

<http://vitasta.org/1999/3a.html>

CONTRIBUTION TO POETICS AND DRAMATURGY

Sures Chandra Banerji

The early Vedic Indians, like the people of many other ancient lands, preferred poetry to prose as the medium of expressing their thoughts. Figures of speech and sentiments of various kinds constitute the very life-blood of poetry. This can be said in a general way without entering into the niceties of academic discussions about the soul (*atma*) of Kavya. The Rgvedic hymns contain figures of speech like Upama (simile), Rupaka (metaphor) etc and sentiments like the erotic pervade many of them. The hymns, for aught we know, were the spontaneous outpourings of the Vedic Rsi (seer) who was, therefore, unconscious of the figures of speech and Rasas employed in the hymns. The conscious employment of these poetic devices presumably took a long time. The beginnings of poetics as a discipline are shrouded in obscurity. To Kashmir, however, belongs the credit of systematizing the ideas of poetics into a coherent form. In the present state of our knowledge, we can safely make this assertion in view of the fact that, of the writers on poetics known hitherto, the Kashmirian Bhamaha is the earliest.

It is noteworthy that all the schools of poetics, viz. Alankara, Riti Rasa and Dhvani, originated and developed in Kashmir. It was the scholars of Kashmir again who propounded different theories of Rasa by independent exposition of the celebrated Rasa-Sutra of Bharata. It is a matter of no mean credit that Kashmir was not only the cradle of the schools of poetics, but it also nurtured generations of poetics through four centuries or more. The valley saw the different systems in their formative, creative, definitive and scholastic stages. No evidence is available to us for determining the date of Bhamaha with absolute certainty. The testimony of Pratiharenduraja and Abhinavagupta is clear that Udbhata wrote a commentary on Bhamaha's work. In Udbhata's *Kavyalankara-samgraha* there are evidences of borrowing from Bhamaha's rhetorical work. The rhetorician Vamana also appears to have been acquainted with Bhamaha's text. Udbhata and Vamana flourished in the last quarter of the eighth century A.D. which, therefore, is the lower limit to the date of Bhamaha.

The upper terminus of his date is more difficult to determine. The mention of *Nyasa* in Bhamaha leads some scholars to suppose that Bhamaha was later than Jinendrabuddhi, author of the *Nyasa*, and exposition of the Kasika commentary on the *Astadhyayi*. Even if this conjecture is correct, it does not help us materially, because the date of Jinendrabuddhi himself is

controversial. While some scholars believe that he lived about 700 A.D., others would place him later than 878 A.D.

The supposed reference, in Bhamaha's work, to the *Megha-duta* is of no consequence in this respect. Kalidasa is placed at different times from the first century B.C. to the fifth century A.D. - a space of five hundred years! In chapter v, Bhamaha appears to have utilised some philosophical doctrines of the Buddhist philosopher, Dharmakirti, who is believed to have lived in the middle of the seventh century A.D.

From the foregoing evidences Bhamaha may, perhaps, be placed between the last quarter of the seventh century and the middle of the eighth.

The question of the chronological relationship between Bhamaha and Bhatti, author of the *Ravana-Vadha*, popularly known as *Bhattikavya*, is difficult. Some scholars believe that the *Prasannakanda* of the *Bhattikavya* was designed to illustrate the figures of speech dealt with by Bhamaha. But, the date of Bhatti himself has not been fixed with certainty. Bhatti mentions Sridharasena as his patron. The fact of the existence of four persons of this name makes it difficult to associate Bhatti with the right person. Again Bhamaha's couplet in ii. 20 appears to be a dig at Bhatti's boastful reference to his pedantry. A comparison of Bhamaha's poetic figures with the *alankaras* illustrated by Bhatti, while revealing close resemblance, betrays some discrepancies too. The conclusion seems reasonable that both Bhatti and Bhamaha used independent sources which had close correspondence with one another and also minor differences.

Of Bhamaha's personal history we know nothing excepting the fact, as he himself states, that he was the son of Rakrilagomin.

Bhamaha's work, called *Kavyalankara* or *Bhamahalankara*, consists of six Paricchedas or chapters and about 400 verses. The contents of the chapters are: I Object, definition and classification of Kavya, reference to the Vaidarbhi and Gaudi modes of composition, some blemishes of Kavya; II-III. The three Gunas of Madhurya, Prasada, Ojas and Alankaras; IV Eleven blemishes with illustrations; V Eleven blemishes arising from a faulty Pratijua, Hetu or Drstanta; IV Grammatical correctness of words used in Kavya.

The object of Kavya, according to Bhamaha, is chiefly twofold, viz. acquisition of fame on the part of the poet and delight for the reader. Like most other theorists Bhamaha deals with the equipment of a poet or the qualities that are necessary for the making of a poet. The first essential is genius. Coupled with this is the knowledge of various arts and sciences. While defining Kavya, Bhamaha says - *sabdarthau sahitaau kavyam*; word and sense together constitute Kavya. This definition obviously takes cognisance of the external element or the body of Kavya, and is silent about its innermost element or its soul. From his treatment of the subject

it is implied that word and sense in order to rank as Kavya must be free from blemishes (*nirdosa*) and embellished with poetic figures (*salankara*). On poetic figures Bhamaha lays the greatest stress. In his opinion, a literary composition, however laudable, does not become attractive if it is devoid of embellishments. He gives a happy analogy by saying that the face of a beloved woman, though lovely, does not look radiant without ornaments. *Alankara* is, according to him, indispensable for a composition to merit the designation of Kavya. Bhamaha is, therefore, the earliest exponent, if not the founder, of the Alankara school of Sanskrit Poetics. Even so, he ignores the *atma* (soul) of poetry of which later rhetoricians make so much; because *alankaras* are nothing but extraneous elements like ornaments to human beings.

In Bhamaha's work we get a fourfold classification of Kavya. A Kavya may be in prose or verse. It may be written in Sanskrit, Prakrit or Apabhramsa. The subject-matter of a Kavya may be human or divine; it may be imaginary or based on the various arts and sciences. Coming to the conventional classification, he divides Kavya into the following classes: *Sargabandha* mahakavya (an epic poem in cantos), *Abhinayartha* (drama) Akhyayika (a historical narrative), *Katha* (romantic tale) and *Anibaddha kavya* (detached verses).

Unlike the advocates of the Riti school, Bhamaha does not attach much importance to Riti or mode of composition; because, in his opinion, the distinction between the Vaidarbhi and the Gaudi Riti is of no consequence. This attitude to Riti perhaps accounts for his comparative indifference to Gunas of which he mentions only *Madhurya*, *Ojas* and *Prasada*.

It is the subject of Alankaras that receives the most detailed treatment at the hands of Bhamaha, and it is quite in the fitness of things because he considers Alankara to be the essential element of Kavya. It should be added that, of the Alankaras, Bhamaha thinks that *Vakrokti* is an essential principle. *Vakrokti* of Bhamaha is strikingness or charm of expression and not a particular poet figure as we find it in later rhetorical works. It is interesting to note that Bhamaha was not ignorant or incognisant of Rasa in Kavya; indeed he mentions a poetic figure called *Rasavat* (lit. that which possesses Rasa). The suggested sense (*vyangyarth*), which is at the root of Rasa, is implicit in the *vakrokti* of Bhamaha so that the germs of the later Rasa of Dhvani school of poetics are there in Bhamaha's work of so remote an antiquity.

