated in Śaka 1471 and 1488 (=1549 and 1566 A.D.). In the last verse of the Kuvalayānanda reference is made to Pradyotana Bhāṭṭa’s commentary Śaradūgama (on the Candrałoka) which in dated 1583 A.D. The extreme limits, therefore, of Appayya’s literary activity are 1549 and 1613 A.D. We may thus assign him to the third and fourth quarters of the 16th century; and as he was alive in the time of Veṅkaṭā I, he may have lived into the beginning of the 17th century. This date is confirmed by the fact that we

1 Cf also śl 168 (ed NSP 1913) which, though occurring also in the text of Jayadeva’s Candrałoka, is probably one of Appayya’s additions.
2 Cat. Bod. 213a. But in his Cat. Cat. 1. 22a and ii. 5a, he assigns the dates, viz. end of the 15th and end of the 16th century respectively. Regnaud’s conjecture (Rhétorique Samsk. p. 375) that Appayya flourished in reign of Kṛṣṇarāja of Vijayanagara in 1520 A.D. is not correct.
3 IOC iii, p. 335.
5 South Ind. inscrip. 1, p. 69f and p. 84. Also see H. D. Velankar in Cat. JBRAS., i. no. 141
6 IA xiii p. 155 and EI iii p. 238 Table.
7 He is said to have lived to the ripe old age of 73 (see introd. to Halasyanatha’s ed. of Kuvalayānanda p. 15). The usually accepted date is 1552-1624 or 1554-1626 A.D. But the date 1520-1593 is argued in JOR, Madras. 1928, pp. 225-237 and 1929, pp. 140-160. See also the Madras Univ. ed. (1929) of Śīvādvaita-nīrṇaya (introd.) and Vanivilas Press ed. of Yādavābhyyudaya vol. ii→(introd.), p. ivf. where the date argued is between 1552 and 1624. Veṅkaṭā, author of the Viṣvagunādarśa tells us that he hailed from Kāñci (or Conjeevaram). That Appayya is
find Appayya cited by Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa in the first quarter of the 17th century and attacked by Jagannātha about the same time.

(2)

We find the author himself using the forms Appa or Apya of his name in his Kuvalayānanda, but it is variously spelt as Appaya and Appayya. A champion of Southern Śaivism he was a versatile and prolific writer, and tradition ascribes to him more than one hundred works,¹ of which Aufrecht mentions nearly seventy. A Tamil Brahman of Bharadvāja gotra, he was the fifth son of Raṅgarāja (or Raṅgarājādhvarin) and had a brother called Apya or Ācchān.

Appayya is notable in Sanskrit Poetics for his three works, viz. the Kuvalayānanda, the Citra-mīmāṁsā and the Vṛtti-vārttika. Of these, the last seems to have been his earliest work, after which comes the Citra-mīmāṁsā which is referred to in his Kuvalayānanda. None of these works displays much originality; and we have seen that his Kuvalayānanda was directly based on Jayadeva’s Candrāloka, up to the section on the figure hetu.² To the “one hundred” Alanākāras of Jayadeva Appayya, however, adds fifteen.³ and this perhaps constitutes

later than the 14th century is shown by the fact that he cites the Ekhāvalī, Pratāparudra-yaśobhūṣana and Sanjīvani comm. of Jayaratha.

¹ So states Nilakanṭha Dīksita in his Nilakanṭha-vijaya v. 44. The question is complicated by the fact that no less than four Appayya Dīksitas belonged to the family in three generations. See V. Raghavan in Proceedings of A-I.O.C., Tirupati 1941, pp. 176-80. In the New Catalogus Catalogorum (ed. V. Raghavan), Madras 1949, pp. 197-200, there are no less than 58 entries after careful sifting. This Catalogue may be consulted for Appayyas II, III, and IV also.

² See above p. 200.

