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THE PROBLEM
I.1. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Problem:

No introduction is needed for a writer like Bāṇa who is the master of Sanskrit gāḍyā literature as Kālidāsa is the master of the world of sanskrit. It is hardly necessary to record the profound meed of praise and appreciation for Bāṇa; for, it is so common and self evident. He can rightly be called as the prince of sanskrit prose writers. As soon as one speaks of a prose writer in sanskrit, it is Bāṇa that comes to one's mind; it is again his Kādambarī of the prose-writings that dwells in the mind of the readers for ever. It would not be exaggeration to say even that the deficiency from the point of view of the extent of prose writings can aptly and adequately be compensated by the only work called Kādambarī.

Right from the emergence of this brilliant literary composition, the great Indian minds have bestowed their unfailing meed of praise in so many words.
Still one is surprised to notice that Bāṇa is much a neglected writer who has not yet drawn considerable attention of the modern critics in comparison to Kālidāsa and others. This statement in no way implies that modern critics have not taken it seriously, or have not commented upon. We have the views of the great critics like De, Dasgupta, M.M. Kane, Keith, Peterson, etc., to name some selected few. What we mean to propose is: a lot is to be done with regard to the study of Kādambarī. No study is known to exist giving a closer analysis of the rich and varied references to the mythological allusions in the works of Bana, and Kādambarī in particular. It will not be out of place to record here the fact that without a thorough grounding of Indian mythologies it is very difficult to grasp the sense in many a case throughout the work. That is precisely the reason why the Western critics have a poor view so far as the understanding of Bāṇa is concerned, when he gives a rich wealth of mythological allusions with their brilliance, plenty and variety.
Further, no serious attempt is made to study the available variants with a view to give the probable and proper reading of Kādambarī.

With these objectives in mind, the present work Kādambarī studies on the basis of Bhānucandra is undertaken.

It may be mentioned here that Bhafuchandra's (and his disciple Siddhichandra's) is the only complete commentary available to us and scholars have a very poor opinion of this commentary. The harsh criticism by the learned Pandit Mathura nath Shastri that this commentary of Bhānu. is almost a useless one not having any merit whatsoever*, is to be reexamined thoroughly. Thus one of the prime concern of the present endeavour would be to verify the validity and truthfullness of his criticism.

1. 2.

SURVEY OF THE WORKS DONE
Before going to propose the plan and the nature of the present work, a brief survey of the works already done on Kāda. is in order. As stated earlier, Bāṇa is much a neglected writer who has not drawn much attention of the modern critics it deserves to. We present here some important and significant works on Kādambarī.

1. Dr. P. Peterson: Kādambarī; Bombay - Sanskrit Series, 1883.

2. C.M. Ridding: The Kādambarī of Bāṇa; London, 1895.

3. M.M.P.V. Kane: Kādambarī; Bombay.


10. Raja Kumari Trikha: Alāṅkāras in the works of Bāṇabhaṭṭa; Delhi, 1982.


Still more or less these studies are of a general type and the study based on Bhānu's commentary has not yet been done. Further, no considerable attempt has been made so far to study the available variants on the basis of the commentaries and critical editions.

Again no study is done giving a closer analysis of the rich and varied references to the mythological allusions in Kādambarī.

Amongst these works mentioned in the foregoing pages, the endeavour made by Dr. Peterson, M.M.P.V. Kane, and few others are of great importance and are worth mentioning.
The introduction of Peterson and his notes are very rich from the point of view of modern research. In his exhaustive introduction to Kādambarī, he has discussed almost all important aspects of the study of Kādambarī in a general manner.

His notes are very significant for the study of variants and from the point of view of textual criticism. He has utilised the comm. of Bhānu., and other four manuscripts to prepare the text. For the first time we are informed about the existence of the commentaries of Śivarāma, Bālakṛṣṇa, Mahādeva, Sukhākara and we get extracts from these commentaries from his notes only.* However, he has not discussed these variants except giving the reading of some. From the point of view of interpretation also this seems inadequate and incomplete.

The introduction and the exhaustive notes of M.M. Kane is a model of excellent research and study. It must be admitted honestly that all later researches are based on his work alone. In his introduction, he has given a clear picture of the personal history of Bāṇa.

