CHAPTER XIV.

SPECIAL LITERATURE.

The names of a few special branches of literature with the names of their authors, and accepted dates are given below without any elaborate treatment.

Law.

Of the secondary Dharma Sūtras of the post-vedic period, the Vaiṣṇava Dharma Sāstra is the most important. This was most probably composed about 200 A.D. and is closely connected with the Kāṭhaka Gṛhya Sūtra.

The regular post-vedic law books are mostly written in verse. These though based on the Dharma Sūtras have wider scope than the latter. The Sūtras discuss only the matters of religion, while the Law books deal with atonement, foodstuff, government etc. along with this.

1. Mānava Dharma Sāstra is the most important of the metrical Smṛtis. This has mostly been based on the Mahābhārata. It is said in the Nārada Smṛti that Manu at first composed his scripture consisting of a lac of ślokas and divided it into 1080 Chapters. This was reduced to 12000 ślokas by Nārada
and then to 4000 Slokas by Bhṛgu. The present Saṃhitā contains only 2385 slokas divided into twelve books, of which 260 are found in the III, XII, and XVI books of the Mahābhārata. According to Sir Willam Jones, Bühler and Max Müller, it was written about 300 B.C., while other Western scholars hold that it assumed its present shape at about 200 A.D. But the Hindus believe that it was composed about 4000 years before Christ.

There are some twenty commentaries on the Saṃhitā of which those of Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Nandana, Dharaṇīdhara, Rāghavānanda and Kullūka are important. Kullu-ka’s commentary named सम्बंधशुद्धार्जी is famous for its conciseness. It was written in Benares in the fifteenth century. The Saṃhitā has been translated by Bühler, Burnek, Manmatha Nāth Datta and others.

2. Yājñāvalkya Dharma Sūtra.—This is next in importance to Manu Saṃhitā. It was written by the sage Yājñāvalkya, the preceptor of King Janaka of Mithilā. It contains 1000 slokas and is divided into three books. It is based on the Dharma Sūtra of the White Yajurveda and was much influenced by the Pāraskara Gṛhya Sūtra. It has, no doubt, connection with
the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra of the Black Yajurveda also. It, according to the Western scholars, was composed about 350 A.D.

The celebrated commentary on the Saṃhitā is called the Mitākṣarā of Vijñāneśvara, who flourished about 1100 A.D. This was followed not only in the Dekhan but also in Benares and a great part of Northern India. It has now acquired great importance in the Anglo-Indian law-courts.

The oldest commentary of the Yājña Valkya Saṃhitā was written by Viśvarūp about the ninth century A.D. Viśvesvar Bhaṭṭa and Vālām Bhaṭṭa wrote two expositions of Mitākṣarā known as Suvodhini and Vālambhaṭṭi respectively.

Aparārka, King of Kaṅkan, wrote a commentary on the Yājña Valkya Saṃhitā called Aparārka after his name. The author lived in the middle of the twelfth century A. D. It is followed in Orissa and Kāśmīr. Besides, there is another commentary, 'Dīpakalikā' on it written by Sūlapāṇi.

3. Viṣṇu Saṃhitā—It was derived perhaps from the Kāthaka Sakhā of the Yajurveda. Mention is made here of the Mleccha kings and many modern holy places. It was commented on by Nanda Pandit under the name of Vaijayanti.

4. Nārada Smṛti.—This has some 12000
slokas in it and is chiefly founded on the code of Manu. Of the metrical law books this is the only one that does not overstep its boundary. The date of the book is probably 500 A. D.

5. Parāśara Smṛti.—This contains some 565 slokas, divided into 12 books. This refers clearly to the practice of widow marriage. This was written by Parāśara probably in the 1200 A. D. The dictum (काली पराशरः सातः) shows that it is suitable to the present age.

**DHARMA NIBANDHAS**

From 1000 A. D. onward a number of legal compendia termed Dharma Nibandhas were produced in India. Of these Hemādri’s *Caturvarga Cintāmaṇi* (1300 A. D.) and Jīmūtavāhana’s *Dharmaratna* (1500 A. D.) are important. The former is a repository of interesting quotations from the Smṛtis and the purāṇas, while, the latter contains the famous treatise entitled *Dāyabhāga* or the law of inheritance.

(a) *Dharma Śastras* and Nibandhas followed in Bengal.

Jīmūtabāhan is said to be the founder of the Śmārta views in
Bengal. His Dāyabhāga is a famous Smṛti Nibandha. As regards the distribution of wealth (Dāyabhāga) there is a difference of opinion between this and Mitākṣara. Śrīkar wrote Dāya Nirṇaya on the same subject. Jīmūtabāhan was born at Pārigrām in the district of Burdwan, situated on the bank of the river Ajay. He flourished towards the close of the eleventh century.

Dāyabhāga of Jīmūtabāhan was commented by several persons. Of these Curāmaṇi of Śrīnāthaścārya, Subodhini of Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālāṅkār and two other commentaries written by Acyuta Cakravortī and Mahesvar Pandit are important.

Raghunandan’s Astābhiṃśati Tattva is a very famous work on the Smṛti Sāstras. He has invariably followed Jīmūtabāhan and added things which were not dealt with by Jīmūtabāhan and filled up the gaps left by his predecessors. Kaśyām Vācaspati has written a commentary on his Dāya tattva.

(b) Dharma Sāstras etc followed in the Deccan.

The commentary ‘Mitākṣara’ is, followed in the Deccan also. Besides, Smṛti Candrikā of Devānanda Bhaṭṭa written in the 13th century and the Sarasvatī Vilās of Pralāp
Rudrādev occupy a prominent place there. Towards the close of the 13th century A. D. Hemādri wrote Caturvarga Cintāmanī, a grand work on Smṛti. In the 14th century Mādhavācārya wrote two other books on this subject called Dāyavibhāg and Parāsar mādhavīya. Besides Varadarāj wrote Vyāvahār Nirṇaya in the 16th century. A.D.

(c) Dharma Śāstras etc. followed in the Western India.

Vyābahāra Mayūkha of Nilkanṭha written in the 16th century A. D. occupies a prominent position in Western India and Bombay Presidency. Of the other books followed there, the Nirṇaya Sindhu of Kamalākar Bhaṭṭa and Viramitrodaya of Mitra Misra are very important.

