SECTION III

Bhattikaavya

As

As'Asstraikaavya
Introductory
Four Kandas of the Sāstrakāvyya

As noticed above, Bhattikāvyya is composed with the double purpose of narrating the life of Rāma with emphasis on the episode of Rāvaṇavadha and illustrating rules of Sabdaśāstra and Kāvyāśāstra.

According to the colophons of the cantos, the illustrative aspect of Bhattikāvyya consists of four kāndas, namely Prakṛṭa, Adhikāra, Prasanna and Tiṇanta. Among these, Prakṛṭa, Adhikāra and Tiṇanta obviously belong to the domain of Sabdaśāstra or Vyākaraṇa.

From one of the concluding verses of Bhattikāvyya, it becomes clear that the composition is intended to elucidate Sabdalakṣaṇa (through illustrations) and that it would be of no avail without acquaintance with grammar.

Planning of the three Kandas on grammar

As regards the Kandas pertaining to grammar, he seems to have reserved the concluding Cantos (XIV-XXII) depicting the episodes of the battle for Tiṇantakānda.

As noticed above, some of the adhyāyas of Rāmāyana contain continuous series of verbs in certain tenses and moods. This would have facilitated Bhatti's selection of this portion of the Epic for Tiṇantakānda.

As regards the introductory portion of the Yuddhakānda,

1 MK, XXII,33:

प्रकृत्यां प्रवेशायं सद्वत्त्वमप्रवर्ततामात् ।
हस्तान्तरं इत्युपाध्यायं स्मर्दार्जासमागाईः ॥
depicting the preparation of the battle, Bhaṭṭi seems to have contrived to allot it to the various aspects of poetics. This section, covered in cantos X-XIII, comprises the Prasannakānda. As noticed above, Bhaṭṭi devotes the first canto of this kānda to figures of speech, the second to Madhurya, the third to Bhāvikatva and the fourth to Bhāṣāsama, and he has construed these topics with the appropriate episodes in the narration of his plot.

He thus managed to cover the portion corresponding to Yuddhakānda in his Prasannakānda and Tiśantakānda. Then he had to cover the contents of the remaining five kāṇḍas of Rāmāyaṇa, in the remaining half of his Mahākāvya.

He thought of giving next preference to the illustrations of adhikāras. For this purpose, he could not but select Cantos VI, VII, VIII and IX. The story as such moves rather slowly from the Jaṭāyu episode onwards.

The illustrations of the different adhikāras fully, (i.e. along with all the sutras: predominated by these adhikāras) necessitated that the subject-matter should go rather slowly. The portion corresponding to the Adhikārakānda in Rāmāyaṇa is the latter half of the Arāpyakānda, Kīskindhā-kānda and Sundarakānda. In this Adhikārakānda also the poet does not rigidly give continuous illustrations of the adhikāras. He also gives miscellaneous sutras in between, so as to adjust to the subject-matter.

Thus, after mentally conceived the planning of Adhikārakānda, he had no other choice, but to include the remaining portion of the Epic in the Prakīrṇakānda.
Other authors, who like Bhaṭṭi, have imposed upon themselves the double task, generally illustrate the miscellaneous topics at the end.

But Bhaṭṭi, because he first planned Tiṁantakāṇḍa and then Adhikārakāṇḍa, had to illustrate Prakīrṇasūtras in the beginning. Obviously, Bhaṭṭi has visualised that the rapid narration of the story could not tolerate even a slight digression and therefore the illustration of any continuous topic might hamper here the rapid flow of the narration. The portion covered by Prakīrṇakāṇḍa corresponds to Bālakāṇḍa, Ayodhyakāṇḍa and the first half of the Āraṇyakāṇḍa of Rāmāyana.

The way in which Bhaṭṭi has adjusted the illustrations of grammar to the subject-matter of the Mahākāvyya, it becomes obvious that though he intends to illustrate as many useful sūtras of Pāṇini as he can, yet he does not insist on exhausting the number rigidly. If he insisted, he could have illustrated almost all the sūtras in his composition. But it seems that he probably regarded the poetic element fundamentally, and considered the illustrative aspect secondary to the literary aspect. Therefore he follows a selective approach in the illustrative aspect. Even in the illustrations given by him, he does not insist on observing the sequence of Pāṇini's sūtras. As noticed above, he has taken the sūtras in a sequence that would suit the requisites of his narrative.

His selection of sūtras for illustrations displays a keen sense of choice, as the illustrations hardly include forms that would mar the lucidity of the narrative to any considerable extent.
Contents of the Prasannakānda

The third kānda designated Prasannakānda serves to illustrate certain topics of poetics. Discourses on theoretical topics like the definition, the aims and the classification of a poetry are naturally not expected to be included here. The poet has aptly selected such topics as would be elucidated through illustrations. The topics selected for this section are as follows: 1) Figures of speech, Canto X; 2) Mādhurya, Canto XI; 3) Bhāvakatva, Canto XII; 4) Bhāṣāsamāvesa, Canto XIII.
CHAPTER 5
Prasannakanda : Alaṅkāras

The significance of the word 'Prasanna'

The section comprising Cantos X-XIII is styled Prasannakanda in the colophons of these Cantos. Herein the cantos illustrate Alaṅkāras, Mādhurya, Bhāvikatva and Bhāsāsamāvesa respectively. It implies that 'Prasannatva' pervades through the subjects illustrated by all these cantos. Accordingly 'Prasannatva' forming the basis of the Kanda should be distinguished from 'Prasāda' regarded as one of the different guṇas of Kāvya. As Jayamaṅgala remarks while introducing this Kanda, 'Prasannatā' (i.e. 'Prasannatva') here denotes the first and universal characteristic of Kāvya. Mallinātha takes no notice of the designation Prasannakanda (though the colophons of the cantos of the text designate the Kanda as Prasannakanda), and hence need not explain the denotation of the word 'Prasanna'. Nor does he suggest any other common designation for this Kanda.

Jayamaṅgala explains 'Prasannatā' by citing its definition given by Bhāmaha. The latter explains 'Prasāda' (or 'Prasannatva' i.e. limpidity) as easily explicable to (even)

1 Comm. of Jayamaṅgala, Introductory remarks to Canto X:

```lightning
श्रव्दन्त्र मुनि मुक्तमणि कद्यमाना कल्यक्षणायुः प्रसभ्राष्ट्रुः

पृच्छितम् काल्यक्षण प्रसभ्राष्ट्र च प्रमाणां यदी तत्वायि नाभ
अधिवेगुखण्डारम प्रस्तितार्थी प्रसभ्राष्ट्रती
```
unlearned men, women and children\(^1\). It is this quality that distinguishes poetry from Śāstra. Hence the term Prasannakāṇḍa here seems to connote 'Kāvyalakṣaṇakāṇḍa'.

The attribution of Alaṅkāra, Madhurya etc. to Kāvya by Mallinātha and the correspondence of Kāvya to 'Prasannatva' in Jayamaṅgala's commentary, bears testimony to this inference\(^2\).

But limpidity should not merely consist in a clear lucid verbalisation. A really limpid piece of poetic composition, should also contain some ornate elements.

**Alaṅkāras illustrated in Canto X**

Bhaṭṭi has devoted Canto X to illustrations of figures of speech (Śabdālaṅkāras as well as Arthaalāṅkāras). The colophons of the text designate the Canto as Kāvyālaṅkāra; and colophons of the commentaries entitle it 'Kāvyālaṅkāradarsāna'.

This Canto has been of outstanding importance from the standpoint of Poetics, as the poet here aims at illustrating all the figures of speech conceived in his times. He has associated this Kāṇḍa on Kāvyālaṅkāradarsāna with the narration on Laṅkādahana and the subsequent events, namely Hanūmat's revisit to Sītā, his return and report to Rāma and the consequent condition of Rāma. Bhaṭṭi here ingeniously contrives to illustrate each figure in sequence through the use of varying metres throughout the Canto.

---

1 II, 3: *अष्टिदशङ्करामलप्रलेखायी प्रसादपत्तः*

2 Jayamaṅgala's introductory remarks on Canto X, p. 287: *काव्यलक्षणाय प्रसन्नकाणुभूषणः*
But as Bhattikāvya has also to play the role of a Kathākāvya, the poet is not in a position to insert the names of the corresponding figures illustrated in the different verses. We wish, he would have supplemented his Mahākāvya with a svopajñā vṛtti. But unfortunately no such commentary is known to us. We are therefore not infrequently at a loss to ascertain the identification of figures intended by the author to be illustrated in certain verses.

The extant MSS. however introduce the different figures in the verses of this Canto with their respective names along with the respective verses. Jayamaṅgala, the earliest known commentator on Bhattikāvya, obviously seems to follow the early MSS., which exactly agree with the later MSS. The entire agreement between the different MSS. as well as between the MSS. and Jayamaṅgala indicates that they all inherited an early common tradition, the origin of which may be traced to Bhaṭṭī's own times. This assumption seems very probable, in view of the fact that Bhaṭṭī intended to make his poem serve to illustrate the topics of grammar and poetics.

The origin of this tradition seems to have been inherited from the poet either directly or through his pupils.

After Jayamaṅgala, the celebrated commentator Mallinātha (15th century) has also noted the figures of speech in Canto X, but being a later commentator, he has applied the definition of

---

1. He introduces and explains alaṅkāras as designated in the early MSS.
alahkaras given by later rhetoricians. These names we cannot accept, because in Bhaṭṭi's times, certain figures of speech were not known.

Identification on the basis of Jayamangala and the MSS.

Therefore we have to depend on Jayamāṅgala, who following the tradition transmitted through the early MSS. can be relied upon.

When we look to the explanations of the names given by him, we can clearly see that he follows mostly Bhāmaha. In thirty cases, out of thirty-eight alahkaras, he quotes Bhāmaha's definitions given in the verses. In case of the remaining alahkaras, he gives explanation of his own, as in the cases of Dīpaka, Vārttā, Freyas, Urjasvī, Samāhita, Udāra, Hetu and Nipuṇa. In only two cases, he has given the opinions of others, as (commentary on X,19), and ii as नेदेव अन्ये: र्वण्डक्षकम् इल उच्चेन (commentary on X,19).

1 Among these figures, Vārttā, Hetu and Nipuṇa are not treated by Bhāmaha at all, while the remaining figures are not defined but are only illustrated by him. Jayamāṅgala, therefore, is not in a position to cite the definitions of these figures from Bhāmaha.

Here it may be made clear that Bhāmaha first introduces Udāṭṭa with the illustration without defining its characteristics, but when he next alludes to the second type of Udāṭṭa, he characterises it before giving its illustration.

2 Vāgbhatālāhkaṇa, v,66.
Otherwise the commentator is generally found to quote particularly Bhamaha and reconcile the names of alankāras mentioned in the MSS. before him, with the definitions given by Bhamaha.

But even if the commentary of Jayamaṅgala is set aside, the parallelism between Bhamaha and Bhatti is no doubt remarkable. The names of alankāras in Bhattikāvya as indicated by the MSS. and supported by Jayamaṅgala with three exceptions (Anuprasavat = Anuprāsa, Udāra = Udātta and Nidarsana = Nidarsanā) correspond to the names given to them by Bhamaha.

The illustrations given by Bhatti represent 38 figures of speech in all. The first two of them are Šabdālaṅkāras and the remaining are Arthālaṅkāras.

Treatment of alankāras by Bharata and the author of VDP

In the early literature, Nātyaśāstra by Bharata and Visnudharmottara Purāṇa devote some portion to the figures of speech. Bharata treats four figures of speech, namely Upamā (5 varieties), Dīpaka, Rūpaka and Yamaka (10 divisions). VDP treats 18 figures, namely Anuprāsa, Yamaka (6 varieties), Rūpaka, Vyātireka, Śleṣa, Utprekṣā, Arthāntaranyāsa, Upanyāsa, Vibhāvanā, Atisayokti, Vārttā, Mathāsamkhya, Viṣeṣokti, Virodha, Nindāstutī, Nidarsana, Upamā and Ananvaya. Among the early works on rhetorics, the works of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata are the earliest extant works and they are dated not far from Bhattikāvya. The other well-known works on Sanskrit poetics belong to much later times comparatively. In order to

1 NS., (G.O.S.), Vol.II, XVI, 40
look for the source of the tradition inherited by Bhaṭṭi, it will here be interesting to compare Bhaṭṭi’s treatment of alaṅkāras with that of VDP, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhāta and see if Bhaṭṭi seems to have drawn from any of them.

First, on comparing Bhaṭṭi’s list with that of VDP, we find that VDP gives 18 alaṅkāras, while Bhaṭṭi gives 38 alaṅkāras. Out of the former, Upanyāsa is not found in Bhaṭṭi’s list. It is strange that Dipaka is not mentioned in VDP. Nindāstuti of VDP corresponds to Vyājastuti of Bhaṭṭikāvyā. Thus from these alaṅkāras, Bhaṭṭi has illustrated 17. It should be noted that VDP treats Vārttā. Except Anuprāsa and Yamaka, the sequence is much different from that given by VDP. Upamā is given almost in the beginning in all works on rhetorics. In the case of these 17 alaṅkāras, Bhaṭṭi has given varieties of Yamaka, Rūpaka, Śleṣa and Upamā. He has given 20 varieties of Yamaka, while the author of VDP has given 6 varieties of Yamaka. Out of these varieties, Pādādiyamaka, Pādamadhya-yamaka, and Pādāntayamaka, Samastapādayamaka and Samudgayamaka have been illustrated by Bhaṭṭi. On the analogy of Sāndastayamaka in Kāvyādārsa, Sāndastayamaka in VDP seems to correspond to Kāhohiyamaka of Bhaṭṭi.

From this comparison, it becomes obvious that, the treatment of alaṅkāras made by Bharata and the author of VDP is very scanty and sparse in comparison to that made by Bhaṭṭi. As no earlier works on rhetorics are known in the present state of our knowledge, it is not possible to trace the possible immediate source or sources from which Bhaṭṭi may have drawn the types, names and sequence of the alaṅkāras.
It will however be interesting to compare the treatment of alaṅkāras by Bhaṭṭi with that by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, who were proximate rhetoricians in later times.

Let us first compare the treatment of alaṅkāras by Bhaṭṭi with that by Bhāmaha, and Udbhata who follows the latter to a large extent.

The two Sabdālaṅkāras are common in the lists of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha. Udbhata treats only Anuprāsa and passes over to Arthālaṅkāras without treating Yamaka.

The MSS. of Bhaṭṭikāvya, designate the first alaṅkāra Anuprāsavat, while Bhāmaha styles it Anuprāsa.

As regards the Arthālaṅkāras, Bhaṭṭi begins with Dīpaka, while Bhāmaha and Udbhata commence with Rūpaka. Anyhow both these figures top these lists in different orders. Then follows Upamā in all the three lists. Like Dīpaka and Rūpaka, Arthanṛtyaśa and Akṣepa are mentioned next, but in reverse order in Bhaṭṭi's list on the one hand, and in the other two lists on the other hand. Next 16 alaṅkāras are identical and given in the same sequence in all the three lists.

Among these Vārttā corresponds to Svabhāvokti given in:

1 Udbhata adds Prativastūpamā between upamā and Akṣepa.
2 Vyatireka, Vibhāvanā, Samāsokti, Atisayokti, Yathāsaṅkhya, Utprekṣā, Vārttā, Preyas, Rasavat, Urjasvi, Paryayokta, Samāhita, Udāra, Śliṣṭa, Apahnuti, Viśeṣokti.
the other two lists. As Vārttā represents a simple presentation of facts, there has been a controversy whether it can be accepted as a figure of speech. Jayamangala classifies Vārttā into two divisions, Viṣīṣṭā and Nirviṣīṣṭā; and identifies the former with Svabhāvokti, which is taken into consideration by Bhāmaha and accepted by Udbhata.

The Nirviṣīṣṭā division of Vārttā is according to Jayamangala Vārttā proper, which is illustrated by गमनस्तम्के:

The illustration of Vārttā given by Bhaṭṭi represents, according to Jayamangala, the Viṣīṣṭā division of Vārttā which contains some rhetorical embellishment and corresponds to Svabhāvokti of the later ālāṅkārikas.

The next five ālāṅkāras are common in the lists of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha, but the sequence varies to a large extent. Bhāmaha adds Aprasūrtaśamacā after Tulyayogita. Udbhata follows Bhāmaha except in omitting Upamārūpaka.

1 Bhāmaha, Kavyālāṅkāra, II,87:

2 Jayamangala’s Comm. BK, X,46:

3 Vyājastuti, Upamārūpaka, Tulyayogita, Nidarsanā (cf. Nidarsana of Bhāmaha), Virodha. It should be noted here that the conception of Virodha given by Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and other early ālāṅkārikas differ widely from that given by the later ālāṅkārikas.
The next 6 alāṅkāras\(^1\) have a common occurrence, in the same sequence in all the three lists, with the exception that Udbhata adds Saṁkara before Upameyopama and omits Utpreksāvayava.

Here the original list of single alāṅkāras seems to be complete, as it is followed by Saṁsṛti (which represents a combination of alāṅkāras) in all the three lists. Bhāmaha and Udbhata introduced Bhāvika after Saṁsṛti, while Bhaṭṭi gives it a separate treatment in Canto XIII. Bhaṭṭi obviously treats it as a 'guna' rather than an alāṅkāra. He is justified in doing so as 'Bhāvika' is defined as a 'guna', running in an entire composition ('Prabandhaviśaya guna') rather than in a particular verse\(^2\).

Some alāṅkārikas treated 'Bhāvika' as a 'guna' (Saṅdaguna or Arthaguna or both), while some others treated it as an alāṅkāra\(^3\).

Bhaṭṭi supplements his list by three additional figures, namely Āśīh, Hetu and Nipuṇa. Even Bhāmaha adds Āśīh after the end of his regular list; there he makes it clear that Āśīh is recognised as an alāṅkāra by some. Āśīh figures as a 'Lakṣaṇa'\(^4\) in the work of Bharata (XVI,28) but Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha seem to have adopted it as an alāṅkāra, probably on the basis of some tradition not known to us. "Some" mentioned

\(^1\) Upameyopama, Sahokti, Parivṛtti, Sasandeha, Anavaya and Utpreksāvayava.

\(^2\) i. Bhāmaha, Kāvyālaṅkāra, III,53-54.

\(^3\) In Sarasvatīkāntābhārana it is treated as Saṅdaguna (I,75), Arthaguna\(^5\) and Alāṅkāra\(^6\) as well.

\(^4\) V. Raghavan, Some concepts of Alāṅkārasāstra p.43.
by Bhāmaha in his definition of Āśīh probably includes Bhāṭṭi, but the other advocates of this view, if any, are not known at present. Bhāmaha classifies this figure into two divisions, while Bhāṭṭi has no divisions in view\(^1\).

Bhāṭṭi and Bhāmaha both seem to be in favour of recognising Āśīh as an alaṅkāra. Udbhāṭa however does not include Āśīh among the alaṅkāras.

The next figure supplemented by Bhāṭṭi is Hetu. It occurs among the three figures: (Hetu, Sūkṣma and Leśa) which have given rise to a controversy among the rhetoricians. Bhāmaha does not recognise them as alaṅkāras, while Daṇḍin recommends them as a superior ornament of speech\(^2\).

Among these, Hetu is treated by Bharata as a Lakṣaṇā\(^3\) (XVI,14), while Bhāṭṭi treats it as an alaṅkāra\(^4\) and illustrates it in verse 73. As in the case of Āśīh here also he may have

---

1 The illustration of Āśīh given by Bhāṭṭi corresponds to the Avirodha division, out of two divisions of Āśīh given by Bhāmaha.

2 Op. Cit., II,235: १०००० दुर्णुक्ते स्वरुपमेत्ति च वाचाकुलमभूषणम् ।

3 V. Raghavan, Some concepts of Alāṅkāraśāstra, p.43.

4 This verse contains two parallel illustrations of Hetu. An emphasis on the inverse parallelness has led Mallinātha and others to take this verse as an illustration of Arthāntaranayāśa or Drṣṭānta. But the MSS. make it clear that this verse is intended to illustrate Hetu. In each of the two statements given in the verse, the hetu is expressly stated by the attributes: 'pramāḍā' and 'guru'.

followed some tradition which is untraced at present. Hetu seems to correspond to Kāvyalinga given by Udbhāta and the later alāṅkārikās.

Nipuṇa, the last figure, supplemented by Bhaṭṭi is conspicuous by its absence in all the other works of alāṅkāra, including those of Bhāmaha and Udṛṣṭa. As the source of this alāṅkāra seems untraceable, the introduction of this figure may be an innovation of Bhaṭṭi. Jayamaṅgaḷa explains it as characterised by depth of meaning but as Vidyāśāgar expounds, this figure is better characterised by a skillful or dexterous expression of a statement.  

Bhaṭṭi and Dandin

While comparing the lists of alāṅkāras given by Bhaṭṭi and Dandin, we find that Dandin has treated Sabdālāṅkāras

---

1 Jayamaṅgaḷa's remark that this figure may also be taken as included in Udātta, seems to be applying to the former half of this verse. The same remark applies to Mallinātha and Devnātha who treat this verse as illustrating Preyas.

and Arthālaṅkāras in different chapters, while Bhaṭṭi illustrates both these types of figures in one and the same canto. Daṇḍin deals with Anuprāsa and Yamaka in connection with Mādhurya in Pariṇāmchheda I (verses 55 to 61). He devotes Pariṇāmchheda II to Arthālaṅkāras, which number 35 therein. It is remarkable that he begins with Svabhāvokti, which exists in Bhaṭṭi's list under the name Vārttā.

Then, if we see the next three alāṅkāras, the order given by Daṇḍin seems to be exactly reverse than that by Bhaṭṭi, because in the former list, the sequence is: Upāma, Rūpaka and then Dīpaka. After Dīpaka, Āvṛtti is given by Daṇḍin. This figure does not appear in the lists of Bhaṭṭi, Bhamaha and Udbhata. Again Ākṣepa is given after Arthāntara-nyāsa by Bhaṭṭi, while Daṇḍin mentions it before that. Then the sequence of the next four alāṅkāras viz. Vyatīreka, Vibhāvanā, Samāsokti and Aṭiśayokti is the same in both.

There after Daṇḍin gives Hetu, Sūkṣma and Lesa, which Bhaṭṭi does not include in his regular list, but Hetu is added by him at the end.

1 Here Daṇḍin remarks that Yamaka being not entirely Mādhura will be treated later on and he treats it in detail in Pariṇāmchheda III (l-77).

2 Bhoja has given this figure in Sarasvatikanthābharana in IV, 78 and Jayadeva has given Chandraloka, in V, 55.

3 Bhamaha does not accept these three as alāṅkāras as noticed above.
Dāṇḍin now gives Yathāsamkhya which precedes Utpreksā in Bhāṭṭī's list. Then again both the lists correspond as regards the six alāṅkāras. Again Bhāṭṭī gives first Śliṣṭa and then Apahmuti, while Dāṇḍin gives first Apahmuti and then Slesa. Then both of them give Visesokti. Thereafter, the two lists differ with regard to some figures and their sequence. Tulyayogita, Virodha, Vyājastuti, Nidarsanā, Sahokti and Parivṛtti are common, though not in the same sequence. As regards certain alāṅkāras illustrated by Bhāṭṭī and not accepted by Dāṇḍin as separate figures, it is interesting to note that Dāṇḍin himself remarks at the end of second Parichchheda that Ananvaya and Sasaṇeha are treated by him under Upamā, Upamārūpaka is treated under Rūpaka, while Utpreksāvavaya is regarded to be a variety of Utpreksā.

Upameyopamā of Bhāṭṭī corresponds to Anyonyopamā division of Upamā in the list of Dāṇḍin. Aprastutapraśamsā given by Dāṇḍin is not treated by Bhāṭṭī (and Bhāmaha). The next two alāṅkāras have common occurrence in the two lists, though the sequence differs. Āśīṅ precedes Samsṛṣṭi in the list of Dāṇḍin, while it follows samsṛṣṭi in Bhāṭṭī's list. Here the regular list of alāṅkāras seems to be complete. After Āśīṅ, Bhāṭṭī gives Hetu and Nipuṇa. As noticed above, Hetu is already treated by Dāṇḍin after Utpreksā while Nipuṇa is not accepted.

1 Preyas, Rasavat, Uṛjasvī, Paryāyokta, Samāhita and Udātta (Udāra in Bhāṭṭī's list).
3 In the verses 359-363 of IIInd Parichchheda treating this figure in particular, Dāṇḍin styles it Samsṛṣṭi, while he designates it as Saṃkīrṇa in the names of alāṅkāras enumerated at the beginning of Parichchheda II (4-7).
by others including Daṇḍin. As regards 'Bhāvika' supplemented by Daṇḍin at the end, it is already noticed that Bhaṭṭī gives it a separate treatment in Canto XII.

**Bhatti, Bhāmaha, and Daṇḍin: General comparison**

On comparing the lists of Bhaṭṭī and Bhāmaha, we can see that they resemble to a great extent. They must have some common tradition before them or either of the two must have imitated the other.

Both of them give the same number of figures of speech. They also resemble as regards the names of the figures of speech, for example, both of them give Udāra and Śliṣṭa, while others give Udātta, Śleṣa etc. Both of them accept Upamārūpaka and Utprēkṣāvayava which are respectively considered subdivisions of Upamā and Utprēkṣā. They give Upameyopama as an independent figure of speech, while some ālāṅkārikas consider it as a subdivision of Upamā. As we have seen, the illustration of Vārttā given by Bhaṭṭī may be considered to correspond to Svabhāvokti; because really that is a difference in name. But it seems that Bhaṭṭī does not blindly follow the tradition of Bhāmaha or that followed by himself, because he has dropped Aprastutapraśamā given by Bhāmaha while he has accepted Ketu and Mipūṇa from some other tradition. We may say that

---

1 Though Daṇḍin includes 'Bhāvika' among the alāṅkāras, enumerated at the beginning of Parichōdheda II, he obviously seems conscious of the wide range of 'Bhāvika' (II,364) and does not supply its illustration.

2 He treats it as a guṇa running in an entire composition.
Dandin represents another tradition. He highly recommends Hetu, Sūkṣma and Lesa.

We can see that Bhaṭṭi has his own discretionary power, because he does not accept any tradition without exercising his discretion. He accepts Hetu from Dandin's tradition, but then also he does not accept Āvṛtti, Sūkṣma, Lesa and Aprastutapraśāmsā.

Moreover, he adds Nipuṇa, which is never found in the lists of any ālāṅkārika. We may guess that this might be his own innovation. It is significant that he adds Hetu and Nipuṇa after giving Āśīḥ that is after concluding the regular list. This shows that he finished his illustrations of alāṅkāras according to one list, but as these two figures (Hetu and Nipuṇa) too deserved to be recognised, he added them at the end. Bhāvikatva is separately illustrated in another canto by Bhaṭṭi.

This shows that Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha did not draw from the same source though they inherited some common tradition. Yet they were not chronologically distant from each other by such a considerable length of time as might be taken for a material difference in the number, order or definition of the poetic figures. Thus Bhaṭṭi has treated all the figures prevalent in his times and he has not adhered to a particular treatise on alāṅkāra.

**Divisions of Alāṅkāras**

In his treatment of the alāṅkāras, Bhaṭṭi illustrates several divisions of certain alāṅkāras. Bhāmaha and Dandin
also give divisions of certain 
alāṅkāras. A comparative study 
of the divisions given by these 
ālāṅkārikas indicates that 
Bhaṭṭi gives divisions \(^1\) of 7 figures in all. Bhamaha gives 
divisions of 3 figures \(^2\) more, while Daṇḍin gives divisions of 
7 figures \(^3\) more than Bhamaha.

The divisions of these figures given by Bhaṭṭi, and/or 
other early rhetoricians may be reviewed as follows.

**Anuprāsa**

Bhaṭṭi begins his Canto X with the illustration of 
Anuprāsa. The MSS. style this figure as Anuprāsavat. Bhaṭṭi 
has not given any divisions of Anuprāsa. Bhamaha gives definition 
of Varṇāṇuprāsa and illustrates it. He also refers to 
and illustrates Grāmyāṇuprāsa and Lāṭāṇuprāsa liked by some 
people. Daṇḍin gives two kinds of Anuprāsa, Srutyanuprāsa 
and Varṇāṇuprāsa. He again subdivides the latter into two 
divisions, whether the Anuprāsa is in a whole Pāda or a Pāda. 
Udbhata gives three kinds of Anuprāsa, Chhekanuprāsa, Vṛttya-
uprāsa and Lāṭāṇuprāsa. Bhaṭṭi's illustration of Anuprāsa 
corresponds to that of Varṇāṇuprāsa of Bhamaha, Vṛttyanuprāsa 
of Udbhata and Varṇāṇuprāsa of Daṇḍin.

**Yamaka**

Bhaṭṭi next illustrates 20 divisions of Yamaka in 21 
verses (2 to 22). Bharata has illustrated 10 subdivisions:

1 Yamaka, Dipaka, Rūpaka, Upamā, Ākṣepa, Udāra, Śliṣṭa.
2 Anuprāsa, Arthāntaranyāsa, Virodha.
3 Vyatireka, Samāsokti, Atisayokti, Utprekṣā, Hetu,

Nidarsanā and Samsṛṣṭi.
of Yamaka in Nāṭyaśāstra. Bhamaha gives only 5 divisions of Yamaka, Udbhata makes no reference to Yamaka, while Dāṇḍin gives as many as 64 divisions.

A comparison of these divisions given by the different ālāṅkārikas indicates that they widely differ from each other, not only in the number of the divisions, but even in some of the designations and their denotations. Many times, the same designations are found, but denotations are different.

On comparing the divisions given by Bhaṭṭi with those of Bharata, we find that out of Bharata's ten divisions of Yamaka, eight have been illustrated by Bhaṭṭi under different names. They may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bharata</th>
<th>Bhatti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Padāntayamaka (XVI,64)</td>
<td>Puṣpayamaka (X,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Samudgayamaka (XVI,69)</td>
<td>Samudgayamaka (X,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vīkrāntayamaka (XVI,71)</td>
<td>Yukpādayamaka (X,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pāḍāntāmreditayamaka(XVI,80)</td>
<td>Pāḍāntayamaka (X,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chaturvyavasita (XVI,82)</td>
<td>Sarvayamaka (X,19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 NS., (G.O.S.), XVI,59-86:
(1) Pāḍāntayamaka (2) Kāṇḍhīyamaka (3) Samudgayamaka
(4) Vīkrāntayamaka (5) Chakravālayamaka (6) Saṇḍaṭṭayamaka
(7) Pāḍādiyamaka (8) Pāḍāntāmreditayamaka (9) Chaturvyavasita (10) Mālāyamaka.

2 Kavyālaṅkāra, II,9:
अति मथ्याग्न यमकं पाधोपङ्गसः तथावली
समस्तपाधोपमकृत्तियेन्तो पञ्चाढीच्छने
Bharata's Kāñchīyamaka and Mālāyamaka have not been illustrated by Bhaṭṭi. The name Kāñchīyamaka given by Bharata occurs in the designation given in the MSS. of Bhaṭṭikāvyā, but the variety illustrated there under this designation is altogether different. Similarly Bhaṭṭi's Yamakāvalī differs widely from Bharata's Mālāyamaka. The latter is not illustrated by Bhaṭṭi, even under another designation.