The next Kashmirian poetician of note is Udbhata. Apart from his typically Kashmirian name, he is stated by Kalhana to have adorned the court of king Jayapida (C. 779-813 A.D.) of Kashmir. Anandavardhana, in the middle of the 9th century, mentions Udbhata. Thus, Udbhata may be placed in the period between the close of the 8th century and the beginning of the 9th.

Besides the lost *Bhamaha-vivarana* (also called *Kavyalankaravivrti*), a commentary on Bhamaha's work, Udbhata appears, on the testimony of Pratiharenduraja, to have composed a poem entitled *Kumarasambhava* which is no longer extant. Udbhata probably wrote also a commentary on Bharata's *Natya-sastra*.

Udbhata's fame, however, rests on his *Kavyalankarasamgraha*. It is written in six Vargas, or chapters. This work has two commentaries, viz one by Pratiharenduraja and the other by an unknown author. Rajanaka Tilaka, who was probably father of Ruyyaka, is mentioned by Jayaratha, in his commentary on Ruyyaka's *Alankarasarvasva*, as author of an *Udbhata-viveka*. or *Udbhata-vicara*.

From the extant work of Udbhata, which is only a short treatise on poetic figures, it is difficult to ascertain his views on the general principles, e.g. the essential constituent of Kavya and such other questions. In his brief work Udbhata follows Bhamaha in the number and even order of the poetic figures. Bhamaha's definitions of some of the figures have been taken verbatim by Udbhata. Udbhata's originality, however, lies in the analysis and distinctions of the different *alankaras*. For example, whereas Bhamaha mentions one kind of *atisayokti* Udbhata distinguishes four varieties of it. In place of Bhamaha's two forms of *anuprasa*, Udbhata gives four. In connexion with the varieties of *anuprasa*, Udbhata for the first time recognises three different *Vrttis* or modes of expression. In Udbhata's work again, we find a clear statement of the grammatical basis of the divisions of Upama according as the idea of resemblance is expressed by suffixes like *-vat*, *-kyac*, *-kalpap* etc. A comparison of the characterization of the poetic figures by Bhamaha and Udbhata reveals also the fact that the latter differs from the former on some minor points. What is most noteworthy is that Udbhata's notion of Rasa is more developed than that of his predecessor, so much so that he even uses the terms *bhava* and *anubhava* which are the elements that give rise to Rasa. Thus by his advanced ideas and critical analysis he threw Bhamaha into background; later theorists recognise Udbhata as the highest authority, and follow in his footsteps in matters relating to poetic figures. The seeds of the *Alankara* doctrine, which we find in Bhamaha's work, grow into a flowering tree in that of his successor.

Mukula is the author of the short work entitled *Abhidhavrthtimatrka*. In fifteen Karikas, with Vrtti on them, he discusses the functions of words called Abhidha (denotation) and Laksana (indication) from the grammatical and rhetorical standpoints. We learn from the concluding verse of this work that Mukula was the son of Bhatta Kallata who, Kalhana informs us, lived during the reign of Avantivarman of Kashmir (855-884 A.D.).

With Vamana we reach a towering personality in the realm of Sanskrit poetics. Vamana's quotations from Bhavabhuti's works fix the upper limit

of his date at the first quarter of the 8th. century when Bhavabhuti is known to have flourished. The lower limit is suggested by Rajasekhara's (9th-10th century) quotation from Vamana's work. According to Kalhana (R. T. IV. 497), Vamana was a minister of king Jayapida of Kashmir (779-813 A.D.).

The *Kavyalankara-sutra-vrtti* of Vamana consists of aphorisms and a commentary called *Kavi-Priya* thereon. Both the text and the commentary appear to have been written by Vamana who says that some of the illustrative verses are taken from others. Of the commentaries on this work, the *Kamadhenu* by Gopendra Bhupala is the most well-known.

The *Kavyalankara-Sutra-Vrtti* is divided into five sections (*adhikarana*) each of which consists of some chapters (*adhyaya*). The titles of the Adhikaranas are in order: Sarira, Dosa-Darsana, Gunavivecana, Alankarika and Prayogika. The titles of the Adhikaranas hint at their contents.

In consonance with the views of his predecessors, Vamana holds that the body of Kavya is constituted by word and sense. It is in the conception of the soul of Kavya that he clearly expresses an independent view. None of his predecessors is explicit on the point. For the first time, Vamana declares *ritir-atma kavyasya*, i.e. Riti is the soul of Kavya. 'Riti' is not a new concept with Vamana, but the idea of its constituting the soul of Kavya is his contribution to poetical speculations. Riti, according to him, is *Visista pada-racana* or a particular arrangement of words. Of Ritis he distinguishes three varieties, viz. Gaudi, Vaidarbhi and Pancali which obviously took their names from the regions in which they originated and had been standardised in the period preceding Vamana. Riti is closely associated with Gunas or qualities. According to Vamana, Vaidarbhi, the Riti par excellence, possesses all the ten conventional Gunas; to Gaudi belong *Ojas* and *Kanti* and the Pancali has *Madhurya* and *Saukumarya*. As Riti, according to Vamana, is the essence of Kavya so Gunas are the essential elements of the Riti. Vamana's idea of Riti as the life-force of Kavya naturally led him to relegate the *alankaras* to a subservient position. In his opinion, a Kavya cannot be so called without Gunas which underline Ritis, but it can be so without *alankaras* which, therefore, are extraneous elements. His remark *kavyam grahyam alankarat* may, at first sight, seem contradictory to what we have just said about his attitude to *alankaras*. But, the immediately following words clarify his position. He says *saundaryam alankarah*, i.e. the charm or beauty is *alankara*; this makes it clear that it is the charm of expression, but not *alankara* in its technical sense of poetic figure, that imparts the status of Kavya to a literary composition. Vamana, for the first time, makes a clear distinction between *sabda-gunas* (verbal qualities) and *artha-gunas* (ideal qualities). While accepting the ten traditional Gunas, Vamana brings out the meaning of each as applied to *sabda* and *artha*. For example, Prasada as a *sabda-guna*, according to him, means looseness (*saithilya*) of structure; as an *artha-guna* it means propriety of sense.

Coming to Rasa we find that his idea about it is more advanced than that of his predecessors. While the writers preceding him recognise Rasa as an element of a certain poetic figure, Vamana takes it as a constituent of *Kanti* which is an *artha-guna*, and, as such, an essential element of Kavya written in particular Ritis.

Rudrata bears a typically Kashmirian name. His date cannot be ascertained with certainty. The mention of Rudrata or reference to his text or views by Rajasekhara and Vallabhadeva fixes the lower terminus of Rudrata's date at the end of the ninth century or beginning of the tenth. Rudrata's treatment of *Vakrokti* as a poetic figure, rather than as strikingness of expression underlying all poetic figures or as the collective name of almost all poetic figures or as a metaphorical expression based on transferred sense, makes it probable that he was later than Bhamaha, Dandin and Vamana. Coupled with this fact the absence of any indication of Anandavardhana's acquaintance with his work tends to establish that Rudrata flourished between the first quarter of the ninth century and its close.

From V. 12-14 of the *Kavyalankara*, as interpreted by Namisadhu, Rudrata, also called Satananda, appears to have been son of Bhatta Vamakha. Rudrata is sometimes identified, on no more convincing ground than the similarity of names, with Rudra or Rudrabhatta, author of the *Srngaratilaka*.