³ In the text of the Kuvalayānanda-kārikā with Āśādhara’s commentary, which is translated by Schmidt and published by the N. S. P. 1906, the fourth chapter dealing with sabdālamkāras is an interpolation, or rather mistaken incorporation into the text of Appayya of a chapter from Ciraṇjiva Bhaṭṭācārva’s Kāvya-vilāsa (IOC ii, pp. 340-44). as the
the largest number of such figures mentioned in any Alamkāra work, and forms the climax in the process of multiplying the poetic figures with endless minute differentiation. The Citramimamsā is a more independent work; but it was probably left incomplete. In most of the MSS, as well as in the printed texts, it goes up to the atiśayokti-prakaraṇa and breaks off with the curious verse:

apy ardha-citramimamsā na muge kasya māṃsalā/
anūrur iva gharmāṃśor ardhendur iva dhūrjaṭēh.l./

which, if authentic, implies that the work was designedly left incomplete. But in some MSS there is an additional verse, which gives a list of the figures to be dealt with (pratipādyā-laṅkāra-sūcī), which ends with the mention of utprekṣā, and omits atiśayokti which ought to come after it. The Candrikā commentary of Vaidyanātha supports this tradition with the remark: utprekṣā-granthānantaram citramimamsā na kvāpi dṛśyate; but the commentary of Dharānanda, son of Rāma-bala, includes and comments on the section on atiśayokti coming thereafter. Appayya’s own references to the Citramimamsā in Kuvalayānanda (pp. 78, 86, 133) relate to the treatment of the figures of śleṣā, prastutāṅkura and arthāntara-nyāsa, which are wanting in the present-day text. The printed text of the Citramimamsā-khaṇḍana of Jagannātha goes only as far as apahnuti. Appayya’s third work, the Vṛtti-vārttika,

colophon at the end of that chapter itself shows. It is well known that the Kuvalayānanda deals only with Arthālaṅkāras.

1 e.g. iUC iii p. 336, ends with atiśayokti at fol. 72a; Madras Trn A 1104: ŚgŚ ii, p. 82.

2 Ed. V. L. Panshikar, Kāvyamālā 38, NSP, 1907. In the text published in the Pandit xii, the work ends with utprekṣā, and the atiśayokti is wanting.

3 upamā sahopameyopamayāthānānvanayāh smaraṇaṁ/ rūpakaparnāti-saṃsaya - bhrāntimad - ulekkha-nihnavotpriksāh// This verse occurs at the end of the text printed in the Pandit and in the India Office MS referred to. The MS kha used in the Kāvyamālā ed. (see p. 101 fn) ends with utprekṣā. In Madras Cat. xxii, MS no. 12879 ends with atiśayokti, but nos. 12880-81 end with utprekṣā.
which is a short dissertation, after a work called Kāvyasarāṇi, on the three functions of word and its sense, is also incomplete as it stands; for it consists only of two chapters on the two functions abhidhā and lakṣaṇā, and the third chapter which should deal with the third function vyañjana is wanting.

Appayya appears to have written another work, called Lakṣaṇa-ratnāvali on the Lakṣaṇas of Rūpaka.¹

Appayya Dīkṣita, second son of Ācān Dīkṣita who was a brother of our Appayya, wrote an Alāṅkāra-tīlaka.

(3)

Appayya’s works appear to have started some controversies in his time. Thus Jagannātha, who flourished immediately after him, not only attacked Appayya in his Rasa-gaṅgādhara and stigmatised him as a slavish imitator of Ruuyaka and Jayaratha, but also wrote his Citramīmāṁsā-khaṇḍana to demolish Appayya’s work of that name. Bhīmasena in his commentary on Mammaṭa, also refers to a Kuvalayānanda-khaṇḍana written by himself as an attack on Appayya’s other work; and we find Atirārayajan, a younger brother of Nilakaṇṭha Dīkṣita and descendant of Appayya’s, taking up the cudgel to defend the fair fame of his ancestor in his Citramīmāṁsā-dosā-dhikkāra.²

Among more recent writers and works cited by Appayya, we find the names of the Sāhityacintāmani-kāra, Ratnākara, Alāṅkāra-sudhānīdi (Vṛtti-vārttika p. 19) and Kāvyasaraṇi.