Now if we compare Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha as regards the divisions, we find that Bhaṭṭi is more systematic both in his divisions and designations. Out of the 6 possible component varieties of Yamaka occurring in the same or two different parts of the Pādas, viz. Pāḍādiyamaka, Pādamadhyayamaka, Pāḍāntyayamaka, Pāḍādimadhyayamaka, Madhyāntyayamaka and Pāḍādyantyayamaka (all of which Bhaṭṭi has given), Bhāmaha gives only two viz. Pāḍādiyamaka (designated by Bhāmaha as Ādiyamaka) and Madhyāntyayamaka. In the case of Pāḍādiyamaka, Bhaṭṭi's designation is more accurate than that of Bhāmaha.

The corresponding Yamakas of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhaṭṭi</th>
<th>Bhaṭṭi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pāḍādiyamaka</td>
<td>(X,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Madhyāntyayamaka</td>
<td>(X,17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. (Yukpāḍayamaka | (X,2) /
| (Āyuṣpāḍayamaka  | (X,10)         |
| 4. Yamakāvalī    | (X,9)           |
| 5. Puṣpāyamaka   | (X,14)          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhāmaha</th>
<th>Bhāmaha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ādiyamaka</td>
<td>(II,11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Madhyāntyayamaka</td>
<td>(II,12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pāḍābhīṣayamaka</td>
<td>(II,13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Āvalī</td>
<td>(II,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Samastapāḍayamaka</td>
<td>(II,15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining divisions given by Bhatti are not treated by Bhāmaha. However, it should be noted that Bhāmaha knew other divisions of Yamaka, but his view is that other types are but ramifications of the five types referred to by him\(^1\).

Then, if we come to Dandin, we find that they both agree to a great extent as regards the designations and denotations of Pādādiyamaka, Pādamadhyayamaka, Pādāntayamaka, Pādādimadhyayamaka, Madhyāntayamaka and Pādādyantayamaka, though it may be noticed that Dandin does not specify Pāda at the beginning of the last three designations: as Bhatti fails to specify it in the case of Madhyāntayamaka.

The corresponding Yamakas of Bhatti and Dandin may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhatti</th>
<th>Dandin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yukpādayamaka</td>
<td>Dvitiyachaturthapādagata (III,61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pādāntayamaka</td>
<td>Pādāntayamaka (III,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pādādiyamaka</td>
<td>Adībhāgayamaka (III,18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pādamadhyayamaka</td>
<td>Madhyayamaka (III,39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Samudgayamaka</td>
<td>Samudgayamaka (III,54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kānchīyamaka</td>
<td>Saṅdaṣṭayamaka (III,52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ayukpādayamaka</td>
<td>Prathamattrīyapādagata (III,58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pādādyantayamaka</td>
<td>Adyantayamaka (III,48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mithunayamaka</td>
<td>Trīyachaturthapādagata (III,62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vṛntayamaka</td>
<td>Adībhāgayamaka (III,29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Puṣpayamaka</td>
<td>Antabhāgayamaka (III,41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pādādimadhyayamaka</td>
<td>Adimadhyayamaka (III,45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vipathayamaka</td>
<td>Prathamachaturthapādagata (III,59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Madhyāntayamaka (X,17) Madhyāntayamaka (III,43)
15. Garbhayamaka (X,18) Dvitiyātṛtiyapadagata (III,60)
16. Sarvayamaka (X,19) Sarvapadagata Pādābhyaśa (III,66)

As regards the scheme of the syllables repeated in Ādiyamaka and Madhyāntayamaka, we find that Bhāmaha resembles Bhāṭṭi. A repetition of the first word occurs at the beginning of a Pāda in Ādiyamaka of Bhāṭṭi, but this word differs in different Pādas. Similarly in Bhāṭṭi's Madhyāntyamaka different words are repeated both in the middle as well as at the end of all the four Pādas. The scheme of Bhāmaha exactly resembles that of Bhāṭṭi.

Now, when we compare Bhāṭṭi and Daṇḍin in this respect, we find that Daṇḍin gives all the six permutations given by Bhāṭṭi and that he also adds one more, viz. Ādimadhyānta type.

The scheme of Daṇḍin however differs from that of Bhāṭṭi to a large extent. In Ādiyamaka, Bhāṭṭi repeats the same group of syllables uninterruptedly at the beginning of a Pāda, but he does not repeat the same group in different Pādas. Daṇḍin gives two varieties of Ādiyamaka, the first (III,18) of which exactly corresponds to that illustrated by Bhāṭṭi, but in the second variety (III,36) Daṇḍin inserts one and the same pairs of uninterrupted groups of syllables at the beginning of all Pādas.

Bhāṭṭi continues the scheme adopted by him for Ādiyamaka uniformly in Madhyayamaka and Antayamaka as well. Daṇḍin however adopts no uniformity in the scheme.

As regards Madhyayamaka, Daṇḍin gives no divisions:
corresponding to the first variety of Ādiyamaka. Dāṇḍin gives a variety of Madhyayamaka (III,39) and that of Antayamaka (III,42) corresponding to the second variety of Ādiyamaka. But he gives no variety corresponding to the first variety of Ādiyamaka, in the case of Madhyayamaka and Antayamaka.

In Madhyayamaka (III,40) he adds a variety wherein the same group of syllables is repeated interruptedly in the middle of all the Pādas. But he gives no corresponding variety of Ādiyamaka and Antayamaka.

In the case of Antayamaka (III,41) he adds altogether a new variety (wherein one group of syllables is repeated at the end of all the Pādas), which corresponds to one variety of Ādiyamaka given by Dāṇḍin (III,29) and which corresponds to Puṣpayamaka of Bhaṭṭi.

In the case of Pādādimadhyayamaka and Madhyāntayamaka, Bhaṭṭi repeats the same group of syllables at the beginning as well as in the middle of a Pāda, but he does not repeat this group in different Pādas. In the case of Pādādyantayamaka, he combines Pādādiyamaka and Pādādyantayamaka by repeating one group of syllables uninterruptedly at the beginning and another group uninterruptedly at the end of a Pāda. No groups are repeated in different Pādas.

In Kāñchīyamaka (V.8) of Bhaṭṭi or Saṅdaṣṭayamaka (V.52) of Daṇḍin, the last part of each Pāda is repeated as the first part of the next Pāda.

Vṛntayamaka (V.13) consists in the repetition of the same group of syllables at the beginning of each Pāda. Dāṇḍin has naturally included it among the varieties of Ādiyamaka (III,29).
Just as Bhatti designates the above division Vṛntayamaka, he styles the next division Puspayamaka. The difference between the two divisions is that the repetition of a group of syllables occurs in this division at the end of each Pāda, whereas it occurs in the beginning of each Pāda in Vṛntayamaka. Daṇḍin also includes the latter among the varieties of Antabhāgayamaka.

Till now, we have seen those Yamakas, wherein Yamaka occurred in a part or parts of a Pāda. Now we come to those divisions, wherein Yamaka entirely pervades two pairs of Pādas, or a single pair of Pādas or one full verse or two verses.

The Yamaka pervading two pairs of Pādas is designated as samudgayamaka by Bhaṭṭi as well as Daṇḍin. Herein, there can be three permutations in all. Daṇḍin has treated all the three divisions in verses 54 to 56.

The similarity of the 1st and the 3rd Pādas and that of the 2nd and the 4th Pādas makes up the first variety of Samudgayamaka. The similarity of the 1st and the 2nd Pādas and that of the 3rd and the 4th Pādas constitutes its second type. Its third type includes the similarity of the first and the fourth Pādas and that of 2nd and 3rd Pādas. The stanza in Bhaṭṭikāvyā corresponds to the first variety called Vyapeta Samudgayamaka by Daṇḍin (III,54).

In the case of Yamaka pervading single Pādas, two, three or four Pādas exactly correspond to one another is sound, though they differ in meaning. This would give 6 permutations in the case of two Pādas, 3 in the case of three Pādas, and 1 in the case of four Pādas, that means 10 permutations in all. Daṇḍin
has styled this group of divisions as Pādabhyaśa. In the case of the six divisions pervading two Pādas, Bhaṭṭi has illustrated 5, while Daṇḍin has treated all the six. As for the first divisions of this group, Bhaṭṭi describes it as Yamaka of odd Pādas (Ayukpādayamaka, v.10) and Daṇḍin describes it as Yamaka pervading the first and the third Pādas (अन्तः प्रथम नूतनीयायवेयस्मादिति v.58). As for the second division of this group, Bhaṭṭi describes it as Vipathayamaka (X,16) and Daṇḍin describes it as Yamaka pervading the first and the fourth Pādas (अन्तः प्रथम-चतुर्थी पादवेयस्मादिति v.59).

As for the third division of this group, Bhaṭṭi describes it as Garbhayamaka (v.18). Daṇḍin describes it as Yamaka pervading the second and the third Pāda (अन्तः द्वितीयानुतनीयायवेयस्मादिति v.60).

As for the fourth division of this group, Bhaṭṭi describes it as Yamaka of the even Pādas (Yukpādayamaka, X,2) and Daṇḍin describes it as Yamaka pervading the second and the fourth Pādas (अन्तः द्वितीय-चतुर्थी पादवेयस्मादिति v.61).

As for the fifth division of this group, Bhaṭṭi describes it as a paired Yamaka (Mithunayamaka X,12). Here the pair is formed of either the first and the second Pāda or of the third and the fourth Pāda. Bhaṭṭi illustrates only the latter variety, while Daṇḍin gives both varieties (अन्तः प्रथम-द्वितीयायवेयस्मादिति and द्वितीय-चतुर्थीयायवेयस्मादिति v.62).

It may be noted that Bhaṭṭi has not illustrated any of the three varieties in which the three Pādas correspond to one another in sound. Daṇḍin has illustrated all the three varieties of this type.
When all the four Pādas correspond to one another in sound, it is styled as Sarvayamaka (v.19) by Bhaṭṭi. It is described by Daṇḍin as yamaka pervading all the four Pādas (अन्तः सर्व एव पाद अन्यायस्तः: v.66).

Then follows the variety of Yamaka designated by Daṇḍin as Ślokābhīyāsayamaka (v.68 and 69), when the whole verse corresponds to another verse in sound. Bhaṭṭi calls it Mahāyamaka illustrated in verses 20 and 21.

On comparing both Bhaṭṭi and Daṇḍin, we can say that the latter, has given fully exhaustive treatment to these permutations. He is more systematic in the sequence, but Bhaṭṭi can defend himself in this respect on account of the double purpose undertaken by him.

Among the varieties of Yamaka, only one variety given by Daṇḍin viz. Pratilomaviṣayayamaka, has no correspondence in the varieties illustrated by Bhaṭṭi. On the other hand, Bhaṭṭi's illustrations of three varieties of Yamaka have no correspondence in the varieties given by Daṇḍin. These varieties are Chakravālayamaka (v.6), Yamakāvalī (v.9) and Ślokādyantayamaka (v.22).

In Chakravālayamaka, Yamaka figures in the shape of a circle, through the repetition of the same syllables at the end of several Pādas in each Pāda.

In Yamakāvalī, Yamaka figures in the shape of a series or garland through the occurrence of several Yamakas running throughout the verse.

In the case of Ślokādyantayamaka, Yamakas occur only at the beginning and at the end of the verse.
Dīpaka

Bhaṭṭṭi begins the illustrations of Arthālaṅkāras: with that of Dīpaka. Bharata defines this alāṅkāra, but gives no divisions, while Bhaṭṭṭi gives three divisions, namely Ādidīpaka (v.23) Antadīpaka (v.24) and Madhyadīpaka (v.25). His treatment of Dīpaka resembles that of Bhāmaha.

This threefold division adopted by Bhaṭṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Udbhata is of no consequence and is not adopted by later writers.

Daṇḍin accepts these broad divisions of Dīpaka given by Bhaṭṭṭi and Bhāmaha, but he again gives their subdivisions of each main variety denoting either genus, activity, quality or individual in the case of Ādidīpaka and only genus or activity in the case of Madhyadīpaka and Antadīpaka.

Rūpaka

Bhaṭṭṭi illustrates five divisions of Rūpaka in verses 26 to 30, viz, Sāvayavarūpaka, Kamalaka, Avaṭamsaka, Ardharūpaka and Lalāmaka.

Bharata defines Rūpaka, but gives no divisions.

1 Op. Cit., II,25:

2 Mallinātha identifies the alāṅkāra illustrated in stanzas 23, 24 and 25 as Kāraṇamālā, Kavyalinga and Kavyalinga respectively.

3 NS., XVI,56:
Bhamaha gives two divisions: namely Samastavastuvishaya and Ekadesavivarti. Udbhata adds two to this list, namely Malarupaka and Ekadesavṛtti.

The five divisions illustrated by Bhatti may be classified under two heads, 1) covering the entire topic and 2) covering a particular portion of the verse. The first one is illustrated in verse 26, while the succeeding verses 27 to 30 fall under the second.

When the superimposition spreads over the Viśeṣyā and some of the attributes, it is styled Avatāmsaka (Verse 28). When the superimposition is confined to the Viśeṣyā alone, it is known as Ardharūpaka (V.29). Sometimes the partial superimposition includes an element of simile. If that element is associated with an attribute, it is known as Lalāmaka, characterised by Anvarthopama (Verse 30). But when it spreads over the Viśeṣyā, it is designated as Kamalaka, characterised by Viśiṣṭopama (Verse 27).

On comparison, it seems that Bhaṭṭi's division No.1 corresponds to Samastavastuvishaya of Bhamaha and Udbhata as well; while his division No.2 would fall under Ekadesavivarti of Bhamaha. Udbhata sub-divides the latter into Ekadesavivarti (proper) and Ekadesavṛtti. These would correspond to Bhaṭṭi's verse No.29 and 28 respectively. The remaining divisions embodying an element of simile are not treated by Bhamaha and Udbhata. Conversely Malārūpaka of Udbhata is not treated by Bhaṭṭi. Daṇḍin elaborates the divisions of Rūpaka into as many as 32. Among them, Sakalarūpaka1 corresponds to Bhaṭṭi's first

1 Daṇḍin, Kāvyādarsa, II,70.
division of Rūpaka or Samastavastuviṣaya of Bhāmaha, Avayavī-
rūpaka corresponds to Bhāṭṭi's Ardharūpaka. Bhāṭṭi's Avataṁsaka Rūpaka corresponds to that of Viśamarūpaka (V.79). Dāṇḍin treats Upamārūpaka as a division of Rūpaka, while Bhāṭṭi treats it as an independent alaṅkāra.

Upamā

After illustrating Dīpaka and Rūpaka, Bhāṭṭi has illustrated 6 divisions of Upamā in verses 31 to 36. Upamā is one of the four alaṅkāras given by Nāṭyaśāstra. The definition of Upamā given by Nāṭyaśāstra is:

\[
\text{मन्त्रिच्छिन्न कल्यन्त-धैर्यु सादृश्येन्द्रोपमीयने} \mid \\
\text{उपमा नाम सा लेखा गुणकृतिसमार्थ्या} \text{ । -XVI, 41.}
\]

Bharata designates its main characteristic as 'Sāḍṛṣya' and Bhāmaha as 'Sāmāya'. Dāṇḍin uses the word 'Sāḍṛṣya', while Udbhata uses the word 'Sādharma'.

Bhāṭṭi illustrates six varieties of Upamā viz. Ivopamā, Yathopamā, Sahopamā, Taddhitopamā, Luptopamā and Samopamā. It seems that all the minute divisions of Upamā were not settled in Bhāṭṭi's time, because Bhāmaha also gives four broad

1 Ibid., 73.
2 Bhāmaha, Kāvyālaṅkāra, II, 30:
3 Dāṇḍin, Kāvyādarsa, II, 14:
4 Udbhata, Kāvyālaṅkārasarasasangraha, I, 15:
divisions of Upamā. 1. When the words 'Yathā' and 'Iva' are used, 2. When the similarity is expressed by a compound, 3. When the similarity is expressed by 'Yat' and 4. Prativast-upamā. Bhaṭṭi's Yathopamā and Ivopamā together comprise the first variety of Bhāmaha; Samopamā also seems falling under the same category. Taddhitopamā corresponds to the 2nd variety. Bāhāmaha has not mentioned Luptopamā and Sahopamā at all.

Udbhata classifies: Upamā elaborately. Ivopamā and Yathopamā of Bhaṭṭi comprise Avyayavaseyā of Udbhata. Samopamā of Bhaṭṭi would fall under Arthivakya-vaseyā of Udbhata if it is compounded. Taddhitopamā of Bhaṭṭi obviously corresponds to Taddhitavaseyā of Udbhata, but Bhaṭṭi does not classify it into any subvarieties. The illustration given by Bhaṭṭi would apply to the Ārthi variety of Taddhitopamā according to Udbhata. Similarly Luptopamā of Bhaṭṭi corresponds to the Luptā division given by Udbhata, but the latter elaborates it into twelve varieties. The illustration of Luptopamā in Bhaṭṭikāvya corresponds to the Vāchakaluptā variety given by Udbhata. Sahopamā has no correspondence in Udbhata's classification.

2 Samopamā having words like 'Sama' compounded, may fall under the second variety, but the characteristics and illustrations given by Bhāmaha do not include the Upamāvāchaka word.
None of the varieties of Bhaṭṭi or Bhāmaha corresponds with that of Dāṇḍin, because he has given altogether different subdivisions. It is remarkable that Upameyopamā and Sasanādeha, which are considered independent figures by Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Udbhaṭa, are included in the varieties of Upamā (as Anyonyopamā and Samśayopamā respectively) by Dāṇḍin. Prativastūpama is not illustrated by Bhaṭṭi, but Bhāmaha and Dāṇḍin both have considered it as a subvariety of Upamā, while Udbhaṭa and later alāṅkārikaś give it an independent status.

Among the six divisions of Upamā illustrated by Bhaṭṭi, Sahopamā is conspicuous by its absence in the works of Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Dāṇḍin.

The illustration of Sahopamā (v.33) bears great resemblance to that of Sahokti (v.66). According to the definition of Bhāmaha, two actions belonging to the same time but to two different objects are conveyed by the same expression in Sahokti. The figure is named after 'Saha' which links the two objects. In verse 33, 'Vadhūsiromaṇi' and 'Jīvitasā' are construed with the common verb "Samadrṣyata", and are linked by 'Saha'. Similarly in verse 66, 'āndhakāra' and 'manmathodaya' are construed with the common verb 'vavṛdhe' and are linked by 'Saha'. Jayamaṅgala justifies the MSS. by pointing to the implication of Upama in verse 33, while Mallinātha interprets it as a variety

1 Later alāṅkārikas also do not mention it.
2 Op. Cit.,III, 39:

नल्लाकोटि क्रिपे यया वसन्तुद्यासमायशे।
पदैलकैन कष्ट्याल साहिन्को सा सत्या यथा॥
of Sahokti. According to the later āḷāṅkārikas, Sahokti is based on Atisayokti and culminates into Upamā. This would apply to both the illustrations given by Bhaṭṭi. Bhaṭṭi seems to emphasize the element of Upamā in verse 33, but it is difficult to distinguish between figurative elements in verses 33 and 66. The only point of distinction drawn by Mallinātha is that, the association lies in the 'karmas' in verse 33 and in 'kartṛs' in verse 66. Even then it can hardly lead to distinction in treating the two verses as illustrating two different alāṅkāras.

Ākṣepa

Bhaṭṭi illustrates Ākṣepa Alāṅkāra in two verses, 38 and 39. The definition of Ākṣepa given by Bhāmaha is as follows:

प्रतिपेधः इवेश्टस्य यो विरोषानिधित्सया |
वश्यमाणोत्किल्वश्यस्मास्ये विधा मन:  || -II,67.

Daṇḍin defines Ākṣepa in a different way:

प्रतिपेधोपिनिराकारः ।

In the opinion of Bhāmaha, Ākṣepa is only an apparent denial for the purpose of putting special emphasis on 'vidhitsitārtha'. In the opinion of Daṇḍin, Ākṣepa means statement of contradiction. Bhaṭṭi from his illustrations seems to follow Bhāmaha, because in his verses, there is an apparent denial.

As regards divisions of Ākṣepa, Bhaṭṭi has given two divisions, Vakṣyamanaviṣaya and Uktaviṣaya. Almost all the

ālāṅkārikas agree about these two divisions of Ākṣepa, except. Daṇḍin, who gives 3 principal and 21 subsidiary divisions. His principal divisions are based on three divisions of time—past, present and future. Apparently it may appear that his Vṛttākṣepa may correspond to Uktavisaya Ākṣepa and his Bhavisyadākṣepa to vākṣyamāṇavisaya Ākṣepa.

However a critical examination of the characteristics and illustrations of Vṛttākṣepa and Bhavisyadākṣepa (Verses 121, 122, 125, 126) indicates that these divisions are simply based upon the threefold time of the action mentioned therein. But in fact, the contradiction is found to have been already expressed in both these divisions. Therefore all the three main divisions given by Daṇḍin fall under the Uktavisaya division of Ākṣepa.

Udāra

Bhaṭṭi illustrates divisions of Udāra in the verses 52 to 54. The MSS. do not specify the particular divisions.

Jayamaṇgala, attributes verse 52, to the first division, related to 'Mahānubhāvatā' and verses 53 and 54 to the second division connected with 'Ratnayoga'². As the illustrations:

---

1 Commentary Prabhā on Kāvyādārsā, II, 120:

2 H. Jacobi in his article numbers these divisions with a mark of interrogation.
given in the last two verses contain no distinction with regard to the alaṅkāra, it seems that Bhaṭṭi has devoted two verses to one and the same division of Udāra, probably on account of his mood to describe the splendour of the ocean in detail. Like Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha also specifies these two divisions of Udāra. Daṇḍin and Udbhata, who style this alaṅkāra Udāttā in place of Udāra, too, agree in this respect.

**Śliṣṭa**

In verses 55, 56 and 57 Bhaṭṭi has illustrated Śliṣṭā in three divisions, namely, Sahoktiśliṣṭa, Upamāśliṣṭa and Hetuśliṣṭa.

The figure illustrated in verses 55-57, is styled 'Śliṣṭa' in the MSS. Bhāmaha and Udbhata also refer to this figure by the same name. But Daṇḍin and other later alaṅkārikas designate it 'Śleṣa'. The modification in the nomenclature seems to be significant, for the concepts of these two schools differ widely from each other.

The illustrations given by Bhaṭṭi correspond to the three divisions found in Kāvyālaṅkāra, where Bhāmaha alone has treated this figure in these three divisions.

The treatment of Śliṣṭa made by Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Udbhata has given rise to a controversy among the later alaṅkārikas. According to them, the figure treated by Udbhata (whose treatment resembles that of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha) can hardly be accepted as Śleṣa, since it contains 'śleṣa' only in the attributes, whereas the principal figure is found to be some other alaṅkāra. It is clear that Bhaṭṭi and others lay
emphasis on Śliṣṭa attributes, whereas later ālaṅkārikas expect 'śleṣa' in the substantive as well as the attributes. It is in this respect that the modification in the title be considered significant.

The illustrations of Śliṣṭa given by Bhaṭṭi would according to the latter view be regarded as illustrations of Sahokti, Upamā and Hetu respectively. The same applies to Bhāmaha's illustrations of this figure. Similarly Udbhata's illustrations would fall under the category of Upamā and other alāṅkāras.

According to the former view it seems that whenever 'Śleṣa' occurs, other alāṅkāras fall in the background and the figure is styled 'Ślistā', while the view of the later ālaṅkārikas is quite the reverse. According to the latter, when 'śleṣa' occurs along with any other figure, it is to be taken as accessory and other figure as prominent.

In this treatment of Śleṣa, Daṇḍin seems to represent a transitional stage. He designates the figure 'Śleṣa' and some of his divisions and illustrations contain true Śleṣālaṅkāra\(^1\). Both the illustrations of this type would fall under the category of Sabdaśleṣa according to the later conception; the later alāṅkārikas like Mammaṭa seem to have taken Śleṣa in its true spirit and elaborated it into two divisions Sabdaśleṣa and Arthaśleṣa.

\(^1\) Kāvyādāra, II,311-312.
The other divisions: (II, 314-322) given by Daṇḍin: however are similar to those given by Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Udbhaṭa. They contain 'śleṣa' only in the attributes, and hence the Śleṣa is subordinate to other alāṅkāras. In this context it is interesting to note that Daṇḍin has incorporated this type of Śleṣa as a subservient element in the illustration of certain alāṅkāras: (Upamā, Rūpaka, Ākṣaṇa, Vyatireka, etc.) given earlier.

Excepting these, Daṇḍin seems to have come nearer the truth in grasping the real essence of Śleṣa alāṅkāra.

Arthāntaranyāsa

Arthāntaranyāsa is illustrated in verse 37. It corresponds to the first illustration given by Bhāmaha who treats this alāṅkāra in two divisions.

The definitions given by Bhāmaha and other alāṅkārikas:

\[1\] Jayamangala and the MSS. style this as an example of Arthāntaranyāsa, but Shri Diwekar (J.R.A.S., 1929, pp. 825 ff.) takes it as illustrating the sub-species of Yamaka.

In fact the verse under discussion illustrates both Arthāntaranyāsa and Yukpādayamaka as indicated by Mallinātha, but in view of the context, it is quite obvious that Bhaṭṭi has here intended to present it as an illustration of Arthāntaranyāsa.

The varieties of Yamaka are already illustrated in the preceding verses 2 to 21, while this verse occurs among verses 22 to 74 illustrating Arthālaṅkāras.
are rather vague. They simply state that 'samarthya-samarthaka-bhāva' would equally apply to Drṣṭānta, Aprastutapraṣamsā, Samāsokti and others of like nature. In fact 'samarthya-samarthakabhāva' is not the only distinguishing feature of Arthāntaranyāsa. It is the 'sāmānya-viśeṣabhāva' that forms the chief characteristic of this figure.

Hence the later alāṅkārikas lay emphasis on this characteristic in their definition of Arthāntaranyāsa. In this figure, one of the two parts, either 'sāmānya' or 'viśeṣa' is 'Prakṛta', and 'Samarthya' and the other is 'aprakṛta' and 'samarthaka'.

However, it must be made clear that the illustrations given by all the early alāṅkārikas invariably contain the 'sāmānya-viśeṣa' feature, though it is not clearly stated in their definitions.

As Bhatti gives only one illustration of this alāṅkāra, he seems to have no divisions in view, but Bhāmaha renders it into two divisions, characterised by the absence or occurrence of the word 'hi'.

Udbhata elaborates this alāṅkāra into four divisions by distinguishing between the 'samarthya-samarthaka' sequence and the 'samarthaka-samarthya' one, and subdividing according to the presence or absence of 'hi'.

---

1 In his illustration of Arthāntaranyāsa, 'Samarthya' is given first and then 'Samarathaka' and 'hi' is not used.
Daṇḍin as usual gives a large number of different types of divisions.

**Vyatireka**

In verse 40, Bhaṭṭi has illustrated Vyatireka. It should be noted that Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha\(^1\) confine the characteristics of this figure only by the superiority of 'Upameya' over 'Upamāṇa' and give no divisions of this figure.

Daṇḍin's definition\(^2\) of this figure is very loose and he considers the superiority of 'Upameya' as Vyatireka. Udharmaṭa's definition resembles more with that of Daṇḍin, because according to him, the statement of the superiority of 'Upamāṇa' or 'Upameya' is Vyatireka. Thus the definitions given by Daṇḍin and Udharmaṭa do not preclude the superiority of 'Upamāṇa', but they do not supply any illustration of this type. It therefore seems that their definitions are rather loose in phraseology, but they do not aim at including this type.

Udharmaṭa gives three divisions of Vyatireka, the first two of which are based on 'Sādharmya' and the third rests on 'Vāidharmya'.

---

1 *Op. Cit.*, II, 75:

```
उपमानयतो यस्य यदिरूर्द्धिर्निदर्शनम्
अपरिमितो नामिनिर्लिङ्गिन विरोधार्यायाम्
```

2 *Op. Cit.*, II, 283:

```
राज्यपाते युतीते वा साद्विषेय वस्तुनिर्दिष्टोः
मन्त्र यदु पैदेक्षणे अनिरूपः स कृत्यचने
```

Danḍin gives ten divisions (II,181-198) which seem to be the sub-varieties of the 'upāttanimitta' variety of the 'Sādhārmya' division given by Udībhaṭa.

**Samāsokti**

In verse 42, Bhāṭṭi has given an illustration of Samāsokti. His illustration accords very well with the definitions of Bhāmaha¹ and Danḍin².

Banhatti³ remarks that Bhāmaha (and Danḍin) are not at all particular as to whether the intended sense should be aprakṛta and the expressed sense should be prakṛta or vice-versa.

But a minute examination of their definitions reveals that the remark applies to Danḍin alone, for the word 'gamyate' in Bhāmaha's definition clearly indicates that the 'anyorthah' that is 'aprakṛta' is intended and not expressed. Udībhaṭa makes the definition more accurate.

Bhāmaha and Udībhaṭa do not give any variety of Samāsokti, but Danḍin gives four varieties.

Bhāṭṭi's verse taken by itself would apply to 'mahāhṛdayāh' and the attributes would apply to Rāma impliedly. But

---

1 Op. Cit., II, 79:

2 Op. Cit., II, 205:

3 Banhatti, Notes on Kāvyaśāṅkara-Sāra-Saṅgāraha, p.78.
when the verse is taken in relation to the context, it seems to apply to Rāma and Jayamaṅgala seems justified in taking Rāma as 'prastuta' by interpreting 'mahahrada' as 'mahahradasama'.

Accordingly, the attributes will apply to the 'mahahrada' impliedly. However according to the strict sense of the later definition of Samāsokti, the 'aprakṛta' is not expected to be mentioned even as an attribute.

**Atisayokti**

Bhattī gives only one illustration of Atisayokti (V.43). Though Bhāmaha gives two illustrations of Atisayokti he refers to only one type. His definition is:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{निम्ततनो वचो यतुं लोकातिक्रान्तगच्छतम्} \\
\text{सन्तानो निराशयोक्ति तमलुकार्ताप्य यथा} \\
\end{array}
\]

-II,31.

Dāndin\(^1\) also considers, the desire to describe a characteristic in a manner transcending worldly limits as Atisayokti. He gives four illustrations to denote four divisions of Atisayokti — (i) when something is described extra-ordinary ('Alaukika'), (ii) Samsāyātisayokti, (iii) Nirṇayātisayokti and (iv) Āsrāyadhikyatītisayokti.

Udbhata's (II,35,36.) four divisions are as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(i) \text{भैरव नन्यवचम्} \\
(ii) \text{अन्यत्र नलचयम्} \\
(iii) \text{सम्भव्यमानायनिधान्} \\
(iv) \text{कार्यखर्चवच्चेर्वेश्वर देवोपपितविध} \\
\end{array}
\]

We can say that the definition of Bhāmaha is very vague, as compared to that of Udbhata. If we judge from the standard of later ālāṅkārikas, the stanza illustrated as Atisayokti by Bhattī may be considered devoid of any figure of speech.

