Amongst the poeticians Mammata is the only persons who made a vivid classification of the poetic defects. A list of ten dosas is given by Bharata in his Natyasastra and other poeticians like Bhamaha, Dandi and Vaśana too have laid emphasis on the avoidance of dosas. Vaśana was the first person to make a scientific distinction between the Pada, Vakya and Artha dosas. But Mammata was the first person to enumerate the Rasa dosas separately. Several dosas of Alamkāras are also mentioned by Mammata. As on several other places, the commentators differ here too.

Māṇikyacandra is generally very brief in his exposition of this Ullāsa. It is very rare that he questions the assertion of Mammata in this chapter. He asserts that the defects ¹ pertain to Rasa but are said to be pertaining to Sabda and Artha by 'Bhakti', 'Mukhyataya Rase Doṣah; bhaktya sabdārthyoḥ'. 'Cutsamākṛtāvya', 'Asamartha' and 'Nirarthaka' cannot be found in sentence, ² because of lack of 'Aṅka', 'Yogyata' etc., but these are there in Pada. 'Pratikūlavārvam' defect can be found in a compound also,

¹Samketa, p. 122.
²Ibid., p. 130.
this is the view of commentator, but Mammaṭa thinks it is only in a sentence. All the three varieties of Visandhi have been accepted. Few more defects can be understood from the defect named 'Asthānasthapada'. In the verse cited as an example of 'Asthānasthasamāsa' there is 'Pratikulavārṇa' defect in the first portion, but in the second portion there is neither any 'Doṣa' nor any 'Gupta'. In the verse cited as an example of 'Akramadosa' Māṇikya thinks that 'Prakramabhaṅga' cannot be here, but on the other hand there is 'Gupta' named 'Karaṭavyatyāsa'. He also does not agree with those who think that there is 'Nyūnapadadosa' in the verse 'Dvyam gatam' etc. On all other defects Māṇikya completes his commentary in a way of formality.

Śrvidyācakravartin declares in his 'Sampradāya-prakāśini' that defects of Rasa² are the greatest defects, the Arthadosas come next and Sābda doṣas are less important as compared to the first two kinds of Doṣas. Why the 'Padadoṣas' are enumerated first? The justification comes from the commentator, that Rasa is in sentence and words are the basic constituents of Rasa.³ The criticism of Mamraṭa’s explanation of the verse 'Etammanda .... etc.' by 'Sandhivigrāhika' is unwarranted and is because of ignorance about...

¹Sanḍketa, p. 141. 'Varṇagrahaṇasyoplsaksnaḥ tvat śmāsa racna-āpi grāhye'.
²Sampradāya-prakāśini, p. 7 (Part II).
³Ibid., p. 8 (Part II).
the intention of Mammaṭa. ‘Paryudāsa’ cannot be there in the verse ‘Ānandasindhu’ etc.\(^1\) which has been cited by Mammaṭa as example of ‘Vimrstavidheyaṁsa’; because in ‘Paryudāsa’ it is ‘Vidhi’ which occupies a high place but here it is ‘Niṣedha’, which occupies a dominant position. ‘Viruddhamati-kṛt’ cannot be found in words as well as in compounds. When found anywhere else,\(^2\) from compounds it is to be termed as ‘Vākya Doṣa’. If pada is at all defective it is also in compound. Of Padadosas, barring three namely (i) ‘Cyutasaṁśkr̥ti (ii) Asmaṛtha (iii) Nirarthaka, all other pada-doṣas can be found in sentence as well.\(^3\) He finds no visible difference in ‘Aprayukta’, ‘Nihatartha’ and ‘Asmaṛtha’. ‘Abhavanmatayoga’ and ‘Avimrstavidheyaṁsa’ are two separate dosas. He is almost silent about the controversies pertaining to various Arthadosas.

Bhattagopala, in the very outset declares that the Expressive and Suggestive meaning both are very important in poetry. He adds that because, ‘Rasasya tu sarvakāreṇa prāthamyaṁ’\(^4\), the Rasa dosas are to be avoided at any cost, and anything that lessens the charm of Rasa must not be

\(^1\)Sampradāyapakāśini, p. 24 (Part II).