¹ See T. R. Cintamani in JOR, Madras, iv, 1930, pp. 242-44 (text of a newly discovered fragment).

² The authorship of this work is uncertain. Oppert 4802 ascribes it to Cinna Appayya, younger brother of Nilakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, but Hultsch (ii, p. 126, no. 1281, up to Apahnuti-prakaraṇa) ascribes it to Cinna Appayya’s last brother Atirārayajan. See New Cat. Cat. 1, p. 200.

³ This is probably the work of the same name attributed to Sāyaṇa, younger brother of Mādhava and elder brother of Bhoganātha. But the illustrative verses, which are in praise of Sāyaṇa, appear to have been composed by Bhoganātha. As ministers of Harihara I (1336-55 A.D.) and Bukka (1355-77 A.D.), Sāyaṇa belonged to the 14th century. He is better known as a commentator on Vedic works. An anthology,
the last work (of which nothing is known) being avowedly the model or source of his \textit{Vṛtti-vārttika}. The \textit{Sāhitya-cintāmaṇi}, also cited by Kumārasvāmin, is probably the work of the same name by Vīranārāyaṇa (q.v., about 1400 A.D.). The \textit{Ālaṃkāra-sudhānidhi} is apparently the same work as cited by Kumārasvāmin at p. 44. If the Ratnākara quoted in the \textit{Vṛtti-vārttika} p. 20 be the same as Ratnākara cited extensively by Jagannātha in his two works, then it refers to the \textit{Ālaṃkāra-ratnākara} of Šobhākaramitra, and should be distinguished from \textit{Rasa-ratnākara} cited by Mallinātha on \textit{Meghadūta}. A \textit{Kāvyāloka} is cited by Appayya in his \textit{Citra-mīmāṃsā} (pp. 27, 53)

(4)

\textit{THE COMMENTATORS ON APPAYYA}

The popularity of the \textit{Kuvalayānanda} as a convenient manual is indicated by the many commentaries on it, the more important ones of which have been published. The \textit{Dīpikā} of the poet Āśādhara, son of Rāmaji and disciple of Dharanīdhara, has been edited as well as translated. The \textit{Ālaṃkāra-sudhā} and \textit{Ṣaṭpadānanda} of Nāgēśa or Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa have not yet found an editor, but the \textit{Ālaṃkāra-candrikā} of Vaidyanātha Tatsat, son of Rāmacandra (or Rāma Bhaṭṭa) and grandson of Viṭṭhala Bhaṭṭa, has been printed several times in Madras and elsewhere. The more reliable commentary of Gaṅgādharādhvarin or Gaṅgādhara Vājapeyin, son of Devasimha-sumati of Vādhūla-gotra and pupil of Viśvarūpa Yati of Benares, probably preserves the text and the Appayya-traditions better, inasmuch as the commentator tells us that Appayya was the teacher of a brother of his grandfather, and he himself takes great pains to settle the readings of his text. Other less known commentaries are mentioned below.

The Citra-mimāṃsā has been commented upon by Dharanānanda, son of Rāmabala of Vasiṣṭha-gotra and grandson of Ēhākura, who had, besides the author’s father, two other sons named Pūrṇadāsa and Devadāsa. The commentator was disciple of Paramānanda and was born in Bharatapura. He wrote also a commentary on Mṛcchakaṭṭika (Madras Cat. xii, 12625).

No commentary on the Vṛtti-vārttika is known.
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**Citram˚im˚˚˚ma˚s˚a**

Editions. (1) ed. Rama Sastri Tailanga in the *Pandit* xiii, 1891.

(2) With Citram˚im˚˚˚ma˚s˚a-kha˚n˚˚ana, ed. Siv˚˚adatta, and
V. L. Panshikar. Nir. Sag. Press, Bombay 1893, 1907 (our references are to the 2nd ed. of 1907).