*For more information on these commentaries, supra pp. 15-27.
The date of Bāṇa, he proves with arguments, to be towards the end of 6th and 1st half of the 7th century A.D.\(^1\) On the date of Bāṇa, M.M. Kane comments 'Bāṇa's date is one of the surest planks in the tottering structure of ancient Indian chronology. He has discussed further the works of Bāṇa, the distinction between Kathā and Ākhyaṅīkā, the literary estimation of Bāṇa, the commentaries on Kādambarī in a greater detail. We quote here a few lines from his estimation, to point out the merit and defects of Bāṇa's writings.\(^2\)


2. For the appreciation of Bāṇa, vide Dr. Peterson's Introduction to Kādambarī, pp. 36-43.
1. He shows great skill and discrimination in characterisation. All the characters in Kādambarī are life-like and consistent. The gentle and youthful Hārita..., these are characters that are bound to make a deep impression on the heart of the reader. Bāṇa, however, lavished all his skill in depicting the hero and the heroine of his romance.

2. Although Bāṇa was fettered by canons of rhetoric which laid down that long compounds were of the essence of prose he displays considerable variety of style. His diction is generally smooth and graceful and he could write with force and bravity when it suited his purpose to do so.

3. He seems to have been a close observer, not only of courts of kings, but even of the less bright aspects of human life.

4. Bāṇa seems to be have been a great lover of nature. He is never tired of using for poetic purposes the flora and fauna of India. His reference to plants and flowers though sometimes overdrawn and fanciful are generally charming.
One of the greatest flaws of Bāṇa's writing is that they abound in puns on words and recondite amidst the array of double meaning words, bold and fanciful allusions, to grasp the exact meaning of the author.¹

One of the most important point to be mentioned here is that he has widely utilised the two unpublished commentaries on Kāda, namely, Āmoda and Darpaṇa. His notes in two parts (pp. 1-124 and 124-237 of Dr. Peterson edition) are very rich from the point of view of understanding and interpretation of Kāda.

Amongst the other works, V.S. Agrawal has made a detailed analysis of Kādambarī from the point of view of culture. The Indian tradition and culture at the time of Bāṇa has exhaustively been studied as reflected in Kādambarī, in these books.

The work of Karmarkar, Bana, Neeta Sharma's A literary study of Bana Bhatta; Prof. Amarnath Pandeya's The literary study of Banabhata (in Hindi) are of general nature.

¹ Vide his introduction, p. 21-26.
S.V. Dixit's Bāṇabhaṭṭa: His life and literature is an excellent collection of the findings of research on Kādambarī. He says in his preface "I have tried to furnish them with the views of the earlier scholars in the field and often giving numerous quotations from their works". It should be mentioned here that he has his own share of contribution while meticulously presenting the essence of the earlier researches in the subject. Bāṇabhaṭṭa's biography, his date, his works, some studies in Kādambarī, merits and demerits of Bāṇa and society in Bāṇa's time are some of the special features of discussion of his work.

Alaṅkāras in the works of Banabhatta by Dr. Trikha is fully devoted to the study of Alaṅkāras. She has tried to identify all the cases of figure of speech in Kāda, classified them on the basis of the definitions of the rhetoricians with examples. It may be mentioned her approach is a model of research on a single aspect of a work or an author.
I. 3.

SCOPE OF THE PRESENT WORK
I.3. **SCOPE OF THE PRESENT WORK:**

The present thesis bases its study and analysis on the Purvabhaga of Kādambarī mainly in the light of the commentary of Bhanuchandra. It is presented and arranged in six chapters including the Introduction and Conclusion. In the introduction, it has been attempted to present a general estimation of the commentaries on Kādambarī and about the present commentator.

