In this chapter, I propose to take a brief review of the noteworthy points emerging from the discussions in the previous chapters. The critical study of the Udayasundarikatha reveals important facts from different points of view, especially literary and historical.

Contribution of Soddhala to the Literary form Campū:

Udayasundarikathā is a work of the period from 1020 A. D. to 1050 A. D. In connection with the history of the literary form called Campū, it may be observed that before Soddhala Campūs were written only on stories taken from the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The Jains used this type of literature for the spread of their religious doctrines. Biographical Campūs like Yaśastilaka Campū and Jivamdhara Campū were already in existence; but Soddhala is the first author, who composed a Campū work with an imaginary plot. In this respect Soddhala's Originality is noteworthy. He is by nature a writer of romance, but he developed the traditional conception of a prose romance like Kādambarī and gave it a new direction by a copious but apt mixture of verses. Thus Udayasundarikathā is nothing but a prose
romance freely mixed with verses and thus he calls it a Campū. Credit may be given to Sodhala for this novel experiment in literary form.

It is regrettable that no one followed Sodhala, in his pioneering experiment which deserves appreciation from all people of literary taste. Despite all the failings and shortcomings of Sodhala, his attempt to present a romance in mixed prose and verse is certainly a milestone in the development of the Campū literature. If circumstances would not have prevented the circulation of the manuscripts of his work, Sodhala would have already gained a high place in the galaxi of Sanskrit poets.

Sodhala's spirit of experimentation in the literary form of Campū can be noted in different directions also. Like Bana in the Harṣacarita, he puts his autobiography as a prelude to the text and tried to connect his own account with the main plot of the romance. Even though his attempt was not quite happy from the point of view of literary taste, still we may credit Sodhala for experimenting a mixture of two literary forms Kathā and Akhyāyika and presenting it in the mixed form of Campū. As noted above Sodhala does not find any follower in this respect also.
SODHHALA'S STYLE ANALYSIS:

While discussing the characteristics of a good composition Soddhala has referred to three kinds of poets. He seems to propound a theory about Gunas and the Classification of style. The theory seems to be original and somewhat different from that propounded by previous writers.

Soddhala does not agree with the previous writers on poetics in the number of Gunas. He does not consider that all the ten Gunas are of any importance for a good literary composition. He mentions only four Gunas, Māsmata (smoothness), Māmsalata (force), Komalta (ease) and Lālitya (polish); so it seems that he includes all the ten qualities in these four Gunas. This view of Soddhala is followed even by later writers, for example, Hemacandra who reduces the number of Gunas from ten to three; so also Mammata. These writers on poetics thought that Madhurya, Ojas and Prasāda were the only three literary qualities; some of the others could be easily included in them and the remaining were only negative in character, since their nature was absence of a defect.

As regards the classification of style Soddhala partly follows the old writers on Poetics and mentions that the styles are to be classified as vaidarbhi, Gaudi and Pāncāli.
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He does not increase the number of different varieties of style as Bhoja did. Bhoja in his Sarvasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa and Śṛṅgāraprakāśa says that there are six styles, Vaidarbhi, Gauḍī, Pāṇḍāli, Avanti, Māgadhī and Lāṭī. Even though Soddhala was Bhoja's contemporary, he does not subscribe to his view.

If we observe the special case of Lāṭī it can be said that poets of Lāṭa appear to possess distinctive literary traits. A kind of style favoured by authors of Lāṭa, had acquired the name of Lāṭī. Rāudrata (A. D. 800 - 850) was the first to enumerate Lāṭiyā. It is indeed curious that Rājaśekhara who came after Rāudrata and was conversant with this view did not accept Lāṭī. Soddhala even though, he was a resident of Lāṭadesa, did not refer to Lāṭiyā. Probably they did not consider it to be different from Pāṇḍāli and hence did not see any necessity of accepting a separate style beyond Pāṇḍāli.

In the classification of style Soddhala introduces innovation by naming the styles as Kaukili, Māyuri and

1. Bhoja : Sarvasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, II - 27
3. Rudrata: Kavyālaṁkāra, II - 4 - 5.
These are synonymous with Vaidarbhi, Gaudi and Pāñcaśāli respectively. Accordingly, he classified poets in three varieties as Kaukila, Mayūra and Māraśāla.

