Several editions of Bhattikāvya are published with some commentary or the other. Among the published commentaries, the commentary by Jayamangala is the most common one. Among the other commentaries, the commentary by Mallinātha is outstanding. I commenced my work with a textual study of the Mahākāvya along with the different published commentaries.

The MSS. of Bhattikāvya contain several variant readings in the text. Some of them are well noticed in the text edited by Prof. K.P. Trivedi. Even the commentators notice and discuss some variant readings known to them.

In course of my study, I found that the commentary Jayamangala, which is the earliest known commentary on Bhattikāvya, seems to represent the early tradition, associated with the times of the author, though Mallinātha the celebrated commentator of the classical Mahākāvyas tries to improve upon the early concepts according to the more developed concepts of later times.

Next I studied the prefaces and notes by the learned editors as well as the comments on Bhattikāvya given in the different well-known works on the Sanskrit literature.

I commenced my critical study of Bhattikāvya with
collecting all the available data about the personal account of the author and interpreting them critically on the basis of the original sources. Then I proceeded with a critical study of the work (i) as a Mahākāvyā and (ii) as a Śāstra-kāvyā.

In embodying the results of my research in the different chapters of the thesis, I noticed with pleasure that the work has lent me ample scope for making some original contribution in the subject of my research. The outstanding points of original contribution are enumerated as follows:

(i) I collected the various data about the name and the identification of the poet, examined them critically and made some suggestions about his probable date especially on the basis of the identification of his patron King Dharasena (pp. 3-16).

(ii) On a critical examination of the modifications made by the poet in the treatment of the subject-matter, I have made suggestions about his personal leaning towards Saivism (pp. 17-18).

(iii) In section II, I have submitted the results of my critical study of Bhāttikāvyā as a Mahākāvyā, with a comparative observation of the other well-known Mahākāvyas of early times in respect of certain characteristics. Here I have examined Bhāttikāvyā according to the characteristics given by the author of Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, Bhāmaha and Dandin, who flourished proximate to the time of Bhāṭṭi.

(iv) To determine the extent of the poet's indebtedness to Vālmīki, I have presented a comparative study (in detail)
of the contents of *Bhattikāvyya* with the corresponding portions in *Rāmāyana* (pp. 28-48).

Some points of modifications and a few points of omissions were noticed by earlier critics. I have here noticed some outstanding points of abridgement (p. 49), many of the noteworthy omissions (pp. 50-51), some additional points (IV, V and X), points of modifications (pp. 52-53) and outstanding additions (pp. 56-57).

When certain points vary in the different versions of the Epic, I have found that Bhatti followed the Northern version (pp. 54-55).

(v) I have traced the sandhis in *Bhattikāvyya* (pp. 58-61).

(vi) In chapter 3, I have noticed the beginnings of the other Mahākāvyas under review and examined whether Dandin's characteristic applies to the beginning of *Bhattikāvyya* (pp. 62-64).

(vii) I have given an appreciation of the poet's art of characterisation in detail (pp. 64-113).

(viii) Similarly I have appreciated the poet's treatment of Vīra Rasa as the principal Rasa of his Mahākāvyya along with its accessory Bhāvas, (pp. 114-130) and the other Rasas as well (pp. 130-144).

(ix) I have given some outstanding examples of the poet's dexterity in presenting vivid description of various topics recommended for a Mahākāvyya (pp. 144-148).

(x) Keith and others have noticed the metres of *Bhattikāvyya* cursory. Here I have studied the metres of *Bhattikāvyya* in
detail, analysed the principal metres in individual cantos; examined the various vipulas: used therein and noticed the varying metres (pp. 149–161). Such an analytic study of the metres of Bhaṭṭī, especially of the various vipulas in the Anustupa is made for the first time to the best of my knowledge. In this context, I have also made some comparative observations about metres in the Mahākāvyas under review.

Here I have also examined critically the so-called metrical irregularities noticed in Bhāṭṭikāvyā (pp. 162–168).

(xii) Next I have treated in detail figures of speech occurring in cantos other than X and given some outstanding illustrations thereof (pp. 174–184).

(xiii) at the end of this section I have noticed the other miscellaneous characteristics of the Mahākāvyā and examined how far they apply to Bhāṭṭikāvyā (pp. 184–192).

(xiv) In the introductory portion of Section III, I have dwelt upon the planning of the three kāṇḍas on grammar (pp. 194–196).

(xv) I have discussed the significance of the word 'Prasanna' in 'Prasannakāṇḍa' (pp. 198–198A).

(xvi) I have given a comparative study of the treatment of alaṅkāras by Bharata the author of Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Daṇḍin in relation to that by Bhāṭṭī (pp. 201–210).