The second chapter is devoted to the study of the textual criticism of Kādambarī (of Bāṇa) on the basis of Bhanucandra. We have selected some one hundred important readings having variants and scope for confusion. The criticism of the editor against the readings of Bhānu. have been thoroughly examined and verified. For deciding the actual reading or rather the probable ones, that might have been intended by the author, we have consulted and made use of the following editions and commentaries. Further we have also given due importance to the context and the syntax of the usage.
1. NSP edition (with the comm. of Bhanu.)
2. Kane's edition (Bombay edition)
3. Peterson edition (as recorded by Kane)
5. Cheukhamba edition
6. Bhanu.'s comm.
7. Āmoda (from the notes of Kane)
8. Darpana (-do-)
9. Bālakṛṣṇa, etc. (from the notes of Peterson)

In the third chapter attempt has been made to unveil the mythological allusions in Kādmārī. Here the occurrence of the allusion in Kādambarī is given with reference and is arranged in an alphabetical order. Where the text cannot be understood and there is an allusion, we have given the story. As far as possible we have tried to trace the source and make a reference to it. Those cases where there is a mere reference to a mythological person, event, etc., and no allusion, are collected and presented here.

In the chapter of interpretation, we have selected some important words having scope for clarification and explanation. In Kāda., we come across many a case where it is difficult to construe the words to
yield a good sense. Some of these cases are included here. There are interpretation of words, concepts and situations. But all these are not classified. The entire chapter is arranged in alphabetical order. We have utilised chiefly the commentary of Bhānu., along with the two unpublished commentaries, namely, Āmoda and Darpaṇa, from the notes of M.M. Kane.

The fifth chapter is entirely devoted to the exposition of the scholarship of Bhānu. We have tried to give ample references with regard to his knowledge of grammar; his acquaintance with the lexicons; his familiarity with Indian lores, beliefs, etc. In this chapter we will be giving a detailed list of definitions of various aspects of Bhānu.

In the concluding chapter, we have given the special features of the comm., peculiarity of the commentator, Bhānu.'s influence on the latter commentaries and modern scholars. This will also include some observations on the criticism of Bhānu.

Along with this we have appended the following appendices:

Appendix I : Citations

Appendix II: Influence of Bhānu on Modern Scholars
Appendix III: Some peculiar words used by Bhānu.

Appendix IV: Index to mythological allusions.
I.4. A GENERAL ESTIMATION OF THE AVAILABLE COMMENTARIES OF KĀDAMBARI:

Bhanuchandra and Siddhichandra's is the only complete commentary available to us on the Pūrvabhāga and the Uttarabhāga respectively. The commentary has been published by the Nirmaya Sagar Press. We reserve the discussion on this comm., to the last, with regard to its merits. On the personal life of Bhānu., we learnt from the introductory verses and the colophon of the Pūrvabhāga that Bhānu. was a Jaina Pañḍit. Even in his comm. in many cases it has been reflected. For, he interprets Kṛṣṇa as Jīna, etc.¹ He was a pupil of Sūracandra and was honoured by emperor Akbar with the title of Upādhyāya.² He has commented on the Pūrvabhāga of Kādambarī to please his pupil Siddicandra who also was patronised by Akbar.³ We do not know much regarding

1. Vide Kāda., p.69, l. 16; p.427, l. 6, etc.
2. Śrī sūracandraḥ samabhūt taḍīya śisyāgrani, etc. p.2, sl. 5.
3. Śrī vācakāḥ sampratī bhānucandraḥ nyakbara kṣmaṇpati
dattamanaḥ... śrī siddha candro'sti maḍīya śisyeb.
kādambarī vṛttiriyam taḍīya manomude tene mayā, pratanyate. p.2, sl. 8-10.
the personal life of Bhānuicandra. It may be mentioned here that scholars of very poor view of this comm.\textsuperscript{1} It is a fact that there are many mistakes throughout the comm., which has been thoroughly noticed by many scholars.\textsuperscript{2} But it is sad to note that this comm., has not been given due credits, which it deserves. It may be regarded here that the later studies in Kādambarī, even the commentaries are greatly been influenced by this commentary, which we will point out in detail in our concluding chapter.

---


2. It is hardly necessary to enumerate those cases of mistakes which have profusingly been pointed out in the notes of Parab's edition. M.M. Kane also has pointed out those shortcomings in his notes to Kada.
Casaka:

From the notes of Dr. Peterson on Kāda., it appears that Sivarama Tripathy wrote a comm. on the Pūrvabhāga of the Kāda., called Casaka. Kṛṣṇamacaryar also mention the name of this comm. in his History of Classical Sanskrit Literature.¹ We present here a few examples from the extractions from Casaka, as quoted by Peterson.