(d) Dharma Śāstras etc. followed in Mithila.

Vibāda Ratnākar and Vibāda candra are two important works written by Candesvar-Thakur in the 14th century A. D. Madan Pārijāt of Vīresvar Bhaṭṭa written about a century before Vibād Ratnākar is highly honoured there. Vibād Cintāmanī of Vacaspati Misra, (he should not be confounded with Vacaṣpati Misra, the famous philosopher and the great commentator of many
Philosophical systems) are held in high esteem in Mithila.

(e) Dattak Nibandhas.

Dattak Candrikā of Raghumaṇi and Dattak Mīmāṃsā of Nanda Pandit are the two important works on this subject.

HISTORY

The Rājatarāṅgini, a chronicle of the Kings of Kāśmīra, is the only book known of the nature of modern history. This was written in 1148 A. D. by Kalhana, a poet of Kāśmīra. It contains about 8000 Slokas. The early part contains legends only. The poet has given names of many historians in his book, but their works are not now available. Nīlmat Purāṇa which is older than Rājatarāṅgini has descriptions of many royal dynasties.

MATHEMATICS & ASTRONOMY

The earliest works on Astronomy are the four treatises called Sīdhāantas. Of these only Sūryasiddhānta is now extant. The doctrines of such works were reduced to practical form by Āryabhaṭṭa, born 476 A.D. He maintained the rotation of the earth round its axis and explained the cause of eclipses of the sun and the moon.
Varāha-mihira (505 A. D.) composed four works, three astrological and one astronomical,—the Brhat Saṃhitā, the Brhat and the Laghujaṭakas and the Pañcasiddhāntika. The last one is a practical treatise on astronomy based on the Siddhāntas.

Brahmagupta, a distinguished astronomer, born 598 A. D., wrote a Karaṇa and also his Brahmaspūtasiddhānta.

The last eminent writer on the subject is Bhāskarācārya, born 1114 A.D. He wrote Siddhānta Siromāṇi.

Śrīharācārya composed Gaṇitasāra in the 10th century A.D. He has dealt with the principles of Algebra here.

In 932 A. D., Muñjala wrote Laghumānasa and in 11th century A. D. Bhoja-raja wrote Rājamārtaṇḍa. About that time Padmanābha composed a book on Algebra.

Jyotirvidabhārṇam—it is attributed to Kālidās, but most probably it was written by some at a later period.

Besides these we get the following books on astronomy and astrology:—

1. Siddhānta Sundar—by Māuarāja in 1503 A. D.

2. Makaranda—by Makaranda in 1478 A. D.
3. *Graha Lāghava*—by Gaṇesa in 1520 A. D.

4. *Siddhānta Rahasya*—by Rāghavānanda in 1591 A. D.

**MEDICINES.**

*Caraka.*—Of the extant works on medicine, the *Caraka* is the oldest. The views of Sāṃkhya taken by the sage Caraka is distinct from and older than that preached by Īśvarkṛṣṇa. At the time of Caraka there were six medical treatises composed by Agnivesa, Vela, Parāśara, Jātukarṇa, Hārīta and Kṣirapāṇi. Caraka is the revised edition of Agnivesa Tantra. It is not certainly known when Caraka flourished. He might precede the Buddhistic era. Prof. Levy says that the Chinese edition of Tripitaka has clearly stated that Caraka lived at the time of the Buddhist king Kaṇiśka whose time has now been ascertained as 125 A. D. Of the commentaries of Caraka those of Jejjata, Cakrapāṇi, Haricandra and Śivadās are important. Jalpakalpataru of Gangādhar is full of philosophical discussions.

*Suśruta*—Caraka was followed by Suśruta. The Mahābhārata has described Suśruta as the son of Viśvāmitra. He was disciple of Dhanvantari. The Vārttika
Sūtra of Kātyāyana mentions the name of Suśruta. Baudhāyaṇa Tāntrik Nāgārjuna revised the treatise of Bṛddha Suśruta and added the last part to it. The Buddhist work 'Mahāvagga' mentions his name. He must have flourished before 5th century B.C. It was commented by Cakrapāṇi, Dalvāṇa, Gayadās, Bhāskara and others. (See p. 188.)

Nāgārjuna—He was a Buddhist monk. He acquired a name in the use of quicksilver. He is said to have started the treatise on rejuvenation. His Rasaratnākara has been published. Herbs were mainly used during the time of Caraka and Suśruta. Use of metal was very rare. During the time of Nāgārjuna metals came to be used largely. Black sulphure of mercury was invented by him. He lived in the 1st century A. D.

Vāgbhata—He was at first a Brāhmaṇa and then adopted Buddhism. His Āṣṭāṅgahṛdaya is a famous work on medicine. His first work is 'Āṣṭāṅgasamgraha'. The Āṣṭāṅgahṛdaya contains the essence of Caraka and Suśruta. It has been commented by Aruṇadatta and Hemādri. The author of Rasaratna Saṃuccaya is not identical with Vāgbhata, the author of Āṣṭāṅgahṛdaya. Vāgbhata lived perhaps in the 2nd century A. D. The treatises of Vela and
Hārita were extant during the time of Vāgbhata.

Mādhavakara.—Nidāna Saṃgraha of Mādhavakar is a famous work. He has quoted often Caraka, Suṣruta and Vāgbhata. It was translated into Arabic in the 8th century A. D. It has been commented by Vijaya-Rakṣit up to चलितवृत्तोऽवस्थित. It has also been commented by Śrīkaṇṭha. He flourished perhaps towards the close of the 6th century A. D.

Vṛṇḍa.—His work is known as "Siddha Yoga". He wrote also a vṛtti on it. Vyākhyā Kusumāṇjali is a comment on it by Śrīkaṇṭha. He lived in the 9th century A. D.

Cakrapāṇī Datta.—He is the author of famous Cakradatta. He has mainly adopted the views of Tantra and Tāntric medicines. In his work he has followed Caraka and Suṣruta. His work has been commented by Śivadāsa. His Cakra Saṃgraha imitates the Siddhayoga of Vṛṇḍa very closely. He lived in the 11th century A. D.

