The problem of the date of Dandin is still an open question, and scholars differ widely in their opinion on the approximate period in which the great writer of Sanskrit literature lived and worked. We shall discuss below the various theories regarding the date of Dandin put forth on the basis of the evidence of the Kavyadarsha and Dasakumaracarita and finally examine the question with reference to the important evidence of the Avantisundarikathā which affords us valuable data for determining the date of the author. The lost dvisamdhānakāvya of Dandin cannot help us in the matter, save indicating that it was written much before Bhoja (reign: 1005-54 A.D.) who in his Śrīnāraprakāśa mentions, and makes a citation from, the work. The independent examination of the date of individual works of Dandin would not only strengthen the position of one date by mutual corroboration, but would also provide us with a strong evidence in support of the theory of the common authorship of the works referred to above, in addition to the evidences adduced in the previous chapter.

Much debated but still open to dispute is the question of the date of the Kavyadarsha, which we propose to detail and settle below. The upper limit of the date is established by a reference in the work to the Setubandha of Pravarasena of fifth century A.D. as also by the probable quotations or adaptations.

1. See above, chap. II, fn. 96.
2. KA. I. 34; also op. ASK. p. 20; Pravarasena II was a
from the works of Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Bāṇa and Bhamarśa, contained therein. The work quotes from Bhāsa (c. 300 A.D.) the famous verse limmatīva etc. The case of the other stanza 'mṛteti pretya'etc., however, said to have been cited from his Svapnavāsavadatta, is doubtful. Of the verses of Kālidāsa (c. 400 A.D.), there are numerous reminiscences in Kāvyādāra, and scholars are unanimous on the point that it owns a number of its illustrations to the great poet. One of the examples of varṇanīyama in the work, containing the only consonant 'n' bears a close resemblance to a similar stanza of Kirātārjunīya of Bhamarśa (c. 600 A.D.) whose influence may be traced in other illustrations of citrālamkāras as well. Kāvyādāra's indebtedness to Bāṇa (c. 610-50) is evidenced by the verse: aratnālokasaṁhāram avāryāṁ sūryaraśmibhiḥ, dṛṣṭi-rodhakaraṁ yūnāṁ yauvanaprabhavaṁ tamaḥ; which is a versification of the following passage of Kādambarī: 'kaivalaṁ ca nisarccata evābhānubhedyaṁ aratnālokocchedyaṁ adīpaprabhāpaneyam atirahanaṁ tamo yauvanaprabhavam'. Another verse of Kāvyā-

Vākātaka king (c. 410 to 440 A.D.); cp. V.V. Mirasınī: Kālidāsa, p. 42; V.S. Amravati: HSA. p. 7; according to Keith (HSL. p. 97) and D.: (HSL. p. 119), however, he was a king of Kashmir, of 5th or 6th century A.D.

3. KA. II. 226; 362; cp. Cāra. I. 19; Bāla. I. 15; also cp. Mroch. I. 34 (see chap. II).


5. While the verse is absent in the drama, it has been traced in Madālasā by the comm. Pramacandra Tarkavāgīṣa; cp. Arāsah, op. cit., pp. liv-lv.

darsa, which resembles a sloka of Magha also, might in fact be a reminiscence of a passage of Kadambari. Again, the statement in the work that irregularity is noticed with regard to the narrator in Akhyayikas where persons other than the hero are observed to have narrated the tale seems to point to the Harsha-carita where the story of Harsha has been related by Bana and not by Harsha himself. The threefold division of karna into nirvartya, vikarya and prapya in Kavyadarsa has been taken from the Vakyapadiya of Bharthari (c. 600-50 A.D.), and the fact cannot be explained away by saying that the work has simply adopted a current doctrine. As both Bana and Bharthari


8. Op. Ka. II. 137; Kd. para 103; op. Peterson; Agashe ed.; p. ix fr.; Keith's assertion (ISHL, pp. 168-9) that Bana may be the person indebted is not convincing; the opinion of Keith is evidently based on the presumption that Danarin wrote before Bana; op. ref. to Bana and his Kd. in ASK., pp. 3 and 20 respectively.


11. Op. Ka. II. 240; op. Vakya. III. 45 f; Patanjali does not divide karna into different varieties. The komis. Maharaja and Bhutiraja tell us that the division was evolved out of the sutra by Bharthari himself and this view is confirmed by Kalyana; op. Pathak: KA., xli, p. 237; also op. Da: HSP. I, op. 61-2.

12. See Keith (ISHL, pp. 168-9) who holds the view.
lived in the first half of seventh century A.D., this period may be fixed as the upper terminus of the date of Kāvyādāra. The lower limit of the Kāvyādāra's date is furnished by the Siya-bas-lakara and Kavirajamarga as also by the works of Bhāmaha and Vāmana. Siya-bas-lakara, the Sinhalese work on Rhetorics by the king Sena I or Śilameghavarnasena, who cannot be placed in any case later than 9th century A.D., refers to Danjin as one of its authorities and profusely draws upon his work. Kavirajamarga, the oldest extant work on Poetics in Kanarese, ascribed to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Amoghavarsa Nāmatuḥa (815-75 A.D.), adopts a good deal of matter from Kāvyādāra and exhibits its great influence throughout the work. Considerable time must have passed before


14. Acc. to Mahāvamśa, he reigned from 846 to 866 A.D.; cp. Barnett: JRAS. 1905, p. 841. Acc. to G.V. Mendis and Prof. Hesler (Early History of Ceylon, 1947, p. 50) his date is 831-51 A.D. Acc. to Nevill, however, the real author of the work was Akbo, VI, son of Kasup III, who ascended the throne in 741 A.D.; cp. Barnett, loc. cit. In any way, the Sinhalese work is not later than 840 A.D.

15. Its first verse is the same as KĀ. I, 1; the second verse mentions Danjin along with Kāyana, Bhāmaha and Vāmana; the 4th and 5th verses are identical with KĀ. I, 3-4; almost all the verses of KĀ. I and II are drawn upon in the work; cp. Barnett, loc. cit., p. 841; Kanis HSP., pp. 99-100; De: HSP. I, pp. 55 ff.

16. At least 6 verses in the work are translations of KĀ. II, 37; 39; 162; 214; 235; 323; most of the varieties of upamā (II. 59-85) have been adopted from KĀ. (II. 14-60); the verses in chap. III are mostly adaptations from KĀ.; cp. Pathak: Kavirajamāra, 1938, intro., op. pp. 18-9; IA., xli, p. 236; for Amogh's date, cp. A.S. Altekar: AIK, pp. 9-11.
the Kāvyādārṣa gained so much popularity to be drawn upon richly by the Sinhalese and Kanarese writers. The lower terminus can be determined more closely from the dates of Vāmāna and Bhāmāha, if their relative chronological position with Daṇḍin is settled satisfactorily. But while Vāmāna (c. 780-810) is almost unanimously regarded as later than Daṇḍin, there is sharp controversy on Daṇḍin's priority to Bhāmāha and the question needs a detailed discussion, because the problem is vital on account of its great bearing on the correct determination of the date of our author.

