The 'Kāvyaprakāśa' the manual of Poetics and Aesthetics is a work, the popularity of which has crossed the limits of time and space. The commentaries on it are more than one hundred in number. This is a clear proof of its popularity. This has been studied and commented upon by a large number of scholars on the subject, during a long span of about 900 years. Amongst these scholars were Jains, Mīmāṃsakas, and Nāyāyikas etc. In fact, this has been an essential text book for all interested in the study of Sanskrit Poetics and Indian Aesthetics. It was equally popular in Greater India. A manuscript of Kav. Pr. was found by late Rāhul Sāmkṛtyāyan in Tibet.

Though this work has been so often commented upon, even then it continues to be as much difficult as it was. Vide Mahesvāra Bhaṭṭācārya's comments ¹ "Kāvyaprakāśasya tīkā grhe grhe tathāpyeṣatathaiva durgamah". The able writer of the treatise has folded the field of whole poetics and rhetorics into only 142 Kārikās. The credit goes to the commentators for bringing into foreground the 'Beacon of light' to illuminate the darkest corners of the poetics. Though the main work of the commentators was to explain the

¹Mahesvāra's Ādarsā, p. 5.
text; even then, they are quite often original in their views. It was surprising to note that poets like Visvanātha and Jagannātha have fed themselves upon these commentaries. Most of the commentators like Śrīdhara, Rucaka, Govinda Thakkura, Candīdāsa, and Vāmanācārya have been very scholarly in their approach, supported by a vast knowledge of the Indian Philosophy, Poetics and Rhetorics.

The commentators of the Kāvyaprakāśa can be mainly divided into four categories:

1) The first of these have taken it as their business to explain the work as it is, line by line, without implicating themselves in the movements and theories expressed, or evaluating them properly. Sarasvītīrtha among early commentators is one of them as he is the foremost also.

2) Commentators of the second type try, often categorically and without sufficient vindication, to impress the invulnerability of the views expressed. This tendency of routine formality is traceable in a little more than one hundred and fifty years after the composition of the work. It is conspicuous in Śrī-Vidyā-Cakravartin and is at its outrageous best in Bhāmasena-Dīkṣita.

3) Commentators of the third type have explained the work in its historic setting. They are supremely conscious of the author's view as being the outcome of earlier investigations. Rucaka, Māṇikyacandra and Somesvara are the representatives of this type.
4) The last category comprises those who took it as their business to explain the work from the viewpoint of Canons and practice and who were often indifferent towards the outstanding issues of Kāvyaprakāśa.

A good many of the Naiyāyika commentators belong to this category. Some of them are so rigid as not to admit Vyañjanā, the cornerstone of the Sāstra.

As to the contents of the text and the evaluation thereof, the divergence of the approach bearing on the difference in the judgement, between old and the relatively modern commentators, is a point worth noting. Of Rucaka, Māṇīkya Candra, Śrīdhara and Candādasā, the last three while admitting the practical importance of Kav. Pr., are agreed that 'Uilāsa' I is not the contribution par excellence in the line of Mammaṭa. This is also the case in 'Uilāsa' X; where brevity in the Kārikā as well as in the Vṛttī has exceeded all proportions.

Some commentators like Rucaka and Māṇīkya Candra have suggested certain amendments in the Kārikā portions, the former in a spirit of supplementing what is thought to be indispensable, the latter by way of variants, to be more compatible with the spirit of the text and with the continuity of the traditional back-ground. Some of them have tried to

defend the text, foremost among them being Śrīdhara,¹ and Bhīmasena.² On rare occasions, he has of course found fault with the wording of the Vṛtti. The earlier commentators have noted interpolations quite a few prominent instances of which are furnished by the Vṛtti on Kārikā 23, where even Maṇīkya- candra³ has recognized a text which is probably not there. The text in Ullāsa X dealing with the Udāharaṇa portion has been sought to be tempered with. Rucaka’s Sāmketa, though small in bulk, is careful enough to take note of this. Jayaratha has noted a similar process in the Udāharaṇa text in the ‘Alaṃkārasarvasva’ a process which occurred in the brief span of less than half a century. One verse ‘Śrenīban- dhastajati’ etc. is left out by commentators like Govinda Thakkura, though it is noted in almost all earlier⁴ commentaries as part of the text.