Utpreksā

Bhaṭṭi has illustrated Utpreksā in verse 45. He has not given any divisions of Utpreksā. The same is the case with Bhāmaha. He defines it as follows:

अविवक्तसमान्या किच्चि-ध्रापमया सह ||
अन्तुणकृतियोगानु-प्रेषणिशिशाचितां || -II,91.

Daṇḍin defines it as follows:

अन्त्येऽवस्थां वृत्तिगतनस्थानस्य वा ||
अन्त्यकृतिनेम्तत् यथ नाम्यप्रेषं विदुर्यया || -II,221.

He gives two divisions, (i) When the condition of some sentient being is poetically conceived as being insentient, and (ii) when the condition of some insentient being is poetically conceived as being sensient.

Udbhāta defines it as follows:

सम्बन्धस्वमनुसाय वाच्यवाच्यात्मकम् पदेः ||
अन्तुणकृतियोगानु-प्रेषणि-शाचितां || -III,39.

He gives two divisions (III,48), (i) when the fancy is positive and (ii) when the fancy is negative. The illustration given by Bhaṭṭi corresponds to the second division of Daṇḍin, as the fancy relates to an insentient thing (mountain) and it corresponds to the first division of Udbhāta, because the fancy is positive.

Nidārsanā

Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha do not give any divisions of Nidārsanā (Nidārsana). Bhāmaha's definition is as follows:
Bhatti's illustration of Nidarsana is in accordance with the definition of Bhāmaha and corresponds to the first division of Daṇḍin and the first division of Udbhaṭa's Vidarsana. Daṇḍin's conception of this figure seems to be different, as can be seen from his definition:

\[ \text{अर्थीन्तरप्रवृत्तेन किंचित्त नत्स्त्रूपाक्षम्} \]
\[ \text{सदस्तवा निद्विस्तेन यदि नर स्पष्टिविद्विस्तेन्} \]

He gives two divisions, (i) when fruit is existing, and (ii) when the fruit is non-existing.

Udbhaṭa's definition is as follows:

\[ \text{अर्थान्तर-वस्तुनिवृत्ती भवन्ता सद्य कृतप्येन्} \]
\[ \text{उपायानोपत्येत्य कृत्ये या निद्विस्तेन्} \]

He gives two divisions which are practically the same as those of Daṇḍin, (i) when the relation between two things causing comparison is possible, (ii) when it is impossible. The other point to be noted in this connection is that Udbhaṭa names this alāhākāra as Vidarsana which is very peculiar and uncommon. It is obvious that all the three differ in the sense of Nidarsana, as can be seen from their definitions.

Daṇḍin and Udbhaṭa give two different divisions of this figure, but the conceptions of both of them differ to some

---

1 (i) Daṇḍin, Kavyādārśa, II,348:

\[ \text{अर्थीन्तर-प्रवृत्तेन किंचित्त नत्स्त्रूपाक्षम्} \]
\[ \text{सदस्तवा निद्विस्तेन यदि नर स्पष्टिविद्विस्तेन्} \]

(ii) Udbhaṭa, Kavyālāṅkāra, V,61.
extent from those of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha.

**Virodha**

Bhaṭṭi gives no divisions of Virodha. Bhāmaha characterises two divisions of Virodha in his definition, but gives illustration of only one. He has indicated that this imaginary contradiction can be between quality and action or between action and action. But his illustration contains only the contradiction between quality and action.

Udbhaṭa also gives one illustration, though in the definition of the figure he seems to have some divisions in view.¹

Dandin (II, 334-339) gives six divisions, but his divisions are not elaborate and exhaustive in comparison to the later alāṅkārikas. His divisions are as follows:

1. Contradiction between 'Kriyā' and 'Kriyā'
2. 'Vastugata Guṇa' and 'Guṇa'
3. 'Avaysavaga Guṇa' and 'guṇa'
4. 'Viṣama Virodha'
5. 'Asaṅgamulaka Virodha'
6. 'Śleṣamulaka Virodha'.

¹ V,57:

यद्विद्रोपाभिधानाय विनोधं न प्रचाहते ||

The illustration given by Udbhaṭa illustrates Virodha between 'guṇa' and 'guṇa', but as the commentator Indurāja (Comm. on V,57, p. 64) makes it clear, the illustration extends over Virodha between 'Kriyā', and 'Kriyā', 'dravya' and 'dravya', 'guṇa' and 'kriyā', 'guṇa' and 'dravya' and 'kriyā' and 'dravya' as well.
The illustration given by Bhaṭṭī contains contradiction between 'guna' and 'kriya'.

Sāṃsrṣṭi

Bhaṭṭī has illustrated Sāṃsrṣṭi in verse 71, wherein four alaṅkāras, namely Tulyayogitā, Śliṣṭa, Virodha and Upamā combine together in one verse according to Jayamahgala.

Bhāmaha\(^2\) gives a simple definition of this alaṅkāra, by stating that it contains a combination of several figures. As he does not treat Saṃkara as a separate figure, it is doubtful whether he aimed at distinguishing between Sāṃsrṣṭi and Saṃkara. However the simile of Ratnamālā given in his definition seems to imply that the figures remain distinct and do not inter-combine with one another.

Udbhata (V,62) adds Saṃkara to his list, but he extends the province of Saṃkara to what the later alaṅkārikas would regard as a sub-variety of Sāṃsrṣṭi\(^3\). Udbhata makes his definition more definite by stating that the figures combining together in a verse, must be independent of one another.

The definition\(^4\) of Sāṃsrṣṭi given by Daṇḍin is very

---

1 Jayamahgala has not made any specific mention of Upamā here, but Mallinātha discerns Virodha and Upamā here. Bharatamallika too has specified Upamā in this verse (Comm. on X,71).

2 Op. Cit.,III,49:

3 Banhatti, Notes on Saṃkar and Sāṃsrṣṭi, p.149.

4 Op. Cit., II,359:
simple. It should be noted that while enumerating the names of figures, he calls this figure Sāmkīrṇa.

Like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin also does not add Saṃkara to his list of Alāhārās

Bhāṭṭī and Bhāmaha give no divisions of Samsṛṣṭi. Udbhāṭa(VI,72) divides it numerically into two divisions, one wherein many (that is more than two) figures combine and the other wherein only two figures combine. Daṇḍin classifies 'Samsṛṣṭi' into two divisions, one, wherein the alāhārās have 'āṅgāngibhāva' and the other, wherein they have 'samakaksatā'. Bhāṭṭī's verse illustrate the second division. The first division corresponds to what the later alāhārikas treat as a variety of a different figure, designated by them as Saṃkara.

**Hetu**

Bhāṭṭī illustrates Hetu in verse 73, but gives no divisions of Hetu. As noticed above, Bhāmaha does not accept Hetu as a figure of speech.

However Daṇḍin gives two divisions namely, 'Kārakahetu' and 'Jñapakahetu'. The illustration given by Bhāṭṭī corresponds to 'Kārakahetu' of Daṇḍin

**Comparative study of Bhāṭṭī's treatment**

From the comparative study of the alāhārās illustrated in Canto X by Bhāṭṭī in relation to those treated by Bhāmaha,

---

1 By treating this figure under the title of Saṃkīrṇa and defining it as a Samsṛṣṭi of various figures, Daṇḍin seems to have both these types of combination in view.

2 Op. Cit.,II,235., He further divides these divisions into subvarieties.
Udbhata and Daṇḍin, we can see that Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha agree to a great extent as regards the names and number of figures of speech. The figures of speech treated by both of them number coincidentally 38 in all. Their conception of the figures of speech commonly treated by them also do not differ. The order of treatment too is almost similar. They differ only as regards 3 figures of speech. Bhāmaha admits Aprastutaprasāṁsā, which is omitted by Bhaṭṭi. Bhāmaha does not accept Hetu as an alankara, while Bhaṭṭi has accepted it. Bhaṭṭi has got Tārttā, while Bhāmaha rejects it as an alankara and dispassionately refers to Svabhāvokti as admitted by some. Bhāmaha mentions Bhāvika in his list, which is separately illustrated in another canto by Bhaṭṭi. Bhaṭṭi admits an unknown figure Nipuṇa, which is not treated by Bhāmaha. Excepting these, Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha agree in all other respects. It is possible that Bhatti's original list ended with Asih just as Bhāmaha's work ends. But he tacked on Hetu and Nipuṇa as two supplementary figures popular in his time. From this brief exposition, it will be clear that there is a general agreement between the treatment of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha with regard to the independent poetic figures.

Daṇḍin differs from Bhaṭṭi than Bhāmaha to a large extent. He includes Upameyopama, Anuvaya and Sasandeha in the sub-divisions of Upama, Upamārūpaka in the sub-variety of Rūpaka and Utprekṣāvayava as the subdivision of Utprekṣā, all of which are taken by Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha as self standing figures.

Daṇḍin gives a new figure of speech named Avṛtti which does not find place in the lists of any of the early
ālāṅkārikas. He accepts Sūkṣma, Hetu and Leśa rejected by Bhāmaha, but Hetu is admitted by Bhaṭṭī also. Daṇḍin admits the more comprehensive figure Svabhāvokti which seems to include Vārttā illustrated by Bhaṭṭī and which is dispassionately given by Bhāmaha. Daṇḍin agrees with Bhāmaha in giving Aprastutaprasāmsā which Bhaṭṭī has omitted. Daṇḍin treats Bhāvika among aḷāṅkārasya though he agrees with Bhāmaha in considering it as 'Prabandhaguna', while it has been illustrated by Bhaṭṭī in a separate canto. On the whole, Daṇḍin agrees with Bhaṭṭī in other respects.

Udbhata does not differ much from Bhāmaha and Bhaṭṭī except that he considers Prativastūpamā an independent figure and adds Kāvyalinga and Drṣṭānta to his list. Like Bhāmaha, he rejects Hetu and Vārttā and gives Aprastutaprasāmsā. He differs from all the three in one respect that he does not treat Yamaka at all and gives Saṃkara as an independent figure which was included in Saṃrṣṭi of Bhaṭṭī, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin.

On the whole, Udbhata agrees much with Bhāmaha, both representing the Kashmirian tradition and do not differ from Bhaṭṭī as much as Daṇḍin.

As regards subdivisions, Bhaṭṭī has given subdivisions of 7 figures. Bhāmaha has given subdivisions of 10 figures and Daṇḍin and Udbhata both have coincidentally given subdivisions of 17 figures.

Bhaṭṭī and Bhāmaha agree fully as regards the subdivisions of Dīpaka, Ākṣepa and Śliṣṭa.

In Anuprāsavat, Bhaṭṭī has illustrated no varieties,
while Bhamaha has given three varieties of Anuprāsa. In the case of Yamaka, Bhaṭṭi has included all the five species given by Bhamaha though sometimes under different names. In the case of Upamā the two of the subdivisions of Bhaṭṭi (Sahopamā and Samopamā) have nothing directly corresponding to them in Bhamaha.

In the classification of Rūpaka, which Bhāmaha divides into Samastavastuviśaya and Mākadesāvivanti, Bhaṭṭi seems to follow a different tradition. He gives one illustration of the first division without specifying its particular name and one illustration each of the four other varieties, which can be taken as subvarieties of the second division, which Jaymaṅgala and MSS. do not specify by that general name. Barring this, Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha agree with each other in the treatment of subdivisions also.

As we have seen, Daṇḍin has included Upameyopamā, Anavaya and Sasandeha in the varieties of Upamā. Daṇḍin’s treatment seems to be copious and exhaustive. His subdivisions of all the figures except Samsṛṣṭi are based on different lines altogether. Like Bhāmaha, Udbhata gives three subdivisions of Anuprāsa. His subdivisions of Dīpaka, Ākṣepa and Uḍāra are similar to those of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha. As regards subdivisions of Upamā, Rūpaka and Arthāntaranyāsa, we can say that he has elaborated upon the subdivisions given by Bhāmaha.

In comparison with the other older writers, Udbhata attempts at a scientific division of Ślisṭa and gives prominence to Śleṣa when it is accompanied by other alaṅkāras. He has subdivided Vyatireka, Atiśayokti, Utpreksa, Vidarsanā, Saṅkara,
Parivṛtti, Sasandeha, Samśārti, all of which have not been subdivided by Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha, while Daṇḍin has subdivided all except Parivṛtti (Sasandeha is not accepted by him as an independent figure).

Like Daṇḍin, Udbhata also gives an elaborate and exhaustive treatment to the subdivisions of alaṅkāras, however, they have not much in common.

From the comparative study given above, it appears that it is not possible to trace the tradition inherited by Bhaṭṭi with respect to the alaṅkāras and their divisions to any extant work known to us.

Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, who are dated not far from Bhaṭṭi, seem to follow two different traditions, one representing the tradition of Kashmir and the other representing the Deccan tradition. Between these two, the Kashmirian tradition is found to be more akin to that followed by Bhaṭṭi.

Bhaṭṭi seems to have adopted 35 alaṅkāras from the original tradition inherited by him and supplemented them by Āśīḥ which would well fit in at the close of the topic. Next he seems to have adopted Hetu from some other tradition like that of the Deccan, but not accepted Sūkṣma and Lesa, which would have figured along with Hetu therein. At the end, Bhaṭṭi adds Nipuṇa, which does not appear in any other extant work of early or even later times. Thus Bhaṭṭi seems to have followed some early tradition to a large extent, but also inserted some other traditions according to his discretion.

Accordingly, he may be estimated to be not only a faithful adopter, but also an ingenious co-ordinater.
Identification of alaṅkāras

According to the tradition inherited by Jayamaṅgala and the extant MSS. Bhaṭṭi seems to have illustrated 38 figures of speech in this Canto. Two of them are Śabdālaṅkāras and the remaining 36 are Arthālaṅkāras.

Of these, 7 figures (1 Śabdālaṅkāra and 6 Arthālaṅkāras) have varieties which number 41 in all.

Bhaṭṭi has devoted one verse each to 31 figures having no varieties, and also to each of the varieties in the case of 7 figures. Accordingly he illustrates 72 figures (the principal ones as well as the varieties). Herein the illustration of Mahāyamaka consists of two verses, and the second variety of Udāra is illustrated twice, hence the verses illustrating these 72 figures and their varieties number 74 in all.

As noticed above, Bhaṭṭi has planned to illustrate the different figures of speech in canto X, but he does not specify their names in the text. The names of the different figures are supplied by the MSS. in relation to the corresponding verses. The early commentators like Jayamaṅgala hold the same view as the MSS. Later commentators like Mallinātha differ in respect of the identification of several figures. It will therefore be interesting to examine the divergent identification and try to ascertain which of them seems to represent the tradition Bhaṭṭi had in view.

Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha do not differ as regards Śabdālaṅkāras and their varieties (together numbering 21 in all) in verses 1 to 22.

Afterwards Mallinātha agrees entirely in the case of the
following figures and their varieties, which together number 12 in all, viz. (1) Arthāntaranyāśa (v.37), (2) Ākṣepa - the second variety (v.39), (3) Vyatireka (v.40), (4) Yathāsaṃkhya (v.44), (5) Udāra1 - the second variety (vs.52-53)2, (6) Apanuti (v.58), (7) Virodha3 (v.64), (8) Upameyopama (v.65), (9) Sahokti (v.66), (10) Sasandeha (v.68), (11) Ananvaya (v.69) and (12) Saṃsṛṣṭi (v.71).

The following figures also tally to a large extent, viz. the first and the fifth variety of Rūpaka, four varieties (Ivopama, Yathopama, Taddhitopama and Samopama.) of Upama, and Utprekṣa. These include one entire figure and six varieties.

According to Jayamaṅgala and the MSS., five verses (verses 26 to 30) illustrate the five varieties of Rūpaka. Verse 26 has been designated only 'Rūpaka' in general while the other four varieties are introduced with specific names.

Mallinātha has noticed Sāvayava Rūpaka in verse 26, which fully agrees with the explanation of Jayamaṅgala, though he has not expressly called it Sāvayava.

As regards the other four varieties of Rūpaka, Mallinātha admits only the fourth as a division of Rūpaka.

---

1 Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. designate this figure 'Udāra', while Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and others style it as 'Udātta'.
2 In verse 53, Mallinātha discerns Atiśayokti in addition to Udātta.
3 Mallinātha here also notices Yathāsaṃkhya and Ādidīpaka in addition to Virodha.
As regards the figure in verse 30, they do not differ much, because Jayamangala and the MSS. call it Lalāmaka that it upamāyukta Rūpaka, while Mallinātha identifies it with Upamāgarbhita Rūpaka.

As for Upamā, Jayamangala and the MSS. have noticed six varieties such as Ivopamā, Yathopamā, Sahopamā, Taddhitopamā, Luptopamā and Samopamā in verses 31 to 35. The figures Ivopamā and Yathopamā among these are treated by Mallinātha as two examples of Pūrṇa Śrauti Upamā. The former two varieties of the early ālāṅkārikas are included in Pūrṇa Śrautī Upamā of the later ālāṅkārikas, who classify Upamā on a wider scale grammatically.

Similarly Taddhitopamā in verse 34 correspond to the Ārthī variety of Taddhitagā Pūrṇopamā of the later ālāṅkārikas.

Similarly Samopamā illustrated in verse 36 also would correspond to the Ārthī variety of the Taddhitagā Upamā of the later ālāṅkārikas.

There is no disagreement between Jayamangala and the MSS. on the one hand and Mallinātha on the other hand as regards the figure in verse 45. Both of them identify it as Utpreksā. But the early ālāṅkārikas made no divisions of this figure, while the later ālāṅkārikas sub-divided it into several varieties. Accordingly Mallinātha identifies this figure as Phalotpreksā.

**Points of difference**

Mallinātha differs from Jayamangala and the MSS. as regards the identification of all the remaining figures and
varieties, which number thirty-two\(^1\) in all.

Among these, 10 are such wherein Mallinātha relying on the later ālaṅkārikas, notices 6 figures\(^2\) of speech, none of which was known to Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin.

Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. have noticed three varieties of Dīpaka, namely Ādidīpaka, Antadīpaka and Madhyadīpaka in verses 23, 24 and 25 respectively. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin also have divided Dīpaka in the same way and their illustrations of Dīpaka resemble those identified by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS.

According to them these varieties are formed by the mention of the predicate in the beginning or in the end or in the middle, respectively.

Ādidīpaka vs. Kāraṇamālā (X,23)

Following later ālaṅkārikas, Mallinātha is not prepared to accept these three varieties of Dīpaka. Therefore he notices a Kāraṇamālā in verse 23 and Kāvyaliṅga in verse 24 and 25 as well. As regards Kāraṇamālā, it is constituted when the meaning of each subsequent sentence depends on that of the preceding sentence. Accordingly in verse 23, the throwing off the waters by Hanūmat leads to the shaking of trees on the banks, the shaking of trees leads to the falling of flowers and the spreading of flower-beds leads to the sitting of Kinnaras

---

1 These figures are marked with an asterisk in the comparative table given at the end of this topic.

2 Kāraṇamālā, Kāvyaliṅga, Pratīpa, Ehrāntimān, Sama and Drṣṭānta.
excited with love. Mallinātha is no doubt justified in identifying this figure as Kāraṇāmālā, but we must keep in mind, that this figure was not known to any of the early ālāṅkārīkīs like Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. It therefore becomes clear that the early commentaries and the MSS. seem to represent an early tradition, which would have been in vogue in the times, when Bhaṭṭi flourished. According to this tradition, the figure in this verse may be styled Āḍidīpaka, because all the subsequent actions take place due to Hanūmat's passing over the ocean hurriedly. Therefore all these actions are the results of his crossing the ocean. In other words, when the meanings of subsequent sentences depend upon the meaning of the first sentence, it is, according to this tradition, called Āḍidīpaka. This verse satisfies that tradition.

Antadīpaka vs. Kāvyalinga (X,24)

The figures in verse 24 and verse 25 are designated as Antadīpaka and Madhyadīpaka respectively by Jayamangala and the MSS., while both these figures are called 'Kāvyalinga' by Mallinātha. He explains verse 24 as an illustration of Kāvyalinga, but the explanation is not convincing. According to later ālāṅkārīkīs, Kāvyalinga is constituted when a poetical reason is implied in a sentence or in a word. Mallinātha says that the compound सिद्धार्थिणि कार्यविनिमयः (Hanūmat indicating the accomplishment of the object by his smile) being the cause of the sense of the fourth pada, the figure is Kāvyalinga. But we do not find any logical connection or the relation of cause and effect between सिद्धार्थिणि कार्यविनिमयः and कार्यविनिमयः crowding together on the mountain.
Even if we agree with Mallinātha that this verse illustrates Kāvyaliṅga, we cannot say that at that time Bhatti had this figure in mind, because none of his contemporaries knew this figure.

Madhyadīpakā vs. Kāvyaliṅga (X, 25)

As remarked above, verse 25, which is regarded to be the illustration of Madhyadīpaka, is also considered Kāvyaliṅga by Mallinātha. Here Mallinātha has severely criticised Jayamaṅgala for noticing Madhyadīpaka in this verse 1. Taking the definition of Dīpaka given by the later ālāṅkārikas, he has shown that it does not at all apply here. He has noticed the excessive speed of Hanūmat being the poetical cause of his accomplishing the work, which is expressed in a phrase, and this leads us to identify the figure as Kāvyaliṅga. But we can see here that Mallinātha's explanation gives the impression of being far-fetched.

Ākṣepa vs. Kāvyaliṅga (X, 38)

Mallinātha notices verse 38 as an illustration of Kāvyaliṅga, while Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. have called it the illustration of Uktaviṣaya Ākṣepa.

According to Mallinātha, the verse also contains Arthāntaranyāsa in the latter half, but it is subordinate to Kāvyaliṅga in the first half. Here the principal figure is Kāvyaliṅga, because the causes of Rāvana's being haughty are

---

1 Dr. Hooykaas thinks that it seems far-fetched to classify this stanza as Madhyadīpaka, because 'sannata' comes in its middle and the cognate word 'amanyata' later. (B.S.O.A.S., XX, 1957, p.8).
contained in the words 'ṛddhimān', 'mūḍha' and 'Rākṣasa'.

Here if we read the verse in context of the text, we find that Mallinātha has missed the point. He has put emphasis on the relation of cause and effect. But the presentation of the verse is such that it would be charming only as an illustration of Ākṣepa. The speaker has started to think about the causes of Rāvaṇa's haughtiness, but he at once remembers that there is no use of finding out all these causes. Rāvaṇa was an 'anārya' and that was more than sufficient to account for his unseemly behaviour. Thus after starting to tell all this, the speaker apparently denies it. Therefore here Uktaviśaya Ākṣepa is illustrated.

That, this variety of Ākṣepa was well known in Bhāṭṭi's time, is supported by the fact that Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata have defined and illustrated it.

**Vibhāvanā vs. Kāvyaliṅga (X,41)**

Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. have identified the figure in verse 41 as Vibhāvanā, while Mallinātha traces Kāvyaliṅga there. Jayamaṅgala cites the definition of Vibhāvanā given by Bhāmaha and explains that the manifestation of 'phalāni' such as 'graṇhaṇa', 'pāṇḍitatva' and 'niṣṭhuratva' along with the negation of 'kriyā', 'parīkṣā', 'vrddhasevā' and 'virodhaṇa' constitute Vibhāvanā here.

Mallinātha reads the verse altogether in another light, and notices here Kāvyaliṅga. He puts more emphasis on the last quarter of the verse and therefore considers that the reasons for the protection of Sītā are mentioned in the form of the attributes of Rāvaṇa, as well as those of Sītā.
The verse seems to contain the elements of Vibhāvanā as well as Kāvyalinga, but as Kāvyalinga was not known to the early ālāṅkārīkas, the verse must be intended to illustrate Vibhāvanā.

**Āśīh vs. Kāvyalinga (X,72)**

Lastly, again, Kāvyalinga is discerned by Mallinātha in verse 72 which according to Jayamāṅgala is an illustration of Āśīh.

It seems that here Bhaṭṭi's original list of ālāṅkāras has come to an end, therefore he has supplemented it with Āśīh here.

It seems that in early times, there was a difference of opinion, as to whether Āśīh deserved to be accepted as a figure of speech or not. Noting the difference of opinion, Bhāmaha has already treated and defined it as follows:

\[
\text{आशीर्धि य कौशल्यिलुप्तत्त्वम्} \quad \text{मना} \\
\text{सौज्ञस्वविविशीर्ज्जु प्रायोगोऽस्मान्य व्युभ्या}
\]

Kāvyālāṅkārā, III,55.

Dandin defines it differently as follows:

\[
\text{आशी: नामाभिनिष्ठाने वस्तुन्यासांत्तथा} \quad {-II, 357.}
\]

The illustration given by Bhaṭṭi corresponds to that given by Dandin rather than Bhāmaha.

Though Jayamāṅgala as usual cites Bhāmaha's definition, he also explains it on the basis of इम्भ्याभासमम् which

---

1 Mallinātha has also noticed Kāvyalinga as a subsidiary figure in verse 49, whereas Jayamāṅgala and the MSS. identify the figure as Īrjasvī.
characterises Daṇḍin's definition. Mallinātha has tried to trace Kāvyaliṅga in this verse, but the reason presented by him seems to be unconvincing. Even if we follow the later ālāṅkārīkās, the figure in this verse may better be taken to be Viṣama rather than Kāvyaliṅga.

Preyas vs. Pratīpa. (X, 47)

In verse 47, Mallinātha has noticed Pratīpa, which is constituted when the things, well-known to be standards of comparison, are themselves turned into objects of comparison. Mallinātha thinks that 'madhukaraviruta' and 'sarasiruha', generally the standards of comparison, are here turned into objects of comparison, therefore the figure is constituted.

But this concept had not developed in the earlier times. Hence the early ālāṅkārīkās treated this type of figure as Preyas, wherein the emphasis was laid on felicitious expression.

Bhāmaha illustrates Preyas, but does not define it. Jayamaṅgala, therefore, explains it in his own words:

\[ \text{प्रेयः इति प्रियतमवस्तत्वत्त्वभियानात्} | \\
\text{This reminds us of Daṇḍin's definition: (II, 275):} \\
\text{प्रेयः इति प्रियतमवस्वानम्} | \\
\text{In later times, the concept of Preyas underwent elaborate modification.}

According to the early conception, however, this verse obviously seems intended to illustrate Preyas. Incidentally the verse also contains some element of resemblance, which leads Mallinātha to interpret the figure as Pratīpa.
Paryāyokta vs. Bhrāntimān (X, 50)

The figure illustrated in verse 50 is designated Paryāyokta in the MSS. as well as in the commentary of Jayamaṅga. He points out that here the mountain is represented in another manner as 'Amarapura'.

Mallinātha interprets the figure in this verse as Bhrāntimān, but the verse contains no poetical illusion ('Bhrānti'). The main purpose of the verse is to suggest its semblance to 'Amarapura' in an indirect way.

This figure was not known to Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin or even Udbhata1.

Tulyayogitā vs. Sama (X, 62)

Mallinātha has noticed in verse 62 Sama, a figure which developed later than Bhaṭṭi's time. Jayamaṅga and the MSS. identify it as Tulyayogitā.

Jayamaṅga cites the definition of Tulyayogitā given by Bhāmaha who explains it as the contact of 'nyūna' with 'vidiṣṭa' through an indication of 'guṇaṁśāmya'. Accordingly Jayamaṅga explains this figure as Tulyayogitā as it brings in the contact of Sugrīva, Lakṣmaṇa and Rāma with the ocean through similar properties.

1 Dr. Hooykaša doubts whether Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin would have applied Paryāyokta to this: Stanza in BK. Instead the figure Bhrāntimān proposed by Mallinātha would fit here. However he admits that this figure and its name both were unknown to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. This clearly means that Bhrāntimān was unknown to Bhaṭṭi as well.

Here Mallinātha is not fully justified in calling it Sama, because according to the later Ālankārikas, Sama is the commendation of an object worthy of another, on account of the fitness of both for each other. Here in this verse, there is no such commendation of the union of Sugrīva etc. and the ocean. Here the verse aims not at indicating the union of two similar objects through an equal emphasis on both, but at bringing out the enhanced splendour of the ocean through the contact of these persons with it through similar attributes, the emphasis remaining on the ocean, which is the matter under description.

The concept of Tulyayogitā got modified in later times to a certain extent. Nevertheless, the main purpose of the verse well fits in with Tulyayogitā rather than Sama.

Hetu vs. Drstānta (X,73)

Drstānta is the sixth figure of speech which was not known in Bhāṭṭī’s time, but which Mallinātha has noticed in verse 73.

Jayamaṅgala as well as the MSS. have called it Hetu, of course he has not defined it, but he explains that the matter in hand has been made clear through the instance of 'Gajapati' seeming as a reason (Hetu).

Here the matter in hand is 'pramādi'. The fall of 'pramādi' is elucidated through the instance of 'gajapati'. The moot point is the nature of the relation between the 'prastuta' and the 'apрастuta'. Bhāṭṭī seems to have cited the instance of 'gajapati' by the way of reason, according to Jayamaṅgala.
Mallinātha, however, traces a relation of 'bimbapratibimbabhava' between the two statements and accordingly identifies the figure as Drṣṭānta.

Thus, the relation between the statements would vary according to divergent interpretations. Hetu may be acceptable as a figure of speech, but the instance given here is not a happy one, as the vagueness about the relation between the two statements leads to ambiguity.

The identifications suggested by Mallinātha fundamentally differ from those given by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. also in the case of 13 entire figures and 9 varieties (of 4 other figures). Of these one variety is of Udāra, three varieties are of Rūpaka, two are of Upamā while three are of Śliṣṭa.

Rūpaka vs. Utpreksā (X, 27)

In verse 27 Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. have noticed viṣiṣṭopamāyukta Rūpaka which Mallinātha has identified as Utpreksā.

Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. explain this verse as an illustration of Viṣiṣṭopamāyukta Rūpaka, because 'hiranyalatāḥ' are imposed on 'chalapiṅgalakesara' and 'maṇiṣaṁhatayah' on 'sphuṭanettrapanktiḥ'. These superimpositions are the results of the superimposition of 'Śānavaḥ' on 'Kapayaḥ'. 'Śānavaḥ' are imagined as being made of gold on account of the presence of the monkeys. This is an additional comparison. Therefore according to Jayamaṅgala, it is Viṣiṣṭopamāyukta variety of Rūpaka, which is specially designated as Kamalaka.

Mallinātha has identified the figure as Utpreksā, because he has given importance only to the phrase...
But actually Rūpaka is the prominent figure in the verse. Even if we agree with Mallinātha in noticing Utpreksā in this part of the verse, that figure is very subordinate.

The figure pervading the verse is Rūpaka, because the emphasis is on superimposition. Otherwise if we take the whole verse to illustrate Utpreksā, then the superimpositions will be futile.

Rūpaka vs. Atiṣayokti (X,28)

The figure in verse 28 has been identified as Seśarthaṇvasita Rūpaka by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS., but Mallinātha has noticed Atiṣayokti endowed with Rūpaka.