3. Sāmantakṛta pādārvinda, etc., p.112.

4. Anekauguptāḥ vaisyaḥ, p.112.

5. Bandhure sundare, p.113.

6. Mahāvīrāḥ surāḥ pakṣe mahāvīrāḥ makhāgnayah, etc., p.114.

7. Alīko nāgaraḥ. nagaravāsi vadhu krtolaka-bhaṅgaḥ kesaraṇaḥ viśeṣaḥ julupha iti bhāsa prasiddhaḥ... alīko nāgare smṛta iti viśvarakāsah. vadvā alīke laṅkte volaka bhaṅgaḥ bhramaraka bhaṅgaḥ, p.114.

¹ M. Kṛṣṇamacaryar, HCSL., p.450.
Sometimes Śivarāma notices variant readings. The comm. is not very rich and tries to explain the meaning of the words generally. It is yet to be published.

Sukhākara:

This is also not published and Peterson has utilised this comm. in his notes to Kāda. Sukhākara gives the text of the seven introductory verses without any comment. This comm. is also very scanty and gives the meaning of the words only. Here follows a few extractions from the comm.:

\[\text{Jātir alaṅkāra puṣpa viśeṣās ca} \quad \text{p.112.}\]
\[\text{guptāḥ kumāraguptādayaḥ} \quad \text{p.112.}\]
\[\text{mānthare gambhire} \quad \text{p.113.}\]
\[\text{nīgrhyamāṇe svamāt prasthāpyamāṇe \& c} \quad \text{p.113.}\]
\[\text{dvijanmanāṁ hiranyagarbhō brahma sa ca dvijanmanāṁ patīḥ, etc.} \quad \text{p.113.}\]
\[\text{mahāvīrāṇ śūraṇ} \quad \text{p.114.}\]
Vaidyanātha:

The name of the comm. is Viṣama pada vivṛtti. Vaidyanāth comments only on the Pūrvabhāga. It tries to explain the important words.¹ It is not published. Prof. Pandey gives the description of the manuscript as follows:

Kādambarī visama pada vivṛtti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>granthakāra</th>
<th>Vaidyanātha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kramasaṅkhyā</td>
<td>41238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrasaṅkhyā</td>
<td>1 - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ākāra</td>
<td>12.2' - 4.7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pafkti saṅkhyā (every page)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akṣara saṅkhyā (every pafkti)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipi</td>
<td>devanagari.²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. avacūleti guccakam cāvacūlakam iti - śobhanā ptā jatā vasya, ptā jatāpi prakīrtita - Amarnath Pandeya, Bāṇabhaṭṭakā Sāhityika Anuśīlana, p.28.
2. ibid. p.27.
Bālakṛṣṇa:

We know from Dr. Peterson's notes that Bālakṛṣṇa has commented upon the Pūrva of Kāda. Peterson has referred to this comm. for almost each and every word. This commentator has also noticed variant readings. Here follows a few extractions from the commentary:

- āsanā vrksa viśesah - p.122
- ārṇā mesādi lomni & c - p.121
- Kaukseyakena khadgena - p.121
- Carcā tu cārcikyaṃ & c - p.121
- Mahāvīraṇ dharmāṁrṇmaṇa - p.114
- Maukharayaṇ karaculyādīvanmahārāja viśesah - p.111
- Viruddha jātimatim vigatā jāti kusumam - p.124

For further references vide pp. 125, 126, 127, 129, 132, 135, 138, 154-160, etc.

Mahādeva:

Dr. Peterson has presented and utilised the extract from this commentary. Aufrecht also mentions this commentary in his catalogue. It is not published
and has not been utilised by anybody further. It is a very meagre and gives the explanation of words.