A great and commendable part of the job of early commentators Rucaka, Śrīdhara, Somesvara and Bhaṭṭa Gopāla being prominent amongst them is to show how the Kav. Pr. uses and builds on the materials supplied by earlier masters, so much so that it is no exaggeration to say that almost every

¹Śrīdhara’s Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 49.
²Bhīmasena’s Suchāsāgara, p. 87.
³Maṇīkya’s Sāmketa, p. 36.
⁴Sāmketa, p. 269.
line of the Kav. Pr. either in the Kārikā or in the Vṛtti is no new matter.

The opinionists amongst commentators on the Kav. Pr. and their commentaries serve as apt specimens of the intensive study followed in our land. They have differed in their assessment of the net contribution of this work to the Śāstra. While one section, has been obsessed with the author's inconsistency and his servile acceptance of oldish views borrowed from tradition, Candidāsa took lead in this connection. The others have exalted him to the position of an embodiment of the Muse of Learning (Vāgadevtāvatāra)¹ this is the view of majority of the later commentators.

Early commentators like Śrīdhara and Bhatta Gopāla and later commentators Gadādhara Cakrawartin Bhāṭṭācārya and Kamalākarabhaṭṭa in their comments on portions Ullāsa II, IV, and V have availed themselves in the glosses of their erudition and skill in exposition, which to the uninformed students look little short of puzzling and confusing.

Often the commentators have spoken very highly of their commentaries. Some of them have done this with modesty and some with pride. The following may be cited as examples:

¹Bhimasena's Sudhāsāgara, p. 2.
1) Manikyacandra\(^1\) - "Nānagrāntha Cutūśpatheśu nibhṛti bhuyoccayam kurvata".

2) Candīdāsa\(^2\) - "Kāvyaprakāśa trūresa Kusampradāya Vyāhā Viḷola marudākuli tapatāhah Śiktah punāca; Pratipallavātāhupaitu Śrīcandīdāsa Kāvivāgamya pravāhai.

3) Sarasvatītīrtha - "Sāhityakumuda kānana nīdrāvidrāyamānayaminīnāthah; Kāvyaprakāśīṭikā vyarīracata Sarasvatītīrthāh".

4) Mahesvara - "Durvyākhyā prajānita pramoha Sāmanī vaiṣamya vidhvansani".

5) Nāgoji Bhatta - "NāgESA Bhaṭṭah kurute pranamsya sivayāśivam, Kāvyapradīpākkadyoṭam gūḍhārthasamvide".

6) Bhīmasena\(^6\) - "Śrīmatkāvyaprakāśojjvalavivṛtti-mayam Sudhāśāgarākhyām.".

Most of the commentators have additional illustrations to clarify their points introduced by my of exposition. Often these have been cited as alternate examples, introduced by the caption 'yadvā' and contain quite a few which are either their own compositions or those of their relations. Number of additional illustrations cited by some of the commentators is given below:-

\(^1\) Samekta, p. 1.
\(^2\) Dīpikā, pp. 1=2.
\(^3\) Samekta, p. 199.
\(^4\) Adarśa, p. 5.
\(^5\) Uddyota, p. 1.
\(^6\) Sudhāsāgara, p. 1.
Like Śrīdhara, most of the commentators of Kav. Pr., hailing from Mithila were well-read in Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā, though very many of them, including even the great Govinda Thakkura, were not thoroughly conversant with the traditional lore on the subject. To name a few, Bhaṭṭa Govinda Thakkura and his son, Devanātha Tarka-pancānana, Paṇḍita-rāja Raghunandan Rai, Ratanpani and his son Ravi, Narsīgha Thakkura, Kalyāṇa Upādhyāya, Bhaṭṭadeva, together with the older writer Ratnesvara, whose commentaries are available, have taken to the method of Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā.

While some of the commentators keep mum about the dual authorship of Kav. Pr., many of them have indulged in this discussion. Some of them have even attributed the Kārikā portion to Bharata. Foremost among them are Candīḍāsa and Bengali commentators headed by Mahesvaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya.

Most commentators early as well as late agree on finding a hint in the concluding verse that the work left incomplete by Mammata was completed by some other persons, but traces of joint authorship have been cleverly obliterated.