Commentaries. (1) Sudhā by Dharānanda, son of Rāmabala of Vasiṣṭha-gotra. Comments up to Atiśayokti. Madras Cat. xii, 12884-86 (extract). Dharānanda also wrote commentaries on the Anargha-rāghava (Madras Cat. xxi. Kāvya, no. 12444. p. 8355) and on Mṛchakāṭika (ibid., no. 1265, p. 8475). The last-named comm. was composed in 1814 A.D. In it he gives his genealogy and an account of himself, from which we learn that he was son of Rāmabala of Bharatapura, grandson of Ṭhākura and disciple of Para-mānanda.

(2) Gūḍhārtha-prakāśikā by Bālakṛṣṇa Pāyagūnda. Aufrecht ii. 38b. He should be distinguished from Bālakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, author of Alambkāra-sāra. See chapter on Minor Writers below.

(3) Citrāloka. SCB 106.

Vṛtti-vārttika

Editions. (1) ed. Rama Sastri Tailanga in the Pandit xii, 1890.
(2) ed. Sivadatta and K. P. Parab, Nir. Sag. Press, Bombay 1893. Our references are to the N.S.P. 2nd ed. of 1910

Lakṣaṇa-ratnāvali

Ed. T. R. Chintamani in JOR Madras, iv, 1930, pp. 242-44 (a fragment). An incomplete Grantha MS entitled Lakṣaṇa-ratnāvali-vyākhyā without the name of the author is noticed in Tanjore Cat. xi, no. 5295, p. 4079; but it is probably a different work which appears to deal with Dramaturgy.

JAGANNĀTHA

In his Bhāminī-vilāsa Jagannātha tells us¹ that he passed his youth under the patronage of the emperor of Delhi, from

¹ dīlīvallabha-pāṇipallava-tale nītām navīnāṃ vayaḥ, ed. Grantha-mālā vol. iv, śl 32. This verse is wanting in the N.S.P. ed. 1894. The
whom we are told elsewhere, he received the title of Pañḍita-
rāja.1 This emperor seems to have been Shah Jahan (1628-
1658). He also seems to have lived under the protection of
Nawab Asaf Khan (d. 1641), brother of Nur Jahan and a
nobleman in the court of Shah Jahan, in whose praise he
wrote his Āsapha-vilāsa and who is also referred to in verses
quoted in his Rasa-gaṅgādharā (p. 166 suḍhīva vaṇī; 457
yuktam tu yāte, referring to Asaf’s death). In the latter work,
there is also a reference in a verse (p. 521) to Nuradīnā
which is apparently the Sanskritised form of one of the
names of Jahangir (1605-1627), Shah Jahan’s father. Shah
Jahan came to the throne in 1628 A. D., and was thrown into
prison in 1658 A. D. In his Jagad-ābharaṇa Jagannātha
eulogises king Jagatsimha of Udaipur (1628-1654) and in his
Prāṇābharaṇa king Prāṇanārāyaṇa of Kāmarūpa (1633-1666);
but they are essentially identical works which have been
utilised, with certain change of names and addition of verses,
to eulogise two patrons. It seems, therefore, Jagannātha enjoy-
ed the patronage of four rulers, Jahangir, Shah Jahan, Jagat-
simha and Prāṇanārāyaṇa at different periods of life. His
literary activity, therefore, lay in the second and third
quarters of the 17th century; and it extended roughly from
about 1620 to 1660 A. D. Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa commented upon his
Granthamālā text is published with the comm. of Mahādeva Dikṣita
who claims to be a grandson of Jagannātha himself. The phrases
dīḷī-ṇarapati and dīḷīśvara occur also in Rasa-gaṅgādharā and other
works (see Aryendra Sarma, Pañḍitarāja-kāvyasaṁgraha, Osmania
Univ. 1958, p. vii for references).