Example: Guptāḥ racksitāḥ – p.112

Parāudhāreva parāḥ paraśuriti śabda bhedāḥ p.121

Sā pratihāri (actually sā refers to mātanga kanyakā) – p.121

Bandhure ramye unnate vā – p.113

Purodāṣaḥ havisēsaṃ – p.113

Mahāvīrāḥ ārāṅ, etc. – p.114

Atidvayā advitiyā – p.115

Gāṅgā pravāha iiva bhagīrathasya rājnyāḥ panthāḥ, etc. – p.116.

Unmukhamayukha unmukhāḥ mayukhāḥ teṣām kāntiḥ – p.121

Urṇā mesādi lomni – p.121

Aṣṭaṃūrti:

The name of the commentary is Āmoda. Aṣṭaṃūrti was the son of Nārāyaṇa, a brahmin by caste. He was an inhabitant of Kerala and belonged to Bhṛgu gotra.¹

---

¹. Pūrveṇa gunatām āśiṭ Keralesu bhṛgoḥ kule, vipro nārāyaṇas tasmād aṣṭaṃūrtir ajāyata – Vide P.V. Rags, op. cit. p.46. See also Amarnath Pandey, op.cit. p.28.
In the introduction of his comm., he says that he composed his commentary in matrical form, as a thing is not easily remembered and retained in mind unless if be put in a matrical form. He has commented upon the both - the Pūrva., and Úttara., Kādambarī.

It is a learned comm., and the comm. seems to be wellread and thoroughly acquainted with the works of poetics and lexicography. However the comm., is not exhaustive and rather meagre. It is fuller in the beginning and three-fourth of the comm. is devoted to Pūrva. only. The comm. often records variants. It refers to other commentaries in the words - kenacit, aparāḥ, etc. We get a reference to a commentator called Matsyaketu in Āmoda. The comm. begins with upasmahe, etc., and ends with tatva vicāra cāru tarayā drstvaiva vikhyāpyatām.

1. Na vinā vṛttabandhena vastu prāyenā sugrahan, ibid.
2. Atha matsyaketupāthah kutracit upacāra mātra madhuram iti. vide para 204 of Kane. II.
We get reference to the following works and authors:

Ajaya, Anargharāghava, Amara, Kāmandakīyanīti, Kalidāsa, Kūmārilabhatṭa, Keśavasvāmi (the lexicographer), Kauṭilya, Kṣemendra, Daṇḍin, Dhanañjaya, Bādarāyaṇa (the author of the Brāhmaṇḍa), Mūrī, Bhārata, Bhoja, Māgha, Yādavapraṇāśa, Rājaśekhara, Rāmāyaṇa, Vāsavadatta, Vaijayantī, Śākaṭāyaṇa, Sāradātanaya Ṣhalāyudha.

Among the other works those are quoted without mentioning the name are:

1. Kāvyaprakāśa
2. Kāvyādarśa
3. Manu smṛti.

Nothing can definitely be said about the time of the comm. However since he refers to the Kāvyaprakāśa, Kṣemendra, etc., he cannot be earlier than 1200 A.D.

Kādambarī Padārtha Darpaṇa:

It is by an anonymous writer. He has commented upon both the Pūrva and Uttara bhāga. The comm. begins
with a salutation to lord Kṛṣṇa.¹ The comm. seldom notices variant readings. He gives south Indian equivalents for Sanskrit words. The comm. seems to be from Kerala or at any case from South India. It is very meagre comm. He has quoted the following works and author:

1. Kūmāra sambhava
2. Kṛṣṇa
3. Keśava
4. Kauṭilya
5. Kirātārjunīya
6. Chando viciti
7. Daṇḍi
8. Bhāva viveka

He has also quoted from the following Koṣas:
1. Amara
2. Vaijayanti
3. Halāyudha.

¹ Prapamya varadam devam ballavī jana vallabham Kādambarī padārthānām kriyate darpanam mayā.
Amoda vis-a-vis Darpana:

A careful observation of the extract of the two commentaries reveal that they remarkably coincide in their explanations of certain words and phrases. We give here a few examples from both:

A. Aham nirvartisyey. Sakala visayopabhogad
   idrśa śapatha trayeneva. Tritvokitś tu
   trisatyā hi devā iti kila śruteḥ - p.105.