---

1Dīpikā, p. 27 Part (I), Candīḍāsa uses two words for the authors 'Grantakṛta' and 'Vṛttikṛta'.

2Mahesvaṇa's Commentary, p. 2.
This view is distinctly expressed by an early commentator like Ruyyaka who himself a Kasamirian and living at period not very remote from Mammaţa, must have been recording a well-known tradition. In this view he is followed by Jayanta Bhaţţa, Somesvara Narahari, Sarasvatīratha, Kamalakara, Ananda Jñanesvara and other early as well as late commentators. Rajahaka Ananda, also a Kasamirian commentator, is however, more explicit and he quotes a traditional verse which records Mammaţa's authorship up to the topic of 'Parikara' Alamkāra and attributes the rest to Alaţa, Alaţa or Alaka.

Some late Bengal commentators amongst whom Mahesavara Nayālamaţkāra is one, would impute the authorship of the Kārikā (Sūtra) portion of the Kavya-prakāsa to Bharata, while Bharata himself is said to have drawn upon the Alamkara section from Agnipūraṇa.

Except Bhīmasena Dīkṣita, none has given biographical information about Mammaţa. The information provided by him also proved to be erroneous later on. As is the tradition with the Sanskrit writers, a good number of commentators have not given any information about themselves. Those who have given, have done it just as a passing remark. They have not tried to delve deep into details. Sarasvatīrtha, Bhīmasena, Manikyacandra Sūri, Siddhicandra Gaṇi, Visvanātha etc. have given some biographical information about themselves.

1Introduction to Bhīmasena's Sudhāsāgara, pp. 1-2.
SELECTIVE TREATMENT OF THE COMMENTARIES

1. **Samketa** - *Samketa* is the oldest available commentary of *Kavyaprakasa*. The proof of its being oldest is that there is no mention of any commentator in the commentary, while in other commentaries we can find the name of their predecessors. The data of this commentary further proves its antiquity. *Manikyacandra*, the Jain writer of this commentary has given the year of writing this commentary as 1216 Vikram Samvat or 1150 A.D. Not only this but all the traditional and modern poeticians agree on this point that the *Samketa* of *Manikyacandra* is the oldest commentary of *Kavyaprakasa*. The latest amongst the Sanskrit commentators *Vamanacarya* has clearly stated that *Manikyacandra* is the earliest commentator of *Kavyaprakasa*.

The fact that the *Samketa* of *Manikyacandra* is the oldest commentary on *Kavyaprakasa* is responsible for its inclusion in the present study. There are two more reasons which weighed heavily for the inclusion of this commentary in the present study. The first being that he belongs to the type of those commentators who have explained the *Kavyaprakasa* in its historical setting and are also supremely conscious

---

1. *Introduction to Manikyacandra’s Samketa.*
2. *Introduction to Kavyaprakasa’s Samketa* by S.P. Bhatthacarya.
of the author’s views as the outcome of earlier investigations. The second reason is that his religious sect was Jain. The curiosity to study the impact of his religious thinking on his literary deliberations made me include this commentary for the purpose of present study. This commentary being within a range of fifty years of Kav. Pr. could also make some revelations about the impact of the treatise on the scholars, who can be termed as almost contemporaries. This commentary merits attention for still another reason. It is that the commentator has suggested amendments¹ in the Kārikā text by way of supplementing it.

In view of the above reasons this commentary has been included in the present study.

2. Dipika - Candīdāsa, the writer of the commentary Kav. Pr. Dipika is one of the early commentators on Kav. Pr. Most logically and rationally he refutes Mammaṭa. At places he has criticised him very badly; even then he has great regards for Mammaṭa. Some people have termed² him as the great denouncer of Mammaṭa. This commentary of Candīdāsa has been the main source of inspiration, nay it has been copied down to the nicest details in the Sāhityadarpāna. A careful perusal of the commentary with its wealth of information and boldness and sobriety in judgement would

¹See p. 8.
²S.P. Bhattacarya's Introduction to Dipika of Candīdāsa.
bear out the rich claims made for it. It is surprising to note that the rhetoricians of great repute like Panditrāja-Jagannātha and Viśvanātha have copied the logics and methods of Čandīḍāsa. At some places Panditrāja seems to be copying Čandīḍāsa word for word. For instance, we can compare the following words of Čandīḍāsa with Jagannātha

\[ \text{Kāvyatvamubhayadharmatayāṅgikriyamānam Sāmyogādivyāśajya Vṛtti vā}. \]

