CHAPTER II

WORKS OF DAKULIN

Rājaśekhara in a verse attributes the composition of three works to Daṇḍin, and taking the Kāvyādāra and Daśakumāracarita to be the two works of his, scholars have made various conjectures about his third book. Thus, Pischel suggested the Mruchakatika as the third requisite book on the ground that it contains the verse * limpativa * etc. ( occurring in Kāvyādāra) which, according to him, is ascribed to Daṇḍin by Pratihārenduṛaja, and that the society depicted in the play closely resembles that described in Daśakumāracarita. Pischel’s curious argument will land us, as Dr. De remarks rightly, in the absurdity of identifying Daṇḍin with Bhasa as well, inasmuch as the same verse occurs in the Bhāsa-plays also. Moreover, the fact that


2. Some scholars do not include even these works in the trio. Acc. to Agashe, while DKC. is not a work of the old Daṇḍin referred to by Rājaśekhara, KA. is not a 'prabandha' (literary composition). Thus in his view, all the three prabandhas of Daṇḍin have been lost; cf. Agashe, op. cit. p. 111vi; 11xvii; cf. below also.

3. Cf. Mruchh. I, 34; KA. II. 362; also 226 (first line only). Acc. to Dr. De (HSP., I, p. 60) the reading in full (II. 362), on which apparently Pischel’s theory was based, is doubtful; the verse is absent in the Tibetan version of the text (JRAS., 1903) as well as in Kannacharya ed. This seems, however, to be the result of an error of omission, because the context requires the verse.

4. Cf. comm. Laghuvṛti on Udbhāta p. 26. As pointed out by De (HSP., I. p. 60), Pischel is not accurate in stating that Pratihārenduṛaja attributes the verse to Daṇḍin. While discussing utpreksa, he simply says that Daṇḍin has already discussed at great length that the verse *limpativa * etc. is an illustration of utpreksa.

the same verse has been attributed to Bhartrumāṇa and Vikrāmā-
ditya by Sārnāvala and Vallaḥādeva, further nullifies the argument of Mr. Pischel. In fact, Daṇḍin borrowed well-known verses from various sources for illustration and discussion, as he himself admits in a general way, and the verse in question is undoubtedly a citation, as his elaborate discussion on it with the introductory words 'itīdam api' unmistakably shows. As regards the second reason adduced by Pischel for attributing Mrochakatika to Daṇḍin, it may be remarked that it is most unsafe to ascribe any two works to one author on the basis of the similarity of the state of society depicted therein. In fact, Pischel's theory which received little support from scholars, has been almost discarded now.

Chandoviciti, referred to in the Kavyādarśa, was suggested by Premacandra Tarkavādiśa and Jacobi to be an independent lost work composed by Daṇḍin. Peterson partially supported the theory on the ground that Daṇḍin has clearly referred to a book here and that, too, of his own composition and this fact, according to him, accounts for his omitting from his work the subject of metre. He, however, being disinclined to recognise in it

8. Cp. KA. I. 2; for verses cited from others, see App. V.
9. See KA. II. 226-34; cp. below also.
10. The theory has amply been refuted by Peterson (Arysha's) ed. of DKC., pp. xi-xi; Kale (DKC., p. xxii); Keith (HSL., p. 296; CSL., p. 67); De (HSP., I, p. 60); S. L. Katre (IHQ. XXIV, p. 112-3) etc.
the third pillar of his fame, regarded it as a more appendix to his Kāvyādārsa. Keith also granted the possibility of Chandoviciti being a supplement to be appended to the Kāvyādārsa. Neither of these views is tenable, because the word chandoviciti has been mentioned here in the sense of metrical science in general, as the word vidyā (science) employed to denote it in the second line of the verse in question, unmistakably shows. At the most, it may denote the science as expounded by Pīnmalācārya in his Chandashūtra. There is no justification, therefore, for regarding Dandin's allusion here as to a work of that name of his own composition. A suggestion was made that Kalāpariccheda, referred to in Kāvyādārsa, might be the third work of Dandin. But, as a matter of fact, it was not an independent book, but a chapter on arts (kalās) in the Kāvyādārsa, as the term 'pariccheda'

