Appendix B

Commentaries on Bhattikāvya

As the poet himself has remarked at the conclusion of his composition, Bhattikāvya is explicable through a commentary. The poet has not given any Svopajñā Vṛtti on it, but several other scholars have commented on it in detail. A few of the commentaries are published, while many remain unpublished. Few particulars about the date of the different commentators are available.

The commentators have followed different systems of Sanskrit grammar while referring to the grammatical rules illustrated in Bhattikāvya. The commentaries may therefore be classified according to the different systems followed therein.

i. Pāṇini

1. Jayamangala has written Jayamangalā commentary on Bhattikāvya. It is the oldest commentary on Bhattikāvya. He names Pāṇini as the authority. This commentary is published.

2. Mallinātha the celebrated commentator has written Sārvapathīna commentary on Bhattikāvya. He flourished in the fifteenth century.

---

1 BK., XXII, 34.
2 Vide Bibliography.

Again there is a sub-commentary of Jayamangalā. It is entitled Bhattikāvya - vyākhyā - vimarsa; the name of its author is not given. (A Triennial Catalogue of MSS., Vol. IV, No. 3695).

3 Vide Bibliography.
ii. Kātantra System

3. Pundarikākṣa Vidyāsāgara, son of Śrīkānta, has written Kalāpadīpikā which explains the text by references to the rules of Kalāpa or Kātantra grammar^1.

4. A commentary bearing the same name has been written by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, which is also based on the rules of Kalāpa grammar^2.

5. Puruṣottama has written his Bhāṣāvṛtti based on Kalāpa grammar^3.

iii. Saṃskīptasāra

6. Nārāyana Vidyāvinoda has written Bhaṭṭibodhīnī which explains all grammatical references by citing the authority of Saṃskīptasāra grammar^4.

iv. Mughdhabodha

7. Bharatamallika, the author of Mughdhabodhīnī, was the son of Ambastha Gauranga Mallika and lived about 1800 A.D.5. He quotes the sūtras from Mughdhabodha grammar^6.

8. Again Rāmānanda has written the commentary named Mughdhabodha based on Mughdhabodha grammar^7.

---

1 A Triennial Catalogues of MSS, Vol.IX, p.7669 R. No.5718.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Vide bibliography.
v. **Saupadma**

Rāmachandra Śarmā has written the commentary *Vyākhyānanda*. He descended from Varendra dynasty and his commentary is based of Saupadma grammar\(^1\).

Another commentary based on the same grammar is written by Kandarpasarmā, a devotee of Rāma\(^2\). The catalogue does not mention the title of the commentary. But it is probably the same as Vaijayanti mentioned by Shri Trivedi\(^3\) as contributed by Kandarpasarmā.

vi. **Commentaries with unnoticed systems:**

In the case of many unpublished commentaries, the systems followed therein are not noticed in the lists or catalogues:

11. Hariharachārya has written *Bhattibodhinī*\(^4\).

12. Kumudānanda has written a commentary named *Subodhīnī*\(^5\).

13. Another commentary bearing the same name has been written by Rāmachandra Vāchaspati\(^6\).

14. Vidyāvinoda, a devotee of Rama, has written a commentary named *Bhattichandrika*\(^7\).

---

2. Ibid., p. 7664, R. No. 5712.
15-16. Two other commentators named Śrīdhara and Śāṅkarāchārya are known to have commented on Bhāṭṭikāvyā, but the names of their commentaries are not given.

17. One more commentary on Bhāṭṭikāvyā is entitled Vyākhyāsāra, but the name of the commentator is not known.

Bhatti has given no hint about the particular system followed by him, while illustrating rules of Sanskrit grammar.

But from external evidence, it appears that the system that prevailed in Gujarat during those times was that of Pāṇini. For King Dhruvasena II (C.628-643 A.D.) alias Bālāditya of Valabhi is represented as proficient in Śālāturiya (i.e. Pāṇineya) Tantra.

Among the other systems of Sanskrit grammar, all systems excepting the Kātāntara system came into vogue after the times of Bhatti. Obviously the later commentators followed the different systems prevalent in their own times without having the chronological sequence of Bhāṭṭikāvyā in view.

As for the Kātāntara system, it seems to have been in common use in Kashmir and Eastern Bengal. However it is worth investigating whether the illustrations given by Bhatti fit in the sutras of the Kātāntara grammar to a larger extent than those of Pāṇini's grammar.

1 Krīṣnamachāri, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, p.145
4 Haraprasada Śāstrī, Op. Cit., p.XI.
On a comparative study, it appears that the sūtras illustrated in Bhattikāvya do not represent a regular sequence even in Kātantra.

The correspondence of the sūtras with the illustrations given in Bhattikāvya can well be studied in Adhikārakāṇḍa in particular. The adhikāras illustrated in Bhattikāvya are especially represented in adhyāyas III and IV of Kātantra; some adhikāras like 'kr̥tya', 'kr̥d' and 'ghāḥ' can be traced satisfactorily therein, but some other adhikāras (for example, 'Karmapravachaniya', 'Anabhihite', 'Iṣṭa', 'Iṣṭapratiṣedha', 'Karaka' etc.) illustrated in Bhattikāvya can hardly be traced completely in Kātantra, while they are well represented in Pāṇini's sūtras.

From this it follows that the sūtras illustrated in Bhattikāvya can better be traced to Pāṇini's grammar than the Kātantra grammar, while the later systems are out of consideration chronologically.