The *Kavyalankara* of Rudrata is written in sixteen chapters (*adhyayas*) and has been commented upon by Vallabhadeva, Namisadhu and Asadhara.

As the title of his work suggests, Rudrata lays the greatest stress on *alankara* as the principal element in Kavya. Indeed, he devotes the bulk of his work to this topic. In comparison with his predecessors he mentions more poetic figures and a larger number of the sub-divisions of many of them. For the first time he clearly distinguishes between figures of words (*sabdalankara*) and figures of sense (*arthalankara*). Rudrata no doubt mentions Rasas which find a fairly lengthy treatment in his work: but the Rasas are still considered as extrinsic elements. He mentions as many as four Ritis, viz.

Pancali, Latiya, Gaudiya and *Vaidarbhi*, but these do not, in his opinion, dominate Kavya. He does not mention *Dhvani*, although he makes the suggested sense an accessory to the expressed one in some poetic figures.

The work of Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana stand as a prominent landmark in the literature of Indian poetics. The *Dhvanyaloka*, also called *Kavyaloka* or *Sahrdyaloka*, is the last great monument to the sound judgment and critical scholarship of the Kashmirian school of poetics. It was succeeded by learned works produced in Kashmir, but none surpassed it in the original and systematic treatment of the subject.

The *Dhvanyaloka* consists of two parts, the text and its running commentary with illustrations. A keen controversy has been raging on the question as to whether or not the text (*Karikas*) and the commentary (*vrtti*) of this work were written by one and the same person, i.e. Anandavardhana who is known to have composed the *vrtti*. We have the authority of Abhinavagupta and Mammata for the assumption that the authors of the two portions were different persons. But, the name of the author of the *Karikas* is not known so that he is generally referred to as Dhvanikrt or Dhvanikara which appellation is sometimes used to refer to Anandavardhana also. Some scholars have suggested that the author of the *Karikas* was named Sahrdaya, but they have not succeeded in adducing conclusive evidence in support of their contention. We have no means of determining the date of Dhvanikara or the region to which he belonged. Anandavardhana, however, is known to have been a Kashmirian who is assigned to the middle of the ninth century on the authority of Kalhana who states (R.T.V. 34) that this great poetician adorned the court of King Avantivarman (885-84 A.D.) of Kashmir. This date is corroborated by Raja Sekhara (9th -10th Century) who clearly cites him by name in the *Kavya-Mimansa*. From the colophon to chapter III of the *Dhvanyaloka* Anandavardhana's father appears to have been known as Nonopadhyaya. Anandavardhana appears to have composed the following works too: -

Devi-sataka, *Visamabana-lila*, *Arjuna-carita*, *Dharmottama*, *Mata-Pariksa*, *Tattvaloka* and *Hari-vijaya*. Of these, the *Devi-sataka*, a lyric on Parvati, exists while the others are referred to either by Anandavardhana himself or by later writers. The *Visamabana-lila* appears to be a Prakrit poem which, judging from the title, perhaps dealt with an erotic theme. The *Arjuna-carita* was a Mahakavya in Sanskrit. The *Dharmottama* was a commentary on the *Pramana-viniscaya* of Dharmakirti. The *Tattvaloka* is stated by Abhinavagupta, in his *Locana*, to have discussed, *inter alia*, the relation between *Kavya-nyaya* (method of instruction in Kavya) and *Sastra-nyaya* (method of instruction in scriptures); the former, according to writers on poetics, is *Kanta-sammita* (like the wife) and the latter *Prabhu-sammita* (like the master). The *Harivijaya* was a Prakrit poem.

In assessing the contribution of Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana we must bear in mind that the Dhvanikara (lit. the maker of Dhvani) was not the founder of the concept of Dhvani. This is evident from the very first Karika of the *Dhvanyaloka* it mentions a tradition (*samamnata-purva*) of this concept. Thus, it appears that long before the author of the *Karikas*, the concept of Dhvani as the essence of Kavya not only originated, but also enlisted a considerable number of adherents. It was the work of the Dhvanikara to systematise, perhaps for the first time, the speculations of this school and to present them in the orderly manner of memorial verses. The *Karikas* being mnemonic naturally left much to be cleared up by an exposition. It was Anandavardhana's task to write such an exposition, and to set the seal of his erudition and authority in establishing the doctrine of this school.

We may now proceed briefly to take stock of the contribution made by the Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana to poetical speculations. The object of the *Dhvanyaloka* is twofold, viz. (1) to establish, by arguments and counter-arguments, that *dhvani* or suggested sense is the 'soul' or essence of Kavya (*dhoanir-atma kavyasya*); (2) to examine the existing ideas of Rasa, Alankar, Riti, Guna and Dosa with a view to correlating them to the Dhvani doctrine propounded in it.

In trying to establish their standpoint the Dhvani-theorists had to combat three antagonistic schools, viz. (1) the school that totally denied the existence of the suggested sense in Kavya; (2) the school that recognised it not as an entity conveyed by words but as something that can be comprehended by the connoisseur (*sahridaya*); (3) the school that recognised the suggested sense, but believed that it was conveyed by the already accepted word-functions of Abhidha, Laksana, Tatparya or by Anumana and not by Vyanjana as the Dhvani theorists would have us believe. After establishing the existence of suggested sense and of the word-function called Vyanjana conveying it, the *Dhvanyaloka* proceeds to classify Kavyas in relation to Dhvani. According to it, Kavyas are divided into three classes, viz.

- (i) Dhvani-kavya - in it the suggested sense (*vyangartha*) predominates over the expressed sense (*vacyartha*); this is Kavya par excellence.
- (ii) Gunibhuta-vyangya-kavya - in it the suggested sense is subordinated (*gunibhuta*) to the expressed one.
- (iii) Citra-kavya - in it, the worst of Kavyas, there is no suggested sense at all, and there is either Sabda-citra (pictorial words) or Artha-citra (pictorial sense).

These three broad classes of Kavya have again been divided and subdivided with great minuteness. The subdivisions of suggestive Kavya reach the stupendous number of five thousand, three hundred and fifty-five! In this connexion, it may be added that the Dhvani or suggested sense may be threefold; it may suggest a matter or idea (*vastu*), a poetic figure (*alankara*) or a feeling or mood (*rasa*).

From what we have said it is clear that the *Dhvanyaloka* recognises Rasa, but not as an entity divorced from Dhvani. Similarly, the other recognized concepts of Riti, Guna, Dosa and Alankara are accepted in so far as they are related to Dhvani. Riti is recognized not as an independent factor, but only in so far as it suggests Rasa. The characteristics of Ritis are not dealt with by Anandavardhana because, as Abhinavagupta points out, Ritis ultimately merge into Gunas. The Dhvanitheorists recognise Gunas as helping the development of Rasa, and accept only three Gunas instead of the conventional ten. These three are *Madhurya* (sweetness), *Ojas* (energy) and *Prasada* (perspecuity). The Dosas or blemishes are recognised by them in so far as they detract from the Rasa. The Dhvani-theorists do recognise the importance of Alankara in a Kavya, but they

would not regard it as a distinct entity. Alankara is necessary to embellish the principal element, mostly the Rasa, in a Kavya. But, an *alankara* for its own sake is relegated by these theorists to an inferior position. A literary composition having an *alankara*, but no suggested sense, is not a Kavya properly so called but its counterfeit.