14. The word occurs in earlier works like Ap.Dh.5 (II. 4. 8. 11) and Kauṭ. (I. 3.3.) as one of the six Vēgāṅgas; it is also found mentioned in Varāhamihira's Br.Ś. (CIV. 64), Vamanā's KAL. (I. 3.3; 6) and in Kedārābhāṭṭa's Vṛttaratrākara (vi. 3) as a science of metre.
15. The comm., Hrd. on KA. (I. 12) regards Chandoviciti as a work written by Pīnmalācārya; In Vāsa, where the word occurs thrice (pp. 73; 95; 207), the reference seems to be to Bh. NS, XIV-XV (KM, ed.), dealing with metres and styled as chandoviciti; op. S.L. Katre: IHQ. XXIV, p. 115.
noted that the term is found applied to the extant chapters of the work itself. The enjoining phrase, 'rupam āvirbhavisyati,' which has been employed at two other places with a view to introducing an illustration, obviously refers here to the topic on arts discussed subsequently in the work itself. A chapter on arts, including drama and music does not appear to be improbable in a work of rhetorics and in the present case, the chapter on kalās, the fourth in Kāvyādārśa, actually existed at one time. Jagaddhara, in his commentary on Mālatīmādhaya, cites six passages under Daṇḍin's name. Of these, only three are directly traceable in Kāvyādārśa, while two other citations can be, with plausibility, accommodated somewhere in the present chapters of the work. One citation, however, which concerns the treatment of the prakāraṇa type of drama, cannot be incorporated anywhere in the extant text. To justify this citation, we would have to assume that Daṇḍin also wrote

18. Cū. KA. II. 265; 315.
20. Cū. comm. on Mālat. I. 10; I. 11; IX. 10; I; I. 10 and I. 18f; op. S.L. Katre: IH, XXIV, pp. 118-22; op. App. VII.
22. Cū. App. VII.
23. Cū. comm. on I. 18f.; also see App. IV.
an additional treatise either as an independent work, or more plausibly, as a section, now lost, of the Kavyadarga itself, wherein he dealt with drama as one of the sixty-four arts. The term kalāpariccheda denotes a section exactly with such a scope. Again, there are two passages cited in Jayamaṅgalā, a commentary by Yasodhara on Vatsayāna’s Kāmasūtra, as from Kavyadarga , which are not found in the extant text. These passages are related with two of the sixty-four arts which the kalāpariccheda dealt with. These instances show that when Jayaddhara ( c. between 1300-1400 A.D. ) and Yasodhara wrote their commentaries, there was a section in Kavyadarga on sixty-four arts, which later became extinct. Tradition also seems to support this view. When Daṅḍin said in Kavyadarga that the nātaka etc. will be dealt with elsewhere, he referred most probably to this chapter and not to the nātyasāstra of Bharata. But the Kalāpariccheda, though composed by Daṅḍin, could not have been meant as the third requisite work of Daṅḍin, because it was a pariccheda and not an independent work.

There are two books more which had been wrongly put in

24. Op. KA. III. 171; for 64 arts, see Kām.S. I. 3. 16; also op. sect. IV.
25. Op. comm. on Kām.S. I. 3. 16 ( the arts, duryācakayoga and kavyasaṃmasyāpūrṇa ); op. below, sect. IV. chap. IV.
the name of Daṇḍin. Of them, the drama, Mallikāmārutsa, ascribed to Daṇḍin on the basis of numerous points of similarity, has been shown beyond doubt to be the work of one Uddāṇḍin or Uddāṇḍa- nātha of the middle of 17th century A.D., while the suggestion of Mr. Haricand that Anānayastotra was the third work of Daṇḍin has been dismissed by Dr. Keith as not worthy of consideration.

All the above speculations regarding the third work of Daṇḍin have arisen on account of the needless stress put on the statement of Rājaśekhara, which, to add to the confusion, has been misconstrued also. A certain work must should be attributed to an author purely on its own merit. To ascribe a work to a particular writer on slender grounds in order to fill the number of the books the author has been credited with is not safe, and is likely to lead to wrong results, as we see in the present case. We should discuss, therefore, the works which have been traditionally ascribed to Daṇḍin on their own merit and then, if possible, try to construe the statement of Rājaśekhara in the new light.

There is complete unanimity with regard to the Kāvyā- darśa being a work of Daṇḍin or Ācārya Daṇḍin as the colophon of the work reads. The work has been frequently referred to as Daṇḍin's in literature right from the end of 7th century A.D. (his own time). The text of the work, however, seems to have come down to us in incomplete form, as we have noted above.

The second work traditionally attributed to Dāṇḍīn is Daśakumārācarīta. While errors in traditional ascription are not denied, there is no ample ground for doubting the manuscript tradition as well as the specific mention of Daśakumārācarīta as a work of Dāṇḍīn in Telugu and Kanarese versions of the romance.

An old Sanskrit work, Abhijñānaśākuntalacaritā by an anonymous author, quotes a passage from Daśakumārācarīta as Dāṇḍīn's. As seen above, there was no tradition whatsoever of differentiating Dāṇḍīn from Ācārya Dāṇḍīn and there is, in fact, strong evidence in favour of their being identical. So the position is quite good for regarding Daśakumārācarīta as a work of Dāṇḍīn, and the majority of scholars favour this view.