Jayamaṅgala explains that the meaning of the phrase अति सुश्रुषाः सेरासिद्धांताय is other than the superimposed meaning, therefore this Rūpaka is styled Seśarthaṇvasita Rūpaka. He has added that it is described by others as Khanda Rūpaka

Mallinātha has noticed Atiṣayokti in the phrase आलंकुपनस्त्रायासायान् because here waters of the ocean have been superimposed on the tears. It, however, has been described by Jayamaṅgala as 'Seṣaḥ arthaḥ'.

Mallinātha is fully justified in noticing 'मेदेस मेदस्' variety of Atiṣayokti here, but we do not agree with him in considering this figure prominent.

Even according to the later ālāhkārikas, the principal figure in this verse is Rūpaka, because the superimposition of

1 Vāgūhaṭa, Kavyānudāsana, IV,69.
'indu' on 'plavaṅgama' has made possible other superimpositions such as that of 'toyanidhi' on 'kapi' etc.

Ardharūpaka vs. Upamā (X,29)

Verse 29 has been taken to be an illustration of Ardharūpaka by the early tradition followed by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS.

Jayamaṅgala justifies his identification by pointing out that here the Rūpaka lies only in the latter half of the verse. But it appears strange that he dissolves the compound 'kapināgāḥ' as 'kapayo nāgā iva' for that would favour taking the figure as Upamā. If the figure is to be taken as a variety of Rūpaka, the compound should be dissolved as 'kapaya eva nāgāḥ'.

As explained by Dr. P.V. Kane\(^1\) such a compound may be dissolved according to the emphasis implied by the context and the figure may accordingly be Upamā or Rūpaka.

The context in this instance would favour taking the figure as Upamā in view of the phrase 'मुदिताङ्गुदात्तया' following 'kapināgāḥ'.

Mallinātha, therefore, is not unjustified in treating this figure as Upamā.

Ardharūpaka of the early tradition followed by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. seems to correspond to Avayavi Rūpaka of Daṇḍin (II,73).

---

1 Dr. P.V. Kane (Ed.), Sāhityadarpana, notes on Rūpaka, p.117.
But we wish Bhaṭṭi should have supplied a better illustration with emphasis on superimposition and then would apply to Ardharūpaka.

Luptopamā vs. Utprekṣā (X,35)

Verse 35 has been taken to be an illustration of Luptopama by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS., while Mallinātha thinks it to be illustrating Utprekṣā.

Jayamaṅgala explains it as Luptopamā because the expressive word 'iva' is not there, specifically this would be Vāchakaluptā according to later ālāṅkārikas.

Here we cannot take the help of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin because neither of them has given Luptopamā.

Mallinātha identifies the verse as an illustration of Utprekṣā, because Hanumāt is imagined to be 'chintāmaṇi'. He explains it thus: 'चिन्तामणिधेतानाचितानांके। निराकःणिज्ञितिप्रेष।' According to later ālāṅkārikas, Utprekṣā is constituted when Viśaya is imagined as Viśayin. Moreover in Utprekṣā we lean more towards Upamāna rather than Upameya and the emphasis in Utprekṣā is on 'Sambhāvana'.

But here we lean more towards Upameya rather than Upamāna because the object of the verse is to glorify Hanumāt's work, by comparing him with 'chintāmaṇi'. 'सामायणेवप्रस्थादितलिमनयित्वा' is the common property between the two. The only object is to give expression to the similarity between two objects.

Here the upamāna 'chintāmaṇi' connotes 'iva' impliedly.

Sahopamā vs. Sahokti (X,33)

According to Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. verse 33 illustrates:
Saliopama, one of the six varieties of Upamā.

Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin do not accept this. Jayamāṇgala explains it as consisting in Upamā revealed by the word 'saha'.

The later ālāhkarikas too do not accept this as a variety of Upamā. They take it as an independent figure entitled 'Sahokti'. Accordingly, Mallinātha also treats it as such.

It should be noted here that both these figures are associated with the word 'saha'. The concept of sahopamā is based upon the element of Upamā, while that of Sahokti is based upon Atiśayokti.

Jayamāṇgala interprets the attributes of 'vadhūśiromaṇi' as also applying to 'jīvitāsā', but the interpretations are far fetched.

Samāsokti vs. Atiśayokti (X,42)

Verse 42 is considered as illustrating the figure Samāsokti by Jayamāṇgala and MSS., while Mallinātha identifies the figure as Atiśayokti.

Jayamāṇgala cites the definition of Samāsokti given by Bhāmaha and shows that here another 'artha' (namely, Rāma) is suggested through common attributes, which apparently apply to which is indicated expressly.

He also points out that this figure differs from śleṣa wherein both the videsyās are expressed.

Mallinātha takes the principal figure as Atiśayokti by indicating that the figure consists in the superimposition of
on प्रियोद्धर्त्त, thus giving rise to 'abheda' in 'bheda'.

But here the figure is not confined to superimposition. Its charm rather lies in the śliṣṭa attributes, which characterise Samāsoktī, even according to the later ālāṅkārikas.

**Atiśayoktī vs. Svabhāvoktī (X,43)**

Atiśayoktī is the figure identified by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. in verse 43. But Mallinātha thinks that the figure is Svabhāvoktī.

Here Jayamaṅgala notices an extraordinary expression in उवाच and accordingly identifies the figure as Atiśayoktī. He also cites the definition given by Bhāmaha (II,81), according to whom 'Lokāṭikrāntavachāḥ' characterises Atiśayoktī.

Mallinātha however discerns no 'chamatkṛtī' other than a matter-of-fact description of the प्रास्थानिक्षप्येषेष्माि क्रिया. Accordingly he identifies the figure as Svabhāvoktī.

The poet may be taken as having intended 'lokāṭikrāntavachāḥ' in this verse as explained by Jayamaṅgala, but the meaning of the expression is left very implicit.

**Vārttā vs. Atiśayoktī (X,46)**

Conversely certain figures of the early ālāṅkārikas:

However Dr. Hooykaas notices that this verse does not confirm to the definition of Atiśayoktī and its example given by Bhāmaha. He thinks that the figure here is Svabhāvoktī, but not Atiśayoktī. (Op. Cit., p.9).
receive a different treatment by the later ālānkārikas.

One of these figures is Vārttā, which is illustrated in verse 46 according to Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. Mallinātha however identifies it with Atisāyokti.

Dr. Hooykaas¹ does not agree that the verse 46 exemplifies Vārttā. He also points out that Daṇḍin does not mention Vārttā as a technical term, and Bhāmaha also was not protagonist of this figure. He therefore thinks Atisāyokti more probable as proposed by Mallinātha. However the tradition of Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. places Atisāyokti in the earlier stage.

In fact it seems that the fourth quarter of the verse contains 'tattvārthakathana', which characterises Vārttā, while the remaining quarters contain hyperbolical statements.

Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. would be justified in applying Vārttā to the entire verse, only if the latter statements are taken as presenting the apparent view that appeared even to a physical eye from a distance, rather than containing any poetic exaggeration.

Rasavat vs. Utpreksā (X,48)

Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. have noticed the figure Rasavat in verse 48, while Mallinātha identifies the figure with Utpreksā.

Bhāmaha² and Daṇḍin³ both have defined and illustrated it.

2 Op. Cit., III,6: रसवद्रिश्निलस्पष्ट शुझारदि रंग चथा |
Jayamaṅgala explains, रसचिन्ति दिवो विरूद्ध स्मीरंविषोरिय गृहः-
रसचभिष्यानां | Here the mountain is described as a lover
and the heaven as a beloved.

Mallinātha takes it to be Kriyāswarupotprekṣā because
of the phrase सदनादिया कृप्या सूक्ष्मन्तः but that is not
prominent here.

Dr. Hooykaas1 draws our attention to the use of the
word 'Rasa' in the stanza illustrating Rasavat.

Urjasvī vs. Utpreksā (X, 49)

As for the figure illustrated in verse 49, Jayamaṅgala
and the MSS. consider it to be an illustration of Urjasvī.
Mallinātha identifies the figure with Utpreksa supported by
Kāvyaliṅga.

Jayamaṅgala explains this figure Urjasvī as follows:
Here the poet imagines that the mountain resorted to the ocean
because it was steady, much elevated and competent enough to
carry clouds, compared to men, unsteady, low and unable to
endure the burden.

Mallinātha however lays emphasis on 'Krtāvasatimiva'
and identifies the principal figure as Utpreksā. Mallinātha
notices here Kāvyaliṅga also in addition to Utpreksa because
the reasons for the abandonment of the people and the resort
of the ocean by the mountain are stated here.

However, Jayamaṅgala seems to have overlooked 'iva' in
the third quarter as he has not included it in his commentary
on this verse.

Dr. Hooykaas\footnote{Op. Cit., p.13.} notes that this verse contains the word 'Urajita' which represents the name of the figure.

The element of Utprekśā does occur in 'kṛṭavasatāṁiva', but whether it should be taken as the principal or subordinate figure, depends upon the relative emphasis laid on 'kṛṭavasatāṁiva' or on 'अन्तरे विविध्यां अर्नियोपकृण्डे कुलविनिः'

The outstanding difference of opinion lies in the identification of the figure with Urjasva or Kavyalīṅga.

If we judge according to the later ālaṅkārikas, we may perhaps agree with Mallinātha. But as we have seen, Kavyalīṅga was unknown to Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Secondly Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin both have illustrated Uṛjasva, though only Daṇḍin has defined it\footnote{Kāvyadārśa, II, 275: कृतिलिङ्गोपेत्यं य स निनिस्त्रम् ||}. Therefore Jayamangala who generally cites definitions of the ālaṅkāras given by Bhāmaha, does not give the definition but simply explains it. This explanation is in tune with the definition of Daṇḍin. The later ālaṅkārikas treat Uṛjasva in altogether a different way, but the illustration given by Bhaṭṭi should be applied to the early tradition indicated by Daṇḍin.

Sāmāhita vs. Svabhāvokti (X,51)

Verse 51 is considered to be an illustration of Sāmāhita by Jayamangala and the MSS.

Bhāmaha does not define it though he illustrates it.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[2] Kāvyadārśa, II, 275:
\end{enumerate}
Jayamangala therefore cites no definition of this figure, but he explains it on the basis of the sole intention in the observations of the direction.

The illustration given by Bhāmaha (II,10) also contains the idea of intention with respect to Kṣatriya ladies attached to Rāma.

Dāndin, however, treats Samāhita in a different way (II,298,299). His conception corresponds to that of Samādhi of the later ālāṅkārikas. The later accept Samāhita, but altogether in a different sense.

Thus the concept of Samāhita seems to have undergone a vital modification after the times of Bhaṭṭī and Bhāmaha.

Accordingly, the figure illustrated in this verse of Bhāttikāvyya can be taken neither as Samāhita nor as Samādhi according to the later ālāṅkārikas.

Mallinātha, therefore, seems to be content with tracing Svabhāvokti in this verse at the most.

Dr. Hooykaas does not agree with Jayamaṅgala and the MSS, and proposes to identify this verse with the figure Svabhāvokti. Here he keeps in view the definition of this figure given by Daṇḍin, rather than the example of Bhāmaha.

Udāra vs. Svabhāvokti (X,52)

Verse 52 has been considered an illustration of the first kind of Udāra by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS, while Mallinātha identifies the figure with Svabhāvokti.

---

As Jayamaṅgala has explained, here actually the emphasis is on the greatness of the ocean, because though able to bear the burden of the world, it does not cross its boundary (महान अरुढ़मुखि उपरेतारसमपि अविच्छेदलिनिष्ठे) Bhāmaha (II,11) has illustrated this variety of Udāra without defining it.

Mallinātha finds no 'chamatkṛti' except a matter-of-fact description of the ocean and hence takes the figure to be Svabhāvokti, but as pointed by Jayamaṅgala, the emphasis lies on expressing the magnanimity of the Ocean.

Sahoktiśliṣṭa vs. Tulyayogītā (X,55)

Jayamaṅgala as well as the MSS. has identified the figure in verse 55 as Sahoktiśliṣṭa, the first of the three varieties of Śliṣṭa.

Jayamaṅgala cites the definition of Śliṣṭa from Bhāmaha (III,17) who defines it as श्रेष्ठद्ययायिकचमत्वचक्षुरे य धिकमे निर्मला and classifies it into three varieties on the basis of the indication of Sahokti, Upamā and Hētu.

As explained by Jayamaṅgala, the figure illustrated in this verse is Sahoktiśliṣṭa rather than Rūpaka inasmuch as it contains 'yugapatprayoga' of the Upamā (ahīn') and the 'upameya' ('girīn') distinctively. Mallinātha however notices here Tulyayogītā (गिरीणामहीना - ज प्रकृतानां धर्मसामयोजयोजनः प्रतीतिन्तुल्योपयोगिनामेततः)

But here the emphasis is not so much on the two attributes associated with the same actions and qualities, as on the śliṣṭa expressions applicable to both 'girīn' and 'ahīn'.

Even according to the later writers, this would, therefore, be an example of śleṣa.
Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. have identified the figure in verse 56 as Upamāśliṣṭa, the second variety of Śliṣṭa.

As Jayamaṅgala explains here, the Śliṣṭa attributes apply both to the Upameya 'Mahātarāṅgān' and the Upamāna 'jalamuchāḥ' given distinctively and 'iva' denotes Simile.

When Śleṣa figures along with another figure, it gives rise to a controversy about its relative importance. According to the early ālankārīkas like Udbhata, when Śleṣa is present, it predominates the other figure. This view justifies the identification of the figure illustrated in this verse as a variety of Śliṣṭa.

The later ālankārīkas, on the contrary, hold that Śleṣa becomes weaker where other figures occur. However, they agree to accept Saṁkara, when Śleṣa and the other figures are equally powerful.

Mallinātha is not definite as regards the exact identification of this figure. He observes that it is Śliṣṭavīśeṣanā Upamā according to Some. According to the later ālankārīkas, this verse would be an illustration of Śliṣṭa Upamā because in Śleṣa, both the Viśeṣaṇa and the Viśeṣya are Śliṣṭa. Here only the Visesanas are Śliṣṭa and the Viśeṣya is not Śliṣṭa. Secondly in Śleṣa the two objects are either both prakṛta or both aprakṛta, while in Upamā one is Prakṛta and the other aprakṛta. Mallinātha also mentions a different view held by others who identify the figure as Prakṛtāprakṛtaviṣaya Śleṣa. This almost corresponds to upamāśliṣṭa mentioned in the early tradition.
Hetuśiliṣṭa vs. Tulyayogita (X,57)

The figure illustrated in verse 57 is taken to be Hetuśiliṣṭa by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS.

The verse includes attributes which equally apply to both the Viśeṣyas, which though compounded, stand in a distinct position.

Hence the early tradition seems justified in taking this figure as a variety of Śliṣṭa. For the very reason Mallinātha identifies the figure as Tulyayogita, but Śleṣa being prominent leaves little scope for Tulyayogita.

Jayamaṅgala identifies the figure illustrated in the verse as Hetuśiliṣṭa by taking the attributes as standing in a causal relation. Here it may be noted that though Bhāmaha has disapproved of the figure Hetu, he has accepted and illustrated Hetu-Śliṣṭa.

The illustration given by Bhāmaha is a happier one, as it distinctly indicates the 'hetu' through the use of the ablative case. Unlike that illustration, the illustration supplied by Bhaṭṭi indicates the 'hetu' rather impliedly.

Viśeṣokti vs. Virodha (X,59)

The figure in this verse has been identified as Viṣeṣokti by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. but Mallinātha has noticed here Virodha.

Here Jayamaṅgala explains that विषेषोक्तिः सिद्धव्यादि—रेकदेशस्य विगमेकव्य प्रदीपकालः। युण्णवेण स्तुनिषिद्यवस्य प्रलिप्रदननां।
He gives the definition of Viśeṣokti given by Bhāmaha. The example of Viśeṣokti given by Bhāmaha has been accepted and illustrated by later ālāhkarikas: as an example of Viśeṣokti.

Even the definition of Viśeṣokti given by Daṇḍin applies to this verse. It would coincide with दुह्याणाः वैकल्प्यप्रलिपिः-नस्त्या (विशेषोक्तिः)

This verse would be an illustration of Vibhāva instead of Viśeṣokti according to the later ālāhkarikas, because the effect is stated to be present, though the cause is absent.

Mallinātha notices Virodha here by laying emphasis on the apparent contradiction, but the apparent contradiction is also shared by Viśeṣokti and Vibhāva. The distinct element of the causal relation underlying the apparent contradiction distinguishes this figure from Virodha. As explained above it leads us to take the figure as Vibhāva, according to the later conception. However the figure illustrated by Bhaṭṭī should be taken as Viśeṣokti according to the conception of his time.

Vyājastuti vs. Atiśayokti (X, 60)

Verse 60 has been regarded to be an illustration of Vyājastuti by Jayamaṅga and the MSS. while Mallinātha takes it as illustrating Upamā supported by Atiśayokti.

1 Op. Cit., III, 23:

Here it may be noticed that the early concept of Vyājastuti was somewhat different from the later one.

Bhāma (III,31) defines Vyājastuti, as characterised by 'tulyatā' under the pretext of 'दूराधिक गुणाप्रदेशः'. Accordingly, Jayamaṅgala explains Vyājastuti in this verse by pointing that the 'stuti' of 'Jalanidhi' and 'nindana' of 'Mahāvarāha' are simply apparent, but are really intended to convey 'tulyatva'.

If this view is left aside, the figure may better be taken as Vyatireka, provided the expressions of superiority and inferiority are taken to be indicative of reality.

Mallinātha traces the main figure Upāma contained in the first half of the verse. He takes the figure in the latter half as subservient and identifies it with Atisayokti by taking 'किस्मायुद्धन' as unrealistic, that is imaginary.

However Upāma seems to be better taken as subsidiary in relation to the other figure.

**Upamārūpaka vs. Utpreksā (X,61)**

Upamārūpaka is the figure noticed by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS, in verse 61. Mallinātha has identified the figure with Rūpaka-nirvyuḍha Utpreksā.

Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha both are agreed as regards the element of Rūpaka in the phrase: धर्मिर्यरसस्तन सुकलचीनपावम् but the moot point is whether the principal figure is: Upāma or Utpreksā in the verse.

Jayamaṅgala notices Upāma by taking the order of words: धर्मिर्यरसस्तन सुकलचीनपावम् इव गवितम् अलनविकृतम् while Mallinātha discerns Utpreksā by taking sequence as: गवितम् धर्मिर्यरसस्तन सुकलचीनपावम् इव अलनविकृतम्
Like Bhaṭṭī, Bhāmaha treats Upamārūpaka as an independent figure, while Daṇḍin includes it among the varieties of Rūpaka. Upamārūpaka is however not accepted either as a figure or even as a variety by the later ālāṅkārikas whom Mallinātha follows.

Nidarsanā vs. Utpreksā (X,63)

The figure in verse 63 has been identified by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS as Nidarsanā while Mallinātha identifies it with Utpreksā.

Jayamaṅgala follows the definition given by Bhāmaha and explains that this figure is Nidarsanā as here the 'viśiṣṭa artha', namely 'न भवति महिमा विना विपन्न' is conveyed by the illustrative example of the certain 'kriyā' of the ocean rather than by the use of the words 'yathā', 'iva' and 'vat'. Here 'mahimabhavana' is connected with 'शैरसर गृहस्थ प्रसादस्य विचित्रत्वभवन' of the 'पवणिधि' through the participle 'avagamayan' and not through any 'sādṛṣṭayadyotaka' word.

But Mallinātha lays emphasis on the element of fancy expressed by 'Avagamayan iva' and identifies the figure with Utpreksā.

It is true that the connective word 'avagamayan' is followed by 'iva' which conveys the sense of Utpreksā. But the two 'arthas' connected through 'avagamayan' stand in the relation of Nidarsanā. Accordingly, the verse may be taken as illustrating Utpreksopetā Nidarsanā at the most. The use of the word 'iva' after 'avagamayan' is obviously 'uptreksādyotaka' and it has nothing to do with Bhāmaha's 'niśedha' of the use of
'yathā', 'iva' and 'vai', which are here intended to be 'sādṛṣyadāyotaka' words. Hence the use of this 'iva' does not come in the way of Nidarsanā even according to the early āłāṅkārīkās.

It were better if Bhaṭṭi had not used the word 'iva' after 'avagamayan' (अवगमयन्) and involved an element of Utpreksā in his example of Nidarsanā.

Alternatively it may be suggested that the original reading in Bhaṭṭikāvya was presumably 'अवगमयन्ति' instead of 'अवगमयन्त्र' for otherwise the word 'iti' has to be taken understood and inserted to complete the sense, and the word 'iva' is here redundant in relation to the illustration of Nidarsanā.

**Parivṛtti vs. Arthāntaranyāsa (X,68)**

Jayamahgala and the MSS. have identified the figure in the verse as Parivṛtti, while Mallinātha notices here Arthāntaranyāsa.

Jayamahgala cites the authority of Bhāmaha and explains that Parivṛtti consists in the 'ādāna' of a 'Viśisṭavastu' along with the 'apoha' of 'Anyavastu'. He remarks that the figure must also contain Arthāntaranyāsa.

This concept well fits in with the example given here, Arthāntaranyāsa being contained in the last quarter of the verse.

In later times, the concept of this figure underwent some modification. Accordingly Mallinātha seems not to recognise Parivṛtti in this verse. He takes the description of the moon-rise as a particular statement, and the remarks in the last
quarter as a general statement supporting the same and accordingly, identifies the entire figure with Arthântaranyāsa.

Utpreśāvayava vs. Utpreśa (X,70)

Utpreśāvayava is the figure noticed in verse 70 by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. It has been defined by Bhāmaha as follows:

\begin{quote}
श्रृंगस्याधिनं संयुक्तं किच्चिदुप्रेस्यधानिः।
सपकार्यं युनकुप्रेसायवधो अवा।
\end{quote}

Daṇḍin (II,359) has included it under Utpreśa.

According to Mallinātha, the principal figure in this verse is Utpreśa and the subordinate figure is Rūpaka.

It seems that Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha both agree that the verse contains elements of Utpreśa and Rūpaka, but the tradition followed by the former treats it as a single figure representing altogether a new type of alaṅkāra, while the later alaṅkārikas treat it as a combination of saṁkara of Utpreśa and Rūpaka where Utpreśa is prominent.

Nipuna vs. Preyas: (X,74)

Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. identify the figure illustrated in verse 74 as Nipuna. As Bhāmaha does not refer to it, Jayamaṅgala is not in a position to cite its definition, but explains it as based on the intensiveness of thought (अच्छोऽवगहत्वान्)².

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1 Op. Cit., III,47.
2 He also remarks that this figure may also be included in Udātta.
Vidyāśāgar observes that the ancient ones identify it as Nipuṇa, on account of being expressed with Naipuṇya.\(^1\)

Mallinātha and Devanātha\(^2\) however identify the figure as Preyāśa.

Though Nipuṇa is not accepted by other ālāṅkārikas, the tradition which is followed by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. does indicate that Nipuṇa seems to have been in view before Bhaṭṭī.

Dr. Hooykaas\(^3\) thinks that the last verse of Canto X (X,75), also illustrates one figure and that figure is Paryāyokta, as the poet meant to present a periphrasis of Rāma's complete relaxation.

But Paryāyokta is already exemplified in verse 50 according to Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. Moreover the sequence of the figures illustrated in this canto clearly indicates that the original list ended with Sāmrāṭi and was supplemented by three figures adopted from some other source or sources. This leaves no scope for the insertion of Paryāyokta at this stage as it was well recognised in those times.

The figures in verses of Canto X identified by Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. on one hand and those identified by Mallinātha on the other hand may be tabulated as follows:

---

1 Bharatamallika, comm. on BK., X,74:

\[ \text{निमुनान्ति कनिष्ठस्य ज्येष्ठापदेशानार्थिन्यैःप्रियः नैपुण्यान्तक्षयान् निमुनान्यायभंधुपुर इति प्राच्य इति विप्रासागरः।} \]

2 \text{Ibid.}: अस्य प्रेयस्यनामस्य इति देवनाथः।

verse No. Jayamangala and the MSS. Mallinätha

1. Anupräsavat
2. Yukpädayamaka
3. Pädäntayamaka
4. Pädädiyamaka
5. Pädamadhyayamaka
6. Chakravälayamaka
7. Samudgayamaka
8. Känchïyamaka
9. Yamakävali
10. Ayukpädayamaka
11. Pädáyantayamaka
12. Mithunayamaka
13. Vüntayamaka
14. Puşpayamaka
15. Pädädimadhyayamaka
16. Vipathayamaka
17. Madhyäntayamaka
18. Garbhayamaka
19. Sarvayamaka
20. Mahäyamaka
21. 
22. Ādyantayamaka
23. Adidipaka
24. Antadipaka
25. Madhyadipaka

*23. Adidipaka
*24. Antadipaka
*25. Madhyadipaka

1 Some MSS. give one number to this couple of verses (2C,21) as they illustrate only one variety of Yamaka.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Rūpaka</td>
<td>Sāvyava Rūpaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Visiṣṭopamāyukta Rūpaka</td>
<td>Utpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Śeṣārthānvasita Rūpaka</td>
<td>Śmāra of Atiśayokoṭi and Rūpaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Ardharūpaka</td>
<td>Upamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Anvarthopamāyukta Rūpaka</td>
<td>Upamāgarbhita Rūpaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Ivopamā</td>
<td>Śrautī Upamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Yathopamā</td>
<td>Śrautī Upamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Sahopamā</td>
<td>Sahokti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Taddhitopamā</td>
<td>Taddhitagā Purṇopamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Luptopamā</td>
<td>Utpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Samopamā</td>
<td>Taddhitagā Purṇopamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Arthāntaranyāsa</td>
<td>Saṃśṛtī of Arthāntaranyāsa and Yamaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Ākṣepa</td>
<td>Kāvyaliṅga and Arthāntaranyāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Ākṣepa</td>
<td>Ākṣepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Vyatireka</td>
<td>Vyatireka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Vibhāvanā</td>
<td>Kāvyaliṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Samāsokti</td>
<td>Saṃkara of Atiśayokoṭi and Rūpaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Atiśayokoṭi</td>
<td>Svabhāvokoṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Yathāsāmkhya</td>
<td>Yathāsāmkhya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Utpreksā</td>
<td>Phalotpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Vārttā</td>
<td>Atiśayokoṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Preyas:</td>
<td>Pratīpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Rasavat</td>
<td>Utpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Urjasvī</td>
<td>Saṃkara of Kāvyaliṅga and Utpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Paryāyokta</td>
<td>Bhrāntimān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Samāhita</td>
<td>Svabhāvokoṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Udāra</td>
<td>Svabhāvokoṭi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A general survey of these two comparative columns indicates that the figures given in the first column are well planned.
1. All figures, if not divided into varieties, are generally illustrated in one verse each.
2. When the figures are divided into varieties, the latter are illustrated in one verse each.
3. The Šabdālankařas and Arthālankařas seem to have been arranged in some logical sequence.

As noticed above, Mallināthadoes not differ from Jayamaṅgala and the MSS. as regards both the Šabdālankařas (including all the varieties). Out of 36 Arthālankařas they entirely agree in case of 10 and partly in case of 4 ones, while differ totally as regards 22 Arthālankařas.

The figures according to his identification seem to be arranged at random. In some cases one and the same figure is traced in several verses, which are sometimes separated from each other and are interrupted by illustrations of other figures. Kāvyaliṅga for instance is traced in verses 24, 25, 38, 41 and 72. Similarly Utpreksā is traced in verses 27, 35, 49, 61 and 70. Likewise Upamā is traced in 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 56 and 60. Even its varieties included in verses 31, 32, 34, 36 are interrupted by other figures.

Secondly as many as 15 figures are not traced at all by Mallinātha though all of them except three (namely Upamārūpaka, 

1 Vibhāvanā, Samāsokti, Rasavat, Ūrjasvī, Paryāyokta, Vyājastuti, Samāhita, Viśeṣokti, Upamārūpaka, Nidarṣanā, Parivṛtti, Utpreksāvayava, Āśīḥ, Hetu and Nipuṇa.
Utpreksavayava and Hipuna) were recognised even by the later Āalahkārikas.

Thirdly, Mallinātha has noticed certain figures in the verses of this Canto, which were not known in Bhaṭṭī'ś time, but developed in later times. These identifications involve the fallacy of anachronism.

Conversely, certain figures are explained differently by Mallinātha as they, though treated by the early Āalahkārikas, were not recognised by the later Āalahkārikas, but the figures illustrated in Bhaṭṭikāvya must be interpreted according to the conceptions of the early Āalahkārikas.

Fourthly, Mallinātha has followed the later Āalahkārikas even in the case of the figures, the characteristics of which have undergone modifications in course of time. Here also the figures in Bhaṭṭikāvya must be identified according to the conception of earlier times.

Fifthly, Mallinātha sometimes identifies the figures differently through subjective interpretations and emphasis, though the characteristics of those figures have remained almost unmodified. Even in such examples, the identifications:

1 Karanamala, Kavyalinga, Pratipa, Ehrantimān, Sama and Drṣṭānta.
2 Varttā, Upamarupaka, Sahopama, Sahoktislista and Upamāślista.
3 Paryayokta, Samāhita, Vyajastutī, Nidarsānā, Hetu, Atisayokti, and Samāsokti.
4 Dipaka, Upopama, Akṣepa, Vibhāvanā and Samāsokti.
given by the early tradition seem congruent as regards the systematic planning of figures.

These points of comparison and contrast clearly indicate that the identifications of the figures given by Jayamaṅgala and the extant MSS. give a systematic presentation of the figures and their varieties if any, generally illustrated through one verse each. The identification given by Mallinātha yield an unplanned presentation of figures and an indefinite number and sequence of their illustrations. This more or less applies to the identifications suggested by Dr. Hooykaas, who follows Mallinātha in the case of the identification of many figures. But in the case of Yathāsāmkhya, he proposes that the verse could be better taken as illustrating Samāhita. In that case, Yathāsāmkhya would be left off unillustrated as it does not occur in any other verse even according to Hooykaas. (Op. Cit., p. 11).

Moreover Jayamaṅgala generally explains the figure on the basis of the definitions given by Bhāmaha, while Mallinātha explains them on the basis of the later works on alabhākāra. As Bhaṭṭi flourished in the earlier times represented by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, identifications accepted and explained by Jayamaṅgala should be taken as applying to the illustrations given in Bhāṭṭikāvya more aptly than those given by Mallinātha.

Though Jayamaṅgala and the extant MSS. are posterior to Bhaṭṭi by some centuries, they evidently seem to have followed an early tradition as compared to the views held by later commentators like Mallinātha.

As Jayamaṅgala and the extant MSS. fully agree in this:
respect, it appears that they both have inherited an early tradition from some earlier source (oral or written), and that the tradition was presumably transmitted to them through generations right down from Bhāṭṭi's times.
CHAPTER 6

Prasannakanda (contd.):

Mādhurya, Bhāvikatva and Bhasamāvesa

Mādhurya

According to Jayamāngala, Mallinātha and other commentators, Bhāṭṭī has illustrated Mādhurya in Canto XI\(^1\). As noticed above, he probably selected this canto for illustrating Mādhurya as he could as well give a vivid and continuous description of the amorous sports of the Rākṣasa couples.