Moreover, the commentary represents the period when not mere exposition but critical exposition was also started. This commentary is nothing short of an independent treatise on Alamkāra sāstra. The writer has very often given his own definitions whenever the opportunity for the same has arisen, for instance, the definition of poetry. The treatment of the topics by the writer is not only critical but also augmented with sufficient reasons and arguments. The fact that the later writers like Viśvanātha and Jagannātha have copied down the ideas from this commentary in their texts; takes it above, the level of mere commentaries. Had Čandīḍāsa written this work as an independent Alamkāra work, it would have been acknowledged with high esteem. There is hardly any later commentator who does not make reference to this commentary. Even the commentators of great repute like Govinda Thakkura have profusely quoted from this work. The style of

---

1The comparison of definitions of poetry in this work, p. 173.

the commentator is highly impressive. Without going into
details the commentator deals with the subject in hand with
accuracy and preciseness. Candida has also testified to
his efficiency in Jyotisa while exposing the Karika's parti-
cularly in Chapter IV and IX. Hence the study of this
commentary recommends itself to achieve distinguished results.

3. Kavyaprakasa-Viveka - Srividhara the writer of
the commentary Kavyaprakasa-Viveka is one of the prolific
commentators of Kavyaprakasa-Viveka is one of the prolific
commentators of Kav. Pr. His commentary bears signs of
erudition almost in every page and there are good many quota-
tions from various authorities on diverse subjects that are
in the purview of the topic. "Namulam likhyate Nanapeksitam-
ucyate", is the author's motto. He does not confine himself
to Nyaya, as his source, but on the other hand, abounds in
citations from Buddhistic logical texts while exposing the
principles and maxims of the work. He has in an unequivocal
manner, indicated how the Kav. Pr. text is formed out of the
nucleus of earlier thought. By introduction of Cit and
Caitya, he has shown his skill in Buddhistic logic. Later
commentators have made ample use of his commentary. He also
declared himself to be Tarikakacarya. Hence he has been
taken along with other merits on the merit that he represents
Tarikas. He belongs to early 13th century, hence he also
represents 13th century, Candida has quoted him.

1 Candida Dipika, pp. 371-402.
2 Introduction to Kavyaprakasa-Viveka, p. xxviii.
Sahityacudamani - Sahityacūḍāmāṇi of Bhaṭṭa

Gopāla is a scholarly commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa which abounds in with a maximum number of additional examples, i.e. 290. This not only shows the vast scholarship of the commentator but also throws some light about his knowledge about the poetica. Quoting as many as 15 writers and from the works numbering even more than that he has been really successful to make this treatise easily understandable. The commentator has successfully carried out his assertion that he made in the Invocation, that the commentary seeks to establish the views of Mammata after rupidiating those opposed to it. Though the author of Vyaiktiviveka has come under much criticism, as far as the Anumāna theory is concerned, yet the commentator has great regard for Mahimabhaṭṭa which is evident from the following passage:

"Rasāmṛta nadi magne Dhvanikāremahāgurau,
Anumāyamapi mahimā kavi-goṣṭhi nā muñcati."  

As K. Sāmbaśiva Sāstrī asserts, this commentary belongs to a period which is very near to that of Kāvyaprakāśa, i.e. 12th century. Hence the above considerations weighed heavily for the inclusion of this commentary in the present study.

---

1 Invocation verse “Yatrānyonyamukhaṅvalokanasaṃkham Sampadyate saṃmitam, Mangalyemaṇiḍarpame maḥti cāyoge Vimarśottaram.”

2 Sahityacudamani, pp. 59, 60 (Part I).

3 Ibid., p. 3 (Part I).
5. **Sampradāyaprakāśini** - Śrīvidyācakravartin has two reputed works on poetics to his credit. The Sampradāyaprakāśini commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa and Saṃjīviṇi a commentary on Ruyaka's Alankārasarvasva. The present work though less expressive than Saṃjīviṇī, has its merit in dealing with the subject matter, in hand accurately. This commentator uses the word 'Manmatha' for Mammata which is a clear proof that the writer must have been knowing the tradition about Mammata very well. He also propounds that this work was completed by Alaka. He is one of the earlier commentators who sincerely support the theories of Dhvani and Rasa and carry on the works of great masters like Ānandvardhana.