We shall examine below the internal as well as the external evidence and the arguments based thereon adduced by the scholars in support of their contentions. The internal evidence consists of the following terms of reference: (i) The identical or very similar verses or matter in the works of the two theorists, (ii) The closely allied matter suggesting that one author refers to, or criticises, the other, (iii) The impression regarding their relative position gathered from the general treatment of the subject-matter and from their respective styles as also from the picture of the literary state of the age, (iv) Arguments ex silentio.

17 The theory of Kielhorn and Peterson (Agashe, ed. pp. vii–ix) that Vāmāna preceded Daṇḍin has been discarded now. It was based on the following grounds: (i) KA. II. 51 is a criticism of Vāmāna IV. 2.8; (ii) KA. II. 358-9 alludes to Vāmāna and (iii) KA. I. 40-3 is a reflection on Vāmāna I. 2. 9-13. These arguments do not stand a critical examination. On the other hand, there are several points in Vāmāna which indicate an advance from Daṇḍin. With regard to the theory of rīti, which he raises to the
There is a good number of verses in the Kāvyādārda of Daṇḍin on one hand and the Kavyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha on the other, which are either identical or very similar in phraseology. The verbal resemblance is so striking that the idea of its being merely accidental cannot be entertained. Since the two authors were not the pioneers in the field, there is the possibility of their having drawn upon some common source. In some cases, however, the fact of borrowing by one author from the other seems to be evident. But, this being admitted, scholars are not unanimous as to which of the two writers is the person indebted.

One of such verses runs thus: adya yā mama Govinda jātā tvayi grhāgata, kālenaśā bhavet pritis tavaivāsamanāt punah, which occurs in both the authors as an example of preyas.

Mr. K.P. Trivedi thought that Daṇḍin was the borrower here, because, while Bhāmaha quotes his authorities itxatikly invariably and cites examples of his own composition as he himself declares, Daṇḍin does not acknowledge the source of his borrowing as in the case of limpativa etc. But, apart from the fact that Bhāmaha's text is too defective to be solely reliable and that his said declaration is not fully justified, Bhāmaha in fact does not recognise the figure, preyas, along with some other figures and

position of the soul of poetry (I. 2. 6), he shows a marked progress. He also adopts some matter from Daṇḍin; cp. I. 2. 11 with KA. I. 42 and IV. 3. 9 with KA. II. 234; cp. also De: HSP., I, p. 60 fn.; for the date of Vāmana, cp. De: HSP. I, p. 80; Kane: HSP. pp. 146-7.

18. See App. VI.
simply refers to it as having been enumerated by others.

We can naturally conclude that Bhāmaha who neither recognises nor defines the figure, cites the example from some predecessor who might be Dāṇḍin in whose work we find the example in question.

Dāṇḍin gives the verse: vijītātmabhavādeśīgurudāhāto janaḥ, himāmitradharair vyāntam vyomābhīndati, as an instance of parīhārīka riddle, while Bhāmaha quotes the second line thereof (excluding abhīndati) as an illustration of the fault avacaka. The verse seems to have been specifically ascribed to Dāṇḍin by Sāṅgadhara and there is no reason to doubt the attribution, while its being a mere citation in Bhāmaha who quotes a part of it containing no verb, seems to be more probable.

20. Cp. Kāl., II. 96; op. Medhāvin, II. 40; 38; Rāmadāman, II. 19; 58; Śākhavardhana, II. 47; Rājamitra, II. 45; III. 10; cp. Trivedi : IA., xliv (1913.), pp. 261-4.

21. KĀ. II. 226; cp. above, chap. II. He, however, expresses his indebtedness in a general way to the usages of early writers; cp. KĀ. I. 2.


23. See KĀL., III. 1-4.

24. It may be noted that Dāṇḍin (KĀ. II. 275-9 ) defines the figure, gives two examples and connects them with the definition.


26. Mr. K. P. Trivedi (Pratāp., intro., pp. xxviii ff.) doubts the correctness of the ascription, as, acc. to him Sāṅgadhara is not faultless in tracing stanzas to their original sources. But in the present case, there is no scope for doubt, as the verse in question is found in KĀ. Again, his suggestion that the verse might have been
Jacobi first held that Daṇḍin borrowed the phrase 'hetau-ca sūkṣmaśādau ca' from Bhāmaha and criticised it, though he later regarded the treatment of the figures hetu etc. as different reactions to an older list. But while there is no evidence of Daṇḍin's borrowing, Bhāmaha clearly seems to have emphatically denied the earlier view of Daṇḍin with his pointed remark that these figures do not contain vakrokti. The argument that Daṇḍin adopted four out of the seven faults of a simile from Bhāmaha carries little weight in view of the fact that Medhāvin had already enumerated the seven faults, as Bhāmaha himself points out. Instead, it can be more plausibly argued that Medhāvin added three more faults to Daṇḍin's list and Bhāmaha followed the former. Again, it is said that Daṇḍin's treatment of mahākāvyā is based on Bhāmaha's whose several terms have been adopted verbatim, but the matter appears to be traditional rather than designed for the first time by either of the two authors.

29. Op. KAL. II. 86; op. also Kane: HSP., p. 113.
32. Op. KA. I. 14-9; KAL. I. 18-20; the terms sargabandha,
The argument of Jacobi that Dāṇḍin's statement that all forms of literary speech are divided into two classes of svabhāvokti and vakrokti is based on a similar dictum of Bhamaha has no real ground for its claim, for, while in Dāṇḍin, svabhāvokti appears as an element characterising poetic speech and enjoys a prominent place as a particular figure also which Bhamaha does not recognise (though he refers to it in deference to tradition), its occurrence in the latter in 'yuktam vakrasvabhāvoktya sarvam evaitād iṣyate' is not at all in the sense of svabhāvokti.

(ii) Secondly, we shall discuss the verses which are so closely related to each other that one author seems to be referring to the other. In this connection, it may be borne in mind that Dāṇḍin seldom refers to particular views of previous theorists, though he, of course, makes a general reference to former ācāryas and their precepts. Bhamaha, on the other hand, frequently refers to the older views, many of which are traced in the Kāvyādāra. Thus he says: svabhāvoktir alamkāra iti kacit praczakṣate, arthasya tadavasthatvam svabhāvo vihito yathā. These words of Bhamaha obviously refer to sadāsraya etc. and the line mantradūta etc. occurs in both; cp. J. Nōbel: FIP., pp. 141-5.

34. Cp. KA. II. 8-13; Kal. II. 93.
35. Cp. Kal. I. 30, where vakrasvabhāvoktya means vakrasvabhāwya uktya, i.e. vakroktya.
36. Cp. I. 2; 9; II. 2; 7; 54; 300 etc.
Danḍin's view and also to his definition of the figure which is as follows: nāṇāvastham padārthānām rūpaṃ sākṣād vivṛttatī, svabhāvoktiścā jātiścetyādyā sālamākrīr yathā.