LATER TĀNTRIC WORKS ON MEDICINE

1. Rasaratna Samuccaya—It was written by Somadeva in the 13th century A. D. It combines the science of rejuvenation and treatment.
2. *Rasa Ratnakara*—It was written by Nityanātha who lived in the 14th century A.D.

3. *Rasa Hīdaya*—It was written by Govinda Bhāgavata in the 11th century A.D.

4. *Rasendra Sāra Samgraha*—It was written by Gopal Bhaṭṭa.

5. *Rasendra Culamāni*—It was written by Somadeva. The author of this book is not identical with the author of Rasaratna Samuccaya.

6. *Bhāba Prakāśa*—by Bhāba Miśra Dās was written in the 16th century A.D.

7. *Cikitsā Sārasamgraha*—It was composed by Vanga Sena. He has given herein the cause and treatment of diseases.

8. *Sārangadhar*—He has a treatise on medicine, besides his Sārangadhar Paddhati, a collection of poems.

**TREATISES ON THE QUALITY OF HERBS**

1. *Dhanvatariya Nighantu*—Compiled by Dhanvantari, the king of Kāśī is the oldest work of its kind.

2. *Madanavinode Nighantu*—It was Composed by king Madnapāla or by his courtier.

3. *Raja Nignantu*—It was composed by Narahari in Mārāṭhi language.

4. *Dravyaguna Samgraha*—It was composed by Cakrapāṇidatta.
MUSIC.

It has been said heretofore that Gandharva Veda is the source of music. This science was propagated by Īśvara, Bharata, Hanumān and Kallināth. Someśvara in his Rāgavir odha has given the opinion of all these four persons. He has given prominence to the view of Hanumān whose work was divided into seven chapters.

According to Bharat and Hanumān there are six rāgas, viz., Bhairava, Kauśika, Hindola, Dipaka, Sṛtrāga and Megha.

Dancing is of two sorts—tāṇḍava and lāsya.

Of the works on music the following are important:

1. Saṅgīta Makaranda
2. Saṅgīta Sudarśana—by Sudarsena.
4. Saṅgīta Dāmodara—by Subhaṅkara.
5. Saṅgīta Nārāyaṇa—by Purośottama.
7. Saṅgīta Darpana—by Dāmodara.
8. Saṅgīta Pārijata.

Hindu music from various authors.—By Rājā Saurindra Mohan Tagore, edited in Calcutta, 1875, deserves mention in this connection.
SILPA SĀSTRA.

This science was highly developed before the time of Buddha. Reference to temple etc., are found in the Rāmayāṇa which was composed long before the birth of Buddha. This may chiefly be divided into three sections—(1) Architecture, (2) Sculpture and (3) Painting.

I. Architecture.

Vāstu Vidyā—It was edited by Gaṇapati Sāstrī in 1913. Viśvakarmā is said to be the god of the architects. Besides, he edited Mayamata in 1919, Manusyālaya Candrikā in 1917 and Silparatna in 1922. Mayamata has 34 chapters. This describes city planning, palace-building and construction of images etc. Manusyālaya Candrikā is divided into seven chapters and deals with house-building. Silpa ratna is divided into two parts. The first describes in 46 chapters architecture and the second in 35 chapters sculpture. He has edited also Samarāṅgan Sūtradhar in 1928. This book has description of constructing machinery etc.

Yuktikalpataru—It has been published by Pandit Iṣvara candra Sāstrī in 1917. The book contains 23 chapters and deals with house-building.
Bṛhat Samhitā—of Barāha Mihir also describes house-building (53rd chapter) and gives the characteristics of palace (56th chap.). Viṣvakarmā Prakāśa is a book on architecture. It has been published from Bombay in 1913. Besides, 252—257 chapters of the Matsya Purāṇa, 46—47 chapters of the Garuḍa Purāṇa, 104—106 chapters of Agni Purāṇa etc. have discourses on this subject.

2. Sculpture.

58th chapter of the Bṛhat Samhitā and 4th chapter of Śukra Niti have discussions on various images of gods. The Viṣṇu Dharmottara in its 3rd section gives the characteristics of images. The Matsya Purāṇa (259 ch.) and Agni Purāṇa (49 ch.) deal with special characteristics of images. Besides there are Pratimā Lakṣaṇa, of Ātreyā, Mayavāstu of Kāśyapa on the subject.

3. Painting.

Citra Lakṣaṇa translated into Tibetan language, Viṣṇuddhar Matottara and the last chapter of Silparatna deal with painting.

METRES

Metres are of two kinds—Vedic and Classical. The Rgveda Pratisākhya,
the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta sūtra, the Nidāna Sūtra of the Śāmaveda, the Anukramanī of Kātyāyana and Chandah Sūtra of Pūgala deal with Vedic metres. The last mentioned work deals with classical metres as well.

The classical metres are dealt with by Chandomañjarī of Gangādāsa, Bṛttā Ratnākar of Kedāra Bhaṭṭa, Bāṁśibhūṣaṇa of Dāmodara Miṣra, and Śrutabodha of Kāli-dāsa etc.

**VAIṢṆAVA LITERATURE**

Bṛhat Bhāgavatāmṛta of Sanātana Bhāgavata Sandarbha (including six other Sandarbhas) of Jīva Gōsvāmī, Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu and Laghu Bhāgavatāmṛta of Rūpa Gōsvāmī, and Govinda Lītāmṛta of Kṛṣṇadas Kavirāja are the philosophical works of Caitanya Sampradāya.

Of the Smṛti works of this school, the Hari Bhakti Vilāsa of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa is famous.

Ujjvala Nīlmani of Rūpa Gōsvāmī, a treatise on rhetoric, deserves mention in this connection. His Nāṭaka Candraśīla like Daśa Rūppaka explains dramatical figures clearly and lucidly. Kavi Karṇapura’s Alankārakaustubha is also a good work in this section of the Vaiṣṇava literature.
Of the dramatical works Rūpa Gosvāmi's *Vidagdha Mādhava*, *Lalita Mādhava* and *Banakeli Kaumudī*; Kavi Karna Pura's *Caitanya Candrodaya* and Rāmānanda's *Jagannātha Vallava* are important.

Jiva Gosvāmi's *Gopāl Campū* and Kavi Karna pura's *Bṛndāvana Campū* are two elaborate works.