D. -do- -do-

A. Ākuṇīta - bhāgatrayasya saṅkoce kuṇītam


A. Ārohanāvarohana sādhanabhedaḥ svarāsrutinām
   yah. Grāma viṣeśabhivyaktyarthah sa sāraṇā
   jñeyā - p.215.

D. Sāraṇā vīnā vādanām - p.215.

A. Ādhisara cchadohamsaḥ Kādambaḥ samūdāhrtaḥ
   - p.70.

D. Kādambaḥ kalmśa varṇo hamsaḥ -
Thus arises the question whether the author of A. knew D. or vice versa. One thing is certain that both
the commentators hail from South and it is probable that either of the two knew the other. M.M. Kane argued D. to
be earlier than A. and at places he seems to improve on A.'s explanation. But it is difficult to say anything definitely in this regard.

Haridāsa, Ghanāśyāma and Sūracandra:

KrṣnaMacārya mentions the names of these three commentaries. It was not possible for us to see any of these for reference and use.

Tattvāprākāśikā:

This commentary is by Mr. M.R. Kale and a modern one. He has commented upon the Pūrva. of Kāda. only. It is accepted as a good and learned commentary. And needs the need of a reader from every aspect. It gives the synonyms of all important words, it breaks the long passages into smaller units, analyses all compounds, shows grammatical peculiarities with rules, quotes profusingly from various Kośas wherever necessary, quotes frequently from books on poetics, gives similar and identical passages from other sources, gives the narration of mythological allusions quoting sources sometimes, records the variants.
He quotes some from the following *Kosas*:

1. Anekārtha
2. Abhidhāna cintāmaṇi
3. Amṛta
4. Kośa
5. Tārapāla
6. Medinī
7. Ratnakoṣa
8. Rudra
9. Yādava
10. Viśva
11. Vaijayantī
12. Vītiśesvara
13. Sabdārṇava
14. Ṣāśvata
15. Halāyudha
16. Hemacandra
17. Haima . etc.

He also quotes the following important works and authors:

1. Amaruṣaṭaka
2. Anargha rāghava
3. Bāla Rāmāyaṇa
4. Daśakumāra carita
5. Daśa rūpaka
6. Hitopadeśa
7. Kāvyādāra
8. Kāvyapraṅgāsa
9. Kirātārjunīya
10. Mallinātha
11. Manu
12. Mṛcchakaṭika
13. Nirukta
14. Pañcāsantra
15. Raghuvamśa
16. Ratnāvalī
17. Śākuntala
18. Saṅkhyaṇarākārikā
19. Siddhānta Kaumudī
20. Sāhitya Darpana
21. Śisupāla Vadha
22. Tarka Saṃgraha
23. Uttararāma carita
24. Vikramorvamāśiyam, etc.
It may be mentioned here that Mr. Kale has widely utilised the comm. of Bhānu. in his comm. In many cases he has accepted the authority of Bhānu. and his interpretation. We are giving here a selected list of citations of the interpretation of Bhānu. as given by Kale with reference.

1. Avatāritam anadhijyam kṛtam, iti Bhānu. p.60, 1.6.
2. Anyasya paksinaṁ tathā yuddhe paksapāto nāstī iti kūkūṭa grahāṇam iti - Bhānu., p.73, 1.6.
3. Āraṇḍha vihitō yo'mṛte caṛuryajña odanaḥ iti' - Bhānu., p.71, 11. 2-3.
4. Ānusvāraḥ ślesaḥbhāṅgakṛṣṇabhavati iti praṅcaḥ. iti Bhānu., p.97, 1.6.
5. Komala mukulākārayoḥ sāmyāccaranayoḥ kośa sāmyam. āraktatva sāmyād alktaka rasena bālēkṛpa sāmyam, iti Bhānu., p.103, 11. 3-4.
6. 'Cūlikā prāntabhāgaḥ' iti - Bhānu., p.185, 1.5.
7. Gṛḥṭryādīnām Lālanārtham mukhena yo dindima dīvanisa tena janitotpādita prītirasya iti. - Bhānu., p.107, 11. 3-4.
8. 'Pāpapākhanda śakinidākini prabhṛtśām praveśa prati- bandhakarmanṝi mantrādyausadha prakāroyasmin' iti - Bhānu., p.114, 11. 2-3.
9. 'Putravatya grhāvāropāri manimaya kalaśāropāṇam kriyate iti rājaśthitih' iti - Bhānu., p.118, 1. 14.
Mukhameva vādyam iti - Bhānu., p.125, l. 3.