Danḍin defines the figure udatta as, āśayasya vibhūtero vā yan mahattvam anuttamaṃ, and illustrates it with the following verse: ratnabhītiṣu saṃkrāntaḥ pratibimbaśaṣṭair vṛttaḥ, jhāto Laṅkēśvaraḥ krochrād Āñjaneyena tattvataḥ. Bhāmaḥ seems to have referred to this in the following words: etad evāpare' nyena vyākyānānānāyaḥ viduh, nānārātādiyuktaṃ yat tat kilodāttam ucyate. The words ' apare ' and ' kila ' are significant in this connection.

Again, Bhāmaḥ, having dealt with the alamkāras, mentions twenty-four additional figures as acknowledged by others, and it is interesting to note that all those figures appear in Danḍin's text, many of them having been enumerated almost in the same order.

It is argued for Bhāmaḥ's priority that he treats upamārūpaka, saṃsādeha, anarvaya and utprekṣāvayava as independent figures, while Danḍin includes, with express admission,
the first in rūpaka, next two in upamā and the last in utprekṣā and thus means to refer to Bhāmaha's treatment of the figures. But Bhaṭṭi had already illustrated these figures separately and the independent status of the figures might have been traditional. Again, in case of Daṇḍin's particular reference to Bhāmaha's treatment, similar confession should have been made by Daṇḍin regarding anyonyopamā also which he includes in upamā, while it is treated independently as upameyopamā by Bhāmaha.

Now let us examine the verses which express contradictory views and appear to be directed against their counterparts in other writer. It may be remarked at the outset that while Daṇḍin does not name any predecessor, Bhāmaha does so, and some times refers to them jeeringly as sudhiyāḥ, sūmedhasāḥ ( wise men ), mahātmabhīḥ ( great men ) etc., and once as amādhasāḥ ( unwise ).

(a) According to Jacobi, De and some other scholars, Daṇḍin does not accept Bhāmaha's distinction of a kathā and an ākhyāyikā and apparently quotes in this connection the following half-verse from Bhāmaha: kanyāharanasaṅgārāṇavipra-lambhodayādayāḥ. Mr. K. P. Trivedi stressed the point divided into two kinds with seven more added to them ( II. 310-22 ). It appears that Bhāmaha adopts the list of figures from many predecessors, Daṇḍin being one of them.

that the marks of distinction between the two species specifically denoted by Dandin were precisely the same as those enumerated by Bhāmaha. Mr. J. Nobel thought that Dandin here rejected Bhāmaha's views regarding language also and that the words 'saṃskṛte ca,' which are ironical according to him, could be fully understood only when they were compared with those of Bhāmaha. But the facts (i) that the distinction between the two species was traditional and (ii) that the points of the alleged attack by Dandin do not agree in all details with Bhāmaha's views stand against the hypothesis of Dandin's borrowing from Bhāmaha; Nor can we see, with Nobel, irony in Dandin's simple words 'saṃskṛte ca.'

(b) Dandin illustrates the (jāpaka-)hetu by the half-verse, 'gato' stam arko bhātindur yānti vāsāya

46. Op. KA I. 31; II. 1; 6; II. 37; III. 4 etc.; op. śamedhāsah in I. 32; op. above fn. 20 for refs. to predecessors.

47. Op. KA I. 29; KA I. 27; also op. KA I. 23-9; KA I. 25-9; op. Jacobii: SBA., 1922, p. 215; De : [[MS]], I, p. 65; also op. Nobel and Trivedi, referred to below.


50. Mr. Trivedi ([Frātap., intro. xxviii ff.]) himself admits the fact on the indication of the word 'kila' in KA I. 23. Bāna distinguishes between the two species; he designates Noar. as an ākhyayikā and Kād. as a kathā. The writers who preceded Dandin and Bhāmaha may also be presumed to have made the distinction; op. sect. II.

51. The point about the narrator in a kathā in KA I. 24 is not exactly the view of Bhāmaha (KA I. 29); op.
Bhāmaha cites the illustration under the same figure and, characterising it as bad poetry, calls it vārttā (a form of conversation). According to Mr. K.P. Trivedi and Dr. De, Dāṇḍin here levels his remarks against Bhāmaha. But in fact, there is nothing to indicate that Dāṇḍin is dealing with Bhāmaha; the case rather seems to be opposite. It is also possible that the half-verse was traditional and was cited independently by both the authors.

(o) Bhāmaha enumerates eleven doṣas, while in Dāṇḍin, we find mention of ten faults (which are identical with the first ten of Bhāmaha), followed by the remark that the discussion whether the doṣa, pratijñāhetudrṣṭāntahāni (the eleventh in Bhāmaha's list) is a fault or not is dry and futile. Jacobi contended here that Bhāmaha, interested as he was in logical matters, invented this eleventh doṣa. Following him, Dr. De thought that Dāṇḍin's remarks were pointed at Bhāmaha's and Mr. Trivedi regarded

---

52. KA. II. 244.
53. KA. II. 87.
55. The words ' iti ' in Dāṇḍin (II. 244) and ' praca-ksate ' in Bhāmaha (II. 87) are indicative of a citation. A figure named vārttā has been exemplified by Bhatti (X. 45), acc. to the comm. Jayamanācala; it has been defined in Viṣṇu. (xiv. 11) also; cp. cp. Kane, op. cit., pp. 103-9. The term in Dāṇḍin (I. 85) means simply a dialogue.
this as 'an almost conclusive evidence' in favour of Bhāmaha's priority. But it appears that some earlier theorist propounded this eleventh doṣa and its admission to the list formed the subject of discussion of the day, as Dāṇḍin's words, 'doṣa na vetyasau vicāraḥ karkasaḥ' imply. Here Dāṇḍin's remark that the matter is not worth discussing certainly does not allude to Bhāmaha who, however, without referring to the current controversy, simply adopts the fault. According to Prof. A.B. Dhruva, Dāṇḍin's words 'tenālīḍhena kim phalām' ironically refer to Bhāmaha who says: 'prathamālīḍhamaḥdavāhā pibanti kaṭubhaṣajam,' in this very context, because otherwise the use of the word 'ālīḍha' with 'vicāra,' according to him, would not be befittingly justified. But in fact there is nothing unusual in the usage ālīḍha which has been employed here figuratively, like the words niṣṭhyuta, udgīra etc., noticed by Dāṇḍin himself. Again, the claim that Bhāmaha was the first to initiate discussions on logical matters in poetics cannot stand, for even the old kaṭhā Bharata mentions a fault 'nyāyād apeta' (want of evidence). Priority on either side,

56. Cp. KaI. IV. 1-2; KA. III. 125-7 (first 3 lines are identical in both).
60. Cp. Ka. I. 95; cp. the word 'ālīḍha' used figuratively with 'dhaiyra' in DāΚ. p. 205; also cp. ālīḍha with artha in DhA. p. 237, and terms like rasāsvāda
therefore, cannot be established on this ground.