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 28. (i) Vyāṣe vākyadosa eva (ii) Svāt na tu padadosa (iii) Smāsagatameva iti niyamah’.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 31. ‘Ato dosa tryamidam varjayita doṣantarāṇi vākyāpi santi’.

\(^4\)Sāhityacudāmaṇi, p. 8 (Part II).
included in the poetry. All the three types of Doṣas as enumerated by Mammaṭa have been accepted. The 'Vidheya-vimarsa' doṣa is found, both in sentence as well as in words. The stand of Mammaṭa about the doṣa 'Paryudāsa' has been vindicated by quoting about half a dozen verses from various works.

Examples of 'Sākanṣa' doṣa in various compounds have been quoted, though Mammaṭa does not give it. It is stated clearly that 'Aprayukta' etc. are in fact the varieties of 'Asmartha'. All the defects counted above are also found in a sentence.

About the defects of sentence, it is pointed out that these are 'Vākyam na tu padam tadeka deso va'. Very often a correct version is suggested after pointing out the defect in the example given by Mammaṭa. 'Asthāmasthapada' has been defined as meaning, 'Apadasthapadapadasthasthasmāsam ceti dve', meaning thereby that 'Smāsa' is also included here in the word 'Pada'. In a verse it is pointed out that 'Vīsesaṇas' as well as 'Vīsesavas' are of two kinds. It is stressed in connection with, 'Bhagnaprakrama' doṣa, that in the use of words and meanings, the popular usage should be followed. Two varieties of 'Prakramabhaṅga', are there, the

---

1Sahityaśudāmaṇi, p. 22 (Part II).
2Ibid., p. 58 (Part II).
3Ibid.
4Ibid., pp. 65, 66 (Part II).
5Ibid., p. 70 (Part II).
first dependent on meaning and the second on word. The commentator adds the example of the variety dependent on meaning. This has not been given by Mammaṭa. He does not agree with Bhamaha that 'Punarukta' should not be regarded as Dosa. On the other hand he has shown examples where it is prominent either in 'Alamkāra' or it is present in words. He has supported Mammaṭa, as far as all other Doṣas are concerned. Towards the end in a verse is composed the practical hint for the poet about the avoidance of Doṣas.

Cāṇḍīḍasa has divided broadly the doṣas into two categories. The first of these directly harm the proper manifestation of Rasa, the second type of doṣas do it indirectly. Pada doṣas are the least harmful for Rasa that is why they have been enumerated and described first 'Cyuta-saṃskṛti' is a 'Vākyadoṣa' according to him. 'Cyuta-saṃskṛti', 'Asmartha-tatva' and 'Nirarthaka' etc. can be found in Padas only, all other are in sentences as well. He supports Mammaṭa on the point that 'Aprayukta' etc. are in fact the varieties of 'Asamartha'.

The defects of the sentence do not anyway harm Padas, but they are only harmful for a sentence. 'Pratikulavarna'

1 Sahityacūdāmaṇi, p. 94 (Part II).
2 Dipikā, p. 263. 'Dosaścā kecidāhatyaiva Rasāsvada-pakarṣakā h keciāukapakarṣa dvāreti dvi-vidhah'.
3 Ibid., p. 285. 'Padāntarāpeksne vākyadoṣa-ayamīti vācyam'.
4 Ibid., p. 285. 'Vākyameva na tu padam cātra duṣṭam'.
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is found only in sentence and not in Padās also. He explains three types of Visandhi like this *Pārthakya-vasthānam vislesah*, *Asabhārthavayāñjakatvamāśillatvam*, *Āsṛvyatvamaśṭatvam*. *Abhavanmatayoga* is separate from *Āvimṛṣṭavidheyaṇa*. While commenting upon the 'Artha-dosās' he has followed Śrīdhara three times in the very start of this portion of his commentary. All the 'Artha-dosās' have been defined together before their separate explanation or enumeration is done. *Apusta* must be counted as a separate defect, Śrīdhara has also counted it as a separate defect. Candidāsa completes the commentary on rest of the portion in a way of formal routine. However, towards and he does more elaboration than in the earlier part.