Definition of Mādhurya

Jayamāngala cites its definition given by Bhāmaha which runs as follows:

अच्छेण नातिसन्मतायाय कवृण्यं सम्प्रमिष्ठते |

1 Jayamāngala's Intro. to canto, XI:

मधुर्येन्यपि काव्यस्य गुण उक्तः | तन्त्रदर्शितायुं लहुः गतप्रमाणायणीः-

Mallinātha's Intro. to Canto XI:

अया मधुर्येण्यपि काव्यशीलभावतया दृष्टिना सगी तन्त्राद्भवितम

लहुः गतायाय कवृण्येऽविष्णुर् तंत्रप्रमाणाय कवृण्येऽविष्णुर् |

Bharatamallika Intro. to Canto XI:

मधुर्येन्यप्रकाशके एवायं सगी आरम्भते |

Curiously the colophons of the text leave the name of the canto unspecified.

2 Kavyālaṅkāra, I,3. It should be noted that what Bhāmaha defines here is Madhura Kāvya and not Mādhurya as a guna distinctly.
The significance of the word 'Sravyatva'

This definition gives two characteristics of Madhura Kāvyā, namely 'sravyatva' and 'nātisamastārthatva'. The latter is a negative concept which differentiates Mādhurya from Ojas. Canto XI of Bhattikāvyā, which consists of 47 verses, hardly contains any long compounds on the whole. 'Sravyatva' on the other hand is a positive concept.

The word 'sravyatva' in this definition is generally taken in the negative sense of 'anudvejakatva', but the term here seems to bear positive denotation namely 'āhlādakatva', which is implicit here; but is explicitly specified in the definition of Mādhurya by later ālāṅkārikas.

This observation is corroborated by the definition of Mādhurya given by Bharata. He states that Mādhurya is an expression, which when uttered or heard repeatedly does not:

1 Compounds covering an entire quarter of a stanza are only few; eg 5b, 8c, 18a, 22a, 22b, 23a, 34c, 35a, 35b and 42a. They number 10 among 188 quarters.

2 Kāvyaprakāśa, VIII,68:

आयुंकत्वं माधुर्यं ग्रंजारे दुनिकरण्म ||

Accordingly these scholars have raised an objection that 'sravyatva' in Bhamaha's definition falls too wide, as it will apply to 'Ojas' and 'Prasāda' as well. cf. Comm. on VIII,68: अम्बराचं पुराजः प्रसादोरिषि |

3 NS., (C.O.S.), XVI,104:

बुधशूलं यक्षशूलं यक्षमुकं बाधि उनं उनं|

नेत्रैज्ज्वलिः यस्मादिः नन्याद्वयोमिनि स्मृतम ||
produce disgust, and thus conveys the positive sense of 'āhlādakatva' implicitly.

But Bhāmaha suggests no particulars about the application of this characteristic (śravyatva) nor does he supply any illustration of Mādhurya.

Other characteristics expected

The credit of presenting and initiating an exhaustive treatment of Mādhurya goes to Daṇḍin, who treats it as one of the ten guṇas. He defines Mādhurya as consisting in the establishment of Rasa, which is contained in 'vāk' and 'vastu'. Here Rasa should be taken in the non-technical sense of pleasant, poetical flavour. According to Daṇḍin, Vāg-rasa consists of repetition of sound belonging to the same 'śruti' and the Vastu-rasa connotes absence of vulgarity. Taruṇa Vāchaspati (comm. on I,51, pp. 33 ff.) gives them names of 'Śabdamādhurya' and Arthamādhurya' respectively.

As for, Vāg-rasa, Daṇḍin explains it as 'Śrutyanuprāsa', i.e., the alliteration caused by the grouping of similar sounds which exists in letters belonging to the same 'sthāna', (i.e. kanṭha, tālu etc). The grouping consists in mediate as well as immediate proximity (āsatti) of similar sounds.

1 Kavyādārśa, I,51:

मधुरः रसच्चात्तिच्च बस्तुवासी रसः स्थितं |

2 Ibid., I,52:

यया कृष्णविश्रुत्या यत् स्मानमच्छ्यैवतीति |

न्द्रयं हि पदासनं सानुप्रासा रसायह ||
If we examine Canto XI of Bhattacharjya from this point of view, it is found that this Canto abounds in śrutyanuprāsa, which can be traced to almost every stanza therein.

The nirantara śrutyanuprāsa may be illustrated as follows:

- v.1: चानि, सान्ति, और तान्त्र in v.5; नार्द, सिन्न, दली and श्रृंग in v.13; नाले, नस्स, बैन, धान, तार्थ, पत्र and रेशु in v.19; नाले, बंधान, योज, शाशु and प्रेम in v.27; नाले, दली, सुन्दर and श्री in v.31; नालिका, धान, निस्त्र, रूपी and गिये in v.35; उज्जवल, धान, धोस and द्राह्त in v.37; धार, द्वार, प्रेम and नन्द in v.38; प्रेमी, द्वाराका and श्री in v.40; दान, सत्ता, सद्द and भूमिनम in v.45; लुक, एकसम्बन्ध, प्रभु, नन्दी and सन्न in v.47.

Similarly the outstanding instances of sāntara śrutyanuprāsa are as follows: चानि in v.8; नाले and नाले in v.9; नाले और नाले and नाले in v.8; नाले और नाले in v.21; रुपीम and रुपीम in v.22; नाले in v.30; नाले, प्रेम and नाले in v.33; नाले, रचना and मुरल्प in v.34; नाले, धान and नाले in v.38; नाले, धान, मुरल्प and सन्न in v.46.

However it may be noted here that Jayamangala, who seems to inherit the early tradition of Bhattacharjya's times, takes no notice of śrutyanuprāsa in his comm. on Canto XI. Hence it seems that the concept of śrutyanuprāsa in relation to Madhurya was not in view of Bhattacharjya in this canto.

Among the later alaṅkārikas, Vāmana¹ and Bhoga² define

1. Kāvyālāṅkārasūtras, III, 1.20: पुस्तक, पदर्थ माधुर्यम् |
2. Sarasvatikanthabhārana, I, 74: अ पुस्तक, पदर्थ द्वारा तन्माधुर्यमिति समृद्धम् |
Mādhurya as 'prthakpadatva' which means in other words 'dirghasamāsarahitatva' Kuntaka\(^1\) defines Mādhurya as 'asamasta' as well as 'manohāri'. The latter denotes the characteristic of 'dravyatva' explicitly.

The concept of this characteristic was elaborated in terms of Rasa by the exponents of Rasa. Ānandavardhana designates this characteristic 'Prahlādakatva' and makes it clear that Mādhurya resides in 'Srṅgārarasamaya Kāvyā' as Srṅgāra Rasa is highly 'prahlādana', and therefore Madhura\(^2\). He also remarks that Mādhurya would be heightened in the case of Vipralambha (Srṅgāra) Rasa and Karuṇa Rasa as the mind excessively attains ādṛata therein\(^3\).

Similarly Mammaṭa also defines Mādhurya as 'āhālādakatva' that would serve as 'drutikāraṇa' in Srṅgāra. Moreover he also observes that the 'drutikāraṇa' would increase in the case of Karuṇa, Vipralambha Srṅgāra and Sānta\(^4\).

\(^1\) Vakroktijīvita, I,30:

\(असभमस्तमनोहारी पदविन्यासविविधम् \| माधुर्ये सुकुमारभाग्य प्रथमे गुणः ||\)

\(^2\) Dhvanyāloka, II,7:

\(माधुर्ये एव मधुरः परः प्रहुःदनो रसः \| तन्नमयं काव्यमहत्त्वो माधुर्ये प्रतिप्रकाशितम् ||\)

\(^3\) Ibid., II,8:

\(जूतिरे विप्रलभस्माचरो करुणे ष प्रकृतिवत् \| माधुर्यमात्रितां चावं वल्लरमाधिधिः मनः ||\)

\(^4\) Op.Cit., VII,69:

\(करुणे विप्रलभमे नक्षाने चावं वल्लरमाधिधिः ||\)
Later on, Mammatā also remarks that a composition having Mādhurya should have no 'samāsa' or have 'madhyamasamāsa' (i.e. compounds of middle size) at the most; in other words, it must not have long compounds. This characteristic, though not specifically mentioned in the definition, is supplemented here and reminds us of the same characteristic given in the early definition of Mādhurya.

Moreover Mammatā also prescribes certain letters (varnas) and the types of letters that must abound in Mādhurya and also specifies the letters that should be avoided therein.

On examining the Canto XI of Bhattikāvyav on the basis of this instruction, it is found that the 'varnas' prohibited by Mammatā conspicuously occur here along with those recommended. It signifies that this concept given by Mammatā was not developed in Bhatṭī's time. The occurrence of recommended 'varnas' in this Canto may therefore be taken as spontaneous.

As regards the insertion of Mādhurya in Vipralambha Śṛgāra or Karuṇa or Sānta, it is found that a major portion of Canto XI of Bhattikāvyav contains Śṛgāra Rasa, but of the Sambhoga type. As this fact is conspicuous by its absence in the definition of Mādhurya given by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, it is hardly likely that Bhatṭī inserted Śṛgāra as a requisite characteristic of Mādhurya.

---

1 Op. Cit., VIII, 74:

\[
\text{मूर्खि अनिष्णुः स्वरूपं अन्योपरिणीति न च अवृत्तिर्मघ्यशृणिविश्रुतां साधुयं घटना नथा} \]

2 XI, 4-33 vs. out of 47 verses.
It is probably on this account that the poet introduces other allied topics, in the subsequent portion of this Canto, otherwise, he would have extended the depiction of Śṛṅgāra Rasa almost up to the end of the canto.

Thus, in illustrating Mādhurya in this canto, Bhatti seems to have followed the contemporary concepts pertaining to 'nātisamastārthatva' and 'śravyatva' that is 'āhlādakatva' as characteristics of Mādhurya.

Bhāvikatva

The colophon of Canto XII of Bhattikāvya designates the third section of Prasannakānda illustrated therein, Bhāvikatva-pradarsana.1

Commentators like Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha too treat this canto as an illustration of Bhāvikatva.

Thus from Mādhurya, Bhaṭṭi passes on to Bhāvikatva. It is certain that Bhāvikatva was in vogue among the critics in the time of Bhaṭṭi because we find that Bhamaha mentions Bhāvikatva in the third chapter (v.4) of his work. In the beginning he introduces it as follows:

भाविकत्वे च निजः: अत्तैकारः सुमेधिस: |

Characteristics

Afterwards, while describing the characteristics of Bhāvikatva, he defines it as a 'Prabandhavisaya guṇa'. But it

1 इनि महाबैयाकरण भेट्टुप्रणिन सम्मानित अध्ये प्रसन्नकाण्डे भाविकत्व- प्रदर्शनस्मृलीयः: |
seems that the word guṇa is here used not in the technical sense of the term, but in the general sense of 'Kāvyasobhākara Hetu'.

Nor does Bhāmaha define it as an alāṅkāra or poetic figure though he introduces it as an alāṅkāra. Here, by alāṅkāra, Bhāmaha seems to mean embellishment rather than a poetic figure. Thus Bhāmaha in fact represents Bhāvikatva neither as an alāṅkāra nor as a guṇa in the technical sense of the terms.

Bhāmaha defines Bhāvikatva as a 'prabandhaviṣaya guṇa' (or embellishment) pervading a 'prabandha'. Here 'prabandhaviṣaya' is used in contrast to 'ślokaviṣaya'.

Bhāmaha describes the characteristics of Bhāvikatva as follows: "It is a vivid representation of the past and future objects as if they were directly perceptible to the eye, the vividness of the representation depending on the conditions that the theme must have a picturesque, exalted and striking significance, and therefore capable of being

1 Kavyalankara111,53,54:

भाविकत्वसिद्धिः प्राणः प्रवभविषयं गुणम् ।
प्रत्येकः इव दृष्टिः प्रभावी भुनिष्ठितः ।
संवेदनाद्वारा विभिन्नत्य प्रसंगः कथाः: स्मरितिनन्दनः ।
गणदानोऽकुलम् चैति नस्य हैतु प्रचक्षते ॥
understood well and that the words must have a consistency"¹.

Like Bhamaha, Daṇḍin also defines Bhāvikatva as a "Prabandhaviśaya guṇa". He too does not use the term guṇa here in its technical sense, for he does not include Bhāvikatva among the guṇas treated by him.

However he designates it Bhāvika as well as Bhāvikatva and puts it under the category of alaṅkāras. Though Daṇḍin defines Bhāvikatva like Bhamaha, the former's conception widely differs from that of the latter. Daṇḍin derives the name Bhāvikatva from the word 'Bhāva' and his explanation of the significance of this term centres round this idea. According to him Bhāvika is so called, because it is 'Bhāvayatata', and 'Bhāva' is the inward conception of the poet.

Daṇḍin² describes the characteristics of Bhāvika as follows:

"Bhāvikatva is declared to be a quality pervading (the whole) poetic composition, Bhāva is the idea of the poet which abides in the compositions from the beginning to the end.

2 Kāvyādārśa, II, 364-366:
The mutual subservience of all the segments of the theme, the non-employment of purposeless adjectives, the description of appropriate topics by force of the matter of narration, the elucidation of even a deep theme, all this is based upon intuition; this is known as Bhāvikatva.

It seems that Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin had inherited different tradition about Bhāvikatva, but it should be noted that Daṇḍin's Bhāvikatva or Bhāvika got extinct with him. For the later writers the concept of Bhāvika was that which they received from Bhāmaha through Udbhata.

Jayamāṅgala explains Bhāvikatva as a 'Prabandhaviṣayā alaṅkāra'. Thus he takes 'Prabandhaviṣayā guṇa' in the sense of 'Prabandhaviṣayā alaṅkāra'. Then he expands the significance of the attribute 'Prabandhaviṣayā' by contrasting it with 'Ekadesāka'. 'Prabandha' generally means a poetic composition, embodying a continued or connected narrative. In this context, the term obviously applies not to the entire Mahākāvya, but to a particular canto of it.

Various aspects of Bhāvikatva illustrated in Canto XII

As Bhaṭṭi has planned to illustrate Bhāvikatva in Canto XII, the word 'Prabandha' evidently applies to a particular canto, rather than the entire Mahākāvya. Jayamāṅgala also introduces Canto XII as 'Mantranirṇaya-prabandha' in this context.

1 Kāvyādārṣa Tr. by R.B. Raddi, pp. 50 f.
2 V. Raghavan traces a similar significance in the use of the word 'yatra' given in the definition by Bhāmaha, but this view hardly seems convincing. (Some concepts of Alāṅkāraśāstra, p.118.)
Jayamangala cites the definition and the characteristics of Bhavikatva from Bhamaha's work, and represents that these characteristics are well illustrated by the poet in this Canto.¹

At the end of the commentary on verse 6, he observes that this (piece of) poetic composition illustrates 'Udāttārthatva' as it contains 'Udāttārtha'.² This remark applies to the speech given by the mother of Vibhīṣaṇa to her son (XII,2-6). In this speech, the mother being a fore-sighted lady, requests Vibhīṣaṇa to dissuade Rāvaṇa from the disastrous policy of hostility towards Rāma and thus the speech contains an exalted meaning.

Thereafter Jayamangala observes that 'chitrādbhutārthatva' is to be traced to the succeeding speeches of Prahasta, Vibhīṣaṇa, Mālyavān, Kumbhakarna and others. This remark applies to the speeches of Rāvaṇa (XII,14-15) Prahasta and others (XII,17-20), Vibhīṣaṇa (XII,22-54), Mālyavān (XII,56-60), Kumbhakarna (XII,62-68), Vibhīṣaṇa (XII,69-75), Rāvaṇa (XII,77-80) and Vibhīṣaṇa (XII,82-85).³

1 Jayamangala's Intro. to Canto XII: भाविकाचनमलतूः प्रव-धिविषय उत्तरः | भैरौदशिरक्त नस्य चिन्ताधिकारयोः।

2 Jayamangala's Comm. on XII,6: यथा प्रव-धिविषय उदात्ततामिविधिमानुदतायत्यत्मिनुसम्

3 Jayamangala's enumeration of the first two speakers is curiously given in a reverse sequence: इन उन्न्रे प्रव-धिविषय-विशेषण-मतामलेकुम्भेकणदीनां चरण- प्रव-धिविषय-चिन्तामिविधिमानुदतायत्यत्मिनुसम्

(Ibid.)
Here Jayamaṅgala treats 'chitrādbhūtārthatva' collectively and points it out in these speeches simply in a vague and general way. He does not explain the exact significance of 'chitrārthatva' and 'adbhūtārthatva', nor does he cite any particular illustrations of the same.

From the context, it appears that 'chitra' and 'adbhuta' in Bhamaha's description of Bhāvikatva mean variegated and marvellous respectively. In the deliberation covered by these speeches, we perceive different theories of polity. When Rāvana invites the opinion of his Councillors, Prahasta and others eulogise the exploits of Rāvana and look down upon those of the opponents, while Vibhīṣaṇa advocates for conciliation with Rāma and is supported by Mālyavān and Kumbhakarna. When Vibhīṣaṇa repeats his appeal for conciliation, Rāvana condemns him for his cowardice and disloyalty and kicks him. Consequently Vibhīṣaṇa abandons Rāvana and joins the camp of Rāma.

Thus the speeches made in this deliberation favour two divergent courses of policy namely: indifference to the opponents on the one hand and conciliation on the other hand. This manifold character of the deliberation may be taken to illustrate 'chitrārthatva' in this Canto.

As for 'adbhūtārthatva' it may be traced to certain portions of the speeches under review, where it is presented through the depiction of marvels:

(1) The boastful utterances made by Prahasta with respect to the Sun, the Moon, Rāma, the monkeys, the Heaven and the Earth (vs.18-19).

(2) Kumbhakarna refers to the hypothetical impossibilities regarding the Sun and the Moon (v.64).

(3) Vibhīṣaṇa points out the portentous phenomena foreboding calamity in verses 70-73.
Havana points the hypothetical impossibilities like stones floating in water, the Sun emitting darkness and the Moon emitting fire (v.77).

As regards two other characteristics: 'Svavinitatā' and 'Sabdānākulatā', Jayamaṅga has remarked that they are to be found in 'Mantranirṇayākhyā Kathā'. As he has explained 'Svavinitatā' means 'Subodhatā' and this characteristic is prevalent not only in this Canto but in the whole composition as such.

It however deserves special notice with respect to this Canto, wherein the poet has successfully maintained it even though the Canto deals with 'Mantranirṇaya' involving obscure or complicated theories. The lucid presentation of obscure concepts is well illustrated in verses 15, 24, 36, 40, 49, 59, 74 and 84.

The other characteristic 'Sabdānākulatā' means that Bhāvikatva should consist of words free from inconsistency. We can say that this characteristic is found profusely in this canto, because the arguments of different speakers are consistent. Take for example, the speech of Vibhīṣaṇa which covers a major portion of the canto. First he puts forth the political theories which apply to the matter in hand, then takes the particular case and finally discusses how in the present circumstances, conciliation with Rāma is the best course to follow, and how the failure of adopting that course would lead to adverse consequences.

Even the arguments put forth by Prahasta and others as well as Rāvaṇa are presented with logical consistency in justifying the contrary view of paying no heed to the so-called valour of the opponents and maintaining the self-confidence in their own strength.

---

1 Ibid., p.334; स्वविनिदताः मुबोधताः शब्दानाकुलताः शेषेन्द्रनायेन प्राप्तते दुर्गाप्रभा भन्मन्ना नम्भर्मिण्याकर्मां दर्शयताः।

2 नातान्तरत्वाय परमात्मानी कार्यं महामहोदयम्।
As regards the remaining characteristic viz. that there should be a vivid representation of the past and future objects as if they were directly perceptible, Jayamaha passes over it silently. In fact, this canto which deals with political deliberation hardly contains scope for such vivid descriptions.

If, however, this characteristic is to be traced in this canto, some glimpses of it may be pointed out in the casual references to the characteristic incidents of the immediate past as well as in the significant hints at the adverse consequences, which could be avoided by adopting the policy of conciliation.

Now let us see how far Dandin's characteristics of Bhāvikatvā apply to this canto. As regards the mutual subservi-

ence of the segments of theme, we can notice that the introductory speech of Rāvaṇa, followed by the speech of Prahasta and others presenting one approach to the matter in hand, the speech of Vibhiṣaṇa and others presenting the other side of the problem and the conclusive course of action adopted by arrogant Rāvaṇa and humiliated Vibhiṣaṇa; all these portions of the canto are conducive to the main theme of political deliberation.

The non-employment of purposeless adjectives is a negative characteristic of avoiding a poetic fault, which no good poet would bring in. It is therefore quite natural that this canto illustrating Bhāvikatvā would be entirely free from the employment of purposeless adjectives which would mar the charm of the poetic composition.

As the commentary Prabhā on Kāvyadārśa explains, स्थानवर्णनाः means स्थानां प्रकृतिपूजनां विषयाणां वर्णितa |Political
deliberation is the 'Prakṛtavisāya' of this Canto and it is treated here elaborately and exhaustively. This topic is evidently subservient (उपयुक्त) to the occurrence of two subsequent events of outstanding consequence, namely (i) Vibhīṣaṇa's abandonment of Rāvaṇa and resorting to the side of Rāma; (ii) and the consequent non-avoidance of war.

Lastly, Daṇḍin expects the elucidation of even a serene theme by the force of the manner of narration. On examining this canto with this view, it is clearly discerned that it presents the elucidation of even the serene topic of political deliberation through the force of the manner of narration. It commences with the mother's appeal to Vibhīṣaṇa to persuade Rāvaṇa for conciliation (vs.2-5).

After that Vibhīṣaṇa's visit to the court of Rāvaṇa is narrated (vs.7-8). The deliberation opens with the introductory speech of Rāvaṇa, inviting the opinions of the councillors. The deliberation is started by Prahasta and others advocating for the policy of indifference and arrogance (vs.17-20). This policy is opposed by Vibhīṣaṇa who strongly pleads for the policy of conciliation (vs.22-54). The speeches of Mālaviyān (vs.56-60) and Kumbhakarna (vs.62-68) corroborate the view of Vibhīṣaṇa to a large extent. This deliberation is followed by the appearance of evil omens to which Vibhīṣaṇa draws the attention of Rāvaṇa and thereby appeals to him for adopting the course of conciliation (vs.69-75). However Rāvaṇa emphasises his own prowess and humiliates Vibhīṣaṇa for his cowardice (vs.77-80). Thereafter Vibhīṣaṇa bids adieu to Rāvaṇa and joins the camp of Rāma (vs.82-87). Thus not only the different aspects of
deliberation are presented in an elucidating manner, but even the antecedent and subsequent incidents are linked with it in an interesting manner.

Thus the characteristics of Bhāvikatva as given by Bhāmaha and Dandin apply to this Canto of Bhāṭṭikāvya to a large extent but in view of the preceding cantos of the Prasannakānda, it appears that Bhāṭṭi's concept of Bhāvikatva would really have been akin to that of Bhāmaha, while the semblance of his concept with that of Dandin is probably incidental.

Bhāṣāsamāveda

In the colophon of the thirteenth Canto, we find Bhāṣāsamāveda forming the fourth section of Prasannakānda\(^1\). Bhāṣāsamāveda is also styled Bhāṣāsāṅkara or Bhāṣāsama\(^2\).

As Mallinātha observes, it serves as an embellishment in a kāvyā on account of its chamatkāra-kārita\(^3\). When Bhāṭṭi tries to illustrate Bhāṣāsama in a canto of his Mahākāvya, which runs in Sanskrit, he gets a limited scope for the other languages (Prakrit and Apabhramśa) to be incorporated into this canto.

---

1 इसी महाभृक्कपेष प्रमेश्वर्काण्ड प्राचार्याचार्य नाम चन्द्रेश: काव्यस्य श्रेष्ठेदाः सर्वे।

2 Vidyavānātha also styles it Bhāṣāsama:

शास्त्रेऽक्षीर्येव भासासु विविधास्वचि | याब्धे यज्ञ भोजन सोऽस्य भासासम् इवोप्यते। || —SD., x, 662.

3 Intro. to Canto XIII:

अन्यायेऽस्मिन स्वर्गभागाः संक्षप्तात्स्या "अन्यायेः" चाणक्येलुः -- कायतैले-निर्दिहनन -- -- -- -- भागासामार्यं गीत्यास्त्रेष्ण मात्रा बूळेनाः।
As Sabdapada (or tadbhava i.e. sanskritabhava) and Desiyapada (or Desiya) varieties of Prakrit Bhasa and Apabhramsa Bhasa cannot be incorporated into Sanskrit, the poet resorts to Sabdasamaha variety of Prakrit which can well be incorporated into Sanskrit.

Bhasasamvesa - a kind of Bhasaslesa

Bhasasamvesa is treated as a kind of Bhagaslesa in the later works of Alanakarastra. It is actually one of the divisions of Sleha.1

Bhasaslesa is generally divided into two classes: (i) when the sentences in different languages convey different meanings2, (ii) when they convey one and the same meaning in different languages3.

Illustrations in Canto XIII

In this Canto, Bhatti has appropriately used Aryagiti metre which is commonly used in Prakrit compositions. This Aryagiti is also named as 'Skandhaka'.

1 Rudrata divides Sleha into eight kinds:

कव्यालंकार, IV, 2.

काव्यप्राकाश, IX, 84.

2 Kavyalankara, IV, 10:

काव्यालंकार, IX, 84.

3 Ibid., IV, 16:

काव्यप्राकाश, IX, 84.
Out of total 50 verses, 5 verses (4 complete and 2 half-ones) have been composed in Sanskrit alone. The remaining 45 verses are 'samkīrṇa' (i.e. in mixed languages). In all these verses, the poet ingeniously contrived to employ such padas that would be common in Sanskrit as well as in śabdasamā Prakrit.

The illustration of this Bhāṣāsamāvesa is very difficult because one has to be very cautious in the selection of words. Take for example, the forms अंद्र्ण and भीम in verse 2. अंद्र्ण and भीम are changed into अंद्र्ण and भीम according to rules of visargaśandhi in Sanskrit, while they form the usual nominative singular forms in Prakrit.

Similarly in verse 3, the forms 'mahīdhara' and 'sabhā' are kept unmodified even in the context of Prakrit, the retention of 'ḍha' (ध) being explicable according to dissolution of the compound into separate padas and the initial position of '�' in the pada 'धर' according to the exception in the rule.

In verse 9, the forms तुषा and गरिवरदेहा are the usual Prakrit forms in nominative plural, while they represent the nominative plural forms in Sanskrit with the omission of visarga in accordance with the rules of visargaśandhi.

In the form 'parihiṇa' in verse 11, 'na' is changed to 'ṇa' in Sanskrit by the rule क्य (VIII, 4–29), while it is changed to 'ṇa' in Prakrit under all circumstances.

1 8 ab, 15 ab, 21, 26, 27 and 28.
The third quarter of the verse XIII,25 reads in some MSS. नीर्गिरिमास्त्रका. But as Jayamaha remarks here no sandhi between गिरिम् and आस्ट्रका is specified on the part of Sanskrit. Accordingly, the correct reading would be according to Jayamaha, नीर्गिरिम् आस्ट्रका.

As noticed by Bharatamallika, the reading नीर्गिरिमास्त्रका would involve the fallacy of 'chhandobhanga' as the first quarter would accordingly lack in one mātra.

The absence of sandhi between गिरिम् and आस्ट्रका would however appear unusual in Sanskrit. Some therefore proposed to read आस्ट्रका नीर्गिरिम्. The quarter would then be regular metrically, but this reading gives rise to another difficulty. For the rules of Prakrit grammar would require the omission of visarga in आस्ट्रका नीर्गिरिम् while the omission of visarga after आस्ट्रका would violate rules of Sanskrit grammar. In that

1 Jayamaha's Comm. on XIII,25:

2 The author of chandrakāla commentary seems to have missed these points and he mistakes Jayamaha's remarks as favouring the comm. on reading नीर्गिरिमास्त्रका.

3 Comm. on BK., XIII,25:

4 Bharatamallika's Comm. on XIII,25:
case, the verse would not yield तस्विरस्वत्य, i.e., Bhāṣāśamāvēda.

Some old MSS. therefore give the reading दीर्घग्रिम्मस्यकः 1. That solves the problem.

In the verse XIII,33, the form तेसवन्तरे retains ते which is generally changed to ते in Prakrit. The retention of ते in this form is explained by taking महामुन्मये as an adhikāra-सूत्र2.

The form अमरीण in verse 4, does not suit Maharashtri Prakrit3.

In case of the two verses 8 and 15, Bhaṭṭi has not composed the first half of the verse in such padas as would apply to स्वविक्रम प्रकरित as well. It is difficult to decide whether he did not succeed in employing padas conducive to Bhāṣāśama or whether he had the discretion of relaxing the adherence to Bhāṣāśama at certain exceptional places. This remark also applies to verse 21, which entirely applies to Sanskrit alone.

In the case of verses 26 to 28, the poet however seems to deviate from the usual course of Bhāṣāśama purposely.

In verse 26, he has avoided finite verbs by employing participles. In verse 27, he has introduced finite verbs intermittently, while the entire verse 28 consists of finite verbs exclusively.

1 Ibid: दीर्घ ग्रिम्मस्यकः इन शास्त्रेः महामुन्मये दृष्टयते।

Bharatmallika proposes to read परसंध्याये in lieu of सिस्मल्लास्याये and take it as qualifying दीर्घे.


3 Jayamaṅgala's Comm. on BK.XIIa:

सीमान्तःप्रयोगः प्रकृते महामृणे आन्ध्रांप्रयोगम्।
Excepting this the poet has well succeeded in accomplishing Bhāṣāsama in this canto. It already indicates that Bhaṭṭi who was primarily a Sanskrit poet had good command over the Prakrit language also.

In order to accomplish Bhāṣāsama, Bhaṭṭi has naturally resorted to some peculiar modes of style in this section.

First of all, as far as possible he uses long compounds. Some verses, which number as many as 13 are made up of only 2 or 3 compounds (XIII, 19, 20, 24, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 46 and 47).

Secondly as far as possible, he does not use finite verbs. In 45 saṃkīrṇa verses, he has used finite verbs only six times. He uses past passive participles in the remaining verses.

At the same time, it must be noted that this canto abounds in attributes. Almost every verse of the canto contains a series of attributes. As this feature is very essential for illustrating Bhāṣāsama, the poet has ingeniously construed it with the theme of 'setubandha', which would naturally abound in descriptive topics.

Thus Bhaṭṭi has devoted one Kāṇḍa to Kāvyalakṣaṇa and selected to illustrate four types of embellishment, namely Alaṅkāra, Mādhurya, Bhāvikatva and Bhāṣāsamavesa.

1 सा्हिर and संगच्छ in v.10, भण in v.11, वहन्तु in v.12, छन्दन्तु in v.13 and गच्छन्तु in v.14.
2 The descriptions of (i) the ocean (ii) the construction of the dam, (iii) Mountain Suvela, (iv) Rāma's army and (v) Rāvaṇa's army.
CHAPTER 7

Tiñantakāṇḍa

After Prasannakāṇḍa, Bhaṭṭi passes on to Tiñantakāṇḍa, as specified at the end of the Cantos XIV-XXII.