Sonitapuram bāṇāsurasya nagaram "tac ca 'devikot'
iti prasiddham" iti - Bhānu., p.147, l. 4.

Śrīnām prāyena daksinā mṛgopā śakunam iti
vasantarājādau prasiddham iti - Bhānu., p.324, 11.8-9.

Hāritāh mṛdānkurāṇ iti - Bhānu., p.204, l. 12.

Arjun: On the Uttara Kāda.

M.M. Kane refers to a comm. by Arjun Paṇḍit, son of Cakradās.¹ It is a learned and critical comm. It discusses and records the variant readings. He seems to be well read and acquainted with the works of poetics. He quotes from Amara, Manu, Gitā and Raṅgu., etc. Among the works and authors quoted are Harṣa C., Kālidāsa, Kāmanḍakiya nītisāra, Kāvyādāraśa, Māgha, Mahābhārata, Mūrārī, Uttara rāma carita, Vis P., etc.

Candrakalā:

It is a very modern comm. by Krishna mohan Shastri, published from Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Benaras. It is based on the P.V. Kane and Peterson's edition of Kāda.

¹ Vide Kane, op. cit., p.47.
It is a good comm. from the point of view of understanding and not research. It gives synonyms of the words, notices the figure of speech, gives the narration of the mythological elements, sometimes quoting sources. It quotes profusely from Kośas like Amara, Viśva, Medini, Anekārtha, Haimah, etc. Normally he does not quote parallel lines from other literatures. For definitions, he quotes from Sāhitya Darpaṇa mostly. Rarely he discusses variant readings in the comm.
I.5. A NOTE ON KATHĀ:

In a work like this that involves the study of a Kathā like Kādambarī it would not be out of place to discuss in detail the nature and form of a Kathā. Kādambarī is accepted as a model of an ideal example of Kathā - a variety of gadya literature. Thus it becomes inevitable to discuss the nature and form of a kathā and brings out its distinction from Ākhyāyikā. We have a lot of discussion on the definition of kathā, etc. To mention a few:


The following discussion is a mere reappraisal of what already has been discussed.

Sanskrit rhetoricians have divided sanskrit Kāvya in three broad divisions, namely, gadya, padya and miśra (campu). The gadya is divided into Kathā and Ākhyāyikā.
Agni Purāṇa deals with Kathā as follows:

\[
\text{Ślokaiḥ svavamām sanksepat}
\]

Kaveryatra prāśamsati

\[
mukhyārthasyāvatāraya bhavetyatra kathāntaram
\]

Paricchedo na yatrasyāt bhavet vā lambhakaiḥ

kvacit sā kathā ...

Actually Agni Purāṇa enumerates five varieties of prose literature, namely, ākhyāyikā, kathā, khandakathā, parikathā and kathāṅkā,1 the last three being the minor subdivisions of kathā.

Bhāmaha gives a similar definition of kathā.2 On the basis of definitions of kathā and ākhyāyikā as given by Agni P. and Bhāmaha, the characteristics of the two may be presented as follows:

1) In ākhyāyikā there is a detail discussion of the poet's family in prose while in a kathā the poet briefly praises his family in verse.

2) In an ākhyāyikā the topics like kidnapping of a girl, battles, separation of the hero are described; in a kathā it is not so.

---

1. Vide Agni P. 337, sl. 113-117.
2. RVlan. 1, 25-29.
3. In an ākhyāyikā it is the hero who relates his own deeds whereas in a kathā the story is told by others and not by the hero.

4. An ākhyāyikā is divided in Ucchāśas and contents stanzas in the Vāktrā and the aparavaktrā metres which are suggestive of future events; a kathā may not be divided into sections and if it is there called lambhaka.