6. **Pradīpa** - Govinda Ṭhakkura, is one of the most respected commentators of the Kav. Pr. Belonging to 14th century his fame as a commentator is of the high order. His commentary 'Pradīpa' has been held in great esteem by the students and the teachers of the Alankārasāstra. The fact that this commentary has again two commentaries on it and that also by the persons of great repute like Nāgojībhaṭṭa is ample evidence to support its case for inclusion in the present study. In fact this is the only commentary which has been commented upon. The above fact also places this work in the category of independent works on Poetics. Though he

---

1“Yadvā Mammathgranthaseṣam paripūritatavatoyamanalar- kasya svapekṣa ślokah." Sampradāya-prakāśini, p. 449 (Part II).
seems to be Naiyāyika from many of his explanations, still his skill in Grammar is superb. His explanations of the maxims like 'Mukhyarthabadhe tadyoge (p. 40) Sākyasambandho laksāṇa' etc. is good example of Naiyāyika's explanation. As at many other places, he has used his skill of grammar here also in chapter VII of Nyūnapadadoṣa's example. He is known to be famous amongst the scholars, as one who knew the heart of Mammaṭa. This commentator does not give the Vṛtti as we have it in the Kav. Pr. but now and then modifies it and clarifies it. So far as the Kārikās and the illustrations are concerned he has kept them as they were but has tried to pose an independent text "Śrīgovinda Kāvyatattvam Vyanakti". This clearly shows that he did not regard his work as simple commentary. The further vindication of this stand can be found in one of his concluding verses "Prakāśāmapi yah prakāśāyati". In fact he has dealt with in an appropriate manner the subject matter in hand.

In 14th century only a few commentaries were written the number being very small. This commentary however shows the scholarship with which the works of poetics were dealt with in that century. His profound knowledge of Vedic rituals and texts both Vedic and non-Vedic is evident from many of his explanations. The explanation of Sruti-liṅga, Vākya etc. in chapter V may be cited as one example.

---

1Pradīpa, p. 1.
The above mentioned points show clearly that without the study of this commentary the study of the Alamkaraśāstra none the less Kāvyaprakāśa is incomplete, hence it was appropriate to include this commentary in the present study.

7. **Sudhāsāgara** - Bhīmasena Dīksita's commentary

Sudhāsāgara is a representative of the Eighteenth century. Out and out a grammarian he has very often criticised the explanation given by the Naiyāyikas. For instance while explaining the passage 'Pathi Pathi Sūka Cancu etc., in Chapter 4th in connection with Dhvani, he has criticised the explanations of Naiyāyikas. Similarly at many other places in chapter two and five he has in explicit terms condemned the Naiyāyikas. He has almost written this commentary on the lines of the Kāvyapradīpa. But at certain places he follows the style of Srīvatsalāncchana Bhaṭṭa and Cakravarti Bhaṭṭacārya. But at places where Govinda Thakkura differs from Mammaṭa Bhīmasena has supported Mammaṭa refuting the arguments advanced by Govinda Thakkura. The uniqueness of this commentary lies in the fact that it has explained Kārikās, Vṛtti and illustrations separately. His firm support for the theory of suggestion places him amongst the commentators who have given ample support to Mammaṭa. Hence he has been included in the present study.

8. **Uddyota** - 'Uddyota' of Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa is a commentary on an earlier commentary, 'Pradīpa' of Govinda
Thakkura. Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa is well known as a grammarian. His numerous works in this field leave no doubt that he was preeminently a grammarian. He has written this work to explain the masterly work of Govinda Thakkura. Though it is a commentary on a commentary yet it is strikingly original. He has three great qualities of a commentator to his credit. (i) The easy explanation of the difficult spots in the text, (ii) The powerful refutation of unwarranted attacks on the original text, (iii) Acceptance of the rightful and truth. With all these three qualities he has written this commentary. His profound knowledge of not only grammar but also of Dharmāstra and Poetics has made this commentary all the more valuable. But the rare quality of this commentary is that though it is a commentary on a commentary yet it looks nothing short of a commentary on the original Kāvyaprakāśa. Keeping in view the above mentioned qualities this commentary has also been included in the present study.