Connected with the Daśakumārācarīta, there is one serious problem that appertains to its prelude in various versions, called Purvapīṭhikā or Purvavṛttāntadārādana, and a

31. Viṣṇukā (end of 7th century) quotes Kā. I. 11 (last line) as Dāṇḍīn's. He has been mentioned in the Siyabakaraka (846-66 A.D.); his work has been drawn upon profusely by Arpatuṇga (815-75 A.D.) in Kavirājāmārga; also cp. for viṣṇus refers to him and to Kā. as his work, Kamsāhu (on Rudra); Abhinavagupta (AB.) etc.; cp. below, chap. III also.


34. Op. above, chap. I.

35. Op. Keith : HSL., p. 296; Kane : HSP., pp. 94-5; De : HSL. pp. 207f. etc. De, however, doubts the identity of the authors of DKC. and Kā; cp. above.
conclusion, similarly in many forms, called Uttarapīṭhikā or Daśakumāracaritadesa or simply a ninth ucchvāsa, which have been doubted for good reasons to be the genuine work of Daṇḍin. That these pīṭhikās are no part of Daṇḍin's text seems suggested at once by their names and this view is confirmed by overwhelming evidence. The title Daśakumāracarita suggests accounts of ten princes, but the present extent of Daśakumāracarita proper contains, with an abrupt commencement, the account of eight princes, the last incomplete, in eight ucchvāsas. The Pūrvapīṭhikā prefixes the tales of two princes in order to make up the required number, while the Uttarapīṭhikā complements the story of Viśvuta, left incomplete in the last ucchvāsa of Daṇḍin's text, and finally concludes the narrative.

These pīṭhikās are definitely known to be the work of different hands. There are at least three versions of Prelude: (1) the current Pūrvapīṭhikā, beginning with the verse Brahmānandacchatradanda etc., in five ucchvāsas, (2) the Pūrvavṛttāntadanda, ascribed to Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa in the colophon by the scribe, in three ucchvāsas and (3) a prelude in verse in three chapters by Vināyaka. Similarly, the Conclusion exists at

38. Cf. (1) Kala ed.; NSP. ed. etc. (2) given in the App. of Arāsaka's ed., pp. 147-55; this Bhāṭṭanārāyaṇa is different from the famous author of Veṇīśaṃhāra; op. Arāsaka, op. cit., p. xxiv. (3) noticed by Engeling, Ind. EMQ Off. Cat., vii, No. 40671/586 a, p. 1553.
The fact that numerous efforts to supply an introduction and a conclusion are known to have been made suggests that the current PurvaPithika and Uttarapithika were not accorded general acceptance as Dandin's work, while the various attempts stand no claim whatsoever. It is also important to note that these versions do not agree with each other in language and style and in extent and contents. While the current PurvaPithika is in greater detail and better style, Bhattharayana's Purva-vrtta-darsana is sketchy and is quite an inferior production.

The details of incidents also vary considerably in the two versions. As regards the Uttarapithika, the current one is


40. In PVD, we have Matisarman, for Sitarman, Dharmapala is stated to have two sons, Kampaala and Sumitra, while Padmodbhava three, Ratnodbhava, Sumantra and Suhruta, (instead of Dharmapala having three sons and Padmodbhava, two, as in PP, where Sumitra is the son of Dharmapala). As the story proceeds, we find more discrepancies in detail. In PVD, the gift of Siva Nis a Sula, instead of a gada; in the story of finding Somadatta, the brahmana wanders in Dandaka instead of the bank of Kaveri; in Somadatta's story, Kulita is mentioned, instead of Lata; in the story of finding Puspodhava, the sage is described as merely wandering on the sea-shore, instead of as returning.
better and more concise than the one by Okrapani Diksita, which is far inferior in style. The other forms also do not square with one another in point of extent and contents.

Again, these pithikas are not fully consistent with the narrative of Dandin and, apart from great difference in language/style, there are innumerable discrepancies in the details of events. While in the ancestry of Rajavahana, Puṣpodbhava, Apahāravarman, Upahāravarman and Viśruta, there is no material discrepancy, the accounts of Arthapāla and Pramati cannot be reconciled. The striking discrepancies are as follows: (1) In Dandin's text, Arthapala and Pramati are Kāmapāla's sons by Kāntimati and Tārāvalī respectively, while in the current Purvapithikā, Arthapala is Tārāvalī's son and Pramati is not his half-brother, but a son of Sumati. (2) When, in Dandin, Candavarman finds Rajavahana with the princess, he derides him as an imposter who has under the cloak of religion attracted the silly people who falsely attribute divine powers to him, but the Purvapithikā has nothing of this. (3) While Upahāravarman's own tale is that he was

from his ablutions in Rāmatīrtha and in the same story we find mention of Yavatārthapi, instead of Kālayavānapāla. Besides, the current PVD, describes the marriage of Avantisundari with Rajavahana as brought about by a magician, (op. ASKS. VII. 54ff.), while PVD. says that the hero simply found an opportunity of entering the princess' apartment where the magician was exhibiting a thunderstorm.