This in brief is the contribution of the Dhvani school to the poetical speculations. The treatment of the subject by the writers of this school was so logical and thorough that it survived through centuries influencing the later writers of this school and throwing the antagonists into the background.

One cannot think of the *Dhvanyaloka* without its celebrated commentary called *Kavyaloka-locana* or simply *Locana* written by Abhinavagupta. He tells us, in his *Paratrimika-vivarana*, that he was son of the Kashmiraka Cukhala, grandson of Varahagupta and brother of Manorathagupta. From the dates of composition, stated by himself in some of his works, we can assign him to a period between the last quarter of the tenth century and first quarter of the eleventh. Abhinavagupta was a profound scholar and a prolific writer. Besides the *Locana*, he composed also an authoritative commentary called *Abhinavabharati* on Bharata's *Natya-sastra*. In his *Locana*, he refers to his commentary, now lost, on the *Kavya-kautaka* of Bhatta Tauta who was his Guru. A commentary on the *Ghatakarpurakavya*, called *Ghatakarpuravivrti*, is attributed to Abhinava. This commentary is interesting from the point of view of literary history; it supports the tradition that the Kavya, on which it comments, was from the pen of Kalidasa. Abhinava was not a mere commentator. His several philosophical works have immortalized him in the domain of Kashmir Shaivism.

Much of the popularity of the *Dhvanyaloka* is accounted for by its masterly exposition by Abhinavagupta. The most striking feature of the exposition is that in it Abhinavagupta carries the idea of Rasa to its logical conclusion. In the *Dhvanyaloka*, Rasa is recognised in relation to Dhvani as Alankara and Vastu are also recognised in relation to this concept. But, Abhinavagupta unequivocally declared that Rasa was really the soul of Kavya and that Vastu-dhvani in the final analysis, merged into Rasa-dhvani. The emphasis laid by Abhinavagupta on the element of Rasa in Kavya, earned the acceptance of his views by the later writers.

In this connexion, mention should be made of the contribution of Abhinavagupta to the interpretation of the basic concept of Rasa propounded by Bharata. Before doing so we shall examine the views of the predecessors of Abhinava in this matter in explaining the process by which Rasa comes into being in a drama, Bharata declares:

vibhavanubhava-vyabhicari-samyogad rasa mspattih.

This means that Rasa originates out of a combination of *Vibhavas* (excitants), *Anubhavas* (ensuants) and *Vyabharibhavas* (accessory feelings) with the *sthayi-bhava* (permanent feeling). The word *nispatti* in Bharata's formula touched off a keen controversy as to its real significance.

Abhinavagupta refers to the view of Bhatta Nayaka on the above Rasa-sutra of Bharata. From the testimony of Mahimabhatta and others Bhatta Nayaka appears to have been the author of a work entitled *Hrdya-darpana* which is lost. It appears to have been a metrical treatise with running prose commentary. From Bhatta Nayaka's supposed familiarity with a Dhvani theory he may be assigned to period later than Anandavardhana who flourished about the middle of the ninth century A.D. Abhinavagupta is the earliest writer to mention Bhatta Nayaka who, therefore, cannot be later than the first quarter of the eleventh century. The above limits of his date accord well with the evidence of the RT. (v. 159) to the effect that Bhatta Nayaka flourished during the reign of Sankaravarman (883-902 A.D.), son and successor of Avantivarman, king of Kashmir. Bhatta Nayaka's theory of Rasa, as explained by Abhinava and Mammata, is known as Bhukti-vada. It means that Rasa is enjoyed with reference to *vibhavas* (excitants) through the relation of the enjoyer and the enjoyed.

In his commentary on Bharata's *Natya-sastra*, Abhinavagupta refers to one Lollata and his views on certain topics of Dramaturgy. From this fact we may suppose that Lollata also wrote a commentary on Bharata's work. The name of Lollata is typically Kashmirian. As he is mentioned as rejecting Udbhata's views on certain matters he must have been either his contemporary or a later writer, Udbhata cannot be later than 813 A.D. Lollata's theory (*Utpattivada*) on Rasa has been mentioned ' by Mammata in his *Kavyaprakasa*. According to this theory, *vibhavas* or excitants are the direct cause (*karana*) of Rasa which is, therefore an effect (*karya*).

Abhinavagupta and some other writers refer to Sankuka as an authoritative commentator of Bharata's *Natya-shastra*. In fact, Abhinava often refers to Sankuka's opinion on various topics of Dramaturgy. By the time of Mammata, Sankuka's theory (*Anumitivada*) of Rasa being *inferred* must have been recognized widely enough to merit a reference in the *Kavya-prakasa*. This Sankuka is generally supposed to be identical with the poet of the same name whose verses are quoted in the anthologies of Sarngadhara, Jalhana and Vallabhadeva. The poet is perhaps to be identified with Sankuka who is mentioned in the R.T. (IV. 703-5) as author of the poem called *Bhuvanabhyudaya* which is said to have centred round the fierce fight between the regents Mamma and Utpalaka, the incident referring to the reign of the Kashmirian king Ajitapida of the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. This poem has not yet been discovered.

Abhinava proposed a novel interpretation of the word 'Nispatti' in Bharata's aforesaid dictum. His theory is known as *Abhivyaktivada* in which he lays down that Rasa is not an effect, and it is neither enjoyed nor inferred, but it is manifested.

The interpretations, suggested by these scholars, had a tremendous significance in view of the fact that Bharata's Natyarasa came to be adopted by later theorists as Kavyarasa.

Kuntaka, author of the *Vakroktijivita*, and hence better known as Vakroktijivita-kara, was in all probability a Kashmirian; he had the title Rajanaka which is used with the names of Kashmirian scholars. Kuntaka's quotation from Rajasekhara, the dramatist, and Mahimabhatta's reference to Kuntaka and his work make it likely that he flourished in a period between the middle of the tenth century and the middle of the eleventh. Abhinavagupta's silence about Kuntaka, whose word acquired considerable prominence, may be explained by conjecturing that both these writers were contemporaneous.

The entire work of Kuntaka has not yet been recovered. From the incomplete Ms., on the basis of which editions have been prepared, it appears that Kuntaka tries to establish Vakrokti as the soul or essential element of Kavya. In this respect the *Vakroktijivita* is unique in the whole range of the literature on poetics. Kuntaka's idea of Vakrokti as the soul of the poetry has been derived from Bhamaha who took it in the sense of peculiar charm. Kuntaka analyses also a poetical figure on the basis of Vakrokti, and it has been accepted by later writers.

It is interesting to note that Kuntaka takes into consideration all the earlier speculations with regard to the soul of Kavya, but makes Rasa, Alankara, Riti and Dhvani subservient to Vakrokti. In the general name of Vakrokti are included Rasa and Dhvani; Rasa or Dhvani makes a composition enjoyable by imparting a peculiar charm to it. Alankara heightens the beauty of a composition in so far as it contributes to the peculiar charm in it. Riti, for which Kuntaka uses the term Marga, is not, as earlier theorists thought, a regional characteristic of a literary composition; it is a diction which owes its existence to the genius and skill of the poet, and, as such, various Ritis should be differentiated with reference to the poet's Sakti (capacity), Vyutpatti (proficiency) and Abhyasa (practice). Ritis, according to him, may be threefold: - (i) Sukumara, (ii) Vicitra and (iii) Madhyama. Each of the first two Ritis has certain Gunas or excellences; the third Riti combines the excellences of both. According to him, Aucitya (propriety of words and ideas) and Saubhagya are common to all the three Margas. By Saubhagya is meant 'the realisation of all the resources of a composition'. Indeed his Vakrokti is *vaidagdhya-bhangi-bhaniti*, that is to say, it is a peculiar expression by one who is *Vidagdha*, i.e. not merely learned but versed in *belles-letters*.