Of the lyrical works Rūpa Gosvāmi's *Uddhava Sandeśa* and *Haṃsa Duta* and Kṛṣṇānanda Sārvabhaum's *Padaṅka Duta* are important. They have been written in imitation of Kālidāsa's *Megh Duta*, Raghunātha's *Dāna Candrikā* and *Muktā Carita* also are noteworthy.

Vaiṣṇava literature lacks in Kavya, *Caitanya Caritāmṛta* of Kavi Karna pura only can be mentioned in this connection. It describes in 22 Cantos the life-sketch of Caitanya.

Of the artificial poems the names of *Rām-krṣṇa Viloma Kavya* and *Buka-Rambha saṃvāda* deserve mention. Besides these there is a number of lyrical poetry in the shape of adoration (शब्द or शुभि).

**RHETORICS**

Rhetorical treatises trace their origin to the vedic works. Rgveda, the oldest work of the Indo-Aryans abounds
in figures, specially simile and metaphor. The Nirukta of Yāska has specific instances of these two figures, collated from the Rgveda. Pāṇini’s aphorisms regarding अपनाम, अपनक्षेत्र and शास्त्राचार्य show that these things were known to people perfectly at that time. Agnipurāṇ gives a fuller account of rhetoric and grammar.

Sage Bharata is said to be the father of treatises in relation to figures etc. and drama. In his Nāṭya Sāstra he has mentioned the name of Druhiṇa and has given a short account of his views. In it we find the principles of rhetoric also in their germanic state. Bhaṭṭa Lallata, Śankuka and Bhaṭṭanāyaka have commented upon Nāṭya Sāstra in the light of Mimāṃsā, Nyāya and Sāṃkhya philosophy respectively. Avinava Gupta has written a comment on it, named Abhinava Bhārati in the 10th century A. D.

The rhetoricians of the latter age may be divided into three groups—the old, the middle and the modern. Daṇḍi, Bhāmaha, Rudruṭa, Bhaṭṭotbhaṭa and Vāmana fall under the first group. In the opinion of these rhetoricians, वक्तव्य is the back-bone of
kāvyā. Some of them speak highly of the style also, Ānandavardhana, Abhinava Gupta, Mahimbhaṭṭa and others occupy the middle position. These lay stress on अनि and try to establish अन्वनारिति। Of the modern rhetoricians the names of Mammaṭa Bhaṭṭa, Jagannātha, Viśvanātha Kavi-rāj and others are noteworthy. Many books have been written on the subject we give below the account of some of them very briefly.

1. Daṇḍi—Kāvyādārṣa of Daṇḍi is an important rhetorical work. In his work he has discussed and refuted the opinion of some old rhetoricians. He is perhaps older than Bhāmaha and lived about 605 A. D. He has quoted Kālidāsa and Bhāsa*. The book is divided into three sections called Paricchedas. The first defines Kāvyas, their divisions and scope along with style and guṇas. The second describes figures and their divisions. The third deals with play upon words and metrical fault etc. Besides Kāvyādārṣa he wrote also Daśakumārcarit and Chandovicitī. He does not take figure as part and parcel of Kāvyā.

2. Bhāmaha Vṛṭti has been commented upon by Udbhata Bhaṭṭa who lived in the court of King Jayāpīḍa of Kāsmira (779—

---

* दक्षिण ब्राह्मण तनोत्ति ते जिपहित तनोपल्यि इति।
818 A. D.). He quotes Kāśika that was written in the earlier part of the 7th century A. D. So he may be placed in the 8th century. Like Viśvanātha he too does not acknowledge श्र as the soul of Kāvya.

3. Rudraṭa—His Kāvyālaṅkāra was written about 9th century A. D. The book is divided into 16 chapters and describes figures principally and comments on language secondarily. Rudraṭa takes श्र as part and parcel of Kāvya. He too like Bhāmaha does not think श्र as the soul of Kāvya.

4. Rājaśekhara.—He flourished in the earlier part of the 10th century A. D. His Kāvya Mīmāṃsā describes chiefly शब्दर, शास्त्रि, पदवारितिक, पद्मारम्भ, कविच्या and राजस्वाल. Vābhaṭ and Vāgbhaṭ also flourished about this time and wrote respectively Vābhaṭālaṅkār and Kāvyānusāsana.

5. Vāmana.—He lived perhaps towards the close of the 9th century A. D. He composed Kāvyālaṅkār Sūtra with his own comment on it. Kalhan makes him a contemporary of Jayāpiḍa of Kāśmīra. According to him style is the soul of Kāvyas. In this work he has dealt also with anomalous grammatical points very clearly.
6. Dhvanikar—According to Prof. Sobhani Sahdaya is the name of the author of the book. The book contains 129 Kārikās. The vṛtti of those Kārikās is known as Dhvanvaloka. It is not yet certain if the comment was written by the author himself. Abhinava Gupta who has commented upon Dhvanvaloka thinks the authors of the Kārika and their vṛttis to be different persons. The author flourished in the earlier part of the 9th century A. D. According to him Dhvani is the soul of Kāvyā* and झोट is at the root of this dhvani.

7. Anandavardhan—He is taken by some as the author of Dhvanvaloka. He lived during the reign of Avantivarman of Kāśmīra. So his time may be assigned as 855—883 A. D.

8. Abhinavaguptacarya—His work is Dhvanaloka Locana, comment on Dhvanaloka. It was written in 1013 A. D.

9. Kuntala—Vakroktijīvita is the work of the author. It was written in the 11th century A. D. along with his own commentary. The book is divided into four chapters called वक्रकृति. According to him वक्रकृति plays an important part in the Kāvyā†

* काव्यवाक्यार्थिः ष
† वक्रकृति: काव्यशीलितम्
10 Bhojaraja—He ruled between 996—1051 A. D. He was a learned man and a great patron of learning. His Sarasvati Kaṇṭhābharan is a famous work on rhetoric. It is divided into five chapters. According to him style is included in बन्धुलक्ष्य। He wrote several other books and commented on Patañjali's 'Yogaśāstra.'