(d) According to J. Bobel, Dandin's statement that
the path of words is manifold with mutual fine distinctions
(asya aneko gīrāṃ mārgah sūkṣmabhedaḥ parasparam) is
polemically pointed at Bhāmaha who declines to make a distinc-
tion even between the Gauḍīya and Vaidarbhī paths. But
there is nothing polemic in the simple statement of Dandin.
Nor is Bobel right in asserting that Dandin's praise of good
kāvyā and description of the body of poetry are a refutation
and correction of the views of Bhāmaha and that Dandin
criticises the statement of Bhāmaha regarding 'pratibhā'
that it is an essential condition for the composition of
poetry. As a matter of fact, no attack is evident in
these cases from either side.

(e) Jacobi held that Dandin in his remark that some
theorists regarded hyperbole as the most important figure
sarcastically referred to the dictum of Bhāmaha with regard
to vakrokti because in Dandin's view, it was the quality
samādhī (metaphorical expression) which constituted the

and rasacarvāṇa used frequently in rhetorical works;
cp. Kane: HSP., p. 80.

61. Cp. Bh. NS. (ChSŚ, ed.) XVII. 88; 93; also cp. the
fault pratijñārahita in Visnu. III. 15. 13; cp. Kane:
HSP., pp. 100-1; also cp. Keith: ISHL., pp. 170-81.

62. I. 40; Kal. I. 31; Nobel: FIP. p. 100.


64. Cp. Kal. I. 104; 105; Kal. I. 31;

65. Cp. Kal. II. 220; Kal. II. 88; cp. Jacobi: SBA., 1922,
pp. 210 ff.
But there could be nothing sarcastic in the statement of Dandin who himself regarded atisayokti as the best figure of speech, and his high praise of the guna samādhi does not stand in the way of his appreciating the figure as the best one. Besides, the ideas of the two authors on this point stand apart from each other.

(f) Dr. De maintains that while Bhāmaha disapproves of a tragic incident in a mahākavya in conformity with a similar conventional prohibition in drama, Dandin, in opposition to Bhāmaha's views, welcomes the idea of the glorification of the hero by depicting his victory over his enemy. According to J. Nobel, while Bhāmaha opposes here a view of some older theorist, Dandin blames no one else but Bhāmaha. A closer examination, however, of the passages in question in the two authors reveals the fact of a direct attack of Bhāmaha on Dandin's doctrine, for the former's words, 'na tasyaiva vādhaṃ brūyat' and 'mudhādaugrahaṇaṃ stave' have the point only when they are taken to be directed against some predecessor who might be Dandin with whose dictum his words exhibit verbal resemblance also.

(g) Dandin recognises two broad divisions of marga, namely, Vaidarabha and Gauḍa and prefers the former which he treats at length. Bhāmaha makes a reference to the

66. KA. I. 100; op. below, sect. II.
70. FIP., pp. 146-7.
view, rejects the distinction and denies the prominence accorded to the former. The evidence cannot plausibly be set aside by saying that the criticism here refers to a traditional view or a matter of common controversy, as his words, 'gatānugatikanyāyān nānākhayam anēdhasām' are taken to indicate; because in these words, he is deriding Daṇḍin, rather than some one else, for blindly following a wrong course. Nor can it be argued with any force that the respective characterisation of the two mārgas has no point of contact; for, the views attacked by Bhamaha are precisely the same as those held by Daṇḍin. And despite the fact that the two theorists view the subject from different angles of their respective lines of thought, Bhāmaha's critical attitude is more than evident. Nobel's contention that Daṇḍin magnified the distinction between the two mārgas which in fact were radically one due to his prejudice against Bhāmaha, is hardly borne out by the

72. KA. I. 40 ff; cp. below, sect. II.
75. See ib.; That Bhamaha's remarks if taken to be against Daṇḍin in particular are off the mark (loc. cit.) cannot prove anything.
76. Op. e.g. (a) Vaidarbha is different from Gauḍa. (b) the former is better; also cp. Bhāmaha I. 32, which obviously attacks KA. I. 44; 54; 92 etc.
fact, as Dandin has successfully, but not in a fighting mood, distinguished between the two mārgas.

(h) Bhāmaha criticises the view of upamā's threefold division into nindopamā, prasāmsopamā and ācikhyasopamā, which varieties have been dealt with in the same order in Kāvyādārśa and it is evident that he attacks here Dandin's view. It is no excuse to say that Dandin divides upamā into not only three but thirty-two varieties; because the term 'tri-prakāratva,' if construed properly, has a simple meaning of a connected group of three, irrespective of the total number of varieties of the figure in the work. Further, 'the threefold division' cannot refer to Bharata's Nātyadāstra which has only the first two varieties and not the third.

(i) Bhāmaha deridingly refers to those who maintain that ojas is a profusion of compounds and Dandin holds the same view. The contention that Bhāmaha's reference

78. FIP., p. 117; in fact Nobel has dealt with the foundations of Indian poetry with the presumption that Bhāmaha preceded Dandin. esp. op. FIP., intro., pp. 13-7.


80. KA. II. 14-50; op. Narasimhachar: IA., xlii, p. 206; for De: HSP. I, p. 65, fn. 5; for the view.

81. Upamā could never have been divided into these three varieties alone. It is also to be noted that Bhāmaha rejects, just in the following verse (II. 38), the varieties malopamā etc. accepted by Dandin (II. 42 ff.).

82. Op. Bh. NS. (Chhib. ed.) XVII. 51-2. Bharata has five varieties of upamā, two of them being prasāmsā and nindā (op. XVII. 50).

might have been to some other author, as Dāndin’s views on mādhurya and prasāda are not identical with those criticised by Bhāmaha, cannot stand, because the latter refers here to two distinct views, one on mādhurya and prasāda and other on ojas, held by two different predecessors, of whom Dāndin, representing the second view, might have been one.

(j) Bhāmaha evidently makes a reference to Dāndin’s definition of the doṣa, ekārtha and illustrates the fault by a verse which bears an apparent resemblance to Dāndin’s example.

(k) Bhāmaha objects to the procedure of treating the alaṁkāras as distinct from the body of poetry which method we observe in Dāndin.

(i) The words, ‘svaṁpaṁśvaṁśkṛtāṁ kuryād abhijātāh katham janaḥ’ of Bhāmaha clearly appear to be directed against Dāndin who makes the casual remark: ‘svaṁpaṁśvaṁśkṛyā doṣa nātra bhūtārthasaṁśinaḥ.’