The most important point in the discussion of style is Soddhala's analysis of the principles on which different styles may be distinguished. Previous writers like Vāmana and others base the distinction of styles on the presence and absence of certain Guṇas; but Soddhala seems to hold a different view altogether. He distinguishes the styles on the principle of Saprāṇatva (liveliness) Ghanaprāṇatva (force) and Alpaprāṇatva (lack of liveliness). Saprāṇatva is liveliness, the characteristic of Vaidarbhi style. This style possesses polish (Saūṣṭhava). Gaudī is with the characteristic of Ghanaprāṇatva, very forceful. It also possesses a very great polish (Aṇalpa Saūṣṭhava). The Pāñcaśāli lacks force (Alpa prāṇatva) and it consists of limited polish (Mitā saūṣṭhava).

It is expected that all the four qualities Maśmatā, Māmsalatā, Komalatā and Lālitya should be present in the case of all the three styles and it's immaterial whether all the four are present or not. The presence and absence
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does not change the nature of the style but Alpaprānātva, or Ghanaprānātva.

The analysis of style suggested by Soddhala is not taken note of by later writers. Mamāta and others base their classification on the presence and absence of a particular Guna, for example, Mamāta asserts that Madhurya is essential in the Vaidarbhi style while ojas in Gaudī, and Paṅcālī, according to him is midway between the two.

Soddhala is of the opinion that the author is entitled to the use of different types of style according to necessity and should show his excellence in all the different types. Soddhala has tried to do so in his work and takes pride in achieving what he has professed.

Thus in classifying style Soddhala gives a detailed and critical analysis, which brings into relief his literary acumen. This analysis presents new point of view about the style and thus stands separately from the traditional writers. This theory of Soddhala being original deserves appreciation from literary critics.

**EMENDATIONS:**

Emendations in the text are suggested in the Appendix IV; but there is one particular occasion in which, there
seems to be a great lacuna. It occurs in the tale of Kumārakesari (P. 62). From the story of the demon\(^1\) we can indirectly supply the details of the situation; which is missing on account of the defective manuscript. After the sentence "Nabhasi nikpācaksurāsthat\(^2\) we have to supply sentences with the following purport. "In a moment there appeared from somewhere a great sharp sword blue and resplendent like a cloud; the Kapalika gave it to me with his blessings. I accepted it politely and bowing down to him, I retired, taking great care of that sword. While I was trying to get sleep, being engrossed in various thoughts, I heard a noise of people as if engaged in gambling. My mind being attracted, I got up and went to see where the gambling was going on. Having come to the crowd of gamblers, I immediately took part in the game as one of them. In the gambling, sometimes I lost and sometimes gained. Ultimately I found that I lost my sword and won an aerial car; so I began to think that gambling was a sort of an exploit possible only to people with strong arms."

Some such details of the situation are lost to us on account of a lacuna in the manuscript. As the emendation is
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long, I have supplied it here as it forms an important link in the development of the story.

SODDHALA AS A STORY-TELLER:

Sodhala's literary insight can be seen from his analysis of the characteristic features of a good romance. He notes that the beginning of the story should be attractive. The plot should be well-constructed. The romance should be rich in the delineation of sentiments and the style should be pleasing. As a literary critic Sodhala has presented in a nutshell the characteristics of a good story. From the appreciation of Udayasundarîkatha, we can come to the conclusion that Sodhala has become somewhat successful in reaching the mark of a good story-teller.

In the text there are various tales which are interwoven in such a way that they make up a complete tale dependent on it. They are as follows: The tale of Vasantasîla, the tale of a parrot, the tale of Kumârakesâri, the tale of a demon, the tale of a female ascetic and the tale of a monkey. These six subordinate tales are so skilfully interwoven by the poet that they make up the main tale which concerns the Nâyaka Malayavâhana and the Nâyikâ Udayasundari.

SODDHALA AS A POET:

Even though, there is artificiality in the work of
Soddhala's poetic excellence cannot be rated low on that account. Krishnamachary rightly says,¹ "In sweetness and melody of language and beauty of ideas, he is uniquely happy and his creative fancy is peculiarly his own." I have already considered Soddhala's sweetness and melody of language in Chapter IX. Here I wish to point out certain characteristics of the poetic ideas and fancies of Soddhala. In this connection it can be said that Soddhala's fancy is mostly original. Even though bound by poetic convention, he does not depend on the ideas presented by previous masters like Bāna and others whose debt he acknowledges.