11. Mammatā Bhaṭṭa—Of the modern rhetoricians he occupies a preeminently high place. His Kāvyaprakāśa is an authoritative work on rhetoric. He flourished perhaps towards the close of the 17th century A. D. Mammatā wrote up to वर्तमानस, the work was completed by परमपर्वतेषु। The book is divided into 10 chapters called Ullāsas. The author does not speak anything regarding drama. The popularity of the book is proved by its numerous commentaries. Of these Saṅketa of Mānikya Candra, Dīpika of Jayanta, Balacittanuraṇijini of Sarasvatītīrtha, Kāvyaprakāś Darpan of Visvanāth and Udyota of Nagesabhaṭṭa are important. According to the author अन्नक्षण is not a characteristic of Kāvyā, but it only enhances its beauty. अन्नक्षण is the soul of Kāvyā.

"अन्नक्षण: श्रीस्रवाण्डार्थमयी: परिवर्तनं। प्रवय: पुरुष। वैभवदिग्ध्य भृतिः।"
12. *Joydeva*—He wrote *Candrāloka* in the 13th century A. D. The book contains 350 verses divided into 10 chapters called *Mayūkhas*.

13. *Viśvanath Kaviraja*—As a rhetorician he is next to Mammaṭa. His *Sahitya Darpaṇ* deals with both शब्द and दर्शन kāvyas. According to Prof. Macdonnell he is a Bengali, but some think him to be an inhabitant of Orissa. He flourished in the middle of the 14th century A. D. Rāmcaran Tarkavāgīsa's *Sahitya Darpaṇ* Vivṛti is a good commentary.

14. *Rupa Gosvāmi*—*Ujjala Nilmani* is the work of the author. The subject matter of the book is indicated by its name. It describes the love sentiment of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. The author discusses the variety of नायक, and some subtle matters also in it. He lived about the 15th century A. D.

15. *Appayya Dikṣit*—His works on rhetoric are *Cītramāṇsā*, *Vṛttivārtik* and *Kulaloyānanda*. These have been written in a very clear and lucid way. The author lived between 1554—1626 A. D.

16. *Jagannath*—He wrote *Rasagaṅgādhara* between 1641—1650 A. D. It is an authoritative work on rhetorics. The author could not finish the book. It was commented on by Nāgęṣa.

17. *Viśvesvara Suri*—His *Alaṅkār Kaustubha* is indeed the middle gem of rhetorical works. It is full of grave discussions and pithy matters.
TREATISES ON DRAMATURGY

Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharat is the oldest work on dramaturgy. The book served as an authority in ancient India as regards the technique in literature and drama. In course of time the book fell into the womb of oblivion. Then the art was revived by Kohala, Sāṇḍilya and others. The Bhāratīya Nāṭya Śāstra is composed of 36 chapters or Adhyāyas. The following is a rough outline of the arrangement of chapters:

1. Fabulous origin of the theatre (Ch. 36)
2. Construction of the edifice and the room (Ch. 2)
3. Ceremonies of construction (Ch. 3)
4. Religious preliminaries accompanied by music, dances and songs (Ch. 4—5)
5. Choriographic art, play, dance, etc. (Ch. 9, 10, 14, 26, 27)
6. Poetics and rhetoric (Ch. 6, 7, 17, 24, 25, 27)
7. Grammar, language, dialects, metric, recitation, declamation (Ch. 15, 16, 18, 19, 32)
8. Decoration, costume, play, scenery (Ch. 14, 23)
9. Theory of music (Ch. 28, 33)
10. Roles, characters, educations of actors (Ch. 24, 25, 26, 35)

The book has been justly characterised by M. Fitz Edward Hall as an “Institute of mimicries”.
The Bhāratiya Nāṭya Śāstra, one may say, is a vast science in verse and in prose under the form of a dialogue not very animated, as in like compositions, between Bharat and numerous ascetics gathered round him. The principal metre used is anuṣṭūpa; other metres are also used casually. The prose appears frequently, specially for definitions and grammatical explanations which do not lend themselves easily to versification. The work is generally described as “Śrī Bhāratiya Nāṭya Śāstra”.

Of the commentaries of the work “Bhuvanābhyyudaya” of Śankuka, “Abhinava Bhārati” of Abhinava Gupta and a commentary by Bhāṭṭanāyak are important.

Of the other works on the subject “Dāsarūpaka” of Dhanaṇḍaya (974—995), “Pratāpa ruddīya” of Vidyānāth (1275—1323), “Ekāvalī” of Vidyādhara (1280—1314) and “Sāhitya Darpaṇa” (ch. VI) of Viśvanāth (1360—1370) deserve mention. We should not omit Samudra Misra’s ‘Nāṭya Pradīpaka’ in this connection which was composed in 1613 A.D.

GRAMMAR

Grammatical points have been clearly discussed in the Brāhmaṇas and in some Upaniṣads as well. This shows that grammar, one of the Vedāṅgas was existent at that time. It is admitted that Yāska preceded Pāṇini. Besides, we find the mention of some 64 grammarians in the system of Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī.

Of these the names of Bharadvāj, Kāśyapa, Sākalya, Sāktāyan, Gārgya, Gālava, Cakrabārman, Senak, Sphoṭāyan etc. are important.
We do not know anything regarding the personal history of Pāṇini. Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya calls him 'Dākṣiṇa Putra. Vyādi is said to be his nephew and his forefathers are said to have lived at Sālātur situated on the north western frontier province of India. From Pañcatantra we get that he was killed by a lion. It is said that he was a disciple of Varṣa and taught grammar to Kautsa. His work is indeed an admirable one. The arrangement is not only methodical but scientific also. It is divided into 8 chapters, each consisting of 4 Pādas.

Kātyāyan—He is otherwise known as Vararuci. He wrote not only Vārttik sūtras but the Prātisākhya of the Vāja Śani Saṃhitā also.

He has written Vṛtti on 1245 aphorisms of Pāṇini and has composed about five thousand Vārtik Sūtras. In course of time, these Vārtik Sūtras have been incorporated into the body of Pāṇini's system to remove its defects and incompleteness.

Patañjali—He is the famous author of Mahābhāṣya. According to old Pandits he composed Yoga Sūtra and published the revised edition of Carak. He is otherwise known as Gonardīya and Gaṇikāputra. Gaṇika was perhaps the name of his mother and Gonarda the place where he lived. But Vātsayana takes these to be two different persons. He thinks them to be different from Patañjali and supposes that they preceded Patañjali. Patañjali in his Bhāṣya has discussed the Vṛtti and Vārttika Sūtras of Kātyāna.