(xvi) I have analysed and compared the divisions of alaṅkāras, especially those of Yamaka, in those works along
(xviii) The old commentators as well as modern critics differ in the identification of figures in certain verses of Canto X. I have discussed the points of difference in each individual case and have suggested that the identification given by Jayamaṅgala reflects the concepts of the poet's times, as it is also corroborated by the tradition transmitted through the MSS (pp. 245-272). I have supplemented this discussion by comparative tables giving identifications by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS on the one hand and Mallinātha on the other (pp. 273-275).

Special attention is drawn to the concluding remarks on the justification of accepting identifications given by Jayamaṅgala (pp. 276-279).

(xviii) I have discussed the characteristics of Madhurya and examined how it is illustrated in Canto XI (pp. 280-286).

(xix) Similarly I have discussed the characteristics of Bhāvikatva given by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Jayamaṅgala and shown how its various aspects are illustrated in Canto XII (pp. 286-295).

(xx) On applying the characteristics given by the different early ālāṅkārikas to the illustrations of Madhurya and Bhāvikatva, I have found that Bhāṭṭi's concepts are more akin to those of Bhāmaha rather than Daṇḍin.

(xx) In the study of the illustrations of Bhāṣāsamāvēsa I have shown how the poet has contrived to illustrate Bhāṣāsāleṣa by adopting words and forms that could be read in Prakrit as well as in Sanskrit (pp. 295-300).
(xxiii) In the study of the Tihantakāṇḍa, I have first indicated how the poet ingeniously contrives to illustrate the different Tenses and Moods in the narration of past incidents that would normally be narrated in the Past Tense (pp. 301–302).

(xxiv) In the study of the illustrations of the forms of the verbs given in the cantos on the different Tenses and Moods, I have treated noteworthy forms denoting the different uses of the verbs concerned (pp. 303–323).

(xxv) I have discussed the denotation of the word 'adhikāra' in 'Adhikārakāṇḍa', and shown how Bhatti has followed Pāṇini in illustrating governing sūtras and governed sūtras as well (pp. 324–326).

(xxvi) I have given a comparative study of the adhikāras differentiated by Jayamangala and Mallinātha and have discussed the points of difference between them (pp. 326–331).

(xxvii) On comparing the portion of Astādhyāyī, covered Adhikārakāṇḍa, I have found that Bhatti has illustrated adhikāras from Pāṇini's adhyāyas I, II, III, VII, VIII and none from IV, V and VI. I have dwelt upon the comparison in detail regarding the sūtras illustrated here (pp. 331–336).

(xxviii) As regards Prakīrṇakāṇḍa, I have examined the different types of topics covered by the sūtras illustrated therein and found that a large number of them are pertaining to Taddhitas and Samāsas (pp. 336–339).

(xxviii) In the concluding remarks on the kāṇḍas on grammar I have estimated Bhatti's esteem as a grammarian (pp. 339–340).
(xxix) In the Appendix to chapter VIII, I have discussed the alleged irregularities (Nos. 1-20) pointed out by different critics in connection with the kāṇḍas on grammar, and shown that many of them can be solved on some ground or other (pp. 341-360).

( xxx) In the concluding section, I have reviewed the different views about the literary merits and demerits of this Mahākāvya.

Here I have shown how the poetic aspect of Bhāṭṭikāvya is not considerably superceded by its illustrative aspect, though the latter inevitably leaves some cumbrous impact on the former.

At the end, I have emphasised how Bhāṭṭikāvya deserves to be assessed as a unique and pioneering example of a new type of Mahākāvya, wherein the illustrative aspect is interwoven with the narrative one (pp. 362-375).

( xxxi) In Appendix A, I have discussed the chronological relation between Bhṛṭṭi and Bhāmaha. The context of Bhāṭṭikāvya (xxii, 34) and Kāvyālaṅkāra (II,20) bearing close similarity and the probable dating of the two authors have led me to conclude that Bhṛṭṭi flourished prior to Bhāmaha (pp. 377-382).

( xxxii) In Appendix B, I have made an outline survey of the different commentaries on Bhāṭṭikāvya. I have classified the commentaries according to the different systems followed therein (pp. 383-387).

( xxxiii) Similarly in Appendix C, I have given a brief
idea of the later Śāstrakāvyas of the type of Bhattacharya (pp. 388-390).

(xxxiv) In Appendix D, on the hearing of Bhattacharya on Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, I have drawn much from the papers contributed by Dr. C. Hooikaas, who kindly supplied offprints thereof at my request.

Here I have contributed some additional observations on the contents and metres of the two compositions (pp. 391-400).

(xxxv) In Appendix E, I have compiled references to Bhatti given in various Sanskrit works on Prosody, Poetics and Grammar and Anthologies (pp. 401-414).

(xxxvi) In the Indices on the forms of verbs illustrated in Tihantakanda, I have given an alphabetic list of the roots and forms used in the respective verses in the cantos on the different Tenses and Moods.

I have tried my level best to study Bhattacharya critically and will spare no pains to incorporate any modifications suggested.