It seems that he had in his mind a preconceived plan as regards the structure of his composition. Through his ingenious insight, he seems to have realised that the only portion which Tilants or verbal forms in different could afford ample scope for illustrating Tenses and Moods, was the last portion which mainly deals with the narration of the war, the contents of which yield various modes of presentation. Therefore the Tiñantakāṇḍa well fits in with the Yuddhakāṇḍa.

Six Tenses and three Moods

Panini has treated the Tenses and Moods in the third

---

1 For instance, देव भाट्कावे तिन्तकाण्डं विद्विद्धितस्य नाम-चानुकीश: सम्भं:।
Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha think that in these nine Cantos 'sauṣṭhava' has been illustrated.

(i) Jayamaṅgala's Intro. to Canto XIV:

एवं सौराष्ट्र: नाम काण्डेश्चेत्ता गुणः: स च सुभाष्ये निदःष्ट ब्युतिस्यि: सौराष्ट्र: प्रकृतितिम: इति व्यविधिः उक्तः।

(ii) Mallinātha's Intro. to Canto XIV:

इति सौराष्ट्र: नाम काण्डेश्चेत्ता गुणः: स च सुभाष्ये निदःष्ट ब्युतिस्यि: सौराष्ट्र: प्रकृतितिमः इति व्यविधिः उक्तः।
Adhyāya of his Astādhyāyī and devised different terms beginning with 'La' for them. They number ten, but one of them namely 'Let' pertains to only Vedic Sanskrit, hence Bhaṭṭi here treats of the remaining Tenses and Moods which number nine in all.

As the subject-matter of the Mahākāvyā is pertaining to 'itivṛttata', all the incidents would normally be narrated only in the Past Tense, especially the Perfect ('Liṭ'). It would therefore be very difficult for inserting the other Tense especially the Present and the Future Tenses in any entire canto. However, the poet skilfully contrives to twist and amplify the different modes of his narration in such a way, that would enable him to illustrate the different Tenses and Moods in different cantos.

Therefore in order to serve this purpose he did not observe the order of Pāṇini\(^1\), but illustrated them according to the convenience of his own narrative as would suit the context\(^2\).

Generally the poet illustrates one form of a verb in the canto, but sometimes the same verb would also occur again if it suits the narration. When a verb is casually repeated, it generally gives a different form or forms.

Even a single form, well illustrated, proves very useful to the student for framing the other forms of the same Tense and Mood.


\(\text{Astādhyāyī, III.}\)

2 'Liṭ'(XIV), 'Luṇī'(XV), 'Lṛṅī'(XVI), 'Laṇī'(XVII), 'Laṭ'(XVIII), 'Liṅī'(XIX), 'Lot'(XX), 'Laṇī'(XXI), 'Luṭ'(XXII).
'Lit' (Canto XIV)

Bhaṭṭi selected Canto XIV to illustrate the forms of the Perfect Tense ('Lit'). This canto on the whole describes the terrible battle between the Rākṣasas and the monkeys in which many prominent warriors are killed.

Pāṇini's sūtra 'Parokṣe Lit' (III,2,115) means that 'Lit' indicates the past time previous to this day and which was not witnessed by the speaker.

Bhaṭṭi illustrates this general use of the Perfect in various roots almost throughout the Canto.

The Perfect conveys a special sense, when used in the First Person, wherein it denotes some distraction or unconscious state of mind. It is illustrated in the speech of Śītā, when she saw Rāma and Laksmana bound by Indrajit:

\[ \text{लोकं मम मर्यादा नु वृण किं बिनिमिने } | \text{मनो में न बिना रामायण पुस्फैं सहस्त्रदा } / \]

-XIV,56; vide 57-58.

In this canto of 113 verses, he has tried to illustrate both kinds of the Perfect - Reduplicative and Periphrastic. He has illustrated the Reduplicative Perfect including its exceptions. In Pāṇini's work, the general sūtra for the Reduplicative Perfect is 'Litidhātoranabhāyāsasya' (VI,1,8) and

---

1 BK., XIV,7: अनगुरुश्रेष्ठं सुरस देवगुरुश्च द्विविनद्रिते परेण: ||
बन्धुरुद्विनिधिणि साबुङ्ग परिविन्देषु: ||
the exceptions are mentioned in the sūtra, 'Dayāyasah' (III,1,37). Each of these exceptions is illustrated by Bhaṭṭi e.g. the root 'day' in v. 42 (dayāmchakre), 'ay' in v. 41 (palāyāmchakrire) and 'kās' in v. 19 (chakāsāmchakruḥ).

The general sūtras regarding the Periphrastic Perfect are 'Kāspratyāyadāmamantre Liti'(III,1,35) and 'Ijādescha gurumatchhrchhaḥ' (III,1,36). This Perfect is formed by adding 'āma' to the root and then adding the forms of the Reduplicative Perfect of 'kṛ', 'bhū' or 'āś' as terminations according to the sūtra, Kr̥nāchānuprayujyate Liti (III,1,40)².

According to the sūtra, Uśavidājāgrbhyo nyatarasyām! (III,1,36), the roots: 'uṣ', 'vid', and 'jāgr' take the Periphrastic Perfect optionally. Bhaṭṭi does not seem to have aimed at illustrating both the types of forms of these roots, because he has illustrated both the forms only in the case of 'vid', 'viveda'(v.71) and 'vidāmchakāra' (v.50). He has illustrated Periphrastic Perfect forms of 'uṣ' and 'jāgr' in v.62 (oṣamchakre) and v.61 ('jāgarāmchakruḥ').

According to sūtra, 'Bhihribhrhuyam dluvacheha' (III,1,36), the roots: 'bhi', 'hri', 'bhr' and 'hu' take the Periphrastic Perfect necessarily. Bhaṭṭi has given Periphrastic Perfect of 'bhi' in v.78 (bhābhayoμchakruḥ) and Reduplicative Perfect of 'hri' in v.41 ('jihriyuḥ').

1 'Āś' has not been illustrated.
2 It is noteworthy that he has also illustrated the exception 'urpu' in v.103 (Urṇunāva). This exception is found in Vārttika on VII, 3, 90, उपनिषादानेनिति वच्यम्.
Bhatti has in one verse illustrated two different forms of the same root, e.g. 'achichaya' and 'achikaya' of 'chir' in v.47, 'mamarjuh' and 'mamrjuh' of 'mrj' in v.92, 'sisveyuh' and 'sasuvuh' of 'svi' in v.79, 'babhrje' and 'bhrerje' of 'bhrj' in v.68, 'ajuhuve' and 'ajuhava' of 'hu' in v.44, and 'uyuh' and 'uvuh' of 've' in v.84. He has used different forms of 'mr' in two different verses, 'mamartha' (v.57) and 'mamara' (v.111).

Similarly, the poet had sometimes to use the different forms of 'gup' in different verses, 'mirjugopa' (v.106) and 'pragopayaamchakara' (v.87). The forms like 'sasvanuh' (v.3) and 'svanuh' (v.4), 'sasyamuh' (v.83) and 'syemuh' (v.77) which are governed by the sutra VI,4,125, are also illustrated in different verses.

Bhatti has illustrated the simple form as well as the causative form of the same root in one verse e.g. 'aropayasamchakruh' and 'aruruhu' (v.8) and 'bhremuh' and 'bhamayamchakruh' (v.9). He has also illustrated the different forms of the same root belonging to different conjugations, of course, in separate verses. e.g. of root 'pur' of 10th conjugation in v.3 ('purayamchakruh') and of 4th conjugation in v.2 ('pupurire').

---

1 विनाय चे: | VI,2,164.  
2 मूलै वृट्टि: | VII,2,114.  
3 विनायकः | VI,1,36.  
4 फर्म ए समानाम | VI,4,125.  
6 विनस स्वामनस्यां किति | VI,1,39.  
7 छिन्न व्ययो यः | VI,2,38.  
8 आयद्य अधिष्ठानूर्य ताः | III,1,31.
In verse 19 and v,30, he has employed six and eight verbs respectively with the one common subject, but he garbs the enumeration of the numerous verbs with the graphic presentation of the movement of the monkeys and the warriors respectively.

This canto illustrates the poet's ingenious mastery over the appropriate use of the various verbs in association with the various actions (vs. 3-6).

'Luh' (Canto XV)

In ancient times, when Sanskrit was a spoken language, the Aorist used to denote recent past time or the mere completion of an action as can be seen from the Vedas, old Brahmanas and the Epics etc. Now according to Pāṇini's sūtras, the Aorist can also indicate past time generally i.e. express simply the completion of an action without reference to any particular time.

Bhaṭṭi has illustrated several forms of 'Luh' to indicate the past time generally as well as the recent time specifically in Canto XV.

1 BK, XIV, 19: चक्रासमीचन्तुर्दश्मनिषिंतिः | यान्तरं भूषयमानु पैथुनेवेक्षयमेव तत्तत्त्वादः ||

2 BK, XIV, 30: तस्मान्मेधरुस्मिन्मेंकुम्भन्युःकुटियोऽतन्तराः | सुमांस्यकृतवाहु िकस्म न्युग्मयोभोज्य भवताः ||

2 BK, XIV, 4: देयमात्र धीरामस्वेतुहेतु: स्वेदनि या गोमुखरेः | घण्टा: शिशिरिके दीधां नदिनेव पड्यंभ्रेष्ठाम् ||

3 R.G. Bhandarkar, 'Preface to First Edition'

Second Book of Sanskrit, p.IX.
Bhaṭṭi illustrates both these uses of the aorist in the speeches of Kumbhakarna (XV,13-18) addressing Rāvaṇa as well as in the speeches of Vibhiṣana addressing Rāvaṇa (XV,39-41; 66-69) inasmuch as some of the past incidents referred to therein are remote while others are recent.

However in the short speeches of Rāvaṇa (XV,72-73) and Jāmbavān (XV,102), the poet illustrates the Aorist only in the use of the recent past inasmuch as the speakers exclusively allude to the incidents of recent occurrence.

While narrating the incidents of the remote past in the major portion of the canto, Bhaṭṭi has here used the Aorist to denote the past time generally.

As regards the third use of the Aorist given in the sūtra, 'Māni Luṅ' (III,3,175), it can be illustrated only in direct speeches. Its use therefore occurs in the speeches of Rāvaṇa.

---

1 BK, XV,16: राधवस्यामु सः कान्तामा तैस्रैको न वाचिष्कः।

2 BK, XV,17: तुस्माप्यक्रमीन काले यनं तदाधिकारितम्। अधानिन्य रक्षासिः परि: कृतसात्त्वत्वल्यथी:।

3 BK, XV,1: राजसेन्द्रस्तनोऽभृतेदेशिस्त पारनं उरम्। प्रानिर्भितस्य कृताधिक्युपेक्षज्ञाय रक्षासान।

4 BK, XV,12: वैर्था मान दर्शस्य यथा मात्रास्य: शर्मा उरम्। नयादाराम वर्यं वैर्थाय प्रभुर्मामी: पुरा सुरान।।
(XV,9-12) and of Vibhīṣaṇa\(^1\) (XV,39-41).

Similarly 'Smottare Lāṇḍōḷa\(^2\)' (III,3,176) has been illustrated in the speeches of Rāvaṇa.

As regards the sūtra, 'Puri Lūn Chāsme' (III,2,122), it is illustrated in v.12. It is rather strange that the commentators have not noted this point. The sūtra 'Ādaṁśayāṁ bhūtavachcha' (III,3,132) has been illustrated in the expression\(^3\) of Jāmbavaṇ, that he would not live without Hanūmat (XV,103).

There are seven varieties of the Aorist and many roots yield several varieties. Here also, Bhaṭṭi has tried to illustrate the various optional forms as far as possible in one verse, without marring the poetic charm of the composition, e.g. 'agluchat' and 'aglochīt'\(^4\) of 'glu'; 'aśisvīyat'\(^5\) and 'aśvatām' of 'śrī' in XV,30; 'āmārjī' and 'āmārkṣīt'\(^6\) of 'mrj' in XV,113; 'agopītām' and 'agopticām'\(^7\) of 'gup' in XV,113; and 'adħāt' and 'adhāsīt'\(^8\) of 'dhā' in XV,29.

\begin{verbatim}
1 BK, XV,40: | कुम्भकरणोऽसैनं मा युधायामयानं नूपात्मकी ||

2 BK, XV,20: | मात्राधिकालं युद्धिनाथां न नयुयुग |
                मात्राधिकालं युद्धिनाथां न नयुयुग ||

3 BK, XV,103: | नत्स्य भाषा महाराजः नाममहाप्रतिक्षिति वधान ||

4 III,1,58. | चूड़कुरुत्सवं नवयुगं च युवा-चुंद्रा-राजाधिक्षिण |

5 III,1,49. | डेंगाका धौराख्योः ||

6 VII,2,114. | स्वरूपसूचि स्यानि धौराख्यों य ||

7 VII,2,44. |

8 III,1,49. |
\end{verbatim}
But many times, he has to illustrate these optional forms in separate verses, e.g. 'abuddha' (v.5) and 'abodhi'\(^1\) (v.10); 'aruddha'\(^2\) (v.63), 'araudsit' (v.80) and 'arudhat'\(^3\) (v.10); 'praumāvit' (v.119) and 'praumāvuit'\(^4\) (v.122); 'aloṭhiṣṭa' (v.56) and 'alūthan'\(^5\) (v.25); 'achchidat' (v.68) and 'achoṭhītsit'\(^6\) (v.67); 'atrīpat' (v.29) and 'atrīpsit'\(^7\) (v.48); 'āhvanta' (v.42), 'āhvāta'\(^8\) (v.28) and 'āhvān'\(^9\) (v.50). In a poetic way he has used two optional forms of 'stambh' ('astambhītī' and 'astabhan'\(^10\)) in v.31.

'Lṛṭ' (Canto XVI)

Of all these Tenses and Moods, the Future Tenses were very difficult to use in this composition. The 'Lṛṭ' or the second or simple Future expresses futurity indefinitely as also that of today. It is also employed to denote recent and future continuous time.

The forms of this Second Future have been illustrated in Canto XVI. It narrates the various imaginations which grasp the mind of Rāvana after his brother's death, in such a way as would

1. 30.9
2. 31.1,26.
3. 31.1,57.
4. 31.2,3.
5. 31.3,91.
6. 31.1,57.
7. 31.3,91.
8. 31.2,3.
9. 31.3,91.
10. 31.1,58.
give scope for illustrating this tense. For instance, in a despondent mood, he imagines the happy condition of the gods after the death of Kumbhakarna and then again in an optimistic mood, he also supposes that he will defeat Rama and the monkeys.

Valmiki has narrated the lamentation of Ravana in 14 verses (Yuddhakanda, LXVII), but Bhatti has amplified it into as many as 42 verses, yet nowhere do we feel that it is far-stretched or in any way incongruous with the subject-matter.

Besides illustrating the forms of the Simple Future, denoting its general sense in the major portion of the Canto, Bhatti has tried to illustrate the sutras of Panini regarding 'Lrt' denoting its particular senses. For example, 'Anavakrpyayamoraksyorakimprpttepi' (III, 3, 145) and 'Kimkindstyarthesu Lrt' (III, 3, 146) have been illustrated in v. 21. 'Kshipravachane Lrt' (III, 3, 133) has been illustrated in v. 26, 'Sele Lrt' (III, 3, 151) in v. 29, 'Abhijnavachane' (III, 2, 112) in v. 36, 'Vibhasa sakaka' (III, 2, 114) in v. 37, and 'Vartamanasamipye vartamanavadva' (III, 3, 131) in v. 38.
In this comparatively small canto illustrating the forms of the Second Future, he has illustrated optional forms in separate verses. The roots ‘vṛt’, ‘vṛdh’, ‘sṛĎh’ and ‘syand’ are optionally Parasmaipadī and when so they do not take ‘ि’ before the terminations.

These have been illustrated in v.17 (‘syantsyati’ and ‘syandisyate’) and in v.6 and v.7 (‘nivartsyarti’ and ‘vartisyate’). He has also illustrated the optional forms, ‘sandarśisyey’ (v.9) and ‘draksye’ (v.10).

‘Laṅ’ (Canto XVII)

Strictly speaking, the Imperfect must exclude the Perfect which denotes the remote past. However Bhaṭṭi seems to have taken the sūtra ‘Anadyatane Laṅ’ (III,2,111), in its general sense without construing it with the exception given in ‘Parokṣe Liṅ’ (III,2,115).

The Canto XVII supplies its illustrations of the general use of ‘Laṅ’ in its major portion.

As regards other particular uses, ‘smottare Laṅ cha’ (III,3,176) has been illustrated in verses 21, 25, 26 and 33.

As ‘sma’ in this sūtra is construed with ‘mā’, it naturally occurs in direct speeches.

The Imperfect is sometimes used even for interrogative

1 BK., XVII, 21
2 BK., XVII, 21
3 BK., XVII, 21
expressions referring to a recent time\textsuperscript{1}. Bhaṭṭi seems to have illustrated the Imperfect in the speech of Indrajit (XVII,32-35) which forms a questionnaire to Vibhīṣaṇa\textsuperscript{2}.

In this canto also he has used two optional forms of the same root in one verse, e.g., 'arodīt\textsuperscript{3}, 'arodīt\textsuperscript{4}, and 'advisūt\textsuperscript{5} and 'advisan' (v.61).

In verse 43, he has given two different forms of root 'kṣip' ('akṣipat' and 'akṣipat') belonging to different conjugations. In verse 56, he has used the simple form and the passive form of the root 'pūr' ('apūrayan' and 'apūryanta').

In verse 71, in order to express the meaning of weeping, he has used two roots instead of one ('prārudan' and 'samaraut').

\textit{Laṭi} (Canto XVIII)

To use the Present Tense through an entire canto was not an easy task in this story of remote past, yet Bhaṭṭi has successfully used in Canto XVIII, which mainly comprises the 'vilāpa' of Vibhīṣaṇa (vs.2-36) followed by a short speech of Rāma (vs.40-42), the introductory and interluding verses (vs.37,38,39ab). The corresponding passage in Vālmiki's \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}, covering Adhyāya CIX of Yuddhakāṇḍa too consists of speeches of Vibhīṣaṇa and Rāma. But unlike Vālmiki, Bhaṭṭi

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Pradēśa śāsōṣṭhakāt}\textsuperscript{1} | III,2,117.
\item \textit{EBK.}, XVII,33: \textit{īḍṭaṭiśa eva kṛśyamānāṃ kramārāmāṇāṃ abhajanaḥ} | \textit{avapasya pāṣṭikarādy daśe kṣitāvyaṃ māyaṃ pāṣṭikarādyāḥ}. \textsuperscript{2}
\item \textit{Kutarkaṇḍa patañjali}: VII,3,98.
\item \textit{Aṣṭ gāyikāgālākhyātī}: VII,3,99.
\item \textit{Śrīkṛṣṇa} | III,4,112.
\end{enumerate}
contrives to use verbs in the Present Tense throughout.

He has used the Present in its general sense, i.e. to denote action taking place at the present time, in verses 2-12, 19-29 and 40-42. Verses 2-12 represent Vibhīṣaṇa mourning for Rāvaṇa, describing the latter's majestic power and his repentence for Rāvaṇa's listening to bad councillors. In verses 19-29 Vibhīṣaṇa feels sorry that all powers in the past conquered by Rāvaṇa retake their freedom. Verses 40-42 express Rāma's advice to Vibhīṣaṇa to administer the rites for Rāvaṇa.

Besides illustrating the general sense Bhaṭṭi has also illustrated the following senses of the Present Tense laid down by Pāṇini in his sūtras.

Bhaṭṭi has illustrated the sūtra 'Aparokṣe cha' (III,2,119) in Vibhīṣaṇa's description of the past grandeur of Indrajit (v.13) and in his scolding to Rāvaṇa for not listening to his advice (v.18).²

In the introductory and interluding verses, expressed in his own words, the poet contrives to use the narrative Present Tense in the sense of the past, through the use of 'sma' as indicated in the sūtra 'Laṭ sme'. Pāṇini's other sūtras have been illustrated as follows:

1 BK., XVIII,18: तैं स्स वै श्रेयं महाराज! मल्ल स्माहं न विधिभवणः।
2 BK., XVIII,37: अन्तःपुराणि पौराण्यं पौराण्यं भृतिदृश्यिव्वताः।
           संबुध्य स्माभिधानिनि हि संमेण संयुगऽ॥
'Garhayam ladpijatvoh' (III,3,142) in verses 16 and 32, 'Vibhāsā Kathaṁ Liṅ cha' (III,3,143) in verse 16, 'Nanau prṣṭaprativachane' (III,2,120) and 'Nanvo vibhāsā' (III,2,121) in verse 17. These verses express the sentiments of Vibhīṣaṇa that Rāvaṇa should not have waged war against Rāma nor have tried to keep Sītā.

Verse 35 illustrates the sūtra, 'Yavatpurāṇipatayor' (III,3,4). 'Vibhāsā kadākārhyoh' (III,3,5) has been illustrated in verses 34 and 35. Bhatti has illustrated 'Liṅ' chordhvamauh-urtike' (III,3,9) in v.36. The sūtra 'Puri Luṅ chāsme' (III,2,122) has been illustrated in v.18.

He has used the two optional forms of 'vid' in v.18 ('vetha') and v.22 ('veda'), v.29 ('samvidrata') and those of 'ührnu' in v.28 ('prorrōtī') and v.29 ('praurnōmi').

'Liṅ' (Canto XIX)

Then the poet had to accommodate 'Liṅ - Vidhilin' and 'Āśirliṅ' both in one canto. For this purpose, he selected

1 BK., XVIII,17: असुप्रेम नू न न्रीति यों मन्त्रे मानामहों हितमप | न करोभिनि पौड़सि तदा मेहात्ममुक्तवान् ||
2 BK., XVIII,35: कदा भविति मै ब्रह्मस्थित्वं पर्याणिन न वेिहायन ||
3 BK., XVIII,18: पुरा त्यजिनि यन्त्र कुप्पो मो निराकुलं संभवित ||
4 धीरो धीरी या || III,4,83.
5 अन्नि (विश्वास) || VII,1,7.
6 उम्मुनेदिबिभाज || VII,3,90.
Canto XIX, which contains 30 verses. In the beginning this canto represents Vibhīṣana as requesting Rāma to bless him and the Rākṣasas with the victory over the opponents. Here Bhāṭṭi uses 'Ṛṣirliṅga'\(^1\) (vs.2-3).

Then Vibhīṣana is thankful to Rāma without whose sympathy he would not have liked to survive after the death of Rāvanā. After calling his ministers, he instructs them to prepare for the funeral rites of Rāvanā (vs.7-13). In these verses, Bhāṭṭi has used 'Vidhiliṅ' in the sense of 'vidhi' proper\(^2\).

Pāṇini illustrates different uses of 'Liṅ', which are given along with 'vidhi' in the sūtra\(^3\) (III,3,161). For instance, Bhāṭṭi illustrates: 'nimantrey Liṅ' and 'prārthanāyām Liṅ' in v.24 and v.15 respectively.

Then the poet illustrates the other uses of 'Liṅ' as follows:

1. 'Ādamsāvachane Liṅ' (III, 3,134) and 'Liṅ chordhvamauhurtike' (III,3,164) in v.5,
2. 'Vibhāṣā Kathami Liṅ cha' (III,3,143) in v.6,
3. 'Kick vṛtte Liṅ Lṛṭau' (III,3,144) in v.16,
4. 'Anavakṛptyamārṣayorākimvṛtte'pi (III,3,145) and 'Jātuyadorliṅ' (III,3,147) in v.17,

---

1 BK., XIX, 2: तं नो देवा विधियन्यृप्यन्य सवणवद्व पवन्य च पवन्यमात्रियम्
2 \(\text{का संस्कृतं ज्ञानं} \)
3 \(\text{विधिनिमन्नः सम्पत्तप्रायेः} \)
It is interesting to note that Bhaṭṭī illustrates these other uses of "Liṅ" almost in the same sequence as that given in Pāṇini's sūtras.

The last three verses (vs. 40-42) illustrate "Āśīrliṅ". These are aptly put in the mouth of Rāma, while he blesses Vibhīṣaṇa and advises him to observe the precepts of Dharma, Nīti and Arthashastra.

In Rāmāyaṇa the performance of the funeral rites of Rāvaṇa is described in Adhyāya CXI of Yuddhakanda and the anointment of Vibhīṣaṇa is mentioned in the next adhyāya CXII. There we do not find Vibhīṣaṇa ordering the ministers for the funeral rites of Rāvaṇa, nor do we find the ministers consoling Vibhīṣaṇa; and even Rāma is not represented as giving blessings and advice to Vibhīṣaṇa.

Therefore it seems that in order to give full scope to "Liṅ" Bhaṭṭī has innovated these dialogues.

1. BK., XIX, 20: क्षणो जनस्य अहं जन्तुवै नौ मैत्रेय मैत्रेयाँ धिः "
2. BK., XIX, 25: इच्छित्सि सुहुद्धं सर्वो वृद्धिमात्रं यतं सुहुद्धं
'Loṭ' (Canto XX)

It was comparatively easier for Bhaṭṭi to illustrate the forms of the Imperative ('Loṭ') in Canto XX, because in Rāmāyana, Vālmiκi also has used that Mood in some verses of the corresponding portions given in Adhyāyas CXIII to CXVI of Yuddhakānda. This canto contains 37 verses. Bhaṭṭi has condensed these four adhyāyas in Canto XX and has persistently employed the Imperative Mood throughout.

The Imperative Mood is used in 'directing', 'giving invitation', 'expressing permission', in speaking of 'an honorar office' or 'duty', in asking questions and in 'prayer'. As in other cantos, here also he has tried to illustrate as many sūtras of Pāṇini as he could in such a way that the Mahākāvya may not suffer.

Besides illustrating the general sense of this Mood, Bhaṭṭi has also illustrated other peculiar uses of the Imperative.

He has illustrated the sūtra 'Āsiśī Linloṭau' (III,3,173) in vs. 6 and 13. When the Imperative is used with the particle 'sma', it expresses a courteous request, e.g. Vibhīṣaṇa requests Sītā to reign over the people of Ayodhya (v.17).

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{कितिमन्त्राणमन्त्राणं धीर्यं सङ्ग्रहस्त्रार्थिन्नेतु विद्र} | \text{III;} 3,161. \\
& \text{कोष } \text{च} | \text{III;} 3,162. \\
2 & \text{e.g. BK.,XX,3: हिंचा भवनु ते विपक्षतान्तु कश निष्ठरम्} | \\
3 & \text{e.g. BK.,XX,13: भवनाधिकूणका नयनत ऊध्वि स्ववेशानि} | \\
4 & \text{समे कोष } \text{च} | \text{III;} 3,165. \\
5 & \text{BK.,XX,17: ऊध्विन्नुमुखरिद्वेषः इन स्वामिनी स्म भव निते} | 
\end{align*}
\]
When words having the sense of wish etc. are to be expressed, 'Loṭ' can be used according to the sūtra Ichchhārtheṣu Līṅloṭṭau (III,3,157) illustrated\(^1\) in verse 21. The sūtra 'Līṅ chordhvamauhurtike'(III,3,164) enjoins the use of the Imperative, when time after a 'muhūrta' is expressed. This is illustrated\(^2\) in v.16.

The peculiar use of the Imperative which specially deserves to be noted has also been illustrated\(^3\) by Bhaṭṭi in v.29. The Imperative Second personal singular is repeated when frequency of an act is indicated and the whole may be used with the root in any tense\(^4\). He has also illustrated the use of the Imperative Second person as indicated in Pāṇini's sūtra\(^5\), III,4,3, to describe the several acts of wanderings of the Wind God\(^6\) in v.30.

In order to illustrate the sūtra 'Vidāṅkurvantvītyanyatatarasyēm', (III,1,41) he has used that form in verse 28\(^7\).
This canto narrates Rāma's message conveyed by Hanūmat to Sītā, Vibhishana's request to Sītā to approach Rāma, Rāma's refusal to accept Sītā, her appeal to Rāma, and at the end, Sītā's invoking the Five Great Elements to bear testimony to her chastity. He has illustrated the three optional forms of 'hā' in v.10, which are formed according to the sutra 'Jahatescha' (VI,4,116).

'Lṁ' (Canto XXI)

In order to use the Conditional Mood ('Lṁ'), Bhaṭṭi has selected Canto XXI. In Rāmāyaṇa also, Vālmīki has devoted one whole Adhyāya (CXVII) to the narration of God Agnī's coming out with Sītā and convincing Rāma of her faultless character. In the preceding Adhyāya, Vālmīki has shown Brahmā manifesting himself and praising Rāma, but there Brahmā does not justify Rāma's suspicion. Bhaṭṭi has associated the contents of these two Adhyāyas (CXVI-CXVII) with the Conditional Mood and on account of the paucity of the use of the Conditional, he has combined them into one canto by making Brahmā justify Rāma's stand regarding Sītā's ordeal, and making Sāṅkara praise Rāma as the incarnation of God.

The Conditional is used in those conditional sentences in which the Potential may be used, when the non-performance of the action is implied.

1 BK.,XX,10: नहीं श्रोक्त्रे वैदिको धृष्टेऽधृष्टि प्राप्यो धृष्टि मात्स्यम् | सायने अतिशि द्वेः नहीं श्रीद्वेश्वरवनम् ||

2 लिङ्गनिमित्ते लूढ क्रियातिपत्ति | III,3,139.
Bhatti has made a wider use of the Conditional, wider in the sense that he has extended almost all uses of the Potential over the Conditional Mood and illustrated them.

The sūtra 'Vibhāṣa Kathāmi Līni cha' (III, 3, 143) has been illustrated\(^1\) in v.I, 'Hetuhetumatorliṇī' (III, 3, 156) in v.\(^2\) 2, 'Utāpyoḥ samarthayorliṇī' (III, 3, 152) and 'Jātuyadorliṇī' (III, 3, 147) in verse\(^3\) 3. 'Kīṁvṛtte Lailṛtau' (III, 3, 144) has been illustrated\(^4\) in verse 5. 'Anavakṛṣṭyamārgayoh' (III, 3, 145) has been illustrated\(^5\) in verses 4 and 14. Verse 8 illustrates the sūtra. 'Chīṛikaṇān cha' (III, 3, 150). 'Garhāyāmcha' (III, 3, 149) has been illustrated\(^6\) in verse 9. 'Bhūte cha' (III, 3, 140) has been illustrated\(^7\) in verses 6, 10, 13 and 15.