Somewhere he has defended them and at other places refuted them also. The language of the Bhāṣya is very simple. But in many
places it is not easily understood as many grave matters have been discussed.

In the middle of the 7th century A. D. Bhartṛhari wrote Mahābhāṣya Dipikā and Vākya Padiya. Kaival in the 11th century A. D. wrote Mahābhāṣya Pradip which was commented again by Iśvarānanda under the title of Bhāṣya Pradip Vibaran. In the beginning of the 18th century A. D. Nāgėś Bhaṭṭa wrote his Mahavāṣya Pradīpodyota.

Besides Puruṣottam Dev wrote Bhāṣya Vṛtti in the 12th century A. D.

KĀSIKĀ

In the middle of the 7th century A. D. Vāman and Jayāditya two famous Buddhist grammarians composed a very easy commentary on the system Astādhyayī under the name of Kasikā Vṛtti. It is not certain which portion of the work was written by Vāman and which by Jayāditya.

Some scholars think that the first five chapters of the book was composed by Vāman and the rest by Jayāditya.

Towards the close of the 7th century A. D. or in the beginning of the 8th Jinendra Buddhhi wrote Kasikā Vibaran Pañjikā or Nyāsa upon Kāsiṅa Vṛtti. This Jinendra Buddhhi is not identical with the author of Jainendra grammar. Haradatta Miśra wrote another commentary on Kāsiṅa known as Padamaṅjari in the 11th century A. D.

Bhāṣa Vṛtti—Puruṣottam Deb wrote this on Loukikaphorisms of Pāṇini alone. He has quoted many famous Kāvyas by way of illustrations. This has been commented by Śṛṣṭidhar under the title of Bhāṣa
Vṛttyartha Vīṛti in the beginning of the 12th century A. D. Śaṅkara Dev wrote Durghaṭa Vṛtti in 1173 A. D. to explain the difficult aphorisms of Pāṇini. This Śaṅkara Dev lived in the court of Laksmana Dev.

Rupamāla—In the fourteenth century Vimal Sarasvatī arranged the aphorisms of Aṣṭādhīyāyī in accordance with different subjects treated in the grammar of Pāṇini. He may be said to be the father of such kind of work. Mādhavācāryya took only the roots and wrote famous Madhaviya-dhātu-vṛtti.” It was followed by Rām candra’s Prakṛyā Kaumudi written in the 15 century A. D. Viṭṭhalācārya wrote a commentary on it known as Prasād and Jayanta wrote another commentary on it known as Tattva-candra.

Siddhānta Kaumudi—Of the Prakriya Granthis Siddhānta Kaumudi occupies the most prominent position. It was written by Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣit in the earlier part of the 17th century A.D. He wrote a commentary on it called ‘Bālamanorāmā’ for the easy understanding of the boys and Praudha Manoramā also in a learned manner. He began to write Sabda Kaustubha’ in imitation of Kāśikā Vṛtti but could not unfortunately finish it. Hari Dikṣit wrote Sabdaratnamonorāmā, a comment on the Praudha monorāmā. Jnanendra Bhikṣu has written Tattva Vadhini on the classical portion of Siddhānta Kaumudi.

Nāgēs Bhaṭṭa or Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa has written two commentaries on Siddhānta Kaumudi known as ‘Sabdendu Sekhar’ and ‘Vṛhad Sabdendu Sekhar’ in the beginning of the 18th century A. D. Besides, he has written Mahābhāṣya Pradipodyota on Kātyāya’s Maha-
bhāṣya Pradīp and Paribhāṣendu Sekhar, a treatise on Paribhāṣā.

Varāda Rāj Dīkṣīt, a disciple of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīt, has composed a treatise on grammar called Laghu Siddhānta Kaumudi having abridged the Siddhānta Kaumudi of his preceptor. Besides he has written two other books of the same nature known as Madhya Siddhānta Kaumudi and Sāra Siddhanta Kaumudi.

Paniniya Dhātu Paṭh.

Kṣīra svāmi—a Kāsmirian has written Gaṇavṛtti and a commentary on Dhātupāṭh. He flourished perhaps in the 11th century A. D. Kṣīra Svāmi’s Gaṇa Vṛtti is not now available. In 1140 A. D. Vardhamān has written Gaṇaratna Mahodadhi in verses. It is an authoritative work on roots. This Vardhamān should not be confused with Vardhamān, son of Gaṇgesopādhyāya.

Unādi

It is said that Unādi Sūtras were written by Śakaṭāyana. But according to Daurga Sinha these were written by Vararuci. In the middle of the 12th century A. D. Ujjvala Daṭṭa wrote Unādi vṛtti.

Non-Paniniian School.

Kātantra or Kalāp.—It is also called Kaumāra grammar. It is said that being asked by king Sātabāhan Sarva Varmā composed it for easy understanding of a novice. It is divided into four sections vis Sandhi, Nāma, Ākhya,ta and Kṛt. The chapter on Kṛt was taken perhaps from the grammar

* महरसा सुखाद्वाम् नुला चेत श्यामानः विशेष विशेषः
पुष्चे कादाय प्रति चतुर्वति।
of Śakaṭāyana. The chapter on Taddhit also seems to be a later addition.

Daurga Sinha wrote a commentary on it under the title of Kātantra Vṛtti. This is the oldest commentary on the work. Daurga singha flourished perhaps in the 8th century. A. D. Vardhamān wrote an exposition of this Vṛtti known as Kātantra Vistara. Trilocan Dāsa's Kātantra Pañjikā is a good comment on Kātantra Vṛtti. This Pañjikā has been commented by Jīna Prabhā Sūri, Kuśal and Rāmcandra, Kaviraj, Gopinath and Kulcandra. Besides these there is a commentary on it called Dhuṇḍika.

This grammar is mainly read in Bengal and in Kāśmir.

Śripati wrote Kātantra Parisīṣṭa which has been commented by Gopināth, Rāmcandra, Śivarām and Puṇḍarikākṣa. Uttara Parisīṣṭa was added to Kātantra Parisīṣṭa by Trilocan Dāsa.

There is a great difference between the Kātantra Sūtra Pāṭh of Bengal and that of Kāśmir.