(iii) Now we shall discuss the question with reference to the impression gathered, about their relative position, from their respective treatment of the subject. It is argued that Dāndin’s elaboration of yamaka and citrālaṁkāras and his

84. Op. KĀL. II. 1-2, where the words ‘sumedhasaḥ’ and ‘kecit’ represent two different views.
division of upamā into numerous varieties indicate his posteriority to Bhāmaha whose treatment is brief and divisions are not minute. The argument, however, leads us to the opposite conclusion. The earlier writers give preference to yamaka and the citrālāṃkāras and in fact it is the later writers who disregard them. Besides, Dāndin's treatment of anuprāsa and yamaka is unsystematic and indicates his somewhat unsettled idea of the same. His elaboration of upamā also is rather unscientific, and unmistakably represents the older tendency. On the other hand, Bhāmaha's division of the figure on grammatical basis is more scientific and later writers like Udhaṭa and Mammata follow him.

Nobel referred to some of Dāndin's views, which according to him, savoured of lateness. Thus he adduced the following points: (a) Dāndin's definition of kāvyā (istārthavyaqchinnapadāvalī) shows some progress when compared with the simple statement of Bhāmaha: sab’dārthau sahitau kāvyam; (b) the divisions of poetry have been arranged a little better in Dāndin who mentions campū and refers to drama as

89. Cp. Bharata (CXX XVII. 62-36) who gives 10 varieties of yamaka. Visāpu also deals with its numerous varieties. The later writers on the other hand neglect these figures; Udhaṭa omits yamaka altogether, while Mammata describes it in brief; cp. below, sect. III.
90. He deals with anuprāsa briefly in the context of mādhur-yamāṇa (I. 55-60), and deliberately leaves yamaka for subsequent treatment; cp. below sect. II.
91. Cp. Kane: HSP., pp. 104-5; also see below.
misraka which terms are absent in Bhāmaha; (c) there are new points in his definition of mahākāvya which he describes in greater detail; (d) Bhāmaha does not define alamkāra which has been defined for the first time by Daṇḍin; (e) Daṇḍin gives a clearer picture of mārga which he deals with at great length. With regard to these claims, it may be remarked here that there is nothing in Bhāmaha which may really indicate his precedence. His definition of kāvya certainly does not represent the older stage; it has been adopted or improved upon by much later writers. Better arrangement of the divisions of kāvya in Daṇḍin can only give him superior credit, while the absence of certain terms in Bhāmaha can prove nothing. New points in Daṇḍin’s definition of mahākāvya merely indicate his general tendency to elaborate the matter in hand. The fact that he defines alamkāra, while Bhāmaha does not, goes in favour of the former’s priority and the word ‘pracakṣate’ in the definition amply repudiates the view that alamkāra remained undefined till Daṇḍin. Again, in giving us a clearer picture of mārga by elaborating it in detail, he represents his

92. Op. (a) KA, I. 10; KAl, I. 16; cp. Nobeli: FIP, pp. 76-9; (b) KA, I. 11-33; KAl, I. 17-30; cp. FIP, pp. 126; 136; (c) e.g. cp. KA, I. 14; cp. FIP, pp. 141-5; (d) KA, II. 1; cp. FIP., p. 88; (e) KA, I. 40-102; cp. FIP., pp. 100-2.


94. Bharata (KM, ed. XVI, 41) defines alamkāra as ornaments of poetry.
particular school of thought rather than an advanced stage.

There are a few more points which have been adduced for showing that in Daṇḍin’s age the study of Poetics was ‘more advanced and fraught with greater complexity than in that of Bhāmaha.’ Thus Dr. De refers to (a) their respective views on guṇa, vākroki and alāṃkāra which last Daṇḍin does not distinguish basically from guṇas; (b) their respective order of treatment of alāṃkāras which Bhāmaha arranges in groups, while Daṇḍin treats independently; (c) Daṇḍin’s finer distinctions of numerous sub-varieties of individual figures and (d) their respective treatment of yamāka, upamā, utprekṣā, ananvaya, sasanādeha, upamārupaka and utpreksāvayava which last four Daṇḍin does not recognise as independent figures.

These points, however, do not help us much in fixing the relative chronological position of the two authors. Daṇḍin’s conception of alāṃkāra, it may be said, exhibits rather an elementary stage, while his independent, and not groupwise, treatment of the figures also points to the same conclusion.

Again, Daṇḍin’s differentiation of various sub-species of the

95. Op. HSP. I, p. 66 fn.; some points raised by De (e.g., their respective views on rīti etc.) have already been discussed while dealing with Nobel’s points.

96. Daṇḍin fuses alāṃkāra with guṇas and (op. II. 3), rasas (II. 280-92) and with saṃādi, saṃādyāna, vṛtti, vṛttyaṅga, lakṣana etc. (II. 367); op. below, sect. II. In Daṇḍin, this is a clear sign of archaism which disappears in later writers. The process of emancipation of Poetics from the grip of Dramaturgy is initiated by Bhāmaha rather than by Daṇḍin who treated the topic in his last chap. on kalā; op. Keith: ISH. pp. 170 ff.

97. Later writers like Rūdrata, Rūyaka etc. classify figures into different groups; op. for detail, K.L. Poddar: SSI., pp. 103-6; see below, sect. II. also.
figures may be more minute, but is certainly less accurate.

On the other hand, Bhāmaha's views on gunas are far more advanced than those of Dāṇḍin who, though showing some progress from Bharata, is still far behind Bhāmaha who is perhaps the first to reduce their number to three. Again, Dāṇḍin's position with regard to the conception of vakrokti is older and more natural than Bhāmaha's viewpoint which is a precursor of the elaborate theory of vakrokti, later established by Kuntaka. Bhāmaha's rejection of certain figures on the ground that they do not contain the element of vakrokti constitutes a more developed view than the simpler standpoint of Dāṇḍin. A notable innovation in Bhāmaha we find in his introducing a new topic, the training of the poet, which was fully recognised by Vāmana, Neṇuḍaṇa, Sañjñākāra etc. in later period.

98. See below, sect. II.

99. The historical process is that Bharata treats the gunas as antithesis of defects (XVII, 95) and Dāṇḍin improves the theory by basing his distinction of the two marāyas on possession or otherwise by them of the gunas (I, 41-2), while Bhāmaha observes vagueness in Dāṇḍin's treatment of the matter and solves the problem by reducing the number of gunas to three (Kal. II, 1-3). This improvement on Dāṇḍin is conspicuous and it is significant to note that the Śrīmadikāra (II, 6-10) and most of the later writers from Śrīmad to Jayānātha accept the new number (cp. Kṛ. VIII, 58-70; SB, VIII. 1; Ṛg. (NŚP. ed.) pp. 67-9; cp. below, sect. II. It is a strong argument against Bhāmaha's priority; cp. Keith: ISHL, pp. 170 ff; Kane: HSP, p. 113.