1 See citation from Āsapha-vilāsa given in introd. to Kāvyamālā
ed. of Rasa-gaṅgādharā p. 2 fn.; also Nāgeśa on Rasa-gaṅgā
p. 3.
The text of the Āsapha-vilāsa appears to contain lacuna and ends
abruptly. The poet Pañḍita-rāja, cited in the anthology Padyāṁśita-
taraṇī of Haribhāskara, whose commentary on the Vṛttā-ratnā-śara
was composed in 1676 A.D. (Bhandarkar, Rep. 1877-91, p. lxii and Rep.
1883-84, p. 60) is probably our author. There is also a commentator on
Mammaṭa named Pañḍitarāja (q.v.) who is a different author. Außrecht
(u. 40a), making a confusion between the two, attributes the Kāvyā-
prakāśa-tīkā to our Jagannātha.
Rasa- gaṅgādhara in the beginning of 18th century, while Jagannātha himself attacks Appayya Dikṣita who lived in the third quarter of the 16th century.

(2)

Jagannātha describes himself as son of Peru (or Perama) Bhaṭṭa and Lakṣmī. He was, like Appayya, a South Indian writer, being a native of Tailaṅga (Telugu country), and belonged to the Veṅginādu, Vegināti or Vegināḍa family of Brahmans. His father was reputed for his learning, having been, as Jagannātha himself tells us, taught the Vedānta by Jñānendradhikṣu, the Nyāya-vaiśeṣika by Mahendra Paṇḍita, the Pūrva-mimāṃsā by Khāṇḍadeva and the Mahābhāṣya by Śeṣa Vīresvara. Our author learnt these subjects from his father, and also from one of his father's teachers, Śeṣa Vīresvara. Very little is known of his personal history, although curious tales about his fondness for a Muhammadan woman, named Lavaṅgī, and his death by plunging into the sacred river Ganges have gathered round his name. Jagannātha was also the author of several

1 On Jagannātha see V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, Jagannātha Paṇḍita (reprinted from Journal of Annamalai Univ. ii-iv) and Aryendra Sarma in the work cited above. Ramaswami Sastri gives Jagannātha's date as 1590-1665.
2 Rasa-gang° i. 3.
3 concluding verse to his Prāṇābharaṇa. 4 Prāṇābharaṇa śl. 52.
5 colophon to Bhāminī-vilāsa. 6 Rasa-gang° i. 2.
7 P. K. Gode, in Studies in Ind. Lit. History ii, 1954, pp. 452-59, finds the earliest mention of the tradition in a MS dated 1843 A.D. But Acyuta Rāya, whose Sāhitya-sāra is dated in 1831 A.D., discusses in his commentary on the Bhāminī-vilāsa (ed. NSP, Bombay 1933) the autobiographical significance of the lyrics in that work and of verses like yavanī navanī-komalāṅgī often attributed to Jagannātha. See also L. R. Vaidya in the introd. to his ed. of the Bhāminī-vilāsa. For a full discussion of the Lavāṅgī episode see V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, op. cit., pp. 19-21; P. K. Gode in Bhāratīya Vidyā iv, 1942, 57-62 and in Rāja-sthāna Bhāratī (Bikaner) ii, 1946, pp. 45-49. Aryendra Sarma assumes the Lavaṅgī verses (given on p. 190, nos. 582-88) to be genuine.
poetical works,\(^1\) besides writing the *Rasa-gaṅgādhara*, the latest yet not the least important work on Poetics, and the *Citramimāṃsa-khaṇḍana*. He also wrote a grammatical work, directed against Bhaṭṭoḻi Dīkṣita's famous commentary *Manoramā*, and called it *Manoramā-kuca-mardana*.

Both the rhetorical works of Jagannātha have been obtained incomplete. The printed editions of the text of the *Rasa-gaṅgādhara* go up to the treatment of *uttarālaṃkāra* and break off with an incomplete verse; and so do most MSS noticed in the various reports and catalogues. Nāgeśa or Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa's commentary also ends with the same section. In conformity to a pun in the word *gaṅgādhara* in the title, the work was apparently planned to consist of five heads (*ānana*) or chapters, of which we have got only one complete and another incomplete chapter\(^2\). The topics covered by the