41. Op. DKC., pp. 126; 127; 135; 143; PVD. pp. 15; 19; also PVD. It is possible, however, that, as Kale (notes on DKC. p. 142) thinks, Tārāvalī addresses Pramati as son on his being friend of her son, as Indian ladies generally do. This seems to be supported also by the similarity of
brought by a monk, the Pūrva-pīṭhikā ascribes the task to the king. (4) The account given of the nurse of Upahāravarman in Pūrva-pīṭhikā differs in several points from that found in the original text of Daṇḍin. (5) The daughter of Upahāravarman's nurse speaks of marriage overture made to her by a Śabara and of her rescue from that plight through the efforts of a servant of the king of Mithilā, an incident not mentioned in Pūrva-pīṭhikā. (6) The fact that Prabhāravarman, on hearing that his kingdom has been annexed by his nephews, sets out for Suhma in order to take military assistance from his sister's son, the king of Suhma and enters a forest on his way, which has been described in Daṇḍin's work, has not been mentioned in Pūrva-pīṭhikā. (7) So also the part of the story of Tārāvalī that she, while returning from Malaya mountain after paying her respects to Lopāmudrā, saw an infant weeping in the cemetery at Vārāṇasī and came to know from Kuhera that the infant was the son of Kāntināti, is simply missing absent in Pūrva-pīṭhikā.

Apart from the discrepancies, the current Pūrvapīṭhikā names, Sumati and Pramati.

46. Op. DKC. p. 103; also op. ASK. pp. 16ff.
47. Op. DKC. pp. 126-7; in PVD, however, the incident occurs.
48. Dr. Keith saw a few more discrepancies in PP.; e.g. (a)
pithikā lacks the grace and finish of the genuine text and contains unfelicitous errors of grammar and idiom. Again, it has got some peculiarities of style which we seldom find in Daśiṇ's text. There is unevenness of style as between one uccaḥvasā and another and two hands may be distinguished even in the Purvapithikā itself. It is also remarkable that the usual metrical preface required by the theory in the

Acc. to Daśiṇ, Viśrūta is descended from the merchant Vāsirāvāya and is grandson of Sīndhūdattā (p. 202), but in PP., he is the grandson of Padmodhava (pp. 4; 12). (b) The scene at the end of the current PP. does not accord with the beginning of the text of Daśiṇ. But while the second discrepancy is just negligible, the first is well explained away by the v.1. Sīndhūdattā (for Sīndhūdattā), preferred in the text of Aeshe's ed. (p. 139).

49. Co. (a) grammatical errors like mahaḥabhikṣyā (p. 12); also cp. pp. 18; 53; parikṣan (p. 40), uttaratam (p. 9) etc.; (b) redundant use of words, as of bhūyaḥ for alliteration (p. 5); (c) loose diction as in bhāsikṛta-cetane makaraketane (p. 3) etc.; (d) solecism as in the use of sahāya for sahāya (p. 7); etc.

50. The characteristic features are (a) fondness for alliteration; cp. pp. 3; 4; 5; esp. cp. p. 23: kumārā mārābhī-rāmā rāmdyayauruṣā ruṣā bhāsikṛta-yayo rayopahasasamē-raṇā rjukṣhāpaṇena rjukṣhāpaṇena yānena. (b) love for passive forms, e.g. abhāni (p. 10); samabodhi (p. 11); avāmi (p. 18) etc.; (c) fondness for denominatives; e.g. nikaśayāmaṇa (p. 1) etc. cp. pp. 2; 3; 37; 42; 45; 49 etc. (d) ektakṣa love for the use of avadhīrītā (p. 3), nukaṣṭa (p. 4) etc. in comparison; cp. pp. 5; 10; 13; 22; 23. (e) repetition of some favourite usages like viśalālaka bālaka (p. 14; 20); nataṅgi (p. 17; 48; 50; 51 etc.); pravāhāyatala (p. 17; 29; 34; cp. once in DKC. p. 126); hetitati (p. 8; 23; 24) etc.

51. The first uccaḥ is the most crude, while the last is far better than other uccaḥs.; cp. Aeshe, op. cit., p. xx; Keith: HSL., p. 299. We may suppose, however, that the writer acquired greater skill as he proceeded on.
beginning of a kathā or an ākhyāyikā is missing here. The case of Pūrvavṛttāntadarsana, which reads almost like a school-boy's summary, need hardly be discussed even if it is more concise and consistent both in order of narration and the nature of incidents than the current Pūrvapīṭhikā. The prelude in verse also stands on claim whatsoever.