In the description of the procession of Malayāvāhana and Udayasundari, when they returned to the city, Soddhala depicts the impatience and haste of city-women. There he does not imitate Asvaghosa² or Kālidāsa.³ Indeed he gives the new idea by depicting the women as Ardhanārīśvara on account of their decoration of only half of the body.⁴

In the description of evening, Soddhala imagines the moonlight to be the milk of the buffalo in the form of night. He fancies that it was spilt on the expanse of the sky while
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being boiled by the flames of the glances of love-lorn people.\(^1\) moreover, when the sun has disappeared, the lotus plant, with its hair-like bees gone, is fancied to be like a widow putting on a white garb of the wide spread light.\(^2\)

He describes the winds as tired travellers resting in the villages near the sea coast,\(^3\) like children sporting in the cradles of the waves of Tamraparni, like guests worshipping in the bowers on the bank of the Kaveri, like travellers crowding in the sprays of water of the Godavari etc. The whole passage proves that Soddhala’s flight of fancy was quite original.

* In describing the glory of Malayavahana, he gives a complicated fanciful idea that as his great elephants moved, the earth suffered depression and consequently the ocean was greatly agitated and the serpent-couch of Viṣṇu toppled down and thus Lakṣmi lost her place on the chest of Viṣṇu.\(^4\)

He describes the fame of Kalindaketu as a swan becoming whiter by plunging in the milky ocean, and while flying

---
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from earth to heaven the drops of water falling from the wings of that swan became stars and the halo of the lustre of its body became the universe.\textsuperscript{1}

While describing hunting, he fancies the teeth of boars to be their bones coming out from their bodies on account of the fear of the fall of the sharp arrow of the king.\textsuperscript{2}

Sometimes his fancies are complicated and their implication is difficult to be grasped. He describes the exploits of Śilāditya as possessing surging flames like the fire emerging from the thunderbolt and so it was but natural that hardness (pride) of kings (mountains) was melted; only Himalaya was not melted; since it possessed supernatural herbs.\textsuperscript{3} The whole idea of identifying the king's exploit with Vajra is complicated. It's implication that Śilāditya was as great as Indra becomes clear only after some consideration.

While describing the great lake, he says that all the seven oceans became frightened and as it were agitated with the thought that again the sage Agastya has returned and the Vindhyā who has fulfilled his promise rose up in the form of
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in-the-form-of its bank. Here the mythological story of Agastya drinking the water of seven oceans is referred to. In the second part of the verses, he refers to the mythological story that Vindhya who has obstructed the path of the sun, bowed down to Agastya, his preceptor and became stunted. He was told to keep in that position by Agastya till his return. Here we have complicated ideas of mythology as the basis of his fancy.

Sometimes he exaggerates an idea to a very great extent. For example, in praising king Malayavahana, the parrot says that the hut built by your enemy was expected to be durable as it was built on a high place and the floods of mountain rivers were unable to reach that place; but while the enemy consoled his beloved in that way, the flood of her own fears washed away the hut. The exaggeration in this idea is quite plain.

Sometimes his ideas rely too much on the pun of words. He describes that the whole family of kings bowed down to Malayavahana and therefore their joints were not broken. Even though the idea is original, it relies solely on the pun upon the word 'Vamsa.'

1. UK : P. 130. 1.काष्ठे भक्त धूलगणाति; -- लििग्यं व लागी दत्ते॥
2. UK : P. 41. करणसम्मधुरीकृतवेदः -- सिविलसुपरा:॥
3. UK : P. 41. स्त्राभिवधशेषा -- क्रमचारण: 'हाव:॥
While describing a poet as swimming with the help of his composition in the ocean of poetry, he states that he has a great danger from the aquatic monster in the form of an ignorant human being. The charm of the idea lies in the pun upon the word Jala to be taken as Jada i.e. a dull person, devoid of the power of poetic appreciation. Here Soddhala solely relies on the artificial pun on the word Jala.

Soddhala's ideas are very rarely tainted with the defects of impropriety. While describing the princess in the assemblage of girls, Kumārakesari describes her to be Laksmi emerging from the orb of the moon, but Laksmi is never known to emerge from the moon but from the milky ocean. Thus the idea is tainted with the defect of impropriety but such cases are rare in Soddhala's work.