Govinda Thakkura's commentary on Ullāsa VII is most bright. It is clear and running like a stream of water. After each 'Dosā' is discussed, it is also proved, whether it is a 'Nitya Dosā' or 'Anitya Dosā'. First of all he after justifying the definition of Dosā as given by Mammaṭa, has given altogether new meaning of word 'Hati' used in the very first Kāraṇa of Dosā-Ullāsa. His meaning is 'Uḍḍesya-pratīti-vighatālakṣaṇo-apkaro haṭisabdarthah', and 'Uḍḍesya' is nothing else but the instant manifestation of Rasa. Dosās

\[\text{ Dipika, p. 286.} \]
\[\text{Ibid., p. 302. Vs. Śrīdhara, pp. 226 & 235.} \]
\[\text{Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 228.} \]
\[\text{Pradīpa, p. 245.} \]
have been categorized firstly into two, namely; 'Saksat' and those which harm the Rasa indirectly or 'Paramparya'. These again are of two kinds namely, without any meaning and and those with incapability to convey meaning. 1 'Nitya' is which cannot be avoided by any other method 'Tatraḥukaṇaraṇādanyena-prakāreṇa śādhatumaśkyo nityah'. All other defects are 'Anitya'. 2 As word is of three kinds, hence the defects pertaining to words are also of three kinds.

'Cyutasaṃskṛti' is different from 'Pratikulavarna' 3 because the main feature of this defect is the use of such words which are bitter in hearing 'Karpopatāpakasabdapravayoga'. This thing is not there in 'Pratikulavarna'. He has enumerated five places where this defect is not found. He has criticized those who call this dosa as 'Arthadoṣa', because the very principle of division amongst these two categories does not permit this. 4 'Aprayukta' is not a defect in 'Anukarna' as well as in 'Yamaka', because 'Mukhyārtha' is not hampered there. 5 The difference of 'Avacaka' from 'Asmārtha' is clearly brought out. 6 'Avacaka' has been termed as 'Nitya-dosa'.

---

1Pradīpa, p. 246.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., p. 248. 'At eva Pratikulavarnadasya bhedah'.
4Ibid., p. 249.
5Ibid., p. 250.
6Ibid., p. 253. 'Vivāksita dharmīṇah kvāpi na vacakam'. 
'Kliṣṭa' is different from 'Nihātārtha' because in the former the knowledge of the meaning is with difficulty in the latter it is delayed. 'Asmartha' etc. defects pertain only to the 'Pada', because of the use of various 'Padas' they are said to be pertaining to Padas. 'Pratikulavarga' is a dosa which pertains only to the sentence and not to 'Padas' as well. The reason for this is 'Ekatra tādṛṣṭavarṇaprayayasā Rasa-virodhītvāt'. 'Visandhi' is of three kinds, as enumerated by Mammaṭa and pertains only to 'Vākyā' and not to 'Padasa'. 'Kathitapada' can also be a 'Padadoṣa' while view of Mammaṭa is contrary to it. 'Abhavanmatayoga' cannot be included in 'Avimṛṣṭa vidheyāmsa' because here even the relationship between the words is uncognizable while in the latter it is not so. He is silent about other controversy about 'Vākyadōṣas'. 'Apuṣṭa' as defined by Bhoja is not acceptable to the commentator. 'Punrukta' is a 'Nitya-dōṣa' and cannot be confused with 'Kathitapadatva' anyway. 'Padasāndigadha' is also something different from 'Arthasandigdha'. He does not

---

1 Pradīpa, p. 261.
2 Ibid., p. 269. 'Naṇapaḍadvṛttitvameva śrāva vākyavṛtti-tvamabhipretam'.
3 Ibid., p. 292.
4 Ibid., p. 275.
5 Ibid., p. 300.
6 Ibid., p. 304.
Mahesvara starts his commentary in a traditional method, on this portion. He defines first of all what a dosa is. He declares that whatever hampers the proper manifestation of Rasa is dosa. 1 'Cyutasaṃskāra', 'Asmarta' and 'Nirarthaka' can be the dosas of sentence only while others can be found in parts of the words, as well.