_Candra grammar—_It was written by Candra with his own Vṛtti. The author was a Buddhist. This grammar was discovered from Nepal by M. M. Hara Prasad Sāstrī and from Tibetan language by Mr. Bruno Libick. The author flourished in the 5th century A. D. The book was commented by Dharma Dās.

_Jivanendra grammar—_It is said that this grammar was written by Mahāvīr. The name of the book owes its origin to the fact that Indra in his childhood asked Jīna the subject matter of grammar. In many man—
scripts Devānanda is found to be the author of the book. This is supported by Hemcandra and Vopadev also. This grammar is older than Cāndra grammar. There are two recensions of the book, the one contains three thousand Sūtras with commentary, Abhayaśand Vṛtti and the other contains three thousand seven hundred sūtras with the commentary Śabdarnava candrikā by Somadeva Suhrit. The author flourished in the fifth century A.D.

Abhinava Śākatayana grammar—This has been quoted by Heimcandra, Gaṇaratna Mahodadhi, Mādhaviya Dhātu Vṛtti, Bhopadev and others. This book is divided into four chapters each of which contains four Pādas. He flourished perhaps in the earlier part of 9th century A.D.

Śārasvat grammar—The author of the book is Anubhuti Svarūpācāryya. He flourished perhaps in the 13th century A.D. The book with seven hundred aphorisms has explained all the important subjects related to classical Sanskrit. Of the commentaries on the work the commentary by Amrita Bhārati, the Siddhānta Candrikā of Rāmāśram, the Prasād of Vāsudev Bhāṭṭa, and the Sāra Pra-dīpikā of Jagannāth are important.

Supadma—It was written by Padmānātha Datta. The author has followed Astādhyāyī in many respects. He flourished perhaps towards the close of the 13th century. The book has seven chapters vis, Saṃjña, Sandhi, Kārak, Akhyat, Kṛt, Unādi and Taddhit. The Vṛtti of this grammar and a commentary Supadma Pañjika by name were written by the author himself. Besides, it has been
commented by Kāśīśvar, Sridhar Chakrabarty, Rāmchandra others.

Samkṣipta Sāra—It was written by Krama-disvar. He followed the opinion Mahābhāṣya Dipīka and has given illustrations mostly from the Bhaṭṭi Kāvya. He has given in brief the opinion of Pāṇini. The book is divided into eight chapters. The first seven deal with classical Sanskrit, while the last with Prākrit language. Jumur Nandī in his commentary, the Rasa-Vati on the grammar, has made good the defects found in the original. In importance the commentary of Goyī candra comes next to Rasavati. The commentary of Goyī chandra has been explained by Kesav dev, Vāṃsi dev, Hari Rām and others.

Mugdha Bodha—The author of the book is Vopadev Gosvāmi. Besides, Mugdhabodha he has written Kavikalpa Druma and its commentary ‘Kāmdhenu’. It is read widely now at Navadvīp and middle Bengal. Rāmtarka Vāgīs is the famous commentator of Mugdha-bodh. It was commented besides by Devī Das, Kāśīśvar, Rāmānanda and others.

PrayogaRatnamala—It was written by Purusottam. He is distinct from Purusottam, the author of Bhāṣā Vṛtti.

We have several other minor grammars of which Harināmāmṛta of Rūpa Gosvāmi, Prabodh Candrikā of Vījjala Bhūpati, Govinda nāmāmṛta of Govindanāth, Kārikāvalī of Dhaṭṭacaryya Cakrabarty, Bhoja Vyākaraṇ by Vinava Sundar are important.
APPENDIX A.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VEDAS

On the question of interpreting the Vedas, the ancient sacred books of the Hindus, which differ greatly from classical literatures in point of language, style and matter, our learned European scholar Theodor Goldstücker shows great respect to the oldest commentators like Śāyaṇa, Yāska, Mahīdhara and others. He holds that it is from the chronological position in which the works stand to one another that we may feel justified in appealing to the oldest commentators for right interpretation. For, the greater the distance between a Veda and the grammarian who appended to it his notes, the more we shall have plausible ground for looking forward, in preference to him, to that grammarian who stood nearer to the fountain head. Thus according to this view, even Pāṇini would cease to be our ultimate refuge if we find Yāska opposed to him and Gārgya, Śākala, Śakaṭāyana or the other predecessors of Pāṇini would deserve more serious consideration than himself, if we are able to see that they maintain a sense of a Vaidik word which is differently rendered by him.

These remarks apply, of course, to the Saṃhitās which Preceded pāṇini. But as to the literature which is posterior to him Kātyāyana becomes necessarily our first exegetical authority and after him comes Patañjali.

Let us now see what other European scholars have got to say on this question. Among others we find the most prominent name of Professor Roth who professes to be a teacher and authority on the subject. Professor Roth in
his preface to the great Sanskrit Dictionary published by
the Russian Imperial Academy says in the following
words:—"We do not believe, as H. H. Wilson does, that
Sāyaṇa better understood the expressions of the Veda than
any European exegete, and that we have nothing to do
but repeat what he says; on the contrary, we believe
that a conscientious European exegete may understand the
Veda much more correctly and better than Sāyaṇa. We
do not consider it our immediate purpose to obtain
that understanding of the Veda which was current in
India some centuries ago, but we search for the meaning
which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases.
We consequently hold that the writings of Sāyaṇa and
of the other commentators must not be an authority to
the exegete, but merely one of the means of which he
has to avail himself in the accomplishment of his task
which certainly is difficult, and not to be effected at a
first attempt, nor by a single individual. We have there-
fore endeavoured to take the road which is prescribed by
philology to elicit the sense of the texts by putting to
gether all the passages which are kindred either in regard
to their words or their sense; a road which is slow and
tedious, and which indeed has not been trodden before,
either by the commentators or the translators. Our double
lot has therefore been that of exegetes as well as lexi-
cographers. The purely etymological proceeding, as it must
be followed up by those who endeavour to guess the
sense of words, without having before them the ten or
twenty other passages in which the same word recurs, can
not possibly lead to a correct result."

If we analyse the ideas and principles presented in the
passage quoted above, we get the following:—
(1) Sāyaṇa gives us only that sense of the Veda which was current in India some centuries ago.