**DEFECTS OF SODDHALA:**

**Construction of the Plot:**

While evaluating Udayasundarikatha as a literary work, we have to note its defects also. Udayasundarikatha has
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   कुमार्केसरि काव्यमहोदयम् प्रलक्षणं विस्मृत्यादि

2. **UK : P. 66.**

   अद्यां तद्नेत्यं कत्वे अंकोद्यमानो अपस्तुमाय आशिः...
followed the model of Kadambari from the second Ucchvāsa onward. In the first Ucchvāsa, he has adopted the device of Harsacarita in order that he may prelude the work with his own biography. This device does not serve any purpose in enhancing the literary excellence of the story; on the other hand, the narration of the poet's lineage and the history of Kayasthas, so also the general discussion of literary excellences of a work are all redundant from the point of view of the main story. In this respect, we cannot compare the Harṣacarita with the Udayasundarīkathā, since Baṇa was a protege of Harṣa and in this way the lives of Baṇa and Harṣa were connected. In the case of the Harṣacarita, the autobiography of the poet has relevancy with respect to the life of the hero of the story; but here in the Udayasundarīkathā, the life of Soddhala is not connected with that of the hero Malayavāhana; since he is not patronized by that king. Malayavāhana is only the hero of an imaginary story. Hence Baṇa was right when he did not attach his biography to Kadambarī. But Soddhala could not think of this discrepancy and so a grave defect in the construction of the plot has crept in. The biographical account in the first Ucchvāsa of Kavivamsānivadana seems to be quite detached and irrelevant to the main story; even though Soddhala has very carefully tried to fill up the gap between the real life of Soddhala and the imaginary story by introducing the
The second important defect in the plot construction is the delaying of the main theme in the body of the work. The theme of the work is the love affair of Malayavāhana and Udayasundarī. This theme takes certain shape only in the fifth Ucchvāsa, that is in the later part of the work. In the first half of the work the main tale is relegated to the background. Even the beginning of the main subject-matter is delayed up to the end of the third Ucchvāsa. This delaying of the main theme is a defect in the plot construction as well as in the delineation of sentiments.

From the beginning of the story Siddhala has tried to hold the interest of readers by following the principle of suspense; but the elements by which suspense in the story is created are only indirectly and distantly connected with the main theme. Moreover, he has relied too much on the element of marvel. Even in an imaginary story too much reliance on marvellous incidents is to be considered as a defect. For example, the transformation of the marble images into human beings, namely Tilaka and Talaka, the transformation of the parrot into a young man, Kumarakasari's journey in an aeroplane and his being involved in an accident, his visit to Nāgaloka where he is transformed into
a parrot by the curse of an old female ascetic, Tārāvalī's journey with the pair of wooden shoes to Lankā and her transformation into a mare by drinking the water of a lake are noteworthy in this respect. Moreover, the mare was transformed into Tārāvalī by the touch of a gem, king Tārakiriṭa of Kosātakī was transformed into a monkey by the curse of a sage, the monkey was retransformed into the original form of Tārakiriṭa, the demons and the Nāgas are said to assume their forms at will and can fly in the sky, Māyābala and Dambholi assumed the form of a bird, while they were in search of Udayasundari, the king, Udayasundari and Tārāvalī were brought to the city by the demon Māyābala assuming the form of an aerial car, Kanhālaka also assumed the form of an aerial car and carried Kumārakesarī. All these incidents are full of marvellous elements.

All these marvellous elements, no doubt create interest in the story, but still to rely solely on them cannot be an ideal method of plot construction. In this respect it is worthwhile to compare Soddhala's method with that of Baṇa in Kādambarī. If we assume that his son Bhūṣaṇa guessed the intention of his father correctly, we can confidently say
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that Bana intended to make use of the element of marvel only in the latter part of the story, namely the Kādambarī, Uttarabhāga. The first part of Kādambarī is free from such marvellous episodes. Therein suspense is created by the story itself. The main characters such as Candrāpīḍa and Pundarika etc., are shown to be transformed only in the latter part of the story. The interest of the story, in the case of the first part of Kādambarī lies in the clever weaving of episodes and the pleasant presentation of different situations. In the Udayasundarīkathā, we are sorry to note that instead of making use of the element of marvel for revealing the different features by which suspense is created and thus winding up the story, we find that the element of marvel is used for creating suspense by complicating the story. The dictum "Kuryāt nirvahanedbhutam" should be taken as true for all forms of literature as for Nāṭaka. Soddhala has not followed this dictum and thus failed to give us an ideal romance free from defects.

The plot construction of Udayasundarīkathā is somewhat loose, even though, Soddhala asserts at the end that he has presented a well-connected story. His assertion is only partly true. For example, the story of the parrot in the beginning is expected to run throughout the whole text; but in the middle there is a gap caused by the transformation of
the parrot. The device of a story within a story is not faithfully followed by Soddhala. Indeed he has made use of the device of many sub-stories within the main story narrated by the author and there again some of the sub-stories contained subordinate tales within them. This sort of arrangement has created breaks in the continuous flow of the story.