100. Cp. Ka. II. 363 with Kal. I. 30; 36; II. 84-5; V. 66; cp. Keith: ISHL., pp. 173-5; see below also.

The effort of some scholars to prove Bhāmaha's priority on the linguistic ground that the Prakrits had not been as popular in his time as in the age of Daṇḍin, is without much success, because while it cannot be proved historically, it presupposes a long gap between the two authors, which even those scholars, who otherwise fight for Bhāmaha, do not admit. Nor is it correct to say from Daṇḍin's silence that the writers so familiarly known in Bhāmaha's period were totally forgotten by the time of Daṇḍin and that the heated discussions between the Buddhists and Brāhmaṇas of Bhāmaha's time disappeared in the age of Daṇḍin. The evidence of style, too, is not convincing.


104. Apart from the inscriptions in Prakrit from Aśoka's time onward, we know of Hāla's Gāthāsaptadāti (4th cent. A.D.), Pravarasena's Setubandha etc. Bharata mentions various Prakrits as Sauruseni, Māgadhi etc.; op. Kane: HSP., pp. 78-9.


106. Bhāmaha mentions authors like Medhāvin, Rāmaśarman, Sākhavardhana, Rājamitra, and works like Acyutottara; op. fn. 20 above; cp. B.N. Sharma and Upadhyaya, op. cit., pp. 35-40; also cp. K.R. Trivedi: (IA., xlii (1913), pp. 261 ff.).


(iv) The arguments ex silentio advanced by some scholars in support of their contentions do not prove much. Thus to argue from Bhamaha's silence that he is unaware of Dañdin's peculiar division of mārga on the basis of the ten guṇas is not of much value, because his reticence on the matter might be ascribed to his anaesthetic attitude towards the mārgas to which he makes a passing reference in five verses only.

That Bhamaha is silent with regard to Pravaraṇa's Satubandha and Gunāḍhya's Brhatkathā which find mention in Dañdin cannot be taken to prove that Bhamaha wrote before Dañdin; for, it would amount to placing him even before Gunāḍhya and Pravarasena.

Now we would turn to the external evidence for determining the lower limit of Kāvyādāra's date. The evidence includes (i) the references of commentators and later writers on poetics to the authors in question and (ii) an examination of their age conducted independently of their relative chronological order. For Bhamaha's priority, some scholars argue that the old writers on poetics are referred to as Bhamahādayah (Bhamaha and others) and that he is regarded as an ancient theorist and his work is reverently called an ākara (a rich source). Mr. K.P. Trivedi made a particular


110. KAL. I. 31-5.

111. Bhamaha's priority to Pravaraṇa (5th cent. A.D.) was suggested by Pt. A. Anantacharya; cp. Ramāsvami Sarasvati (QJMS. XIII, pp. 683-4) who quotes and dismisses the suggestion. T. Ganapati Sastri (Svap., 1912 ed., intro., p. xxvii) suggested that Bhamaha lived before Gunāḍhya and that his date went back to 1st cent. B.C.;
reference in this regard to Rudrata's remark: 'Bhāmahādīmatena tu arthāntarānyāṣa eva,' where, Dandin's view being the same as Bhāmaha's, Trivedi thought, he could have said: 'Dandvadīmatena,' had he regarded him as the older. The above argument, at its best, may indicate the prominent position enjoyed by Bhāmaha in the field, but it certainly cannot prove him to be the older. Rudrata's special reference to him where he could well refer to Dandin instead, shows merely his predilection for Bhāmaha to whose line of thought he belonged. It may be recalled that Nāmisādhu (1069 A.D.), an old commentator on Rudrata, begins his enumeration of ancient writers with Dandin, and Abhinavagupta (c. 980-120 A.D.) and Jayaratha (13th century) refer to him as an ancient writer. But in fact, reference to one as an old acārya

he, however, withdrew the suggestion in the next ed. (1916) of the work.

112. Cp. Pratāp, I. 2; Ruyyaka: AS., p. 3 and Rāgahavabhaṭṭa on Sāk. (p. 14); Mammāṭa and Abhinava upta etc., refer to Bhāmaha with great reverence; cp. Trivedi: IA, xiii (1913) p. 261 ff.


114. Cp. Nāmisādhu on Rudrata I. 2. He is older than all the authors mentioned by Mr. Trivedi as referring to Bhāmaha as ancient; cp. Kane: HSP., p. 103.

115. Cp. AB. on Bh. NS. VI (KM. ed., p. 62); it may be noted that Abhinavagupta is much older than Ruyyaka who (in AS.) refers to Bhāmaha as ciraṃṭana; cp. Kane: HSP., p. 104.
cannot necessarily make one the most ancient. Namisādhuc's reference to old writers, however, is significant; it has the following order: Daṇḍin, Medhāvirudra and Bhāmaha. The fact that Medhāvin certainly preceded Bhāmaha makes one to presume that the authors have been arranged chronologically. The evidence of certain commentators of Daṇḍin, which seems to go in favour of Bhāmaha's priority should not be relied upon in view of the enormous evidence proving his posteriority and much so because the commentators wrote much later than the disputed authors. Again, as pointed out by Dr. Kane, it is possible that the commentators, noticing controversial views, thought that Daṇḍin has criticised Bhāmaha, as we see in other analogical cases. The evidence of a solitary manuscript of Bhojā's Śrīgāraprakāśa which contains the passage, vākratvameva kāvyānām para bhū-ṣetī Bhāmahaḥ, śleṣāḥ pūṣpāti sarvāsu prāyo vakroktisu śriyam, indicating, according to Dr. A. Sankaran, that Kāvyā-darśa cited Bhāmaha, is highly doubtful. While the later half occurs in Daṇḍin's book, the first half is not found

116. Even Udbhata, a comparatively later writer (c. 800 A.D.) has been included among the ancients; cp. Auyyaka's As. p. 3.

117. See above, fn. 115. Medhāvin and Rudra (different from Rudraṭa; cp. M.T. Narasimiegar: JRAS., 1905, pp. 538 ff.) may be two authors.

118. Bhāmaha (II, 40; 88) quotes him. It appears that Daṇḍin, Medhāvin and Rudra were almost contemporaries, while Bhāmaha followed a few decades later.

119. Cp. Taruna, (13th cent.) on KA. I. 29; II. 235; also cp. on I, 23-4; II. 237; 258, III. 127 etc.; again cp. Harinātha (bet. 1575 and 1675 A.D.) on I. 15; Vādi-
in any edition of the work. Probably the first half or the full verse is a quotation from some predecessor of Bhoja who might have taken the later half from Danḍin.

From the above discussion, we arrive at the conclusion that Bhāmaha actually knew Danḍin and criticised his views on certain matters. We shall now examine the date of the two authors independently of their relative chronological position and corroborate the above conclusion.