'Pratikūlavarpa' 2 is to be found only in the sentences and not, anywhere else. 'Viśandhi' has been accepted of three kinds. 'Abhavanmatayoga' is a separate defect and not the same as 'Avimśṭavidheyānsa'. On all other defects there is commentary, which does not touch the debatable issues at all. The completion is done by way of routine. Only the difference between 'Nyūnapada' and 'Anabhīhitavācyā' has been shown.

Siddhāntakara Gaṇi has criticized many points in this Ullāsa pertaining to interpretation and propriety. His main contention, however, is that he excludes 'Artha-doṣas' from the category of defects and shows how these can be included in different 'Sabda-doṣas'. 3 For ascertaining the permanence and non-permanence of Doṣas, he mainly follows Govinda Thakkura. He has quoted as usual the definition of Doṣas as given by

---

1 Adarsa, p. 281.
2 Ibid., p. 329.
3 Kav. Pr., Khandāna, p. 45. 'Ityete prācinaiartha-doṣah kathitaste ukteṣu sabda-doṣas vantrabhavantītī'.
Navinas. 'Pratikulavarpa' cannot be a doṣa, because the Navinas think that 'Varnas' cannot do any harm to the 'Mukhyartha'.\footnote{Kav. Pr. Khandaṇa, p. 34. 'Tanna caru, Varanānām mukhyarthāpakakṣaktvabhavat'.} Similarly, 'cyutasaṃskṛti' and 'Aprayukta' also cannot be doṣas. In the former there is lack of potentiality to harm the meaning, in the letter the intention of the poet is involved. 'Avimṛṣṭavidheyānśa' can be defect according to some and not according to others.\footnote{Ibid., p. 36.} 'Nihitārtha' and 'Viruddhamatikṛta' are different in character, in the letter the knowledge of meaning is delayed.\footnote{Ibid., p. 37.} 'Cyutasaṃskāra' etc. are 'Pada-doṣas' only while others are 'Vākyadoṣas' only.

In 'Rasa-doṣas' also he differs sometimes from Māmāta. The direct mention (Sva-sabdavacyata) of 'Vybhicāri' etc. is not a defect but a Guna; this is the view of Navinas.

Bhimasena as usual copies Govinda Thakkura profusely. There is nothing significant in the commentary which may be different from earlier commentators. Some earlier commentators are, however, often quoted.

Vamanacārīya has written a very bulky commentary on this portion. It runs into almost 200 pages. He has quoted the two prevalent views about the definition of Dosas. The synthesis of these views presented by him is like this
'Mukhyarthapakarsakatvam doṣatvamiti matadvye-āpi lakṣāṇam'; meaning thereby that whatever harms the manifestation of primary meaning is Doṣa or defect. After a long discussion about the meaning of the word 'Hati', he declares the meaning given in Vṛtti as the only correct one.² Avācaka is different from 'Asmartha',³ because in the latter there is some power while in the former there is none. 'Apratīta' is different from 'Aprayuktā' because the arguments of Govinda Ṭhakkura hold good. 'Sarabodhini' and 'Sudhāsāgara' also support this view. Out of the sixteen 'Padadosās', thirteen can be found in sentence as well as in word. 'Cyautasamskāra', 'Nirarathaka' and 'Asmartha' pertain only to words.⁴ 'Pratikūlavarga' can be found in words as well as in sentences. On all other points, there is detailed commentary, supported by the quotations from earlier commentators as well as from other poetic works. But no where there is any difference of the commentator from Mammata.

Conclusion

There is very little difference amongst commentators on this portion. Siddhicandra Gāpī is the solitary example who does not spare Mammata. He even goes on to the length

---

¹Balabodhini, p. 263.
²Ibid., p. 265.
³Ibid., p. 274.
⁴Ibid., p. 296.
of discarding all the 'Arthadoṣas'. The explanations of Candidása have also come under fire. Those who attack him are Govinda Thakkura and Bhimasena. All other commentators complete the work in routine. Govinda Thakkura, however gives a very scholarly erudition.