---

1 Some of these have been published by the N.S.P. For a list, see *Intro. to Jagannātha’s Rasa-gaṅ* (N. S. P. ed.); Aufrecht i. 196b. Kāvyamāla Gučchaka i, p. 79; and Aryendra Sarma in the work cited. These are: (1) Amṛta-laharī (Km. Gučchaka ii) (2) Āsapha-vilāsa, praise of Asaf Khan (in Aryendra Sarma. *op. cit.*) (3) Karuṇā-laharī (Km. Gučchaka ii) (4) Gaṅgā-laharī or Piṭūṣa-laharī (ed. N. S. P. Bombay 1930) (5) Jagadābharaṇa, praise of Jagatsimha of Udaipur (6) Prānahaharaṇa, praise of Prānānārayana of Kāmarūpa (Km. Gučchaka ii; 51 verses in different metres) (7) Bhāmīṇi-vilāsa (in four Samullāsas on Anyoktī, Śṛngāra, Karuna and Śānti. ed. N.S.P 1894) (8) Manoramā-kuca-mardana, directed against Bhaṭṭoḻi Dīkṣita’s *Manoramā* (9) Yamunāvarnana-campū (quoted in Rasa-g. pp. 19, 128) (10) Lakṣmī-laharī (Km. Gučchaka ii) (11) Sudhā-laharī (Km. Gučchaka i). Of these nos. 3, 6 and 11 are quoted in the *Rasa-gaṅgā*, e.g. *ṣl* 60 = p. 36; *ṣl* 4 = p. 56; *ṣl* 1 = p. 20; as also *Gaṅgā-laharī* p. 243 (*samṛdham saubhāg-yam*), 491 (*samupattiḥ*); Bhāmīṇi-vilāsa p. 402 (*digante śṛṣyante*), 403 (*pura-sarasi*). The *Paṅca-laharyāḥ* (five laharias) are mentioned at p. 109.

2 It cannot be determined whether the work was completed: but it was certainly composed before Jagannātha wrote his *Citramimāṃsa-khaṇḍana*, the second verse of which refers to the *Rasa-gaṅgādhara*. In *Citramimāṃsa-khaṇḍana*, however, a reference iṣ made to Udāharanālaṃkāra-prakaraṇa of *Rasa-g.* (*viśesa tu udāharanālaṃkāra-prakaraṇe rasa-gaṅgādharaḥ avasevalḥ*, p. 12), but this Prakaraṇa is not found in the extant text of *Rasa-g.*
first Ānana are: definition of Kāvya, its four varieties Uttamottama, Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama; Rasa and Bhāvas; Guṇas, whether three or ten. In the second Ānana we have divisions of Dhvani, with a discussion of Abhidhā and Lakṣaṇā, after which comes treatment of Upamā and other poetic figures, enumerated as 70; but it is incomplete. The work is written in the form of Sūtra and Vṛtti. The Citramūmāṃsā-khaṇḍana, directed against Appayya's work of that name, also goes as far as the apahnuti-section and does not deal with utprekṣā and aitīśaya which are found in some MSS of the Citra-mūmāṃsā. There is a reference to a matter to be dealt with in the Nidāraśanālaṃkāra-prakaraṇa (p. 101: adhikaṃ tu nidāraśanālaṃkāra-prakaraṇe cintayiṣyate) which Jagannātha obviously contemplated writing.

(3)

Of comparatively recent writers, Jagannātha, besides citing Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka and Jayaratha extensively, refers to and quotes Vidyādhara (p. 254), Vidyānātha (p. 162), Viśvanātha (and the Sāhitya-darpaṇa, p. 7) and Appayya, and refers very often to the navyāḥ (pp. 25, 149, 240, 313, 429, 478). The scathing criticism which he levels against Appayya as a slavish imitator of Ruyyaka and Jayaratha was, no doubt, prompted by the zeal of eclipsing the fame of another South Indian writer in the same field. Jagannātha also cites Śrīvatsalāṅchana (p. 39), apparently the commentator on Mammaṭa, an unknown Alāṃkāra-bhāsyakāra (pp. 239, 365, also referred to by Jayaratha), and Ratnākara (pp. 202, 207, 209, 211, 221, 225, 281, 313, 480, 492 etc.) which last name is also cited by Appayya. Jagannātha also refers to a work called Alāṃkāra-ratnākara (pp. 163, 165). An anonymous Alāṃkāra-ratnākara is mentioned in Burnell 54a; but Bühler1 describes a work of that name by Śobhākara-mitra, son of Trayiśvaramitra. Peterson informs us2 that