We would try to determine the age of the Kāvyādārśa (a) by a probable reference in the work to Kānci and the Pallava as also to a Pallava king and (b) by the evidence of the poetess Vijjakā. Although the first evidence has not been unanimously admitted as beyond doubt and the second one is weak on account of the disputed identity and age of the above poetess, yet they should not be wholly discarded, especially in view of the fact that they accord well with the conclusion reached otherwise. In the solution, by the commentators, of the example of the saṅkhvāṭa variety of riddle, we have


124. See KA. III. 114 and Tarou, thereon. The phrase 'asta-varṇā occurs, as pointed out by Mr. J.K. Sankara, in the Mamandur inscription of Mahendravarman I (600-30 A.D.).
a hint that the author lived in the period of the Pallavas who ruled over Kāñcī early from the 4th century till about the end of 9th century A.D. At another place, there is a reference to a king Rājavarman who is identified with Narasiṃhavarman II, who assumed the title Kālakāla, alluded to in Kāvyādārṣa. He ruled over Kāñcī from c. 680 (or 695) to 722 A.D. and, if the evidence is admitted, we may place our author towards the close of 7th century A.D.—a date arrived at by other evidences also.

A Karpṭākaka poetess, Vijjakā cites the last line of the benedictory verse of Kāvyādārṣa in the following verse: nilotpaladalasyāmām Vijjakām mām ajānatā, vrthaiva Daṇḍinā pro-ktaṁ: sarvaśuklā Sarasvatī. The word 'ajānatā' in the humorous raillery has a point only when taken to convey the idea of her contemporaneity with Daṇḍin who, on his part, could not see her. Vijjakā is identified with the famous Vijaya-

mahādevī or Vijayabhaṭṭārikā of c. 659 A.D., and her

The comm., Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa interprets Pundraka instead of Pallava, as pointed out by Dr. De (HSP., I, p. 58 fn.); but the solution of this modern comm. (1863 A.D.) of Bengal (which includes ancient Pundraka) cannot be relied upon.


126. KA. II. 278-9; op. Kālakāla, III. 50; op. Fleet: Dynasties of Kānarese Kings, p. 330; Agashe, op. cit., pp. lvii ff.: Narasimhachar: IA. xli, p. 92. We cannot, however, reject the possibility of Rājavarman being a legendary king (op. De: HSP., I, p. 57) or the verse itself being a citation from some work describing the king (op. Jacobi : SPA. XXIV, p. 214). On the other hand, Vādijangṛhāla regards Rājavarman as a Kerala King.
K.P. Trivedi (IA, xiii, pp. 258-61) deny the reference as meant for the Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi, because, acc. to them, while it does not contain the example to which Bhamaha takes exception, there are other Nyāsakāras, even earlier than Jinendrabuddhi (op. Trivedi, op. cit., p. 261). But, the Nyāsa contains the jāhapa object to by Bhamaha (though the example here is bhayaśokahantar). The authors of other Nyāsas could not have been meant, as (a) they are not generally known as Nyāsakāras, and (b) they do not draw a jāhapa from the sūtra of Pān. (II. 2.15). Besides, the use of the terms Nyāsa and -kāra in Madhaviyadha-vṛtta is restricted to the Kāśi-kāvivaranașānjikā (commonly known as Nyāsa) and its author Jinendrabuddhi (op. Pathak: ABORI, xi, pp. 246 ff. and 388-92); cp. for detail, Kané: HSP., pp. 115-9.

132. The Nyāsa, which is a comm. of Kaś. of Jayāditya (who died in 661-2), may be placed c. 700 A.D.; op. Kané: op. cit., p. 118. It is certainly earlier than Haradatta (died 878 A.D.) who refers to its views; op. Pathak: JSSAS., XXIII, pp. 18-30; ABORI, XII, pp. 246-51; also op. Kané: op. cit., pp. 118-9. The view of Dr. V.S. Aśrawal (HSA. pp. 53-4) that Kaś. and Nyāsa belonged respectively to 4-th and 6-7-th cent. is based on feeble ground; nor I.J. Pawate (Structure of Aśādyāyi, intro., pp. 12-3) is right in identifying the authors of Nyāsa and Jainendrayākaraṇa, which he places c. 450 A.D.


134. Op. Sharma and Upadhyaya: Kal., intro., pp. 39-40; this view received little support from scholars; op. above fn. 108 also.
date is the closest lower limit of the date of Dandin which, on its part, serves as the nearest upper terminus of Bhāmaha's time.

The question of the date of Dasakumāracarita also has engaged much controversy. Mr. Agashe placed the work in 11th century A.D. on various grounds. He argued that the work is not mentioned in the Kavirājamārga (815-75 A.D.) which profusely draws upon Kāvyādāra, in Nāgavarman's work on Poetics (12th century) and also in other rhetorical treatises and literary compositions up to the close of 11th century A.D. But the silence, which by itself can prove nothing, may well be accounted for by the probability that Daśakumāracarita, in that age of artificial style, was taken as the work of a novice, so that it could not gain ready recognition. Again, its total disregard of conventions might not have been favoured by fastidious theorists in whose works it is not cited till a very late date.

The argument that the original of the Kannarese and Telugu Daśakumāracarita, both of the 13th century, could only be written within the preceding two centuries at the best is not at all convincing. Also the fact of its late abridgments or that of its influence only on very late works cannot be least emphasised. Again, it is incorrect to hold that the work draws upon the Bṛhatkathāmāśājari (11th century) or Kathāsaritsāgara (1063-82 A.D.); because the work is

in fact indebted to the original Brhatkathā (c. 4th century A.D.) itself. Nor can the reference to the Bhoja race in the work support Mr. Amshe's hypothesis, for Kālidāsa (c. 400) also uses the name Bhoja with reference to the rulers of Vidarbha. Moreover, as Mr. Collins and, following his views with certain improvements, Dr. Mirashi point out, the Bhojas referred to in Dasakumāracarita must be the Vākāṭakas who ruled in Deccan from the close of the third century to the middle of 6th century A.D.

The evidence adduced for a late date from the term Yavana, occurring in the work allegedly meaning Arabs or Persians, is not conclusive, since the term is found applied to various foreigners in Sanskrit works. Again, the term Bhilla, which is unnoticed by Amarasimha (c. 5th century), might have occurred in the work of Guṇāḍhya. The argument based on the evidence of the state of society depicted in the work fails to prove a late date; the cock-fight has already been mentioned in the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana and Arthaśāstra of Kautilya, as also in Bāṇa's Kādambarī.