Certain elements in the plot construction seem to be totally redundant. For example, the incident of the meeting of Vasantasila with a ploughman and the narration of the latter’s account and Kumārakesarī’s visit to the house of Pippalaka. Even if these episodes are removed from the story the plot does not suffer. Neither is there any deficiency in the main interest of the story nor is there any deficiency in the delineation of the sentiments. Practically, these episodes serve no purpose and hence their inclusion in the work should be considered a defect.

In the construction of the plot of Udayasundarīkatha, Kumārakesarī who becomes the friend of Malayavāhana and Tarāvalī who is the friend of Udayasundārī must be considered as sub-hero and sub-heroine. Their union in the end points out that the union of these two persons is without any love affair whatsoever. In order to give a suitable background to the love between Malayavāhana and Udayasundārī,
Soddhala should have depicted the love between Kumārakesari and Tārāvalī. He had an opportunity to do so, since Tārāvalī and Kumārakesari had met in the Nāgaloka at the time when Kumārakesari was cursed by the female ascetic, but he had not availed himself of that opportunity. Moreover, Kumārakesari along with Malayavāhana sees Tārāvalī in the hermitage of Viśvabhūti. He had an opportunity at that time to depict the love between the two; but he did not avail himself of it and thus failed to give a suitable parallel to the love affair of the hero and the heroine.

A case may be found out where Soddhala through oversight has allowed discrepancy to creep in the thread of the story. For example, the parrot narrates about his childhood that he was born of old parents, abandoned by his mother and the birds of his own species, that he was taken care of by a Śivān deity Saradī etc., but all this is obviously false. The parrot is no one else but Kumārakesari transformed into a parrot. So as the story of Kumārakesari proves, the narration of the parrot becomes untrue. The parrot is not likely to tell a lie there, before kind, where he is expected to give a true account of his life. It was only proper for him to say that he forgot every thing about his young days. He only remembered that he was shunned by the fellow parrots because he had a crest and for a long time he wandered from
tree to tree in the forest. The account given by the parrot and that given by Kumārakesarī come into conflict and thus a discrepancy has arisen in the plot construction of Udayasundarīkathā.

**SENTIMENTS:**

As regards the depicting of sentiments, there are certain defects noticeable in the work. First of all, the whole love affair between Udayasundarī and Malayavāhana appears to be very artificial. Even if we accept the fact that love was aroused in the minds of both by looking at the picture-canvas as plausible, still that love is not properly developed and enhanced by the poet in suitable stages. For the proper delineation of Śrīrāja, this sort of development is quite necessary, otherwise the ultimate union of the hero and the heroine seems to be devoid of any sentimental value. The artificiality in the main theme has created a serious flaw which prevents us from ranking Udayasundarīkathā as a very great work.

Soddhala sometimes overlooks the fact, that propriety must be observed in the delineation of sentiments. For example, in order to show his skill in depicting the Bibhatsa rasa, Soddhala has made Tarāvalī in the garb of a young Tāpasī to describe the cemetery. The whole situation seems to be very artificial. Tarāvalī had gone through the
harrowing experience of being pursued by a demon. Moreover, she was afflicted by the loss of her dear friend Udayasunda. Under these circumstances a young girl only fourteen years old, as Tārāvalī was, is not expected to describe the cemetery in all its details. But Soddhala makes her give us very detailed and touching description of the cemetery—would have been otherwise very much appreciated, if given through the mouth of a proper character, in appropriate circumstance.

As we have seen before, in the delineation of sentiments, Soddhala follows the traditional way and gives artificial descriptions. His depiction of a sentiment does not seem to rise from personal experience or deep knowledge of the inner working of human mind. The psychological complications of human mind seem to be ignored by Soddhala. His treatment of human feelings and sentiments is straightforward and follows the model of previous poets.

Artificiality:

The artificial nature of the work is observed in other features also. For example, in the case of descriptions, the artificiality of Soddhala is quite noticeable. In describing the various aspects of nature, he has followed the models of previous poets. He appears to be original, not
on account of his keen observation of nature, but on account of clever imagination and flights of fancies with which he adorns his descriptions. In great masters like Kalidāsa and others nature is made to sympathise with human feelings and thus we discover an inner bond of affinity of the world spirit and the human spirit; but Saddhala is not able to present nature in that higher aspect. There are rare examples in Udayasundarikatha where we find nature associated with human feelings. On account of the lack of appealing personalification Saddhala's descriptions of nature seem to be only artificial.