\(^1\) BK., XXI, 1: कालुक्त्य! दयितवं संध्विनि न्यायाङ्गिकोः लक्ष्यम् ||
\(^2\) BK., XXI, 2: नाभविविक्षिणं रुपा युपक्षम् महि नन्तय ||
\(^3\) BK., XXI, 3: अचै नत्र रिपु सीता नाथयीतिं दुम्भीिति: ।
KC में आत्यविचिंध्य आत्यसंविचिंध्य स्थकाम ।
\(^4\) BK., XXI, 5: त्यां इवक्षये किं नास्त्या: शीर्षं संवसनां चिंस ।
\(^5\) BK., XXI, 14: नामोस्याम वयं गण्डकिमहाधक्षणं चढःवारं ।
किं वा विनिर्देशं चुङ्के भवानं धदाकरित्य ||
\(^6\) BK., XXI, 9: यज्ञा यज्ञार्थिक्यं स्कृतं सर्वसाहार्यापणिनां ||
\(^7\) e.g. BK., XXI, 15: प्रात्यास्तिक्यं चेष्टायाद्यायान्यविषयं नव ।
अनुरास्स्ये त्याः लोके सार्वकालिकाः नन्तय ।
He has used the optional forms of the root 'drś' in v.5 ('adṛṣṭṣyata' and 'adarsṣyanta') and of the root 'vṛt' in v.15 ('pravartisyanta' and 'avatsayarṣtāṁ').

'Lūṭ' (Canto XXII)

Then for using the forms of the First or Periphrastic Future ('Lūṭ'), Bhaṭṭi has selected the major portion of the last canto by presenting an advanced picture to Hanūmat regarding the journey from Laṅkā to Ayodhyā and the consequent union of the relatives.

In Rāmāyaṇa, Hanūmat leaves ahead for Nandigrāma to inform Bharata about the ensuing advent of Rāma, but there Rāma does not describe the journey to Hanūmat in advance. Instead, while travelling by Puṣpaka, Rāma describes the current journey to Sītā in the Present Tense. But in order to introduce this Future, Bhaṭṭi deviates slightly from Rāmāyaṇa and puts the advance description in the mouth of Rāma, who instructs Hanūmat in his journey to Ayodhyā.

Thus Future denotes a remote future time not of today. At the outset\(^1\), the poet makes it clear that Hanūmat is to start on his journey the next day, hence all the subsequent actions which would take place during his journey and thereafter, refer to a future time\(^2\).

---

1 Bk., XXII, I: अयोध्यो श्य चुः चयासि कपे भरतप्रचिताम्

2 e.g. Bk., XXII, 14: अयोध्यानिर्देशाः दृश्या पुष्करयाऽवंशायोः शिवम्।
ँचास्तः सह भैरविवा लोक्ष्या ये भरतः परम्।
Here the poet uses verbs in different persons and numbers, sometimes even resorting to the passive voice. He has illustrated the two optional forms of the root 'drś' in v.4 (darsitäraḥ) and v.10 (Drṣṭāraḥ).

But the use of the Future Tense could be extended only up to a certain extent, this being the concluding canto, wherein the poet had to sum up the past events in the Past Tense.

Bhaṭṭi concludes the illustrations of 'Luṭ' (and at the same time in fact the entire Tīhantakāṇḍa) with verse 23 (�नायुक्तविलासिनम्).

The subsequent events of the past, are summed up in the next 8 verses (XXII,24-31). The narration is followed by the general remarks on his composition in the conclusion (XXII,31-35).

General Remarks

Thus Bhaṭṭi has illustrated six Tenses and three Moods in Tīhantakāṇḍa. In this Kāṇḍa, poet gives a rich vocabulary of verbs. Here he has ingeniously adjusted certain Tenses to such cantos as would give ample scope for illustrating them in large numbers. These Tenses are 'Luṭ', 'Luṅ' and 'Laṅ' illustrated in Cantos XIV, XV and XVII respectively. The narrative in these Cantos covers a large number of verses each numbering over a hundred, while the other cantos of this Kāṇḍa are considerably shorter, the number of verses ranging from 42 to 23.

1 BK.,XXII,7: चन्द्र सन्दर्शिताः ते मालयमुद्रकाव्ये |
2 These Cantos contain 113, 123 and 112 verses respectively.
On counting the number of different verbs used in this Kānda, it is found that their total number is 423. As regards the number of verbs illustrated in individual cantos, the largest number (279) occurs in Canto XIV on 'Lit'. Next Canto XV illustrates 'Lun' forms of verbs numbering 230 and Canto XVII illustrates 'Lan' forms of 208 verbs in all.

As for the other Tenses and the Moods, the verbs illustrated in individual cantos number as follows in their descending order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense or Mood</th>
<th>Canto</th>
<th>Number of verbs illustrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Laṛ'</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lṛt'</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lot'</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lin'</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lṛṅ'</td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lut'</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Tide Indices 1 to 9 pp. 416 ff.
2. Some of these verbs yield more than one optional forms. Accordingly, the Cantos contain more forms than the verbs illustrated therein.
CHAPTER 8
Adhikāarakāṇḍa and Prakīrṇakāṇḍa

Adhikāarakāṇḍa

The MSS. have not designated this portion of the Mahākāvyā as any specific Kāṇḍa, but the ingenious commentators have named it Adhikāarakāṇḍa.

In this portion, Bhaṭṭi has illustrated some of the governing rules of Pāṇini. The governing rule means a superintending aphorism, which gives no meaning by itself where it is mentioned, but lends its meaning to several aphorisms that follow by being repeated along with them.

The MSS. and the commentators specify the different adhikāras covered by the illustrations given in this Kāṇḍa. Some of these adhikāras represent the adhikārasūtras given in Pāṇini’s grammar, e.g. Krtyādhiḥikāra¹ (III,1,96 to III,1,132) illustrated in BK.,VI,46–67; Tāchchhilikādhiḥikāra² (III,2,134 to III,2,177) illustrated in BK.,VII,1–27; ‘Bhāve’³ adhikāra (III,3,20 to III,3,93) illustrated in BK.,VII,34–67;

1 E.g. the word ‘sahya’ in BK.,VI,47 is governed by the sutra ‘Sakisahasōcha’ (III,1,99).
2 E.g. the word ‘apalāsinah’ in BK.,VII,12, is governed by the sutra ‘Apepha lasah’ (III,2,144).
3 E.g. the word ‘samravah’ (BK.,VII,35) is governed by the sutra ‘Upasargaruvah’ (III,2,22).
Atmanepadādhiṅkāra¹ (I,3,12 to I,3,93) illustrated in BK.,VIII, 1-48; Kārakādhiṅkāra² (I,4,23 to I,4,54) illustrated in BK., VIII,70-84; Karmapravachanīyādhiṅkāra³ (I,4,84 to I,4,97) illustrated in BK.,VIII,85-93; and Anabhīhitē adhiṅkāra⁴ (II,3,1, to II,3,73) illustrated in BK., VIII,94-130.

But some other adhiṅkāras represent sūtras which are not adhiṅkārasūtras in the strict sense of the term. In fact only the main word of sūtra of this type gets repeated in the following sūtras and not the whole of it. For instance in Tādhiṅkāra⁵ the sūtra 'Charēṣṭāh' (III,2,16) governs the sūtras III,2,17 to III,2,23; in Nidādhiṅkāra⁶ 'hit' from the sūtra 'Gaṅkuṭādibhyc-āṃśīhit' (I,2,1) governs the next three sūtras. It is illustrated in BK.,VII,91-108.

1 The form 'nyavikṣat' (BK.,VIII,7) is governed by the sūtra 'Nerīvīśā' (I,3,17).
2 The form तस्ये in तस्ये स्वाह्यमाणे 5 सैं यहन प्रियम्मानत (VII,75) is governed by the sūtra 'स्त्रेतिप्रेषा' (I,4,36).
3 The word 'भव्यनम्' in 'अभिधीपिष्टे राज्ये भव्यनमदिष्टप्रदेष्ट' (VIII,89) is governed by the sūtra 'Abhirabhāge' (I,4,91).
4 The instrumental case in दक्षिणेन in the दक्षिणेन दक्षिणेन दक्षिणेन दक्षिणेन (VIII,108) is governed by the sūtra 'Enapādāvitiya' (II,3,31).
5 The word प्रवेशस्तर्व in V,97 is governed by the sūtra 'प्रवेशस्तर्व' (III,2,19).
6 The form 'उद्भविन्तः' in BK., VII,92 is governed by the sūtra 'Vija it' (I,2,2).
The meaning of the word Adhikāra

The term 'adhikāra' should therefore be taken here in the wider sense, according to which it also applies to the rules, some portions of which govern the succeeding rules.

According to Jayamaṅgala, Mallinātha and other commentators: Adhikārakāṇḍa starts from verse 97 of Canto V and ends at the end of Canto IX. It thus covers four entire cantos with the concluding portion of the preceding one.

From the study of this Adhikārakāṇḍa it seems obvious that Bhaṭṭi has very faithfully followed Pāṇini. In the sūtras that follow the governing rules, he has maintained the exact order given by Pāṇini. Seldom do we find a governed sūtra left unillustrated by him except that pertaining to Vedic grammar.

As regards the sequence of the governing sūtras, it is found that Bhaṭṭi followed the sequence given by Pāṇini to a large extent.

Differentiation of Adhikāras by Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha

As regards the different adhikāras covered by Adhikārakāṇḍa, Jayamaṅgala classifies the illustrations under 28 adhikāras, while Mallinātha has classified them under 26 adhikāras. The adhikāras given by Jayamaṅgala are as follows:

(V,97-100) Tādhikāra; (V,104-108; VI,1-4) Āmadhikāra;
(VI,8-10) Duhādīdhikāra; (VI,16-34) Sījadhikāra; (VI,35-39) Śnamadhikāra; (VI,87-93) Krūadhikāra; (VI,94-108) Khaḍadhikāra;
(VI,109-111) Pañḍhikāra; (VI,112-133) Upapadādhikāra; (VI,134-143) Sopapadādhikāra; (VII,1-27) Tāchchhālikādhikāra; (VII,28-33)
The number of the verses here indicate those given by Jayamangala.

The adhikāras given by Mallinātha are as follows:-

(V,97-100) Ṭādhikāra; (V,104-108, VI,1-4) Āmadhikāra;
(VI,9-10) Duhādhikāra; (VI,16-34) Sijadhikāra; (VI,35-39)
Śnamadhikāra; (VI,47-68) Krtyādhikāra; (VI,72-87) Krddadhikāra,
(VI,88-94) Sopapadhikāra, (VI,95-109) Khaśādhikāra; (VI,110-112)
Ḍādhikāra; (VI,113-136);(VI,137-146) Anupapadhikāra; (VII,1-27)
Ṭaṭṭcchalikādhikāra; (VII,28-31) Uṇādiadhikāra; (VII,32-69)
Ghanadhikāra; (VII,70-85);(VII,93-95) Nidadhikāra; (VII,96-100)
Kidadhikāra; (VIII,1-69) Ātmaneapadadhikāra; (VIII,80-84)
Kārakādhikāra; (VIII,85-93), Karmapravachaniyādihikāra; (VIII,
(ix,8-11) Sichivrddhyadhikāra; 94-131) Anabhihitadhikāra; (IX,12-22) Ṭapratisēdhādihikāra;
(IX,23-57) Iḍadhikāra; (IX,58-88) Satvādihikāra ; (IX,87-91)
Satvādihikāra; (IX,92-109) Ṛtvādihikāra.

These numbers indicate those given by Mallinātha whose text sometimes contains a few verses more than those in the text of Jayamangala.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) (1) In Canto VI, the text before Mallinātha adds one line between the first line and the second line of verse 40 of (Footnote contd. on next page)
Out of these adhikāras, 22 are common in both the commentaries. Herein they both agree that kṛdadhikāra starts...

(Footnote of last page contd.)

the text before Jayamaṅgala and similarly it adds one line between the second line of verse 43 and the first line of 44.

(ii) Verse 42 in the text before Jayamaṅgala comprises three lines (i.e. six quarters), but the text before Mallinātha omits the second line and makes the verse of regular quantum.

(iii) The text before Mallinātha adds two verses between verse 122 and 123 of the text before Jayamaṅgala.

(iv) In canto VII, the text before Mallinātha adds one verse between v.59 and v.60 and one verse between v.62 and 63 of the text before Jayamaṅgala.

(v) In Canto VIII, the text before Mallinātha adds one verse between 118 and 119 of the text before Jayamaṅgala. Thus the MSS. represented by that before Mallinātha gives six additional verses: all of which occur in Adhikārakāṇḍa.

1 Ṭāḍhikāra, Āmadhikāra, Duhādiḍadhikāra, Sijadhikāra, Śnāmprakaraṇā, Krtyādhikāra, Nirupapadadhikāra, Sopapadadhikāra, Khasādhikāra, Īṭaḍhikāra, Īṭachchhīlikādhikāra, Nidadhikāra, Ātmanepadadhikāra, Kāraḍadhikāra, Karmapravachaniyādhikāra, Anabhihitādhiḥkāra, Sici vṛddhyadhikāra, Īṭapratiṣedhādhikāra, Iḍadhikāra, Satvāḍhikāra, Šatvāḍhikāra and Netvāḍhikāra.
with v. 71 of Canto VI and ends with the concluding verse of this canto, but as regards the sub-topics except Nirupapadādhikāra, Khaśādhikāra and Ḍādhikāra, there is a slight difference in classification.

First, Jayamāṅgala has designated the section covered by vs. 134-143 as Sopapadakṛt, while Mallināṭha has designated it 'Anupapadādhikāra. Actually this section comprises in the beginning Anupapadādhikāra in vs. 134-137 and sopapadādhikāra in vs. 138-1431 with one exception in the latter that the first half of the verse 140 again illustrates 'anupapadedakṛt'.

Therefore we can say that neither is quite wrong in his classification, because Jayamāṅgala has remarked 'iti sopapadedakṛt' keeping in view the concluding verses, while Mallināṭha has kept in view the beginning of this section. Jayamāṅgala should have separated the section of vs. 134-137 from the section of vs. 138-143 and named the former as 'Anupapadakṛt' at the end, while Mallināṭha should have commenced the first section as 'Anupapadādhikāra' and introduced the succeeding section as 'Sopapadādhikāra'.

Then again they differ in the section comprising verses 28-33 of Canto VIII. Jayamāṅgala has designated it 'Niradhikārakṛt' by remarking 'ito Viśeṣādhikārābhāvāt Nirvīśeṣakṛtodorśayannāha' while Mallināṭha has not included 32-33 in this adhikāra and designated this section as 'Unāḍkīpadakrtrapratyasādhikāra', even though this adhikāra covers only one verse (v. 28) out of the four verses taken by him under this adhikāra. Here Jayamāṅgala seems to be more accurate.

---

1 According to numbers given by Jayamāṅgala.
Again they differ as regards the designation of the next adhikāra styled by Jayamāṅgala as 'Bhāva akartari kārake cha śamjñyām', illustrated in verses VII, 34-67. But Mallinātha as we have seen, has included two preceding verses (32-33) in this section and designated the whole section as Gaṅadhikāra. Thus they have named this section rather differently, but here Jayamāṅgala has designated it more systematically because 'Bhāve' is technically an adhikāra sūtra, while Gaṅadhikāra is only an anuvṛtti.

Again, Jayamāṅgala has designated the next section as Strīliṅgādhikāra, which covers vs. 68-77, while Mallinātha seems to have taken this section as covered by Kṛdadhikāra, as he has not designated them specifically.

As for the classification of the verses under the above adhikāras, it thus appears that they differ only in a few adhikāras. Here also Jayamāṅgala gives a more systematic classification comparatively.

It should be noted that sometimes Mallinātha leaves certain sections of these cantos without any sub-heading e.g. the section of verses 113-136 of Canto VI and the section of verses 70-85 of Canto VII.

Actually in this Adhikārakāṇḍa, there are 16¹ adhikāras

1 Āmadhikāra, Duhādiadēhiā, Sichādhikāra, Śamadēhikāra, Kṛdadēhikāra, Nidadēhikāra, Ātmanepadādhikāra, Parasmaipadādhikāra, Kārakādēhikāra, Karmapravachenīyādēhikāra, Sichi vṛddhādēhikāra, Itapratishedhādēhikāra, Idadhikāra, Satvādēhikāra, Satvādēhikāra, and Ṛtvaḍēhikāra.
instead of 28 or 26, if we do not consider independently the sub-topics under Kṛjādhikāra and the sub-topics under Kāra-kādhikāra.

Kṛjādhikāra is: (BK.,VI,71-VII,85) which principally covers five sub-topics such as 'kṛtya', 'Nirupapada', 'Sopapada', 'Tāchchhīlika' and 'Bhāve'.

Again the sub-varieties of the sub-topic 'Sopapādhikāra' viz. Khaśādhikāra (BK.,VI,94-108), Tādhikāra (BK.,V,104-108, VII-4) and Śādhikāra (BK.,VI,109-111) have been illustrated. Strīlīṅgādhikāra (BK.,VII,68-77) again is a sub-variety of the sub-topic 'Bhāve akartari cha kārake sāṁjhīyām' (BK.,VII,34-77). These sub-topics and their sub-varieties should really be not taken as separate adhikāras.

In this context, it should be noted that the commentators have designated the section BK.,VII,1-69 as Atmanepadādhikāra, but in fact the portion is split into two sections, i.e. Atmanepadādhikāra (BK.,VIII,1-47) and Parasmaipadādhikāra (BK.,VIII,48-69).

Kāra-kādhikāra includes: Anabhihitādhikāra.

The portion of Astādhyāyī covered by Adhikārakānda.

It is clear that in Adhikārakāṇḍa, Bhāṭṭi has illustrated adhikaras from Panini's Adhyāyas I,II,III, VII and VIII. He has not illustrated any adhikaras from Adhyāyas IV,V and VI.

Bhāṭṭi has illustrated three-sevenths of the total sūtras of the Adhikārakāṇḍa from the first Adhyāya which mainly deals with 'Saṁjhīa'.
These sūtras include not even a single one from the first Pāda; a few sūtras from the Second Pāda are illustrated here, while all the sūtras from the third Pāda and majority of sūtras from the Fourth Pāda are illustrated in this Kānda. For example, Nitvādhiṣṭhā (I,2,1 to I,2,26) is illustrated in BK.,VII,91-108. As regards the sūtras in the third Pāda, those governed by the sūtra 'Anudāttahita ātmanepadam' (I,3,12) are illustrated in BK.,VIII,1-47. The adhikāras illustrated in Canto VIII comprise the Kāraka and Karmapravachanīya adhikāras from the Fourth Pāda. Out of 201 sūtras not illustrated in this kānda, 13 are illustrated in Prakīrṇakāṇḍa, while only one is illustrated in Tīhantakāṇḍa.

From the second Adhyāya, he has illustrated Anabhiḥite adhikāra which covers third Pāda. This Pāda commences with the governing sūtra 'Anabhiḥite' (II,3,1), which governs 72 sūtras that follow. One of these sūtras illustrated in Canto VII, is as follows:- The locative case in 'madhaṃ kulaṃśvabhāvyam: pitūreṇāsti mano vāyusnāyanāḥ' (BK.,VIII,117) is governed by the sūtra 'Nakṣatre cha lūpi' (II,3,45).

The other three Pādas not illustrated here, deal with the rules regarding compounds, ārādhadhātuka adhikāra and the peculiar modification in the verbs. Out of these, about 40 sūtras regarding compounds have been already illustrated in Prakīrṇakāṇḍa, while few out of the rest are illustrated in Prakīrṇakāṇḍa, and the remaining have been illustrated in Tīhantakāṇḍa that follows.

As regards the third Adhyāya, a major portion of the first Pāda and almost the entire Pādas II and III have been illustrated in Adhikārakāṇḍa. For instance, the following adhikāras
illustrated in Cantos V and VI are from first Pāda - Āmadhikāra\(^1\) (III,1,35 to III,1,41) illustrated in BK., V, 104-108, VI, 1-4; Sijadhikāra\(^2\) (III,1,44 to III,1,66) illustrated in BK., VI, 16-34; Śnamadhikāra (III,1,78) illustrated in BK., VI, 35-39; Kṛtyādhikāra (III,1,96 to III,1,132) illustrated in BK., VI, 46-67; and Nirupapādādhikāra\(^3\) (III,1,133 to III,1,150) is illustrated in BK., VI, 71-86.

The remaining portions of the first three PADAS and the entire fourth Pāda which deal with the conjugation of verbs, the uses of Tenses and Moods and terminations are not illustrated in this Kānda. Almost a half of these are illustrated in the Prakīrṇakānda and the Tiṅanṭkānda in equal proportion.

Again he has illustrated in the major portion of the second Pāda of Adhyāya VII in Canto IX. Sichi vrddhyadhiṅkāra (VII,2,1 to VII,2,7) has been illustrated in BK., IX, 8-11. Itapratisedha adhikāra (VII,2,8, to VII,2,30) and Itadhikāra\(^4\) (VII,2,35 to VII,2,78) has been illustrated in BK., IX, 12-22 and IX, 23-57 respectively.

---

1 e.g., the form 'dayāmchakre' (BK., V, 106) is governed by the sūtra 'dayāyāsascha' (III., I, 37).
2 e.g., the form 'aśīśriyat' (BK., VI, 17) is governed by the sūtra 'Miśrīrūṣrubhyāḥ kartari chaṁ' (III,1,48).
3 e.g., the word 'gāthakaih' in BK., VI, 84 is governed by the sūtra 'gasthakan' (III,1,146).
4 e.g., the form 'vivariṣuḥ' (BK., IX, 26) is governed by 'Īt Sani vā' (VII,2,41).
The remaining three Padas, dealing with the changes in the terminations, affixes and suffixes, वृद्धि, गुण and अभ्यास are not illustrated here. Prakīrṇakāṇḍa and Tiṁantakāṇḍa illustrate almost a half of these sūtras in almost an equal portion.

From Adhyāya VIII, Bhaṭṭi has illustrated only Satvādhikāra, (VIII,3,34 to VIII,3,48), Satvādhikāra (VIII,3,55 to VIII,3,117), and Natvādhikāra (VIII,4,1 to VIII,4,36). These are illustrated in BK., IX,58-66\(^1\), IX,67-91\(^2\), and IX,92-109\(^3\) respectively.

The first Pada which deals with अभ्यास and padādhiṅkāra, is here left unillustrated entirely. Four sūtras of this Pada are illustrated in Prakīrṇakāṇḍa and two in Tiṁantakāṇḍa. Two sūtras of the fourth Pada are illustrated in the Prakīrṇakāṇḍa as well as Tiṁantakāṇḍa.

With the second Pada starts the 'asiddha' section. This Pada is entirely in Adhikārakāṇḍa, but a number of sūtras therein are illustrated in the other two kāṇḍas.

He has not illustrated any adhikāra from adhyāyas IV, V and VI in this Kāṇḍa.

---

1 e.g., the word 'dhanuspaṁśabhṛtaḥ' (BK., IX,60) is governed by the sūtra 'Iṇaḥ śaḥ' (VIII,3,39).

2 e.g., the word 'pariśkandantaṁ' (BK., IX,75) is governed by the sūtra 'paṁśoḥa' (VIII,3,74).

3 e.g., the word 'antarayāṇaṁ' (BK., IX,103) is governed by the sūtra, 'āyanaṁ cha' (VIII,4,25).
In Adhyāya IV, the noun terminations are given in sutras IV,1,1-2 and then the formation of feminine bases is dealt with in sutras IV,1,3-75. This is followed by the section of taddhitas, which covers the remaining sutras of the first Pāda and the succeeding three Pādas of adhyāya IV and the entire Adhyāya V.

Adhyāya VI commences with 'dvirvachanasprakaraṇa' (VI,1,1-12) followed by 'samprasāraṇa prakaraṇa' (VI,1,13-44), 'ātvaprakrāṇa' (VI,1,45-63), 'ādesapraṇaraṇa' (VI,1,64-71) and 'sandhi prakaraṇa' (VI,1,72-157) and terminates with 'svaṣprakaraṇa' (VI,1,158-223). It continues further and covers the whole second Pāda. The third Pāda gives rules regarding āluk (1-33), pumāvadabhāva (34-65) and mumāgama (66-139). Pāda IV gives rules regarding anāgādhikāra and bhavikāra.

As regards illustrations in the other kāṇḍas, he has illustrated 19 sutras regarding the formation of feminine bases and 51 sutras regarding taddhita affixes from Adhyāya IV in Prakīrṇakāṇḍa, while 9 sutras from this adhyāya have been noticed as illustrated in Tiṁantarāṇḍa.

From adhyāya V, 115 sutras are noticed as illustrated in Prakīrṇakāṇḍa and only 15 in Tiṁantarāṇḍa.

From Adhyāya VI he has illustrated 25 sutras in all from amongst the sutras 1-157 in the Prakīrṇakāṇḍa and 20 sutras in Tiṁantarāṇḍa. The poet has not illustrated any sutras from the svarapraṇaraṇa treated in the concluding portion of Pāda I and entire Pāda II.

From this review, it becomes clear that Bhaṭṭī has illustrated some select sutras from almost all sections of these
adhyāyās (IV-VI) in the Prakīrṇakāṇḍa, and a few of them from Adhyāyas IV, V and VI are also illustrated in the Tīnanta-kāṇḍa. It is probably on this account that the poet has contrived to pass over these Adhyāyas in the cantos pertaining to the Adhikārakāṇḍa.

As regards Svarapraṅkaraṇa (VI, 1, 158–223; VI, 2, 1–199.) left uncovered in all these kāṇḍas, it seems probable that this section was not deemed necessary by the poet, in whose times accents were not in vogue in classical Sanskrit.

Prakīrṇakāṇḍa - Contents and miscellaneous sūtras:

This kāṇḍa covers the first five cantos excluding the verses 97–108 of the fifth Canto. Unlike other kāṇḍas, Prakīrṇa kāṇḍa is not devoted to any specific topic.

This kāṇḍa is styled Prakīrṇakāṇḍa as it abounds throughout in illustrations of miscellaneous sūtras from the different adhyāyas of Panini's Astādhyāyī.

In a way, the other three kāṇḍas also include illustrations of some miscellaneous sūtras, but there they occur incidentally.

Naturally, grammatical topics like taddhitas, tīhanta, sandhi etc. would figure throughout in any poetic composition and accordingly illustrations of the sūtras pertaining to them can be traced to all these kāṇḍas including the first one. But unlike the other Mahākāvyas like Kumārasambhava and Raghuvamśa, Bhaṭṭīkāvyya obviously aims at illustrating these topics purposely.

The verses in the first kāṇḍa of Bhaṭṭīkāvyya accordingly abound in illustrations of Panini's sūtras.
These sūtras are not pertaining to any specific section, nor are they arranged in any systematic order. The Kāṇḍa is, therefore, appropriately designated 'Prakīrṇakāṇḍa'. As the sutras illustrated in this Kāṇḍa are scattered at random, they are obviously of the miscellaneous type.

Nevertheless, on examining the different types of topics covered by the sūtras, it is found that in comparison to the illustrations occurring in the other Kāṇḍas, the Prakīrṇakāṇḍa contains a large variety of illustrations of the sūtras pertaining to the taddhitas and samāsas.

Some illustrations of taddhitas are as follows:

(i) The word 'अग्राध्य' in BK., I, 22 is governed by the sūtra 'अग्राध्य' (IV, 4, 116).

(ii) The word 'मनस्वी' (in BK., I, 10) is governed by the sūtra 'मनस्वी' (V, 2, 121).

(iii) The word 'गिरिकूटदर्धनी' (BK., II, 30) is governed by the sūtra 'गिरिकूटदर्धनी' (V, 2, 37).

(iv) The word 'आत्मजीव' (BK., II, 48) is governed by the sūtra 'आत्मजीव' (V, 1, 9).

The outstanding sūtras illustrated in the different Kāṇḍas number as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kāṇḍa</th>
<th>Taddhita</th>
<th>Samāsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakīrṇakāṇḍa</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhikārakāṇḍa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasannakāṇḍa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiṅnantakāṇḍa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) The word 'विषाख्त' (BK.,II,50) is governed by the sutra 'गानुपच्छिनुमृत्यु' (V,2,28).

(vi) The word 'कथिन' (BK.,III,7) is governed by the sutra 'स्त्र्यादिके इमनिद्र्याः' (V,1,122).

(vii) The word 'छृद्यासम' (BK.,III,54) is governed by the sutra 'उत्तम्येण च' (IV,4,94).

(viii) The word 'रामन' (BK.,IV,18) is governed by the sutra 'कर्मम्यं भेष्यतिनिलयसि' (V,2,138).

(ix) The word 'विद्यादिकेद्विमुःप्रम्याः' (BK.,IV,41) is governed by the sutra 'द्विमिष्यो धुमेिने' (V,4,115).

(x) 'अनुकामीनता' (BK.,V,15) is governed by the sutra 'अवादधात्यतानुकामं गामी' (V,2,11).

(xi) 'श्रोणेष' (BK.,V,54) is governed by the sutra 'साम्योऽकृत्' (V,1,127).

Examples of samāsas may be cited as follows:–

(i) The compound 'सत्यवन सुरवाम' (BK.,I,5) is governed by the sutra 'सत्यवन विश्रोपणे वुष्क्रीको' (II,1,40).

(ii) The compound 'विप्रवशिक' (BK.,I,23) is governed by the sutra 'उपमतं व्याघ्रादिपिः सामाल्याध्यायोगे' (II,2,56).

(iii) The compound 'भृगुयोधय' (BK.,II,49) is governed by the sutra 'तुस्पणा: भिप्रस्तुते आभिमुख्ये' (II,1,14).

(iv) The compound 'नागेन्द्रयाध्यनिमित्ते' (BK.,III,37) is governed by the sutra 'प्रेमस्तुरासमो नागेकुलंतिपुयमिनिमिश्रस्यनि' (II,1,51).

(v) The compound 'मध्ये अलाद्' (BK.,III,50) is governed by the sutra 'चारे मध्ये चन्द्रव था' (II,1,18).
(vi) The compound कुरुक्तकवल्लिका' (BK.,III,21) is governed by the śūtra, 'तत्त्वेन नाजुविविधेनानं' (II,1,60).

(vii) The compound दिविक्षण (BK.,IV,33) is governed by the śūtra, 'तद्धुरुक्ते कृतिकुषुलम्' (VI,3,14).

(viii) The compound दुर्वर्ष लक्ष शाक्षी (BK.,IV,26) is governed by the śūtra, 'वतुर्धी तद्धार्थं अल्पित्वं सुपरिलिख्य' (II,1,36).

(ix) The compound कुरुक्तम्यस्क (BK.,V,41) is governed by the śūtra, 'कुरुक्ति प्रद्यः' (II,2,18).

(x) The compound कुरुमान्तश्च (BK.,V,85) is governed by the śūtra, 'पाय शमित्यदयाः' (II,1,4).

But as these śūtras are not illustrated in any regular sequence, the Kānda has remained to be a Prakīrṇakānda.

**General remarks on the kāndas on Grammar**

From the above analysis of Prakīrṇakānda, Adhikārakānda, and Tiṅantakānda, it becomes obvious that Bhaṭṭi has preconceived the plan of this poem as regards the illustrative aspect.

The very fact that Bhaṭṭi has undertaken to incorporate illustrations of the rules of grammar in his Mahākāvya, indicates that he must have been well-versed in grammar. Even the colophons of the text and its commentators introduce Bhaṭṭi as a great grammarian. Bhaṭṭi has efficiently given numerous illustrations pertaining to grammar and hence he emphasises in the concluding verses the important position of grammar in his composition and the utter necessity of commentary for comprehending it.