5. An ākhyāyikā is distinguished by possession of certain catch words which the poet puts in; in a kathā it is not so.

It may be mentioned that Daṇḍin does not find any distinction between the two.¹ Prof. Keith observes: "the distinction between kathā and ākhyāyikā.... is presented to us in a puzzling confusion in the writers on poetics explaining and justifying in large measure the refusal of Daṇḍin in his Kāvyādarśa to have anything to do with the distinction."²

Thus, according to Daṇḍin, the characteristic of the two as mentioned are not exclusive. M.M. Kane gives the distinction between the two after Daṇḍin thus:

1. In an ākhyāyikā it is the hero himself who tells the whole story, while in kathā, the story is told either by the hero or by someone else.

2. An ākhyāyikā is divided in sections named Ucchvāsas, etc.

3. In a kathā, topics like kidnapping of a girl, battles, separation, the rise of the sun and moon are described. In an ākhyāyikā it is not so.

4. A kathā is distinguished by possessing certain catch words which the author intentionally puts in.1

It may be mentioned here that there is some difference from the points given to us after Agni P. and Bhāmaha.

S.V. Dixit on the summary given by M.M. Kane observes "But about points three and four from M.M. Kane summary from Daṇḍin we wonder whether M.M. Kane has not erred in summerising."¹

Prin. Karmarkar makes additional points:

1. A kathā uses the āryā metre.
2. Also a kathā is written either in sanskrit or in prākṛt (kathā hi sarva bhāsābhīḥ, etc.)²

Most probably Daṇḍin had some authority before him for maintaining such view of the non-distinction between the two. He indeed a noted writer and might have heard before him many more examples of kathās and ākhyāyikās than what we have today and most have noticed that there are no significant and significant distinction between the two varieties. As one can see his Daśākumāra carita neither fits to the stereo-typed definitions of either kathā or ākhyāyikā strictly.

---

¹ Vide Dixit, op. cit., p.145.
Inspite of all these, the orthodox division was accepted and followed in later period by rhetoricians like Rudraṭa, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and others. Bāṇa himself has referred to this two classes of literature among others. His compliments to previous अक्ष्यायिकाकाराः suggest that before him these two गद्यः literature were accepted as different. He himself calls Harṣa C. as an अक्ष्यायिक and Kadambari as a कथा. The author of Alankāra samgraha makes a further point on the distinction, namely, अक्ष्यायिक shall be based on historical facts and कथा on a fictitious plots (gadyantu kathitam dvidhā kathetyakhyayiteti ca, katha kalpita vṛttānta satyarthē- khyayikā matā). Amarakoṣa makes a similar distinction (अक्ष्यायिकोपालदार्थेप्राबंधकेप्राप्तात्रथा). This new principle seems to be added following Bāṇa's work.

Rudraṭa in his Kāvīlam. has defined the katha and अक्ष्यायिक following Bāṇa's Kāda. and Harṣa C. as the two standard specimen of the two kinds of prose composition.¹

---

Ānandavardhana accepts the distinctions in his Dhvanyāloka with certain reservations on the use of long compounds. To him long compounds should not occur in description of pathos and love of separated lovers.¹

Abhinavagupta distinguishes between these two classes by pointing out that the ākhyāyikā is possessed of sections called Ucchyasas and stanzas in Vaktra and aparavaktra metres, whereas the kathā is free from such characteristics.²

The most modern definition of kathā and ākhyāyikā are those given by Viśvanātha which are based on the earlier ones. "According to him - A kathā contains a fine plot. In prose with here and there a stray stanza in the āryā, vaktra or aparavaktra metres. In the beginning there is a salutation in verse and a mention is made on the conduct of wicked, etc. An ākhyāyikā is

¹ Dhvanyaloka, pp. 143-144.
similar to a kathā but in it we have in addition an account of the poet's family and sometime of other poets. The division of the narrative are styled as Ṛśvāsas, which contains in the beginning stanzas in the Āryan, vaktra and aparavaktra metres that are suggestive of future events.  

1. S.V. Dixit, p.147.

cf. Kathāyāṁ sarasāṁ vastu gadyaṁ eva vinirmitam kvacit atra bhavet āryā kvacit vaktraṁ aparvaktrade ādaupadyaṁ namaskāraṁ khalāder vṛttaṁ kīrtanam, etc.

Sān Dar. VI.