The position of Uttarakāṭhika is still worse. There are frequent variations from the text of Dāṇḍin. The reference to Mānasāra and his defeat and death at the hands of Rājavāhana and his companions seems to be confused, because, the reigning king of Mālava then was Darpasāra and not Mānasāra, unless we suppose that Mānasāra resumed the reins of government of Ujjayinī. The name of Vasuḍhārā has been wrongly given as Vasumatī here. Again, this is full of grammatical faults and is less ambitious in language and style. The Śeṣa by Cakrapāṇi Dīkṣita is still more objectionable; its style does not fit in with Dāṇḍin's in point/purity and force.

That these are later substitutes of the lost original portion is also confirmed by the fact that older commentators have not commented upon these parts and that some manuscripts and certain early editions do not contain them.

54. Op. DKG. p. 57; also op. PP. p. 38.
55. See UP. p. 212.
56. E.g. abhyahārat (p. 212), rajyadhūḥ (p. 213) for -dhūra (op. Fan. V. 4. 74) etc.
The authors of the current pithikas have remained unknown and it is, therefore, natural that in manuscripts the entire work should be frequently found attributed to Dandin.

Now, we are faced with the question: how to explain the curious feature that the work presents. The authors of the supplements have offered no explanation and so we are left to resort to conjectures. According to J. Hertel, Dandin left the work as we have it with an abrupt beginning and incomplete for some cause or other. The view, however, is baseless and unconvincing and the argument that if these parts of Dandin's work had ever existed, they would not have been lost is simply unacceptable. It is definite that Daksamūrayaracarita once existed in complete form; at least it did have a beginning, since, though an author may leave his work incomplete towards the close, he would

58. E.g. the comm. Pada., Bhūsa., and Laghu.; op. NSP. ed.
59. E.g. (a) Ind. Off. Cat., MS. No. 4059/2694; Engelina: Ind. Off. Cat., vii, p. 1551; (b) the Calcutta ed. of Madanamohana Tarkalakara, 1849; Agashe's ed. does not contain UP.; acc. to him, the statement in PVD. (p. 149) that Rajaahamsa recovered his lost kingdom through the favour of Vamadeva leaves no room for the Sesa or UP; op. cit., p. xxiii.
60. For rejecting the PB. as genuine work of Dandin, KSS. Sastri (ASK., intro. pp. 9-22) and G. H. Sastri (ASK., intro. pp. iii-iv) put forward the evidence of ASK. and its Svara, presuming that ASK. is the genuine prelude to DKC. and elaborate the points of difference; the presumption, however, is not tenable; see below.
hardly begin it abruptly in the middle. Mr. Hertel also made
the surmise that Daṇḍin's plan extended far beyond what he
has accomplished; he found allusions to a scheme which would
have related the history of the king Kāmapāla and his five
wives in three births, so that what we have is a mere fragment.
The conjecture is based on a very slender ground, and
there is nothing whatsoever of substantial nature to prove the
theory.

Similarly implausible is the suggestion that Avanti-
sundarīkathā is the lost prelude to Daśakumāracarita, which
question we will discuss below. Prof. Wilson made the conjectu-
re that some of the disciples of Daṇḍin filled in a sketch
approved by the author and each one tried his hand and that
possibly the longest and the one which made an approach in
manner and diction to the work of the preceptor was finally
accepted. The conjecture, though very ingenious, must be
discarded in view of the existence of various versions of the
piṭhikā, some of which are evidently late productions, and
also because some manuscripts do not have them.

In fact, Daṇḍin did complete his work, and it appears
that the work most probably contained a prelude, introducing
the ten princes and describing their setting out for the
quarter-conquest, Rājavāhana's parting from them to help

64. See DCU, p. 127; op. Kale's notes thereon.
65. Cq. Arashe ( op. cit., p. xxxi ) who mentions the surmise
of Wilson and seems to give it his support.
Mātanga, the princes' wandering about separately in search of Rājavāhana and finally their reunion, followed by the tales of the ten princes, in ten uchchvāsas and then a conclusion, describing their return to the capital and eventually their ruling over different countries as feudatories of the sovereign Rājavāhana. Later, perhaps after the 13th century A.D., when Ketana translated the original work into Telugu, a considerable portion in the beginning including the prelude and the following two uchchvāsas and a half as also the concluding portion along with a small part of the tenth uchchvāsa came to be lost. Some admirers of his work who either remembered the account of the lost portion or had some other source, supplied the missing part to the best of their ability, of course, trying to follow the style of the original text. As the current supplements betray a comparative modernity, it is possible that their authors reconstructed the lost portion from Telugu version of the original made by the poet Ketana in the middle of 13th century A.D. This fact is testified

