CONCLUSION

The commentaries of Kāvyaprakāśa which have been included in the present work have yielded rich results. Though all works are not up to the high standards, yet some of these are really landmarks in the scholarly tradition. Commentators, a majority of whom were well versed with the traditional lore on the subject have taken pains to make their works appealing to the scholars. Besides the division of these commentators into four categories, they can still be divided into two categories. The first of these seem to have written their commentaries to show their scholarship and establish their wide knowledge amongst the scholars. Amongst such commentators are Govinda Thakkura, Bhāttatopala, Candīdāsa, Nāgoji Bhatta, Śrīdhara and Vāmanācārya. There are other commentators too, who make the simple elucidations of the text, these are Manikyacandra, Bhīmasena, Śrīvidyācakravartin and Maheśvarācārya.

Amongst the critics of Mammata are two; who have attacked not only the theories propounded by Mammata, but also the explanations. Candīdāsa takes lead in this connection, following him is Siddhicandraśā. Siddhicandraśā has made all out attack on Mammata. There are rare places where he agrees with Mammata. The established scholarship of Candīdāsa makes the astonishing revelations, i.e. that scholars of great repute like Viśvanātha and Jagannātha not only copy his ideas but also his words. Bhīmasena has almost given the commentary Kāvyapradīpa; only after making few more additions, which
unfortunately are not very impressing. Mahesvara Bhattācārya is often found with lack of interest in the theoretic moot points of the treatise. He almost completes a formality.

The commentators have expressed their views with great elaboration in Ullāsas 2 to 5. But only few pay the required amount of attention towards the rest of the portion of the treatise. Definition of poetry, its sources and divisions have been the main points of discussion in Ullāsa I. Appertainment of conventional denotation is the point about which there are wide differences amongst commentators. Rasa-sūtra and varieties of Dhvani and its establishment also give enough scope to commentators to show their scholarship.

Mammatā gets unstrung support on most of the issues. Commentators, irrespective of their religious followings have discussed the literary theories, from the viewpoint of literary thinking. The strongest defence ever to come for any theory is for Dhvani and Rasa theories. Majority of the commentators also defend Mammatā forcefully; though some of them do not spare him also, though the nature of the work of commentators had little scope for original contributions in the field, yet the striking originality in some of them like Caṇḍīdāsa, Govinda Thakkura, Bhaṭṭagopāla and Sridhara; is certainly pleasing. These commentators not only discuss the theories with accuracy but also give the readers a taste of their wide knowledge in the sphere. Some of these works are capable of being treated as independent
works in the field; Kāvyaprakāśa Viveka of Śrīdhara, Dīpiṅka of Candīdāsa, Uddyota of Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa and Sahityacūḍāmaṇi are the specimens of this category. The work of Vamanacārya can be rightly termed as encyclopaedia of the commentaries. In this work alone 29 commentators of Kāvyaprakāśa are quoted.

In the end I can only say that only the world of scholars can decide whether my effort to put some light on these scholars has been fruitful or not.