Characterisation:

In the case of characterisation, we have noted previously how Saddhala has used all his skill in making his hero and heroine ideal characters. But his character, including the hero and the heroine, lack individuality and become only types. They do not present special traits of behaviour consistent with their personality. Almost all the characters of Udayasundarikatha seem to live in a fairy world, and moving in the realm of imagination. They seem to have little connection with the affairs of every day world.

Style:

His attitude towards the reader is sometimes not
praiseworthy. He perhaps considers them to be inferior in intellectual capacity and unable to grasp his clever puns. This attitude makes him explain his puns. In the same way a sentiment is depicted, he himself gives its name. Both these must be considered as defects of his style. Among other defects of style a mention may be made about Soddhala's use of bewildering compounds and out-of-the-way words and formations. The details of this topic are noted in the section on the language of Soddhala.

There are two solitary instances where Soddhala has committed the fault Chandobhangha.1 In the verse 'Tadimamata-dra...' which is in Giti metre, there is one Matra less in the fourth pada, so also in the verse 'Sā jayati...' which is in Arya metre, there is one Matra less in the first pada.

Obscenity:

Sometimes Soddhala even borders on obscenity in the description of sensuous love. For example, in order to show, how very greatly and city-women were attracted by the handsomeness of Malayavahana,2 Soddhala mentions, that the
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women were pursuing themselves to hand over their bodies to the king for sexual enjoyment. They were uttering their grief of not being able to unite with the king in the presence of their mothers-in-law. They were tutoring their sisters-in-law to approach the king as messengers and thus they degraded themselves. He also says that the city women became intimately friendly towards each other on account of the same character and the same infatuation, and as co-wives shared the same sensuous love for the king. The mother-in-law with the daughter-in-law shared the same sensuous love, so also the sisters-in-law. This sort of description of the city women may not be considered as appealing to good taste.

**HISTORICAL DATA:**

The significance of the historical data available in the *Udayasundarikathā* is discussed in connection with the life of Soddhala. As compared with the authors of the time, Soddhala seems to possess historical sense to a considerable extent. The historical references given by Soddhala are corroborated by the facts available from other sources. His information about the Valabhi dynasty, and the Kalukyas and Silaharas fairly approximate to the information available from the copper-plate-grants and inscriptions. Some of the inscriptions are given in Appendix II. Still we are not to view the *Udayasundarīkathā*, as a source of historical
information. It is primarily a literary romance and the historical references serve only a subordinate purpose in the scheme of the work.

In connection with the story of Udayasundarikathā, I have noted a point hitherto not discussed in Indian history, and on which Soddhala throws new light. It refers to the friendship of Latakings and Konkana kings in the eleventh century A.D. The influence of this friendship must have been felt in the social and cultural life of both these regions. The cultural friendship of these two regions made it possible for Soddhala to receive honours from the kings of both the regions and received the patronage of both the courts.

In describing his life Soddhala has given incidentally some important facts about the history of Kayasthas. Soddhala's information about Vallabha Kayasthas is most important. I have devoted a separate chapter to the history of Kayasthas and their contribution to literature. Soddhala traces his descent from Kaladitya whom he praises as an incarnation of a Gana, called Kayastha. This Kaladitya left behind him an extensive family of Kayastha Ksatriya caste. One of the branches of that caste was Vallabha, belonging to Valabhi.

Invasion of Samanatha:

Soddhala lived at a time when great historical events
took place in the Gujarat region. Sometimes Gujarat was
swept by internal fights of its kings. Sometimes confederacy
of Gujarat kings fought with Bhoja, the king of Malwa, and
the most important of all was that at least some of the
invasions of Mahmud of Gazni took place during the life
time of Soddhala. Rawlinson points out that in 1024-5
Mahmud carried out his last and most remarkable raid, direct-
ed against the rich temple of Somanatha standing on the sea-
1
coast of Kathiawad. The same view can be corroborated by
the clear remarks of Shri Jote. He mentions that Mahmud tha
arrived at Somanatha on Thursday, the 30th of January 1025
A. D. Thus Soddhala was the contemporary of this historical
event as it can be shown by the date of the composition of
his work. He has referred to Somanatha, but he does not
give us the slightest mention about the invasion of Mahmud.
Whether the poet was totally unaware of this historical
event or whether he purposely kept silence about the
mortifying fact remains a moot point.