67. G.K. Sastri (ASKS., intro p. iii) says that Dandin's scheme of the story contained not ten but eleven boys. He thinks that PP. has left out Devarakṣita, the son of Satyasārman, who was posted to watch the entrance of the cave which Rājavāhana entered (op. sect. III). The view, which is apparently based on the presumption that ASK., is a prelude to DKC., is unwarranted; see below.
69. Op. M.R. Kari: ASK., pref. p. 14; K.S. Mahadeva Sastri: ASK., intro., p. 9. But C. Hariham Sastri (ASKS., intro., p. iv) places the revision of the work before Ketana. This, however, does not seem to be probable, for in this
to by the close agreement between the current Sanskrit text and the Telugu version and by the presence in the current Pūrvavāthikā of several idioms and usages prevalent only in Telugu language. The express mention by Ketana that he is translating Dandin's book indicates that he had before him the full text of the work. The authors of the supplements either perhaps deliberately or probably in confusion termed their additions in the beginning and at the end as a prelude and a conclusion respectively, regardless of the fact that their supplements contained matter more than the original introduction and conclusion possessed. Thus, in confusion, the original prelude and the two uchhvāsas and a half (of the third) were substituted by the extant Pūrvavāthikā which itself was divided into three or five uchhvāsas. Similarly, the original conclusion and a portion of the lost tenth uchhvāsa were

70. There are a few minor differences also; e.g., the story of Somadatta comes after the meeting of Rajavāhana and Avantisundari, but before their marriage (as in ASK; op. ASKS, VII. iff.) and that the later portion is very much condensed in Telugu; op. M.R. Kavi, op. cit., p. 14.

replaced by Uttarapithikā or Śeṣa in one or four uucchvāsas.

Probably in order to make the things appear natural, the numbering of uucchvāsas was changed, the original third uucchvāsa having been made the first, the fourth numbered as second and so on.

This fact accounts for the abrupt commencement of the story of Rājavāhana in the first uucchvāsa as also for the incomplete story of Viṣrūta in the last uucchvāsa in the extant text of Daṇḍin. If the supposed original planning of the work of Daṇḍin be applied to the present Daśakumārācarita with its current pithikās, it would be divided somewhat like this:

Extant text with pithikās.

Pūrvapithikā:

I. (Introduction of ten Princes)

II. (Setting out for quarter-conquest and Rājavāhana’s parting from his companions)

III (Story of Somadatta)
IV (Story of Puṣpodbhava)
V (Story of Rājavāhana— incomplete)

Daṇḍin’s Text:

I (Story of Rājavāhana, completed)

II. (Story of Apahārāvarman)
III (Story of Upahārāvarman)
IV (Story of Arthapāla)
V (Story of Praṅati)
VI (Story of Mitrāvahana)
VII (Story of Mantrāvahana)
VIII (Story of Viṣrūta— incomplete)

Uttarapithikā:
(a) Story of Viṣrūta, completed
(b) Conclusion.

Supposed original text.

Prelude:

I (Introduction of ten princes, their setting out for quarter-conquest and Rājavāhana’s parting from his companions).

III (Story of Rājavāhana)

IV (as in extant text)

V ("

VI ("

VII ("

VIII ("

IX ("

X (Story of Viṣrūta)

Conclusion.
The other romance attributed to Dāṇḍin is Avantisundarī-kathā, which also unfortunately has come down to us in incomplete form, as is evidenced by its anonymous summary (Kathāsāra) in verse, which though itself incomplete carries the tale further up to the beginning of the story of Upahāravarmā.

According to the colophon, the name of the work is Avantisundarī and that of its author Acarya Dāṇḍin. In the introduction to the main narrative, it has been stated, in a manner similar to that followed by Bāna in his Haracarita, that the story is narrated by Dāṇḍin at the instance of his friends. That the work belongs to Dāṇḍin is further confirmed by a reference to, and a quotation from, the work as

72. A fragment of the work, which was based on a very defective MS. discovered from Kottakkal in Malabar, was published in 1924 by Mr. H. Kavi. This ed. covered only 25 pages in print. With reference to this ed., Keith (HSL, pref. p. xvi) remarked that it should never have been published from one mutilated MS. But the new ed. of the work, published from Trivandrum in 1954, is based on a far fuller MS., though fragmentary, and runs to 246 printed pages, carrying the story to the episode of Kādambarī.

73. The colophon mentioning the work as complete is evidently a mistake of the scribe who not having the continuation took the portion for a complete work. The extant work covers nearly half the story in PP., the subject-matter of which is identical; op. sect. III.