9. Kāvyaprakāśa-Khandana - Siddhīcandra Gaṇḍa is one of the severest critics of Māmata. After Candīdāsa he is the only commentator who attacks Māmata at about 60 points in the whole of Kāvyaprakāśa. The very name of his book shows how much efforts he might have made to demolish the principles and divisions of Dhvani and other poetic essentials, set up by the author of Kāvyaprakāśa. Siddhīcandara's intention was to write a critical exposition and he, therefore,
calls his Vṛtti. 'Kāvyaprakāśa Khaṇḍana' to distinguish it from mere expositions. In fact Siddhīcandra wrote a big commentary in the name of his Gurū. The Brhatṭikā is not yet discovered so we cannot say anything on the relation of Kav. Pr., Khaṇḍana with it, whether Kav. Pr. Khaṇḍana is a work called from it or a separate work. It will be seen from the numbers given to the Kārikās that Siddhīcandra has left several of them and that reading of some of them differs considerably from those of published text of Kāvyaprakāśa. The verse giving the definitions of Dosa seems to be from a different work. He has at some places changed the order of the Kārikās also. The Vṛtti on the Kārikās is dealt with only in parts. Along with these things Siddhīcandra's method of refutation is also different from that of others. In the beginning he says "Tatrāṇuvādapūrvakam Kāvyaprakāśa Khaṇḍana- margbhūyate' He first explains then refutes. The above mentioned distinct features of the commentary are responsible for the inclusion of this commentary in the present study.

10. Ādarsā - Mahēśvara Bhāṭṭacārya, a Bengali commentator, has written a lucid and bulky commentary on Kav. Pr. named Ādarsā. This commentator has been popular amongst the Bengali students of Alamkāra Sāstra. The commentator has

---

1Kāavyaprakāśa Khaṇḍana, p. 1.
2Ibid., p. 36.
3Ibid., p. 1.
claimed that this commentary is the only commentary which makes the Kav. Pr. understood. He has tried to clear up in the true historical or critical spirit the acknowledged obscurities of the text. He belonged to the latter half of 17th century, this has been acknowledged by S.K. Dey. ¹

It is interesting to note that he is one amongst the commentators who impute the authorship of the Kārikā text of Kav. Pr. to Bharata and the prose Vṛtti alone to Mammaṭa. He has been termed as 'Khaṇḍana mandana Nipuṇaḥ', ² by Amrendramohan Bhattācārya who had edited this commentary. That his style has not been very much appreciated by Navīnas, is the contention of the editor. He has gone to the extent of saying that this commentary was written simply for the sake of writing 'Sarjanamityarthe-Sṛjana'. ³ But the commentary is not so bad as to be condemned like this. It may not be up to the standard of the great scholars, but certainly it recommends itself to the students for understanding the original text easily. Hence this commentary has been included in the present study.

11. Balabodhini - Vāmanācārya Jhalākara's commentary Balabodhini is most voluminous. This is almost latest in the series of Sanskrit commentaries. Amongst the

²Introduction to Ādarsa, p. 6.
³Ibid., p. 6.
scholars of taste as well as amongst the students this commentary has been most popular. Uptil now it is being studied in every corner of the country. The merit of the commentary lies in the fact that it has been built up on the material of earlier commentators in a nice way. As many as 29 commentators have been quoted at numerous spots in the commentary. The earlier commentators have been quoted sometimes word by word and sometimes only sense of their sayings has been incorporated. Only appropriate material of the predecessors has been used. The commentary has been written in an easy language, naturally with a view of making it understood to the students. The commentator has however shunned preciseness. However, the difficult style of earlier commentators which was often abounding in philosophical terminology is missing here. One more distinguishing feature of the commentary is that the commentator has been careful enough to record the difference of opinion amongst earlier writers. He has given a useful list of 46 commentators\(^1\) before the start of the commentary in verse. A useful preface giving appraisal of pre- and post-Mammata Alamkārikas and a detailed introduction of about 17 commentators\(^2\) has made the commentary all the more useful for the purpose of inclusion in the present study. The writer himself quotes 29 commentators.

\(^1\)See Appendix

\(^2\)Ibid.