In this respect he might have behaved in the same
way as other Hindu writers. Commissariat says, "The most
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memorable event of Bhima's time (1022-64 A. D.) viz., the sack of Somanatha is passed over in sullen silence by the Hindoo chroniclers, a silence which finds a parallel in the complete absence of any reference to the name of the invasion of Alexander the great either in Sanskrit or in Buddhistic books."

**GEOGRAPHICAL DATA:**

Geographical data available in Udayasundarīkathā though interesting are not very scientific and so possess very little importance. The information about the world given by Sodhala is mostly taken from legendary accounts of the Purāṇa literature; and as all the information does not tally with facts, we cannot lay any stress on the scientific authority. In this respect, we may clearly infer that Sodhala was not a man who had travelled widely. He was intimately acquainted only with the regions of North Konkaṇa and South Gujarat. There are references to these two regions in the text and thus we can show traces of his intimate and personal knowledge of these two regions; but Sodhala seems to be quite ignorant about the Southern part of Konkaṇa or the Northern part of Gujarat. Even though he refers to

several places of North Gujarat and Saurāstra, it is doubt­ful whether he had personally visited those places.

Soddhala knew different regions of India. He mentions the countries, Paṇḍya, Kuntala, Āṇdhra, Konkana, Maharāstra, Lāṭa, Kamātaka, Telinga, Kerala, Cōla, Abhira, Kānci, Mūrāla, Simhala etc. So also he mentions the rivers, Tamraparnī, Ka­verī and Godāvari. Most of the regions mentioned by Soddhala belong to the central and the southern part of India. But it is doubtful whether he visited all these regions and had direct knowledge about them.

Most of the geographical descriptions are conventional and show only Soddhala's book-knowledge of the literature available at the time.

His weakness in geography has created a baneful effect on his work. Udayasundarīkathā is all pervaded with an atmosphere far away from the realities of the world at the time of Soddhala. The descriptions of cities, rivers and mountains only artificial and conventional and they do not show individuality of their own. All this is clearly due to the fact that Soddhala was not a widely travelled man and consequently without intimate knowledge of the places which
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he intended to describe. It is therefore not possible to compare Soddhala with great masters like Kalidasa and others whose knowledge of the different parts of India was personal and intimate.

Soddhala's Native Place:

The personal account of the author as shown before does not give us the exact location of the important places connected with the composition of Udayasundarikātha. Soddhala does not give the name of his native place where he was born and where he retired for the composition of the work. He only refers to it as his native place where he could get all facilities for the composition of a great work.\(^1\)

The text refers to the fact that Soddhala was the hereditary Dhruvaprabhu of the districts of Sikkarakāra, Vahirihāra and Annapalli of Lātadesa.\(^2\)

As regards the identification of these places, even though certain evidence is not available, we can make plausible guesses. The district Vahirihāra may be identified with Bahirika vāsaya referred to in the copper-plate grant of Śryāśraya Śilāditya.\(^3\) Dr. Hariprasad Shastri suggests that Bahirikahara may be identified with the
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village Behara situated between the rivers Pumar and Ambikā in Navsāri Tālukā. Dwivedi suggests that Bahirika may be identified with Vahara or Vasam in the Navsāri Tālukā of the Surat District. Sikkerhara may be identified with Siker, a village near Bardoli of the Surat District. Anāpallī may be identified with Anāval, a village in the Mahuwa Tālukā of the Surat District, on the analogy of Parnapallī being identified with Panolī, Suryapallī being identified with Surāli and Asapallī being identified with Asaval.

All these places, namely Bahira (Vasar or Behera), Siker and Anaval are situated in the Surat District of South Gujarat. So the inference that Soddhala's native place belonged to the region between the rivers Mīndholā and Ambikā seems to be plausible. The poet must have been the Dhruvaprabhu of this region.

Location of the Shrine of Sarasvati:

The other point which remains unanswered is the location of the temple of Saravata on the walls of which Soddhala has written the eulogy of former poets. In the
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text it is said that the shrine was originally established by Bhārgava i.e. Parasurāma in a secluded forest. This shrine of Sarasvatī must have been somewhat famous in South Gujarat and North Konkan during the times of Soddhala, but where the shrine of Sarasvatī was remains a problem, because it cannot be identified with certainty with any of the temple-remains available at present. We can only infer that this temple of Sarasvatī might be somewhere near Sūrpāraka, modern Sopāra; since Vatsarāja informs Mummunirāja about the Praśasti after he came to the court of the Konkan king from Sūrpāraka.  
At least it can be said that the temple of Sarasvatī might be on the route from Brgukaccha to Thānaka i.e. Thāna via Sūrpāraka, because this was the route which was followed by Vatsarāja.