74. The ASKS, which is a faithful summary of ASK, covers the extant portion of ASK. in 658 verses (upto V. 141) and runs to VII. 125 where it breaks off. Op. sect. III., Chap. III. The writer of ASKS. has been conjectured by S. Kuppuswami Sastri to be one Pāṇḍāśikha who used (acc. to Bhoja's Sr.P.) the word Ananda in the last stanza of each canto as a distinctive mark, which we notice in ASKS., but his work, acc. to Sr.P. itself, is Sudraka-kathā (and not ASKS., which is obviously a different work); op. ASKS. intro. p. iii.
Daṇḍin's in Nāmasamrāheshālā of Appaya Dīkṣita (middle of 16th century) as also by the citation of a verse from it under Daṇḍin's name in the Sūktiratnahāra of Kalinjarāya Sūrya (14th century), as pointed out by Dr. V. Raghavan.

It may also be noted that the meaning of the panegyric of the poetess Gaṅgādevī (c. 1350 A.D.) who glorifies Ācārya Daṇḍin's poetry as sipped in ambrosia and as a jewelled mirror of Sarasvatī can well be understood with reference to Avantisundarīkathā which has the characteristics worthy of a poet of the calibre of Ācārya Daṇḍin. Besides, the work, which conforms to the rules neither of a kathā nor of an ākhyāyikā, explicitness follows the dictum of the Kāvyādārśa which refuses to accept the fine distinctions between the two species of prose kāvyā.

Some scholars doubt the ascription on the ground that there is a striking difference in style between the two romances. We have seen, however, that the difference can

75. ASK. p. 17; cp. Hoar. p. 92.
80. Op. KA. I. 29; see above chap. I, fns. 49; 82.
be accounted for, and this, therefore, should not present any real difficulty. Other objections made to Dandin's authorship of the work are the presence of supernatural element about the Gandharva who sings an Arya verse of Damodara, 32 the half-biographical and half-fanciful nature of the story of a Dandin, 33 want of clear indication of the authorship in the body of the work, non-mention of the Kiratarjunya when its author has been mentioned and the meagre extent of the text. Some of these objections refer to the older edition of the work and do not hold good now when we possess a much fuller text of the book. As regards the first objection, it may be remarked that there is in fact nothing supernatural in Gandharva's story except that he is a Gandharva. The story of Dandin, again, is fully biographical; it is only the description of the circumstances leading to his narration of the story of the katha which is fanciful. As the story of Avantisundari is imaginary and not based on historical facts as that of Haresa, the author skilfully depicts its fanciful revelation to him by the grace of the god, Visnu, unlike, of course, Bana who introduces his akhyayika as having been based on his

82. Cp. ASK, p. 9; ASKS, I. 16.
83. Cp. ASK, pp. 9-17; ASKS, I. 15-62; cp. below, chap. IV.
84. Cp. ASK, p. 10; ASKS, I. 23.
85. Cp. for these objections, De: IVt, III, pp. 398-402; Kane: HSL, p. 98 fn.
personal knowledge of Harṣa's life. Again there is a clear indication of Daṇḍin's authorship of the work in the body of the text. The non-mention of Kīrātārjunīya cannot be taken to prove much. There is no ground, therefore, for doubting Daṇḍin's authorship of Avantisundarīkathā. Dr. Kane and other scholars, though inclined to accept the attribution, hesitated to declare the same due to some of the aforesaid objections which we have amply refuted.

The Avantisundarīkathā is regarded by some scholars as the lost prelude to Daśakumāracarita. Thus it is suggested that Avantisundarīkathā is the first portion of the whole story, the current Daśakumāracarita is the middle part and there is one uucchvāsa for the Uttarapiṭhikā. It is said that Avantisundarīkathā was broken to fragments long ago with its earlier portion preserved in Kerala. When the earlier part was not available and the Vṛṣṭipithikā was prefixed to the work, it came to be called Daśakumāracarita, the stories in it being divided into uucchvāsas. The theory seems to be supported by the colophon of the first uucchvāsa in a manuscript of Daśakumāracarita which reads: 'ity Avantisundaryāṃ Daśakumāracarita prathamā caritam', and indicates that the name of

86. Cp. ASK, pp. 11-2; 17; ASKS. I. 32; 57; 63.
the work was Avantisundarīkathā and that Daśakumāracarita
formed a part thereof. But, if the name Daśakumāracarita was
given to the middle portion later, as the theory suggests,
the colophon should not have made a reference to Daśakumāra-
carita. Either the colophon which stands suspiciously solitary
is the result of some scribal confusion or there is some error
of omission. Moreover, the title Avantisundarīkathā is a
misfit in case the entire text of Daṇḍin's Daśakumāracarita
is considered to be the middle part thereof. As a matter of
fact, the titles of the two romances are appropriate only when
they are regarded as independent works. Besides, we have got
a long tradition which differentiates the two titles or works.
While the name Daśakumāracarita is distinctly given to the
simpler romance in the colophons of the manuscripts as well as
in Telugu and Kanarese versions of the text, the name of the
other romance is clearly mentioned as Avantisundarīkathā in the
colophon as also in the interior of the work, and again
it is confirmed by Appaya Dīkṣita and Vādijānghāla and
also by the title of its summary called Avantisundarīkathāsāra.