2 Rep. i p. 12. Bühler (Report 1877) mentions a small work called
the Kashmirian poet Yaśaskara extracted some sūtras on Alamkāra¹ from a work called Alamkāra-ratnakara by Śobhākaramitra, and illustrated them in his Devī-stotra by composing verses in praise of Devī, as the opening words of the latter work themselves show². The work of Yaśaskara in Stein is for this reason called Alamkarodāharanasaṁnibaddha Devī-stotra.³ The Ratnakara of Jagannātha undoubtedly refers to this Alamkāra-ratnakara of Śobhākaramitra; for the citation from Ratnakara at p. 202=sūtra 11 (as given in Peterson i p. 78).⁴ Jayaratha criticises (pp. 41, 52) the Kashmirian Śobhākara who deviates from Ruyyaka. Jagannātha says (p. 281) that Appayya Dīkṣita follows Alamkāra-ratnakara.

( 4 )

Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa

The commentator on the Rasa-gaṅgādhaṇa is Nāgesa or Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, whose name we have already mentioned as a commentator on Mammaṭa, Govinda Ṭhakkura, Bhāṇudatta Dhvanigāthā-paṇḍikā which contains explanations of Prakrit verses, apparently of the Dhvanīyāloka; but there is no evidence (except the epigraph Kāśmirakācārya in the colophon) to show that he was the same as the Kashmirian Ratnakara, author of the poem Hara-vijaya. BORI MS no. 182, Cat. xii, p 207.

1 These are given in Peterson, op. cit. App. pp. 77-81.
2 ratnākarāḥhyantarato gṛhitvāalamkāra-sūtrāni yathākrameṇa/ bandīva devyā girirāja-patryāḥ karom  ṣaṃsan śruti-gocarāṇi. The commentary on this verse explains: śrī-trayiśvara-mitrāmajā-śrī-śobhākaramitra-viracite’laṃkāra-ratnakare’laṃkāra-sūtrāṇi. The colophon to Bühler’s MS of the Alamkāra-ratnakara reads trayiśvara-mantra-purasya as a description of Śobhākaramitra, in which the word mantra is obviously a mistake for mitra. Stein’s Jammu MS 58 reads Śobhākaramitra as the name of the author (cf. also W Bod 1162).
3 The original is also called Alamkāra-ratnodāharana and the author Śobhākaresvara. See also Mitra 1822; Hultzsch’s Eine Sammlung ind. Handschriften 170.

4 The work has been recovered and edited by C. R. Devadhar, Poona 1942. See under Minor Writers below. Jagannātha refers to Alamkāra-ratnakara in as many as eleven different places (see C. R. Devadhar in Proc. A.I. O.C., Lucknow 1955, pp. 60-65).
and Appayya. He was a Mahratta Brahman (with the surname Kāla or Kāle), son of Śiva Bhaṭṭa and Satī. He lived in Benares and was patronised by Rāmasimha of Śrīgavera-pura (near Allahabad). He is one of the latter-Jay grammarians, who composed a number of works and commentaries on grammar, poetics and philosophy. He was a pupil of Hari Dikṣita, who was the son of of Vireśvara Dikṣita and great-grandson of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, the well-known author of the Siddhānta-kaumudi. Bhaṭṭoji is known as a punil of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, whose son Śeṣa Vireśvara was, as we have noted, a teacher of Jagannātha himself. Nāgoji was, thus, separated from Jagannātha roughly by two generations, and flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. The India office MS of his commentary on Bhānudatta’s Rasa-mañjari is dated in Māgha Saṃvat 1769=Feb 1713 A.D. Nāgoji was the teacher of Vaidyanātha, the Maithili grammarian, and of Gaṅgārāma, the great-grandfather of Maṇirāma (1802 A.D.).