His religion:

As regards the religious views of Soddhala, we may note that he seems to be a devotee of Śiva. In the beginning and at the end of his work he bows down to Śaṅkara in special stanzas. He calls him his favourite deity. Even in the beginning of his Praśasti, he has a eulogistic stanza dedicated to Śaṅkara. Moreover, he referred to Somanātha and Hātaksesvara in terms full of devotion. He considers that
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Sankara is a god who fulfils desires. As the spouse of Sankara he refers to Gauri and in the story he describes a temple of Candi and gives eulogistic stanzas in honour of that Goddess. All this shows that he was a Saiva in his religious inclinations.

Soddhala's Life:

Even though Soddhala remained at the courts of the Lata king Vatsaraja and the three royal brothers of Konkana kings, he does not seem to have got himself involved in the political intrigues of the court. There is not even an indirect reference to show that he took part in the political intrigues of the time. His knowledge of men and matters is obtained from books of literature and Sastras. It seems that he has not seen the world as an adventurer, as Bana had done in his young days. Soddhala must have spent the life of a Pandita away from the general public, the secluded life of a learned man.

The list of his friends includes Jain Suras, like Cādanācārīya, Vijayasimhācārīya, Mahākīrtī and Indra the author of a Cāmpū namely Ratnamañjari. All these men seem to be somewhat eminent and learned. His friendship with these people proves that he moved in an elite society; but the society is not much helpful to widen the writers' horizon.
of the worldly experience.

The effect of this sort of life is seen in his work also. We find that his characterisation is all flat and conventional. There is no individuality which differentiates one person from the other. The delineation of sentiments and feelings which he gives does not throb with life emanating from similar personal experience.

Two Soddhalas:

The poet Soddhala is not to be confused with another Soddhala who was a physician. This latter Soddhala lived in the 12th Cent. A. D. He was a Raikvala Brähmana and his works Guṇasamgraha and Gadānigraha are considered to be of exceptional merit. He belonged to Vatsagotra. The Raikvala Brähmanas generally reside in Gujarat. It is almost certain that he was a Gujarati. He seems to be a famous and learned physician and his works take a complete survey of all the medical literature available at the time. This physician is referred to as Soddhala 2 or Soddhala 3.

Kavipraśasti:

Soddhala has given a kavipraśasti, in which he is:

---
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mentioned poets in the order of Valmīkī, Vyās, Guṇāḍhya (1st A. D.), Bhārtr̥yāntha (430 A. D.), Kālīḍāśa (450 A. D.), Bāna (630 A.D.), Bhavabhūti (720 A.D.), Vākpatirāja (720 A. D.), Abhinandana (905 A. D.), and Yayavara (880 - 920 A.D.). In other poets, he has mentioned Kumāradāsa and Bhāsa. The order of the principal list shows that Soddhala has broadly followed the chronological order, as is shown by their approximate dates. Soddhala does not arrange them according to their poetic excellence.

Estimate of Soddhala:

Soddhala is referred to as being honoured by Cchittara-ja as Kavipradīpa, as the Konkana king was pleased with his brilliant stanzas. In the Udayasundarīkatā also, we find that his stanzas are purposeful, apt and frequently give some poetic idea. After hearing Udayasundarīkatā, Tāḷaka addressed him as Kavipradīpa, thus Soddhala fully justifies his title Kavipradīpa by means of his brilliant stanzas in the Udayasundarīkatā.

Soddhala has no doubt worthily tried to emulate Bāna in all his good points, yet we have to accept the view of
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Pandita Krishnamacarya with some reservations. In this chapter, we have pointed out certain defects in Sodha's composition. The work of Sodha lacks in some of the charms which we find in Bana's Kadambari and Harşacarita. However, he represents the literary activities of the Lātadesa during this period when literary history of Gujarat remained dim, till it is lighted up by Hemacandralāra. (1089 - 1173 A.D.) We can be proud of Sodha, both as a story-teller and a poet, though not of the first rank, still worthy of an honourable position in the line of poets in which he places himself in the Prasasti.

1. UK: Introduction.