Ksemendra Vyasadasa, whose identity with Ksemaraja, author of works on Shaiva philosophy, is advocated by some without conclusive evidence, is a prominent figure in the history not only of poetics but also of Sanskrit literature as a whole. Endowed with a master mind he had a variety of interests, and wrote quite a number of treatises on diverse subjects. He is truly described as a polymath. Happily for us, he gives an account of his personal history, and records the dates of the composition of some of his works. Son of Prakasendra and grandson of Sindhu, he was a disciple of one Gangaka. Father of Somendra, he was preceptor of Udayasimha and prince Laksanaditya. Ksemendra wrote his works in the reign of the Kashmirian king Ananta and his son Kalasa; as such, he may be assigned to the second and third quarters of the eleventh century A.D.

His works on poetics are two, viz. the *Aucityavicara-carca* and the *Kavi-kanthabharana*. A *Kavikarnika* by the author is referred to by himself in his *Aucitya-vicara-carca* (verse 2).

The *Aucitya-vicara-carca* of Ksemendra is a unique work in the sense that it deals with the question of Aucitya or propriety in Kavya most exhaustively, and declares it as the very soul (*jivitabhuta*) of Kavya. Aucitya, in his opinion, relates to twenty-seven items, viz. word, sentence, sense of the composition, literary excellences (*gunas*), poetic figures, employment of grammatical matters like verb, preposition, etc., time, place and so on. What renders his work more valuable is the collection of verses culled from a wide range of classical Sanskrit literature. Some of these verses are given as conforming to Aucitya while others are examples of compositions devoid of it. Ksemendra follows in the footsteps of Anandavardhana who holds Aucitya as the highest secret (*para upanisat*) of Rasa. The idea of Aucitya, anticipated by Bharata in connexion with dramaturgy, and explicitly dealt with by writers of the Dhvani school and discussed by most post-Dhvani writers in connexion with Rasa-dosa, found the strongest exponent in Ksemendra. He considers it to be founded on the aesthetic pleasure (*camatkara*) that underlies the delectation of Rasa. No Guna or Alankara, devoid of Aucitya, has any significance in Kavya according to Ksemendra.

In the *Kavi-kanthabharana*, Ksemendra deals with the making of a poet, his defects, the peculiar charm (*camatkara*) of a poetical composition, the Gunas and Dosas of words, sense and sentiment (*rasa*). There are, according to Ksemendra, two things that engender in a person the capacity for producing Kavya. The first one is Divyaprayatna (divine effort) and the second is Paurusa or individual effort. Divya-prayatna is the name given to prayer, incantation and the like. In discussing Paurusa-prayatna, he states that there are three kinds of persons according as they require little effort, strenuous effort or as they are incapable of poetic power despite effort. A poet, in his opinion, must possess knowledge of the various arts and sciences a list of which is given by him. The various branches of knowledge include, *inter alla*, (grammar, Logic, Dramaturgy, Erotics, Astronomy etc.

While discussing the question of one poet borrowing from another, he mentions different kinds of borrowers or plagiarists. Of them, some borrow an idea, a word or the foot of a verse while others copy an entire composition. He mentions, apparently with approval, the practice of borrowing from sources like the work of Vyasa. Incidentally Ksemendra dwells on the training of a poet and the moulding of his life and character. An important part of the work is devoted to discussion on *camatkara* or the peculiar charm which is an essential requisite of a poetical composition. *Camatkara* has been divided into ten varieties in accordance with its nature and substratum. It may be readily comprehensible or realisable after much thought. It may reside in the whole of a composition or in a part of it and belong to *sabda*, *artha* or both, to *alankara*, *rasa* or may relate to the nature of a famous subject-matter.

Mahimabhatta, whose title *Rajanaka*, appears a hint at his Kashmirian origin. tells us that he was son of Sri Dhairya and disciple of Mahakavi Syamala. His work, the *Vyakti-viveka*, betrays his familiarity with Anandavardhana and even Abhinavagupta. He quotes certain views of Kuntaka to criticise them, and quotes from some works of Rajasekhara. Ruyyaka is the earliest of the later writers to quote and criticise Mahimabhatta's views. These evidences would lead us to assign Mahimabhatta to the close of the eleventh century. In the said work he refers to another work of his, entitled *Tattvokti-kosa*, dealing with *pratibhatattva*, which no longer exists. On the *Vyaktiviveka* there is an anonymous commentary generally attributed to Ruyyaka.

The *Vyakti-viveka* is written in three chapters called *Vimarsas*. The work, as its very title indicates, has as its subject the critical consideration of *Vyakti* or *Vyanjana*, i.e. suggestion in *Kavya*. His chief target of attack is the concept of *Dhvani*. The definition of *Dhvani*, given in the *Dhvanyaloka*, applies, in his opinion, more fittingly to *Anuman* or inference which had already been recognised in poetics.

The importance, attached by him to *Anumana*, led him to recognise a twofold sense of the word, viz. *Vacya* (expressed or denoted) and *anumeya* (inferred). The latter includes the *lakshyartha* (indicated sense) and the *vyangyarth* (suggested sense). The *anumeyarth* is threefold according as it is a matter (*vastu*), a poetic figure (*alankara*) or a sentiment (*rasa*). Thus, the threefold *Dhvani* of the earlier theorists has been taken by Mahimabhatta as the threefold *anumeyarth*. He differs from the earlier writers in the process by which the expressed sense leads to the unexpressed. He quotes some verses, given by Anandavardhana as examples of *Dhvani*, to demonstrate that the unexpressed sense is comprehended not by anything like suggestion but by inference.

Mammata is the last great figure in the galaxy of the poetics of Kashmir. Those who followed him in this field are not so renowned. His Kashmirian origin is vouchsafed by his title *Rajanaka* and by his name.

Manikyacandra's commentary on the *Kavyaprakasa* is dated Samvat 1216 (1159-60 A.D.). Ruyyaka of the second-third quarters of the twelfth century commented upon the *Kavyaprakasa*. The earliest of the extant Mss. of the *Kavya-prakasa* appears to have been copied in 1158 A.D. All this makes it probable that Mammata flourished in the beginning of the twelfth century at the latest.

On certain evidences of an inconclusive nature some scholars would make him a contemporary of king Bhoja. Mammata's reference to Bhoja in a verse (under X. 26 of the *Kavya-prakasa*) proves his posteriority to that king, but does not give any clue as to his precise date. If this Bhoja was the Paramara king of the same name of Dhara, then Mammata may be placed approximately in the last quarter of the eleventh century. This date is made probable by the fact that Mammata mentions Abhinavagupta.

The Kavya-prakasa is the *magnum opus* of Mammata; on it rests his fame. His other work is called *Sabda-vyayara-paricaya* (or, *Sabdavyapara-vicara* or *Sabda-vyapara-carca*) in which he discusses the nature of the different functions of words. The *Kavya-prakasa* has quite a number of commentaries; this is a pointer to its immense popularity. Among the commentators Rajanaka Ruyyaka, Somesvara, Rajanaka Ananda, and Rajanaka Ratnakantha were probably Kashmirian.