That the Avantisundarīkathā could not have been a pre-
lude to the current Daśakumāracarita is further evidenced by
great divergence of style of narration between the two works.

91. The first ucca of DKC is styled in the colophon as
Rājavāhanacarita, while the V ucca of PP, ( the story
of which is continued in I ucc of Daṇḍin ) is named
Avantisundarīpariṇāyaya. The original complete text of
Daṇḍin probably styled the ucc as Avantisundari-
Rājavāhanacarita. So the colophon in question should
have been ' iti Daśakumāracarita Avantisundari-Rāja-
vāhanacaritaṁ nāma prathama uccaḥvāsaḥ.'

92. Cp. p. 17; see above also.
While Daśakumāraraṇita has been composed in an unaffected style, the other romance clearly exhibits a strong influence on the author of the orthodox conventions and tendencies of the age in general and of the works of Subandhu and Bāṇa in particular. The manner of story-telling too, is essentially different in the two works. The style of narration and the enclosing of tales within a tale as well as the extended measure of descriptive material in Avantisundarikāthā, when compared with the simple and direct narrative in Daśakumāraraṇita, give a clear indication that the work was an independent treatment of the story of Avantisundarī, embellished in the best fashion of the age. As noted above, the Daśakumāraraṇita was written by the author in his youth, while the other romance which represents a developed art and mind, was the product of his old age, and an attempt, therefore, to establish them as originally one would be futile.

One more work, a lost dvisandhānakāvyā or a poem in double entendre is ascribed to Daṇḍin on the authority of Bhoja's Śrīpāraṇaprakāśa which makes a reference to, and a citation from, the work. The literary feats discussed in


94. Cn. below, sect. III; Dr. De ( IHQ. III., pp. 393-402), however, advanced this argument for rejecting the common authorship of DSC. and ASK; see above.

95. Cn. below, sect. III.
96. Op. Srp., VII ( mentioning the work along with the dvi-
Kāvyādārāṇa and employed in two romances are quite in keeping with his authorship of the dvisadhānakāvyya which dealt with cunningly the stories of the two Spices simultaneously, and the ascription seems to be correct.

From the foregoing discussion, it may safely be concluded that Dāṇḍin wrote four books, one on poetics, two romances and a ślagākāvyya. Now the question arises: how to reconcile with the statement of Rājaśekhara who attributes the composition/three prabandhas to him. According to Dr. Kane, all that the verse ( of Rājaśekhara ) means is that 'three compositions of Dāṇḍin are wellknown in all the three worlds' and not that Dāṇḍin wrote only three works. The interpretation, however, is not convincing. It seems rather more plausible to hold that Rājaśekhara meant by three Dāṇḍi-prabandhas only the three poetic compositions of Dāṇḍin and not his rhetorical treatise, for the term prabandha, strictly speaking, means a literary production, in which sense it has been used by classical writers and especially by Dāṇḍin and Rājaśekhara.

It would not be out of place here to discuss the probable chronological order of the works of Daṇḍin. As noted above, the Daśakumārācarita seems to be his first attempt written in unsophisticated prose. He had not yet become an ācārya and the colophons of the work record him accordingly as simply Daṇḍin. The second work may have been the Kāvyādārśa written in comparatively riper age. The Avantisundarīkathā is evidently his last work which perhaps he might not have been able to complete. The colophon of Avantisundarīkathā indicates that he had already been famed as an ācārya when he wrote the work. Unfortunately, we do not possess the dvīsamādhanakāvya and, therefore, its exact position cannot be determined. It may, however, be placed after either Daśakumārācarita or Kāvyādārśa, but might fall before Avantisundarīkathā which is evidently an elaboration, in polished form, of his earlier romance. And most likely he elaborated his first work after having composed the other writings. So the relative order of his works may be like this: (i) Daśakumārācarita, (ii) Kāvyādārśa or dvīsamādhanakāvya, (iii) dvīsamādhanakāvya or Kāvyādārśa, (iv) Avantisundarīkathā.

intro. v. 13; Sūd. II. 73; etc.; op. also KA. II. 364; III. 131; Rājaśekhara in Sūkt.M.; also op. Arashe ( op. cit., pp. 11 ff.) who however, advanced this argument for proving that the author of the three prabandhas was different from the rhetorician.