(2) Professor Roth is far more able than Sāyaṇa and other commentators to give us the correct sense of the Veda.

(3) He can put together some ten or twenty passages referring to the same word, whereas Sāyaṇa and other commentators could not do this, but had to guess out its sense.

(4) He is confining himself to the purely etymological process which is above that of these commentators.

(5) His object is not to understand the sense of the Veda which was current in India a few centuries back, but to know the meaning which the authors of the hymns themselves gave to their songs and phrases.

(6) Professor Roth is a conscientious European exegete.

Adducing these views of Professor Roth, Goldstücker deigns to criticise every point. He begins his criticism thus one by one:

(1) As regards the first point of attack against Sāyaṇa that he and the other commentators give us only that sense of the Veda which was current in India some centuries back, he meets his opponent, saying that Roth's is a bolder statement that should not proceed from the lips of a scholar. Sāyaṇa incessantly refers to Vāska. All his explanations show that he stands on the ground of the oldest legends and traditions; yet Professor Roth ventures to tell the public at large authoritatively and without a particle of evidence that these legends and his version of the Ṛgveda are but some centuries old.

(2) On the second point he presumes that he is more competent than Sāyaṇa in the interpretation of the Veda. But Goldstücker is of opinion that when Roth says so, he
seems to declare that he has been familiar with all that Sāyaṇa knew. When an author tells us that he is able to do that which another author cannot do we are entitled to infer that he is at any rate thoroughly acquainted with all that this author has written. But the fact is that notwithstanding his stay in Paris, in London and in Oxford for the collection of the Vaidik commentaries of Sāyaṇa for his lexicographical purposes, when he began his Dictionary he was only acquainted with the commentary of Sāyaṇa as far as the first Aṣṭaka and when he wrote these lines he might perhaps have known its continuation up to a portion of the third Aṣṭaka; and yet he ventures to speak of the whole commentary of Sāyaṇa and to say that he can do what Sāyaṇa was unable to perform.

(3) On the third point Goldstücker finds Professor Roth insane. The statement that Sāyaṇa cannot put together some ten or twenty passages in corroboration of the sense of a word like Professor Roth is more than puerile. Mādhava Sāyaṇa, one of the profoundest scholars of India, the exegete of all the three Vedas, of the most important Brāhmaṇs and a Kalpa work, the renowned Mīmāṃsīst, the great grammarian who wrote the learned commentary on the Sanskrit radicals, who shows at every step that he has Pāṇini and Kātyāyana at his fingers' ends, who on account of his gigantic learning and his deep sense of religion lives in the legends of India as an incarnation of Śiva,—such a great Mādhava had not, in the opinion of Professor Roth, the proficiency of combining in his mind or otherwise those ten or twenty passages of his own Veda, which Professor Roth has the powerful advantage of bringing together by means of his little memoranda.

(4). On the fourth point Prof. Roth accuses Sāyaṇa of
giving us the meanings of Vaidik words on a purely etymological basis. There is, in the opinion of Goldstücker, too much of boldess in such an assertion. Goldstücker declares that he knows of no work which has come before the public with such unmeasured pretensions of scholarship and critical ingenuity. His Dictionary has given many meanings without the slightest regard to the grammatical proprieties of the word. But an etymological proceeding (which Prof. Roth presumes to know) without a thorough knowledge of grammar is altogether a cypher.

(5) On the fifth point Prof. Roth has got to say that he must not have understood the Veda such as it was current in India a few centuries back, but to know the meaning which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases. This is no doubt a very important point. If Śāyaṇa gives us the sense of the Veda such as it was handed down to him from generation to generation from time immemorial and not a few centuries ago. How are we to know the revelations of the sages without having any regard to the learned commentators who are qualified to interpret them? Goldstücker makes here fun of Prof. Roth saying that the latter has received a revelation at Tübingen like the former Rṣis which has neither reached the bank of the Thames nor those of the Ganges. Who will not hail his revelation which dispenses with grammar and all that sort of thing, and who will not believe in it? Goldstücker then seriously declares that in those cases no critic has anything to do with the sense which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases, but he has simply to deal with that sense which religion or superstition imparted to the verses in order to adapt them to the imaginary effects of the sacrifice.

(6) On the 6th point Prof. Roth says that a conscientious European exegete may understand much more correctly and
and thoroughly the sense of the Veda than Śāyāna. Goldstücker criticises the view in the following way: In scientific treatment Dr. Bohtlingk stands in the fore front, but he himself is incapable of understanding even the easy rules of Pāṇini, much less those of Kātyāyana. The errors in the department of the Dictionary which chiefly consist in the abolition of the radicals and nominal bases taught by Pāṇini and subsequent grammarians are of a peculiar kind and simply cancel all the categories of grammatical forms and those of the greatest importance and comprehensiveness. But a Sanskrit Dictionary has no such aim. The immediate object is the actual language which it has to deal with. It must be taken as it is; its function is not to correct the real historical language, but to record its facts; and in doing so to collect the materials which are to be used by the specialists as well as by the comparative philologer. So far as its direct purpose is concerned this is all it has to do. Any observations it may choose to attach to the real historical facts may of course be given; but it shows another want of judgment, to say nothing else when it presumes to alter the very forms of the language itself.

Alfred Ludwig was the first man to admit that the indigenous expounders are not to be followed blindly, but he at the same time believes that these expounders at least partly drew upon an uninterrupted tradition and therefore deserve to be respected. He refers to the Nirukta, Śāyāna and Mahādāhara and tries to judge them by their own merits.

Ludwig was followed by Pischel and Geldner. They combine the two methods of Prof. Roth and Ludwig. They have shown conclusively that howsoever fanciful, irrational and inconsistent the explanations of Śāyāna are as a rule,
no one can any longer ignore them as Roth and Grassman have done, and yet call himself a Vedic scholar. We may meet with much of chaff, but a kern might be hidden beneath is worth the perusal.

Of the oriental scholars some join with Goldstücker in saying that only the Indian exegetes, Sāyaṇa and his predecessors are able to interpret the Vedas aright, while others following Pischel and Geldner say that the Indian scholiasts with their traditional knowledge are eligible to interpret them being dependent upon the European scholars for their philological knowledge. The latter in our opinion is the right method which should be adopted to interpret the Vedas.