The *Kavya-prakasa* consists of 143 Karikas with *vrtti* thereon and illustrative verses. It has ten chapters called Ullasas. The topics, discussed chapterwise, are: -

- I. Object, definition, source and division of Kavyas.
- II. Functions of words.
- III. Power of suggestion of all kinds of senses.
- IV. Divisions of Dhvani and nature of Rasa.
- V. Gunibhuta-vyangya.
- VI. Citra-kavya.
- VII. Dosas.
- VIII. Differentiation of Guna and Alankara.
- IX. Sabdalankaras.
- X. Arthalankaras.

There is a controversy as to whether or not the Karikas and the *Vrtti* of the *Kavya-prakasa* are of common authorship. There is a view that the former were composed by Bharata while the latter was the work of Mammata. Some have expressed the view that the Karikas are the work of Mammata and the *Vrtti* was written by some other person. It is now proved, on good grounds, that almost the entire work was written by Mammata and that a small portion was composed by one Alata or Alaka.

The reason of Mammata's popularity is that his *Kavya-prakasa* combines the merits . of completeness and lucidity within a brief compass. A glance

at the contents shows that it traverses the entire field of poetics with the exception, of course, of dramaturgy. This work is like a place where all the streams of divergent speculations of the earlier writers have converged. Mammata, while accepting the main thesis of the Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana, sums up the other doctrines in an easily intelligible manner. He defines Kavya in the following words: -

tad adosau sabdarthau sagunav-analankrti punah kvapi.

Kavya, according to him, consists of Sabda and Artha which are free from blemishes, possessed of excellences and sometimes devoid of embellishments. This definition reveals that he accepts the time-honoured constituents of Kavya, viz. Sabda and Artha. The qualification *sagunau* implies the acceptance of Riti. By *analankrti* he admits *alankaras* of Sabda and Artha as necessary attributes for a composition in order to be designated as Kavya, but denies their essentiality as urged by the writers of the Alankara school. There is no direct mention, in the definition of Kavya, of Dhvani and Rasa. But, his threefold classification of Kavya into Dhvani (that in which the suggested sense predominates over the expressed one), Gunibhuta-vyangya (that in which the suggested sense is subordinate to the expressed one) and Citra (that which is merely pictorial having no suggested sense at all), clearly demonstrates his acceptance of Dhvani with reference to which Kavyas have been classified.

Rasa, according to Mammata, is included in his *asamlaksya*-kramavyangya or the suggestion of imperceptible process. He refers to the different views on Rasa-nispatti put forward by Lollata, Sankuka, Bhatta Nayaka and Abhinavagupta, and discards the views of the first three agreeing with Abhinavagupta.

He defines Guna and Dosa in relation to Rasa which he considers as essential in Kavya. A Guna owes its existence in so far as it conduces to the excellence of Rasa. A Dosa is so called because it detracts from Rasa.

Of Alankaras which, in his opinion, are extraneous to Kavya as ornaments to human body, he enumerates as many as sixty-seven independent varieties.

Alata or Allata or Rajanaka Alaka, the supposed author of the portion left unfinished by Mammata in his *Kavya-prakasa*, was perhaps son of Rajanaka Jayanaka. He commented upon Ruyyaka's commentary on the *Kavya-prakasa*.

Judging from the epithet Rajanaka, prefixed to his name, Ananda, author of the commentary called *Sitikantha-vibodhana* or *Kavyaprakasa-nidarsana* on Mammata's *Kavya-prakasa*, seems to have been a Kashmirian.

Ruyyaka or Rucaka has the Kashmirian title Rajanaka. He was son of Rajanaka Tilaka, and is supposed to have flourished in the second and third quarters of the 12th. century.

The *Alankara-sarvasva* of Ruyyaka is his most well-known work. It consists of Sutras and Vr̥tti. Some think that the Vr̥tti was written by one Mankhuka or Mankhaka described as Sandhivigrahika (minister for peace and war) to a Kashmirian king. According to some, the Sutras of Ruyyaka were known as *Alankara-sutra* while the Vr̥tti was entitled *Alankarasarvasra*.

Ruyyaka's work concerns itself with poetic figures which he analyses meticulously, and of which he mentions about eighty independent varieties. He begins with the suggested sense which, he believes, embellishes the expressed meaning which in its turn predominates in the poetic figures. Thus, ultimately the suggested sense falls within the scope of *alankaras*. Ruyyaka considers *vicchittivisesa* (peculiar charm) born of Kavi-pratibha to be the foundation of Alankaras. In this respect, he appears to have accepted Kuntaka's conception of Vakrokti.

Ruyyaka's prose-poetic work, entitled *Sahridayalila*, is composed in four chapters called Ullekhas. In the first chapter on Guna he describes the ten attractions of a woman, viz. Rupa, Varna, Prabha and so on. In the second chapter, entitled, Alankara, the author speaks of the ornaments of gold, pearls etc., unguents and flowers used by women. In the third chapter on Jivita he dwells on youth as the source of feminine charm. In the last chapter, entitled Parikara, Ruyyaka deals with the paraphernalia of beauty.

Ruyyaka appears to have written also the following words on poetics and dramaturgy: -

- (1) *Kavya-prakasa-sanketa* - comm. on Mammata's *Kavya-prakasa*. This is referred to by Jayaratha and Ratnakantha.
- (2) *Alankara-manjari* - referred to by Ruyyaka himself
- (3) *Sahitya-mimamsa* - it is published.
- (4) *Alankara-nusarini* - mentioned Jayaratha.
- (5) *Vyakti-viveka-vicara* (or - *vyakhyana*) - comm. on Mahimabhata's *Vyakti-viveka*. It is referred to by Jayaratha.
- (6) *Nataka-mimamsa* - referred to by himself.
- (7) *Alankara-vartika* - cited by Jayaratha.

Ruyyaka himself mentions his *Srikantha-stava*. Obviously a hymn in honour of *Shiva*, in his *Alankara-sarvasra*. In the same work on poetics, as well as in his *Vyaktiviveka-vyakhyana*, he refers to the *Harsa-carita-vartika* as his own work.

Jayaratha figures in the domains of poetics philosophy and poetical compositions. In poetics, however, he does not appear to have written any

original work. He is well-known as a commentator of Ruyyaka's *Alankara-sarvasva*, the name of his commentary being *Alankara-vimarsini*. From the commentary, as well as from that on Abhinavagupta's *Tantraloka*, we learn that his father was Srngaranatha whose other son was named Jayadratha. From the latter we learn that his great-grand-father's brother, Shivaratha, was a minister of king Uccala of Kashmir (1101-1111 A.D.) Jayaratha is believed to have flourished in the beginning of the thirteenth century. Jayaratha's other work on poetics is the *Alankarodaharana* which appears to be intended mainly for supplying illustrations to Ruyyaka's work.

CLASSIFIED LIST OF THE SANSKRIT WORKS OF KASHMIR
- *Sures Chandra Banerji*

The Sanskrit works, written by Kashmirians, may be broadly classified as follows:

- A. Works on Poetics and Dramaturgy (including commentaries).
- B. Poetical Compositions (including commentaries).
- C. Philosophical and religious works (including commentaries).
- D. Miscellaneous works.

The titles of the works of each class, along with their respective authors, are given below in the Sanskrit alphabetical order. This list includes also titles known by names only.