1 BK.,XXII,33-34.
It is probably with this emphasis in view that the poet commences his concluding verses with the remark that this good composition would ever lead the future and present orators to victory. 

The esteemed position of Bhaṭṭi as a grammarian is well reflected in the citation of Bhaṭṭi as an authority in several discourses on grammar. 

When a particular form occurring in it seems to violate Panini, it is with great reluctance that commentators call it Pramāda or a mistake. Great ingenuity is shown in establishing its correctness.

1 H.E.,XXII,32
2 Vide Appendix E below.
3 Vide Appendix E below.

It must be noted that the forms which are departures from Panini can hardly be called incorrect, as other grammars that have now been lost, were in the time of Bhaṭṭi considered authoritative; at two or three places Mallinātha says: - अङ्ककणानन्तरे द्रुष्टव्यम् (K.P. Trivedi, (ed.), Bhattikāvyā, Introduction,p. x, fn).
Appendix
Alleged Irregularities in the Kāṇḍas on Grammar

Before the completion of the study of the kāṇḍas on grammar, the irregularities pointed out by later scholars, in the use of certain words occurring in these kāṇḍas deserve special notice.

In view of the large number of verses (1625) of Bhattikāvya, these alleged irregularities form a very small number.

The alleged irregularities are now discussed here one by one.

1. The second half of 1.23 runs as follows:

इत्यं नृपः पूर्वमयानुवृत्तः ततो नुस्ते गमार्य नुस्त्य

Here 'नर्पह' is the subject of 'वालुलोचे' in the first quarter, but it cannot be grammatically construed with 'अनुजाज्ञे' in the second quarter.

For according to the sūtra 'Anupasargājjñāḥ (I,3,76) 'ज्ञा' takes ātmanepada even when it is transitive, provided no preposition is prefixed to it. Intransitive 'ज्ञा' takes ātmanepada terminations even when preceded by a preposition according to the sūtra 'akarmakāchcha' (I,3,45). Here the verb 'ज्ञाने' is used in ātmanepada, though it is preceded by the preposition 'अनु'.

If it can be taken as used in the active voice, it can be construed with 'नर्पह' but it cannot be in the ātmanepada as it
is preceded by a preposition. The author of Siddhānta Kaumudi\(^1\) therefore remarks:

Jayamaṅgala takes 'anujajñē' in the passive voice and construes it with 'nrpeṇa' inferred by vibhaktipariṇāma. Bhaṭṭoji Dīksit too adopts this view. Though Mallinātha notices this view given in Siddhānta Kaumudi, he adopts the reading 'anumene' in place of 'anujajñē' and this reading involves no grammatical irregularity.

Bharatamallika explains the form 'anujajñē' as follows:

(i) अज्रानुजाक्षरस्य उपसमानिन्द्रपन्नकणियैन्विजन्धनपियैनि मं |

(ii) Optionally he proposes to take the verb in the passive voice. As a second alternative, he proposes to separate 'anu' from 'jajñē' and take the former in the sense of 'paschāt'. But it hardly seems acceptable.

Prof. Kale\(^2\) however holds that according to the context, the verb is used in the active voice by poetical license. Some MSS.\(^3\) read 'anujajñāu' in place of 'anujajñē'. This reading makes the form grammatically regular and involves no metrical difficulty.

---

1 Siddhānta Kaumudi, Pt.IV, p.394.
2 Notes on BK.,I,23, p. 36.
3 K.P. Trivedi (ed.), Bhattikāvya, fn. 2:
   नातीसुजुमें जो T., Com. नातीसुजुमें (को?) E3.
2. **Madhavīya Dhātuvṛtti** has criticised Bhaṭṭī for using 'dandasūka' (I,26) in the wider sense of हिंसा in general without the establishment of that usage in Nighaṇṭus.

But etymologically, the word 'dandasūka' would apply to wild creatures that are habituated to bite maliciously.

It is true that etymologically, the word 'dandasūka' may be confined to mordacious beings. But it is beyond doubt that Bhaṭṭī has applied it here to demons. He seems to have taken the word in the wider sense of injurious, murderous and applied it to demons who are notoriously known as such.

It is well-known that many words denote several secondary meanings which not infrequently become common, or sometimes even become more prevalent in usage.

In the case of the word 'dandasūka' Bhaṭṭī seems to have followed some tradition wherein the word conveyed the secondary sense of demon. However this meaning seems to be a rare one as it is hardly found in any lexicons in Sanskrit.

But Medini (c.1159-1350), the well-known lexicon of later times, gives two meanings of the word namely a demon and a reptile.

1 **Madhavīya Dhātuvṛtti**, p. 73:

2 Medini, V,193:
3. In Madhavilya Dhatuvrtti, Sayana has also criticised the use of the word मुख्यमिदम in I,26.

Mallinatha too criticises the use of मुख्यमिदम.

Jayamangala explains the word मुख्यमिदम on the basis of the rule सप्तमस्या चर्चिपिरुद्धकर्मे: (III,4,49), which means that the रामुल्ल of the roots पीड़, सृष्टि and क्रृत preceded by उप should be used when the object of gerund used as an upapada is the same as that of the main verb and which would have stood in the Instrumental or the locative, if the gerund had not been used.

The grave objection against the use of this word in Bhattacharya is that the sūtra sanctions the application of to the roots: पीड़, सृष्टि and क्रृत preceded by उप while पीड़ is here preceded by मुख्यि and not उप.

Mallinatha explains the word as मुख्यमिदम क्रमेण नाघ्वा तथा...

Bharatamallika too favours this explanation, मुख्यमिदम पीड़ अस्त्य नन्त तथा। एतेन मुख्यद्वायुः सृष्टिमि। The commentator also cites another explanation given by others wherein the word मुख्यमिदम is taken as qualifying धनुः मुख्यि पीड़िति मुख्यमिदम-स्मिति विरोपणेन अनुप्रोतित्वेय सृष्टिमिति केवचिन्त।

1 p. 540: धनुसिसिसम्प्रवृत्तमुख्यमिदम दधाने इति कदन भृत्वकार उपर-पण्ड्यमूलाम पन्नाने।

2 BK.,I,26: इतिहासिनी रघुसिनिः दन्तसम्मात्मुख्यमिदम वनसिसिसम्प्रवृत्तमुख्यमिदम दधाने।
Bharatamallika also cites another interpretation, wherein the word मुक्ति is taken in the sense of theft (लोषण). But this explanation seems to be far-fetched.

To take मुल्लिपीडम् as modifying द्वाणे is rather preferable to taking it as qualifying धनुः.

Sabdakalpadruma (Saka 1808) and Vāchaspatya (1962 A.D.) the famous Sanskrit lexicons of encyclopaedic character and modern dictionaries of Sanskrit into English too, give demon as one of the meanings of 'dandasūka', the usage of this meaning of course is illustrated by the quotation of this line by Bhattikāvya.

4. Bhaṭṭi has used the word मुग्ध्य as an adjective of गंधवर्ण in II,10.

Normally गंध्य is changed to गण्धि at the end of a Bahuvrīhi compound, when preceded by उद्र, श्री, सु and सुरभिम according to the sūtra मात्रस्तेच्यद्ययुत्प्रच्छ वर्मिभवः (V,4,135). But as Jayamaṅgala remarks, र cannot be affixed to गंध्य here though it is preceded by सु it being forbidden by the Vārttika, गांध्यमेच्य नेत्ताकालग्रहणम्.

According to the Vārttika, गांध्य can take र at the end of the compound only when it is the natural property of the substance; and here the fragrance is acquired and not natural.

In his Manorama (quoted by K.P. Trivedi, notes on II,10, pp. 24 f) on this Vārttika, Bhaṭṭoji Dīxita also justified the use of मुग्ध्य here on the same ground.

1 कैथिन्य मुक्ति लोषण पीड्यनि ब्यंध्यनि इत्यनि योगीपरांमयं विविधिबिविभिषेति. ——— इति कैथिन्यः
Though the word in the Vārttika is interpreted differently by some grammarians, Mallinātha as well as Bhaṭṭojī Dīxiṭa- takes the word एकान्त in the sense of स्वासांतिक.

According to the other explanation of the word एकान्त, गन्ध is changed to मानिधि in the sense of fragrance rather than that of a fragrant substance. The variant reading सुमानिधि noticed by Mallinātha and Bharatamallika as well as occurring in some MSS.\(^1\) would fit in with this explanation of the word एकान्त.

5. The use of the word फलेषुग्रिहि for ascetics in II,33\(^2\) by Bhaṭṭi has been noticed as unusual as remarked in Mādhaviyā Dhatuvṛttī.\(^3\) Though the word etymologically applies to those taking fruits, it is generally used as denoting trees, yielding fruits.

The Kāśika Vṛtti says:-

अमराविलिगुहानीनिफलेषुग्रिहिक्या न। Amara and other kosas give the same sense. The same sense is however found in कीर्तिकामुदी III,60, 'स्वासान्तिकरणनः फलेषुग्रिहि' and in the Malatimādhava, Act IX ‘निवृत्तयः फलेषुग्रिहि दृष्टंवरो।’

---

1. K.P. Trivedi (ed.), Bhaṭṭikāvyā, I, p.25, fn,5: \(\text{मुगलिक} \) B. Noticed also in the Comm.
2. BK., II,33:

\(\text{आत्मसंस्थिन्यं विशिष्टिनेत्राणं फलेषुग्रिहीत हृदि कन्सपतीलाम्} |\)

3. p. 536:

\(\text{भविकायने तु फलेषुग्रिहिमात्रे प्रयूनयने,} \quad \text{"फलेषुग्रिहीत हृदि कन्सपतीलाम" इति} |\)
Here, however, the word is used in the etymological sense of "taking fruits" i.e. "living upon fruits".

6. The use of उक्षाम्प्रचुक्तः in III, 5 has given rise to criticism.

उक्षाम्प्रचुक्तः is the Periphrastic Perfect of उक्ष्. According to the सूत्र गुर्जरचारुप्रयुज्यस्य निदित्तः (III, 1, 40) nothing, not even a preposition, can be allowed to intervene between आम्ल and the forms of the roots धूः, अस्त् and कुः nor can the order be reversed.

Mallinātha however holds that the intervention of an upasarga does not make the form incorrect. Rāmānanda,* who has written Mughdhabodha on Bhaṭṭi is of the same view: "भवस्तु कुन्याम्यः"

In order to avoid the inaccuracy on the author's part, Jayamāṅgala reads उक्षाम्प्रचुक्तः and explains it as सैक्वन्त: प्रचुक्तः. This reading occurs in a few MSS.² Mallinātha criticises Jayamāṅgala for rejecting the common reading उक्षाम्प्रचुक्तः and adopting the rare one.

According to Bharatamallika, some take the genetive नगरस्य as कृमिणि and separate उक्षाम्प्रचुक्तः नगरस्य from मागोन् which

1  BK, III, 5:
उक्षाम्प्रचुक्तः नगरस्य मागोन् क्षणान् वर्ष्ण्युप्रुमुचुः सवर्ष्णान् ||


* Quoted by K.P. Trivedi, Notes on BK, III, 5, p. 37.
they construe with व्याख्यान वयस्सु. But this interpretation seems far-fetched.

7. The word अध्ययनः in BK.,III,18 has raised a controversy about its grammatical correctness. The word is the nominative singular form of present participle of इक्त्रु to remember; since it governs the genitive राध्यायन: according to the sutra ‘अध्ययनं द्वैदेशः कर्मणि’ (II,3,52).

Jayamahgala explains the form according to श्लोकेशु, but if इ is here changed to स् the form should have been आध्ययनः not अध्ययनः.

Mallinātha’s explanation of the form according to श्लोकेशु is acceptable, as इ is here changed to स् which gives the form अध्ययनः.

According to the Vārttika, इण्वदिक इनि वक्तव्यम्, the root इक्त्रु (इक्त्रु to remember) should be treated like इरु (इ to study), both being preceded by the preposition अधि here. Hence the sutra ‘इरु यणः’ (V,4,81) could be applied to अधि + इ (to remember) as well. This seems to have led Sayana to remark in his: याहविया धात्यर्भि that this prayoga is चिन्तनः.

But in fact, the Vārttika falls within the adhikāra of 'अर्धदाहतुके' (II,4,35) and hence it cannot apply to सर्वदाहतुका. It therefore cannot apply to अध्ययनः which is सर्वदाहतुका.

1 BK.,III,18:
सस्तत्वः राध्यायनार्ध्योत्सना कृत्यं तुस्मादविद्वेषः

2 p.359: एवं च ‘सस्तत्वः राध्यायनार्ध्योत्सना’ इनि भविष्योगार्थिनः
Accordingly, the form अर्धीयन्त्र should be explained according to इवादेरा and not चणादेरा.

Mallinatha's view is, therefore preferable to Jayamangala. Bhaṭṭoji Dixit also takes notice of the former¹. Bharatamallika² and Prof. K.P. Trivedi³ too favour the view of Mallinatha.

8. The occurrence of the form पणायाणम् in शोभेम् विभिन्ना पणायाणम् (III,27) is criticised in Kairatarangini⁴ and Madhaviya Dhatūrtti⁵.

The root पण्य takes आय when it is used in the sense of स्तुनि and not in that of व्यवहार. Vide the sūtra गुप्ट धूप विदिष्ठ पश्चिमनिष्ठ आय: (III,1,28).

As the context indicates, the word पणायाणम् here seems used in the sense of mercantile transactions. Jayamangala therefore takes the word as पण + आयान्.

Jayamangala notices the variant reading पणायाणम् and takes आय in the sense of स्तुनि. He also notices a third reading प्रणाणम्.

Bharatamallika gives another variant reading, namely, विभिन्न पणायाणम् which means transactions in the market places (विभिन्न + आयान).

1 Siddhānta Kaumudi, pt.III,p.190: कैकित्वं आर्द्रविद्याकार्यस्त्यवर्तिक्यं निदेशामात्रं। तन्मलयः पण्यं। तथा व भीतं। सूर्योध्वंसार्द्धवर्षीय! |

2 Comm. on III,18 स्वाधेशं कृतिप्रमाणार्द्धवर्षीयान्तः स्तुनिस्यायानम् तैत्तिकाः भूद्वृक्षविनिष्ठमात्र सर्वादेशं। |

3 Notes on canto III,18, p.39.

4 p.66: न वोपलैम्ब विभिन्ना पणायाणम् (III,27) दिनष्टं तु भेटित्। |

5 p.127: अति एव नरदिष्यामपिः: न वोपलैम्ब विभिन्ना पणायाणम्। इति प्रमु- न्यानां भेटितं।
Some commentators read विनास अत्यावश्यक that is accusative plural of विनास (transaction).

9. Then again, Bhaṭṭi is criticised by Madhaviya Dhaṭyṛtti for the use of the compound ‘विनास’ in V,8.

Here Jayamaṅgala reads ‘विनास’ in place of ‘विनास’. This reading, which also occurs in some of the extant MSS yields a regular Bahuvrihi compound.

The commentator also notes ‘विनास’ as a variant reading. As this reading is taken and discussed by the later grammarians, it is clear that this reading was common in the MSS of their times. Anyhow it also occurred in some MSS in the time of Jayamaṅgala.

The word ‘विनास’ cannot be taken as a Bahuvrihi compound. For we cannot substitute अत्यन्त and the final अत्यन्त by अत्यन्त नामिकायां: संशयो अस्यान्तप्रायत्’ V,4,118; nor can the sūtra ‘उपसागरायु’ (V,4,119) be applicable here; since, when नामिकायां is preceded by ब्रदेश् by the Vārttikas, ब्रदेश् कारणः, ब्रदेश्य: we get विगम्या नामिकाया अस्य विग्रहः or विग्रहः.

Jayamaṅgala therefore explains the compound differently.

---

1 p. 164: ‘यदाहुः नाथ! नाद्याश्य विनास हनमाधवया’द्विभिः ब्रह्मक- चोगे विशेषविद्विन्ति ग्राह्येण भविष्यति महानो न सहने |

2 BK.,V,8: ‘यदाहुः नाथ! नाद्याश्य विनास हनमाधवया’ |

He first takes विनासिका as a karmadharaya compound and then substitutes नस for नासिका by VI,1,63, taking the Instrumental in the sense of इत्येवुतनलुक्ते (II,3,21). Hence विनासिका is equal to विगलि नासिकोपपलुक्तिता.

Bhattōji Dikṣita holds almost the same view (Siddhanta Kaumudi, pt. II, p.590).

Bharatamallika seems to notice both the explanations. Like Jayamaṅgala he first adopts the reading विनासिका and treats it as a Bahuvrihi compound. Next he also takes into consideration the other explanation of उपपलुक्तिता विोपिनी तृतीया thereby implying that he explains the other reading विनासिका.

From the variant readings given in some MSS. and the first reading adopted by Jayamaṅgala and Bharatamallika, the correct reading seems to be विनासिका. This reading causes no difficulty in the meaning or in the metre and it is hardly likely that Bhatti would not have विनासिका in his original text.

10. The form इस्नरोधः त्रिम in V,32 has given rise to criticism as सुक्षिपट in I,26.

The sūtra सङ्ग्रामं सेवपीडुसधक्षः (III,4,49) is interpreted differently. Some construe उप only in पीठ while others...

1 विगलि चासी नासिकोपपलुक्तिता

2 Like विनासिका in विनासिका नास्ति यथा: in the commentary of Jayamaṅgala, the first reading adopted by Bharatamallika seems to be विनासिका though the term is here confusedly misspelt as विनासिका in the passages of both the commentaries in Jivänanda's edition.

3 BK.,V,32: यो सङ्ग्रामुपरस्थानो इस्नरोद्घः दाधिदुः
construe it with रूढ़ि and कर्म as well. The latter view is held by Jayāditya, Durgasimha and Dharmādaśa. The former view also noticed in Dhātuvṛtti is advocated for by the author of Bhāgavṛtti.

According to this view, the form इत्तत्त्विधिः would be regular, as रूढ़ि is not necessarily construed with उप.

11. Mādhaviya Dhātuvṛtti has criticised यथामुखैनः सीताय: used by Bhaṭṭi in V.48.

In the word यथामुखैनः, the basic word is यथामुख, wherein यथा has the exceptional sense of सादृश्य To the word यथामुख thus formed, रूढ़ि (ईन्) is affixed in the sense of a: mirror or a reflector. Thus the meaning of यथामुखैनः is a mirror, but Bhaṭṭi has used it as a preposition construed with Sītā.

Mallinātha however explains it as यथामुखैनः दर्शिने यक्स्मिन् i.e. standing before Sita so that her body may be reflected in his, or in other words, 'standing just against Sītā'.

Jayamanigala has tried to explain the word in another manner: चिन्नाय मार्गी यथामुखी: प्रकरिक्षास्थः इव भृत्वा उपलुऽये |

Bharatamallika takes ईन् in the sense of a recipient of the reflection (दर्शिने स्थलायिनिमिन्), the avyayābhava

---
1 For details vide Bhāgavṛttisaṁkalan, p.23, fn. 3.
2 Ibid., p. 23: एन्दृश्यमेवं इत्तत्त्विधिः ददनुः (४,3४) इसी भृत्ययोगी
3 p. 226: भयापूति कृष्णं क्ष्याचैव वद्यद्बैग्यम् |
4 BK, V.48: यथामुखवैः सीताय: 'इसी भृत्ययोगीसिद्धिन्यः' |
compound denoting the sense of a reflection. Then he explains: that the stag was रत्नमय and क्षेत्र, therefore her face could be easily reflected into it.

Accordingly, leaving the imagery aside, the word वयामुस्वल also stands: here simply in the sense of अभिमुख (अभिमुखवर्मात्रे तिर वर्तने). Thus: Bharatamallika takes: the phrase meaning' in front of Sītā'.

12. Bhāṭṭi is also criticised for using सुचु as vocative singular of सुचु in VI,111.

The author of Śīdrāntakaumudi noted that the correct form must be सुचु and not सुचु as the sutra, नेत्रदु दु स्यानावस्थी (I,4,4) precludes the application of नदीसंज्ञा to it. Many therefore hold that this is: sheer प्रमाद.

Some contend to justify the form by applying वा in the succeeding sutra-कारिप (I,4,5) to it and making the application of the sutra नेत्रदु दु स्यानावस्थी optionally.

But the detachment of वा from आभिष renders the sutra futile. Others take the form in the neuter gender and explain it somehow.

Jayamaṅgala contends to explain the form सुचु as follows:- The word सुचु forms a Bahuvrīhi compound wherein चु becomes subordinate and सु therefore becomes सुचु

1 BK.,VI,11: हि पिनि: क्रसि है सुचु बद्रेवं बिकल्पाय सः |
2 Śīdrāntakaumudi, pt. I, p. 211: कप्प नहि इव पिनि: क्रसि है सुचु 'इनि भद्रि: |
Then 354
By the sutra, मौड़ित्यो रूपस्यनस्य (I,2,48). Then it takes ऊठ् by the sutra ऊठः (IV,1,66). The द्वारा of सुम्भू in the vocative is then established through its प्रतिपद्धति बन्ध on the basis of the sutra अन्तरालिक मूद्र (VI,1,85).

Tāranātha tries to justify the form by explaining that प्रभु should here be taken as on the part of Rāma rather than on that of the poet. Here he means that Rāma used the form inattentively as he was suffering from the pangs of separation and that the poet put the form in his lips consciously. This explanation is hardly convincing.

Mallinātha explains the form with less complexity. He applies the maxim ‘ऊठादायि ऊठ’ to it and refers it to नदीशंशा. Accordingly the form would be सुम्भू in the vocative.

Kālidāsa uses सुम्भू in the vocative in Kumārasambhava V,43 as well as in Vikramorvāsīya III,22. Mallinātha explains the form in Kumārasambhava on the same lines, but in detail.

13. As regards ‘हि नित्यः वृक्षसि है सुम्भू!’ in BK.,VI,11, it is objected that छुँ must govern the accusative according to the vārttika (अभिन्न: परित: सम्बन्धिकप्राय: प्रतियोगिपय: ) on I,4,48. To this, the author of Bhāgavṛtti replies that the accusative is an exception to the genitive indicating relation between शोच्य and शोचक. But here the संबंधण is governed by the nominative, as Kārakavibhakti predominates the Upadāvibhakti.

\[1\] Bhāgavṛtti-sahkalana, p.15: शोच्य शोचकसन्नवन्ति वधन कारकविभक्तिविना शोचय। संबंधणे नृपपद्विभारे कारकविभक्तिविना शिवस्यी।
14. The author of Bhāgavṛtti has criticised the form आहृत्यो मा रघुनमस्म in আহৃত্য মা রघূত্মাস্ম (BK, VII, 101).

Bhāgavṛtti has considered it sheer প্রমাদ because the root ন with হন takes আত্মাপদ মা only when it is intransitive according to the sūtra অস্তকাল্প (I, 4, 26) or related to one's own body according to the Vārttika on আহৃত্য মা (I, 3, 28), স্ত্যাকাল্প মা বব্বম। Here আত্মাপদ is not justified because হন is not intransitive nor does the action of killing pertain to one's own body.

But as the author of Siddhāntakaumudi (pt. IV, p. 377) explains, this প্রস্তুত of Bhatti could be defended by taking প্রাপ্য as understood in relation to রघূত্মাস্ম. In that case the word রघূত্মাস্ম would become the object of প্রাপ্য and the verb আহৃত্যমা would become intransitive as its object would be left off অববিষ্ণুত।

Here it should be noted that most of the MSS. as well as commentators like Jayamaṅgala, Mallinātha and Bharatamallika read মোদয়বেং instead of আহৃত্য মা।

The author of Subodhinī commentary gives a third reading মোদয়বেং which denotes almost the same meaning as আহৃত্য মা.

1 Bhāgavṛttisingalana, p. 8:
কব্য নন্ত্র 'আহৃত্যো বিশবালীচনস্য যা ইতি ভাগর্ভে; আহৃত্য মা রघূত্মাস্ম (ী) ইতি ভাইন্দ। প্রমাদ এদ্যাম ইতি ভাগবদৃত।

2 Bāmanora on I, 3, 28:
ধর্ণাপিতানাং যুতেড়ালয়িরোপসনামুদ্রাত ।
প্রসিদ্ধিবিবাহাত: কর্মে করিকা ক্রিয়া

3 Quoted by Mallinātha, Commentary on VII, 103 (VII, 101 according to Jayamaṅgala) p. 253.
Orthographically the reading is proximate to मीदर्धवि.

The reading adopted by the commentators and most of the MSS. precludes the discussion on the grammatical irregularity of the rare reading आद्धिव्व. MA.

15. Mādhavīya Dhatuvṛtti has criticised Bhatti for using the ablative case of राम in connection to अधीनस्तेश्व: in VIII, 72.

According to the sūtra आद्धिव्वोपयोगो (I, 4, 29) the ablative case is used only when the student is receiving instruction regularly उपयोगस्तु नियमपूर्वकविविधाप्रभुणम्;

As Hanumāt receives the message from Rāma प्रसंगन: and not नित्यन: the use of the ablative is difficult to justify.

Jayamangala however tries to justify it thus:- रामस्यार्थम्-नुन्तयानं सार्थानित्यं सदेशग्रहानम् नियमपूर्वकतिविधाय तस्करस्यद्रापानम्;

Mallinātha remarks:- रामाधिन्यातुधिनिस्तेश्वो भक्तया गृह्वित्वाचिकः;

Bharatamallika says:- रामधिनिस्तेश्व: गृह्वित्वाचिकः यत आदानमित्रयादानात्मम्;

But in fact, Bhatti seems to have used the ablative here rather loosely in the midst of several illustration of अपदानम् (VIII, 70—72) and the commentators have tried to justify the actual प्रयोग made by the poet.

1 p. 357: 'रामधिनिस्तेश्व: इति भाट्टीयोगे पञ्चमी विन्यान |

2 BK, VIII, 72: रामधिनिस्तेश्व: अध्याजनिःश्रुतानिःमिताम् |
The use of the forms of the root उप + यम्म in अत्माने-पड़ा have proved to be controversial.

As the author of Bhāgavatī points out, the following expressions in Bhattikārya are found to be controversial:—उपायेऽस्य महास्वाग्निः (XV,21), तथा उपायेऽस्य महास्वाग्निः (VIII,33), बस्तर्क्षुत्स्कम् जिन्दगिः (I,16), तोपायकालं भयं सीताम् नापायेंस्तं दिशानः (VII,101).

The sūtra उपायं: स्थ्यकरणे (I,3,56) enjoins that यम्म preceded by उप can take अत्माने-पड़ा only when it means स्थ्यकरण. But the term स्थ्यकरण is interpreted differently. The author of the Mahābhāṣya is inclined to take it in the general sense of acceptance, while the author of कासिक ण तakes it in the particular sense of पाणिग्रहण.

Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha seem to take स्थ्यकरण in the sense of पाणिग्रहण especially in the case of सीताम् नापायेंस्तं दिशानाः (VII,101).

In the case of रस्तामयुपायेंस्तं जिन्दगिः (I,16) Jayamaṅgala takes: उप + यम्म in the general sense of स्वीकरण (acceptance) and takes: the form उपायेऽस्य in the passive voice. Mallinātha, however, takes the form in the active voice and explains: स्थ्यकरण in the sense of पाणिग्रहण idiomatically. But the interpretation of Jayamaṅgala is evidently preferable, especially in view of its uniformity with the passive in the preceding quarter of the stanza.

1 Kasika on I,3,56:
पाणिग्रहणाचिबित्तिद्वीपम् स्थ्यकरण गृह्यते, न स्थ्यकरणमार्गः
In Manorama (as quoted by Prof. K.P. Trivedi, notes on BK., I,16,pp.16 f) Bhattoji Diksita also takes the ātmanepada form in the general sense of acceptance.

As regards उपायंसन आसखसम (VIII,33), Jayamaṅgala remarks that here the form उपायंसन can be taken in the sense of आनिग्रहणपूर्वककरण formally.

As an alternative, he explains the form according to the sutra समुदायेय यमोऽग्रन्थे (I,3,75) and takes the root उप+आ+यम् as equal to उद+आ+यम् i.e. 'to take'. Mallinātha observes that the use of the root उप+यम् in ātmanepada in the general sense of acceptance is चिन्त्य as it generally denotes स्वकरण i.e. आनिग्रहण.

As regards उपायंसन महास्बाणि in BK., XV,21, both Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha follow the Kāśikā in taking स्वकरण in the sense of आनिग्रहण and explain the ātmanepada form according to the sutra समुदायेय यमोऽग्रन्थे (I,3,75).

However Bhattoji Diksita takes स्वकरण in the general sense of acceptance, as indicated in his Manorama (Quoted by K.P. Trivedi, notes on I,16,pp.16 f).

In the case of नौनायत्यं भं (VII,101), Jayamaṅgala takes the verb as denoting 'to indicate', but notices no grammatical peculiarity of the form. Mallinātha observes that the verb being transitive the ātmanepada is admissible. But as Prof. K.P. Trivedi

1 Bhāgavṛtti gives a variant reading 'इस्ते कृत्य महास्बाणि (Bhāgavṛtti: Saṃkalana, p.10).

2 Notes on BK.,VII,101, pp.111 f. (VII,103 according to Mallinātha).
contends, the ātmanepada can be explained by the sūtra
समुदायं प्रथमं (I, 3, 75).

From these different expressions, it follows, that Bhaṭṭī probably used उप+यम्त in ātmanepada in the general sense of acceptance, when it denoted स्वकरण.

Thus the alleged irregularities number about twenty in all. Out of the twenty cases discussed above, six are based on certain readings for which there are variant readings, which remove the grammatical irregularities.

In the case of the different forms of उप+यम्त, four are used in the sense of स्वकरण, which here seems denoting accepting-ance in general, while one is used in altogether a different sense, namely that of indication.

The use of हा पिनि (No. 13) and इस्मोरण्ड्र (No. 10) are justifiable in certain ways.

Among the remaining seven cases, the use of दन्देशक in the sense of demons implies the adoption of its wider denotation, while the use of ग्रहणविन्द (No. 5) for sages implies its original meaning.

The use of मध्यामुद्गिन (No. 11) in relation to Sītā looking at the deer can be explained only figuratively.

The use of अधीयन्त (No. 7) नुस्तिसीस (No. 3) and मुक्त (No. 12) is defensible in a farfetched manner. The same applies to the use of the ablative in सामाद्वीपसंदेश (No. 15).

From this it follows that Bhaṭṭī who was a good grammarian, really used only a few forms that cannot be taken as regular

1 Nos. 1, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 14.
easily. Among these it is only in the case of अधिष्ठन that the unusual form may have been used by the poet for the sake of metrical facility.

Most of the unusual forms occur in the Prakṛṣṭakāṇḍa. Anyhow it seems rather strange that Bhaṭṭī who undertook to illustrate Sabdāśṭra in his Mahākāvya and who got renowned as a महावेयाकरण may have used even a few forms that may be irregular grammatically. Possibly the difficult task of interweaving the illustrations of grammar with the narration of the story made the poet stumble in a few cases.

However, Bhaṭṭī left high esteem as a grammarian to the posterity, which not infrequently cited his authority in discussion of queer grammatical forms and usages. It is held to be a sort of authority on questions of grammar.  

1 Vide: Appendix E below.