Nāgoji wrote the following commentaries on various works on Poetics: (1) Guru-marma-prakāśikā on Jagannātha’s Rasa-gaṅgādhara. (2) Brhat and Laghu Uddyota on Govinda’s Pradīpa on Mammaṭa. (3) Udāharana-dipikā or Pradīpa on Mammaṭa. (4) Ālaṁkāra-sudhā and Viṣampada-vyākhyāna Śaṭpadānanda on Appayya’s Kuvalayānanda. (5) Prakāśa on

1 author of the Pada-candrikā and Prakriyā-prakāśa, and son and pupil of Śeṣa Narasimha or Nṛsimha. For the Śeṣa family of Benares see 14 1912, p. 245f.—Nāgoji’s relation to Jagannātha is illustrated thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śeṣa Vireśvara</th>
<th>Perubhaṭṭa</th>
<th>Jagannātha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(son)</td>
<td>(pupil)</td>
<td>(pupil of Śeṣa Vireśvara and son of Perubhaṭṭa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa—Nṛsimha</th>
<th>Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita</th>
<th>Vireśvara Dikṣita</th>
<th>Hari Dikṣita</th>
<th>Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(son and pupil)</td>
<td>(pupil)</td>
<td>(son and pupil)</td>
<td>(pupil)</td>
<td>(pupil)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Maṇirāma wrote a comm. on Jagannātha’s Bhāmini-vilāsa in 1802 A.D. See IOCl vii, p. 1526.
Bhānudatta’s *Rasa-mañjarī*. (6) A commentary on Bhānudatta’s *Rasa-taraṅgiṇī*.

The relative chronology of some works of Nāgoji is fixed by P. K. Gode (*Oriental Thought* 1, no. 2, 1955, pp. 45-52) between *circa* 1670 and 1750 A.D.
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CHAPTER IX

LATER WRITERS ON RASA AND KAVI-SIKṢĀ

WRITERS ON RASA

( 1 )

ŚARADĀTANAYA

Śaradātanaya, author of the Bhāva-prakāśa, *prakāśikā or *prakāśana, appears to have been a popular writer on the Rasas and Bhāvas, who is quoted extensively by Kumāra-
svāmin,¹ and in the Kāma-dhenu on Vāmana,² as well as by commentators like Rāghavabhaṭṭa, Raṅganātha³ and Vāsu-
deva.⁴ He is described as son of Bhaṭṭa Gopāla and grandson of Kṛṣṇa, and great-grandson of Lakṣmaṇa of Kāśyapa-gotra who is said to have been a resident of Māṭara-
pūjya village in the Merūttara country of the Āryāvarta, and to have written a commentary on the Vedas, called the Veda-
bhūṣaṇa. Our author was so named, because he was con-
dered to have been born by the grace of Śaradā, worshipped in Benares. He learnt Nāṭya-sāstra from Divākara, and says that he is following Abhinavaguptācārya; but his work in some parts is in reality a condensed epitome chiefly of Bhoja’s Śrṅgāra-prakāśa, which it cites and practically summarises. This fact will place Śaradātanaya chronologi-
cally later than Bhoja; and the citation of the Bhāva-prakāśa by Śiṅga-bhūpāla (pp. 20, 139, 169, 202 etc.) will fix its other terminus at 1330 A.D. We may, therefore, assign our author roughly to the period between 1100 and 1300 A.D.

Śaradātanaya cites Agastya (p. 2), Kohala, Māṭṛgupta Subandhu and Āṇjaneya (p. 251) as authorities on the dramatic

₁ pp. 12, 15, 44, 68, 102, 106, 118, 121, 127, 129, 139, 143, 145, 219, 223 etc.
₂ e g. on I. 3. 30.
₃ on Vikrama°. ed N. S. P. 1885, p. 10.
₄ on Karpūra-mañj° ed. N.S.P. 1900, pp. 5, 7, etc.