[A]
WORKS ON POETICS AND DRAMATURGY (INCLUDING COMMENTARIES)

Title	Author
Abhidha-vrtti-matrka	Mukula
Abhinava-bharati	Abhinavagupta
Alankara-sarvasva	Ruyyaka
Alankara-sutra	Ruyyaka
Alankara-manjari	Ruyyaka
Alankara-vartika	Ruyyaka
Alankara-virnarsini	Jayaratha
Alankarodaharana	Jayaratha
Udbhata-viveka(or, -vicara)	Tilaka
Aucitya-vicara-carca	Ksemendra
Kavi-kamika	Ksemendra

Kavi-kanthabharana	Ksemendra
Kavya-Kautuka	Bhatta Tauta
Kavya-prakasa	Mammata
Kavya-prakasa-nidarsana (Same as <i>Sitikantha-vibodhana</i>)	Ananda
Kavya-prakasa-sanketa	Ruyyaka
Kavyalankara -samgraha	Udbhata
Kavyalankara (Same as <i>Bhamahalankara</i>)	Bhamaha
Kavyalankara	Rudrata
Kavyalankara-vivrti (Same as <i>Bhamaha-vivarana</i>)	Udbhata
Kavyalankara-sutra-vrtti	Vamana
Kavyaloka (Same as <i>Dhvanyaloka or Sahrdayaloka</i>)	Anandavardhana
Kavyaloka-locana (Briefly called <i>Locana</i>)	Abhinavagupta
Tattvaloka	Anandavardhana
Tattvokti-kosa	Mahimabhata
Dhvanyaloka (Also calls <i>Kavyaloka or Sahrdayaloka</i>)	Anandavardhana
Nataka-mimamsa	Ruyyaka
Bhamaha-vivarana (Same as <i>Kavyalankara-vivrti</i>)	Udbhata
Bhamahalankara (Same as <i>Kavyalankara</i>)	Bhamaha
Mata-pariksa	Anandavardhana
Locana (Same as <i>Kavyaloka-locana</i>)	Abhinavagupta
Vakrokti-jivita	Kuntaka
Vyakti-viveka	Mahimabhata
Vyakti-viveka- vicara	Ruyyaka

(or, - vyakhyana)	
Sabda-vyapara-paricaya (or, - vicara, or, - carca)	Mammata
Sitikantha-vibodhana (Same as <i>Kavya-prakasa-nidarsana</i>)	Ananda
Srngara-tilaka	Rudra
Sahrdaya-lila	Ruyyaka
Sahrdyaloka (Same as <i>Dhoanyaloka or Kavyaloka</i>)	Anandavardhana
Sahitya-mimamsa	Ruyyaka
Hrdaya-darpana	Bhatta Nayaka

[B]
POETICAL COMPOSITIONS
(INCLUDING COMMENTARIES)

Title	Author
Anyokti-muktalata	Sambhu
Arjuna-carita	Anandavardhana
Arjuna-ravaniya (Same as <i>Ravanarjuniya</i>)	Bhatta Bhima or Bhaumaka
Ardhanarisvara-stotra	Kalhana
Alankaranusarini	Ruyyaka
Avadana-kalpalata (Same as <i>Bodhisattva-vadana-kalpalata</i>)	Ksemendra
Ananda-kavya	Ananda
Isvara-sataka	Avatara
Katha-kautuka	Srivarā
Katha-sarit-sagara	Somadeva
Kapphinabhyudaya	Sivasvamin
Kala-vilasa	Ksemendra

Kadambari-kathasara	Abhinanda
Kuttani-mata	Damodaragupta
Kumara-sambhava	Udbhata
Ghatakarpara-vivrti	Abhinavagupta
Caturvarga-samgraha	Ksemendra
Caru-carya	Ksemendra
Caura-pancasika (Same as Cauri (or, Caura) - surata-pancasika)	Bilhana
Jayasimhabhyudaya	Kalhana
Jaina-rajatarangini	Srivardra
Darpa-dalana	Ksemendra
Dasavatara-carita	Ksemendra
Devinama-vilasa Sahib	Kaula
Devi-sataka	Anandavardhana
Desopadesa	Ksemendra
Dvitiya-rajatarangini	Jonaraja
Dhvani-gatha-pancika	Ratnakara
Narma-mala	Ksemendra
Niti-kalpataru	Ksemendra
Prthviraja-vijaya	?
Bilhana-kavya	Bilhana
Brhatkatha-manjari	Ksemendra
Bodhisattva-vadana- kalpalata (Same as Avadana-Kalpalata)	Ksemendra
Bhallata-sataka	Bhallata
Bharata-manjari	Ksemendra
Bhavopahara	Cakarapaninatha
Bhovanabhyudaya	Sankuka
Mugdhopadesa	Jahlana

Raja-tarangini	Kalhana
Rajavali (or, Nrpaivali)	Ksemendra
Ramayana-manjari	Ksemendra
Ravanarjuniya Bhatta Bhima or (Same as Arjuna-ravaniya)	Bhaumaka
Vakrokti-pancasika	Ratnakara
Vikramankadeva-carita	Bilhana
Visama-padoddyota	Alaka
Santi-sataka	Silhana
Samba-pancasika	?
Srikantha-stava	Ruyyaka
Srikantha-carita	Mankha
Samanya-matrka	Ksemendra
Subhasita-muktavali (Same as Sukti-muktavali)	Jalhana
Subhasitavali	Vallabhadeva
Sukti-muktavali (same as Subhasita- muktavali)	Jalhana
Sevya-sevako-padesa	Ksemendra
Somapala-vilasa	Jahlana
Stava-cintamani	Bhattanarayan
Stuti-kusumanjali	Jagaddhara
Stotravali	Utapaladeva
Hara-vijaya	Ratnakara
Harsa-carita-vartika	Ruyyaka
Rajavali-pataka	Prajya Bhatta
Rajendra-karnapura	Sambhu

[C]
PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS WORKS
(INCLUDING COMMENTARIES)

Title	Author
Ajada-pramatr-siddhi	Utpala
Isvara-pratyabbijna (Same as Pratyabhijua-sutra or Pratyabhijua-karika)	Utpala
Isvara-pratyabhijna-vimarsini (Same as Laghvi Vrtti)	Abhinavagupta
Isvara-pratyabhijnavivrti-vimarsini	Abhinavagupta
Isvara-siddhi	Utpala
Kamakala -vilasa	Punyanandacarya
Tattvartha-cintamani	Kallata
Tattva-samdoha	Ksemaraja
Tantra-sara	Abhinavagupta
Tantra-vatadhanika	Abhinavagupta
Tantraloka	Abhinavagupta
Dharmottama	Anandavardhana
Naresvara-pariksa	Sadyojyoti
Nyaya-kalika	Jayanta Bhatta
Nyaya-manjari	Jayanta Bhatta
Para-pravesika	Ksemaraja
Paratrimisika-vivrti	Abhinavagupta
Paramartha- sara	Abhinavagupta
Pratyabhijna-karika (Same as Isvarn-prntyabhijna)	Utpala
Pratyabhijna-sutra (Same as Isvara-pratyabhijna)	Utpala
Pratyabhijna-hrdaya	Ksemaraja
Pradipika	Utpala

Bodha-pancadāsika	Abhinavagupta
Madhuvahini	Kallata
Malini-vijaya-vartika	Abhinavagupta
Laghvi Vrtti (Same as Isvara-pratyabhijna-vimarsini)	Abhinavagupta
Siva-sutra	Believed to have been revealed to Vasugupta
Siva-sutra-vrtti	Ksemaraja
Siva-sutra-vimarsini	Ksemaraja
Siva-sutra-vartika	Bhaskara
Siva-drsti	Somananda
Spanda-sutra	Vasugupta
Spanda-vrtti	Kallata
Spanda-sarvasva (Spanda-sutra and Kallata's Vrtti thereon are together so called)	
Spanda-samdoha	Ksemaraja
Spanda-nirnaya	Ksemaraja
Spanda-pradipika	Utpala Vaisnava
Spandamtra	Vasugupta

[D]
MISCELLANEOUS WORKS

Title	Class to which the work belongs	Author
Anekatha-kosa (Same as Mankha-kosa)	Lexicon	Mankha
Agamadambara	Drama	Jayanta Bhatta
Karnasundari	Drama	Bilhana
Kasika-vrtti	Grammar	Vamana-

		Jayaditya
Candra-vyakarana	Grammar	Candragomin
Tantrakhyayika	Fable	?
Nilamata- purana	Purana	?
Pradipa	Grammar	Kaiyata
Mankha-kosa (Same as <i>Anekartha-kosa</i>)	Lexicon	Mankha
Ratnakara-purana	Purana	?
Ramabhyudaya	Drama	Yasovarman
Lasaki	Commentary on the <i>Bhagavadgita</i>	Lasakaka
Lokaprakasa	Lexicon (?)	Ksemendra
Lokananda	Drama	Candragomin
Visnudharmottara	Purana	?
Sangita-ratnakara	Music	Sarngadeva
Suvrtta-tilaka	Prosody	Ksemendra

ADDENDUM

We set forth here information about certain authors and works, believed to be of Kashmir, that escaped our notice while this brochure was prepared.

Titles of works and names of authors have been given in the alphabetical order.

Ahirbudhnya-samhita.

A Tantra of the Visnuite Pancaratra sect. It is believed to have originated in Kashmir not long after the fourth century A.D. As it knows the three great schools of Buddhism and as the astrological term *hora* occurs in it, it cannot have possibly originated before the 4th century A.D. It is believed, on good grounds, to have been contemporaneous with, or a little earlier than, the *Samkhya-karika* of Isvarakrsna.

It is in the form of a conversation between Ahirbudhnya (Shiva) and Narada, and deals partly with philosophy and largely with occultism. The philosophical portion includes some chapters on Creation. In connection with creation, it gives an interesting survey of the various systems of

religion and philosophy. It is followed by rules for the castes and Asramas. Several chapters deal with the mystic significance of the letters of the alphabet. There is a fine description of the ideal Vaisnava teacher and there are rules about Diksa. The usual topics of Tantra, viz., Mantra. Yantra etc. are described in the work. Some chapters describe diagrams which are to be used as amulets too. In a few chapters are described the cult, the theory and practice of Yoga, secret powers by which might can be attained. Ceremonies to be performed by a king to ensure victory in war form the subject-matter of some chapters. Several chapters are devoted to sorcery. An appendix contains a hymn of the thousand names of the divine Sudarsana.

Alamkara-ratnakara of Sobhakara.

From Peterson (*Report. i, p. 12*) we learn that the Kashmirian poet Yasaskara extracted some *sutras* on Alamkara from a work entitled *Alamkararatnakara* by Sobhakaramitra. The *Ratnakara* of Jagannatha refers to this *Alamkara-ratnakara* of Sobhakara. Jayaratha criticises the Kashmirian Sobhakara who deviates from Ruyyaka. Jagannatha says that Appayya Diksita follows the *Alamkararatnakara*.

Chiku Bhatta

A grammarian believed to have been a Kashmirian.

***Devi-stotra* of Yasaskara**

According to Peterson, the Kashmirian poet Yasaskara extracted some *sutras* on Alamkara from the *Alamkara-ratnakara* by Sobhakaramitra, and illustrated them in his *Devistotra* by composing verses in praise of Devil

Drdhabala

Son of Kapilabala, he appears to have been a Kashmirian, and is assigned to the eighth or ninth century A.D. The extant *Caraka-samhita*, believed to be the earliest available text on Ayurveda, is stated to have been revised by Drdhabala. Drdhabala himself admits to having added the last two chapters of the work and to having written 17 out of 28 or 30 chapters of book vi.

Jagaddhara

Author of the grammatical work *Balabodhini* (1475 A.D.), and believed to have been a Kashmirian. A Stuti-kusumanjali (1450 A.D.) is also ascribed to him.

Jejjata

Commentator on the *Caraka-samhita*, and perhaps belonged to Kashmir.

Ksirasvamin

The famous commentator on the *Namalinganusasana* of Amara, he is supposed by some to have flourished in Kashmir. Others, however, think that he was an inhabitant of Central India. He is generally assigned to the second half of the 11th century A.D.

Mahesa Daivajna.

The work on astrology, entitled *Ranavira -jyotirmahanibandha*, is stated to have been written by Mahesa under the patronage of Ranavirasimha, king of Kashmir.

Medhatithi

The oldest commentator on the *Manu-smṛti*. He is supposed by some to have been a Kashmirian. The main reasons for this assumption are as follows :_

(i) He introduces Kashmir in explaining such word: as *svarastre* and *Janapadah* (*Manu-smṛti*, VII. 32 and VIII. 42). .

(ii) He states (on *Manu* VIII. 400) that the monopoly of the sale of elephants is a privilege of the kings of Kashmir where saffron is available in plenty.

(iii) He says (on *Manu* IV. 59) that the rainbow is called *vijnana-chaya* in Kashmir.

(iv) He says (on *Manu* II. 24) that in the Himalayas in Kashmir it is not possible to perform daily *Samdhya* (prayer) in the open nor is it possible to bathe every day in a river in Hemanta and Sisira.

Later writers like Kamalakarabhatta, author the *Smṛti digest Nirnaya-sindhu*, however, regard Madhatithi as a southerner.

Patanjali

Author of the *Mahabhasya*, traditionally known a Kashmirian.

Pingala

Author of the *Chandahsutra*, and believed to have been a Kashmirian.

Ratirahasya

A work on erotica, dealing with biological and psychological problems of sex, by Koka, son of. Tejoka, believed to have been a Kashmirian.

(Rajanaka) Ratnakantha

The title Rajanaka indicates that he was a Kashmirian. Son of Samkarakantha and grandson of Anantakavi of the Dhaumyayana family. He wrote the *Sara-samuccaya*, a commentary on thh *Kavyaprakasa* of Mammata. He wrote also *Stuti-kusumanjali-tika* (called *Sisyahita*) in 1611 A.11 and a *Yudhishthiravijaya-kavya-tika* in 1672 A.D Besides, he copied the *codex* archetypus of the *Rajatarangini*, mentioned by Stein (introduction, p. vii f), and also transcribed Mss. of the *Samketa* a Ruyyaka in 1648, of Rayamukatu's commentary on the *Namalinganusasana* of Amara in 1655, and of Trilocanadasa's *Katantra-panjika* in 1673 A.D. To him are ascribed also the *Ratna-sataka*, 100 versed in praise of sun, the *Surya-stuti-rahasya* and the *Laghu-pancika*, a commentary on the *Haravijayn*

Vrttaratnakara

A work on prosody, by Kedarabhata who is supposed to have been a Kashmirian