139. DKG. p. 127; op. Amshe, op. cit., pp. xliliiff; op. Kach. V, 39–40; VII, 13; 19; 35 etc.; op. also MBhār., Ādi, 35; 213; 219 etc.
141. DKG. p. 120; the name Khaniti (Khāna-iti) in Bombay recension or Aṣabhiti (Āṣaf-iti) in southern recension
The history of betel-leaf chewing goes back to very early period and the word citrāśārana is as old as the Rāmāyana. Besides, as Dr. D® remarks, the argument can be applied equally well to the Kṛṣṇakatika and the Caturbhāṇī, the early age of which has unanimously been admitted and to which the Dāsakumāracarita bears a close resemblance in spirit, style and diction. The use of unfamiliar words, grammatical solecisms and stylistic peculiarities of the work, on which stress is laid for a late date, point, as a matter of fact, to an early period for the work. The view of Dāsakumāracarita's indebtedness to Naigadhacarita (12 century A.D.) is totally supposed to be an Arabic or Persian name and the reference to watering of grape-plants (p. 155) is taken to support the above supposition; cp. Agashe, op. cit., pp. xlv-xlv; also Ex op. Dr. Moticandra: DKG., Hindi transl., pref. p. 9; acc. to him, Rāmeṣṭa (p. 155) is a Syrian word meaning good Jesus.

142. DKG., p. 103; Agashe, op. cit., p. xlviii.

143. DKG., p. 143; op. Kām. S.I. 4, 21; VI. 1. 28; Kaut. II. 20; Kād. para 85. Agashe (op. cit., p. xlv) erroneously thinks that cock-fight is mentioned for the first time in Palnitī Virulā Bhāgavatam (1080-7 A.D.).

144. DKG., p. 144; op. sect. IV, chap. III for other refs. Acc. to A-ashe (op. cit., p. xlv), the practice of habitually chewing betel-leaf and the use of a purse for its ingredients (upahāstikā) esp. in the case of brāhmaṇas is very modern. But in view of its very old history, the above conjecture may be discarded. The references to tāmbūla and its ingredients are found in Kalidāsa's works and in Caraka, Suśruta, Br.S. (c. 490 A.D.) etc. The Mandasor insc. of silk-weavers (473 A.D.) refers to tāmbūla; cp. F.K. Ude; SDH., I, pp. 113-5; op. also Kād. para 54; Hotar. pp. 33; 42; etc.


146. HSL., p. 209.
impossible; it is the latter work itself which is the borrower.

The impossible dating of Daśakumārakarita has almost been discarded now, but the equally untenable view that the work was composed in 6th century A.D. is still held by some scholars. Mr. Mark Collins assigned the work to the 6th century A.D. on the basis of geographical data which referred to a state of society that existed in a period anterior to the date of Harṣa's empire. Keith and De supported the view, also because, according to them, the work must have been composed before the works of Subandhu and Bāṇa, as the romance is free from the affected style and developed form of those writers. As far as the evidence afforded by the geographical and historical data is concerned, it does not necessarily warrant the period prior to Harṣavarman (606-47 A.D.) for the composition of the work, even if the data contained in it belong to 6th century A.D., because the author's detailed knowledge of different kingdoms of the period may merely indicate that the author lived at a time when the events were well remembered. The evidence, therefore, cannot come in the way of placing him in the 7th century A.D. on the positive evidence of the Avantisundarīkātā. And taking this evidence


in view, Mr. Mirashi rightly concludes his discussion on the historical data of the work with the remark that the author of the romance may have flourished about a hundred years after the occurrence of the events alluded to in the work, that is, the fall of the Vākātakas वाकातक (c. 550 A.D.) when in all probability, he had a fairly reliable information about the last days of the Vākātaka rule in Vidarbha. The cultural data contained in the work bear, in numerous points, a general resemblance to those afforded by the works of Bāna who belongs to the first half of the 7th century in which we propose to place Daśakumāracaṇita.

Nor the evidence of style should present any difficulty, because the romance does not represent the literary tendency of any particular age by its style which is rather exceptionally conspicuous by its unconventionality, as Dr. De himself admits. And when no period of Sanskrit literature is free from conventionality, it is not fair to ascribe a particular period to a certain work on the basis of its 'unconventional' style. As a matter of fact, the style of Daśakumāracaṇita reflects the peculiar individuality of its author rather than represents a certain era which may seem to be characterised by the features it displays. Besides, no period in the history of Sanskrit literature can, with justification, be said to be possessed of the peculiarities that the present romance which

152. Op. below, sect. IV.
is unique in its content, spirit, style and diction, exhibits.

The evidence of Avantisundarikathā is indeed of great importance in determining, within narrower limits, the date of Dandin, because it is, to a great extent conclusive and reliable. According to the romance, Dāmodara, the great grand-father of Dādin, secured friendship of the prince Viśṇuvardhana through Bhāravi, and a little later, when he was twenty, he joined the court of king Darvinīta of the Jāhag dynasty. The Pallava king Simhaviṣṇu, who was ruling over Kāncī at this time, came to know of his poetic talent and somehow managed to get him in his court. This account refers to some historical figures and makes them contemporaries.

When we turn to history, we come across the following facts:

(i) The Pallava ruler, Simhaviṣṇu ruled over Kāncī from c. 575 to c. 601 A.D. He was a great conqueror, and he inaugurated a new era both politically and culturally. He introduced into the Pallava society the elements of Vedic religion and culture.

(ii) Viśṇuvardhana (or Kubja Viśṇuvardhana) was the son of Kirtivarman (c. 566-7 to c. 597-8) and a younger brother of Satyāśraya Pulakesin II (reign: 610-1 to 642 A.D.), the Caḷukya king of Vatāpi. He was made the

154. Even De who doubts the identity of the authors of DKG. and ASK, admits (Iff. III, p. 403) that the biographical details about Dandin given in ASK. may be correct.


crown-prince early in the reign of his elder brother about 615 A.D. He ruled for 18 years, most probably from 615 to 633 A.D.

(iii) The king Durvinita of the western Galugas ruled from 540 to 600 A.D. He was a great conqueror. He had friendly relations with the Gālukyas but not with Pallavas. He was a great scholar of Sanskrit and is said to have written the grammatical work, Śabdāvatāra and commented on the 15th canto of Kirātārjunīya and also translated the Prakrit Bṛhatkathā into Sanskrit. He patronised Sanskrit and Kannada learning.

(iv) Bhāravi, the Saiva author of the Kirātārjunīya, wrote before the Aihole inscription of 634 A.D. wherein he is mentioned along with Kālidāsa, and lived probably towards the close of the 6th century A.D.

✓ These historical facts are quite in agreement with the evidence of the romance. As Damodara, through Bhāravi, made friends with Vīśṇuvardhana when the latter was a rājasūnu, it seems that the event took place during the later part of the reign of his father Kirtivarman ( c. 566-7 to 597-8 ),


159. Op. IA., V, pp. 67-71. Keith ( HSL. p. 163 ) places Bhāravi about 550 A.D. and De ( HSL. p. 178 ) also is inclined to place him much earlier than 634 A.D. in order to account for his poetical fame at that time. But as Bhāravi lived in the Gālukya court to which Rāvikṛti of the Aihole insc. also belonged, we need not suppose that he wrote much earlier than his recognition in 634 A.D.
and much before 615 A.D. when he became yuvarāja. The meeting may be assigned to c. 595 A.D. and, as they seem to be of about the same age, they might have been about twenty, though Dāmodara was certainly below twenty. At this time (i.e. 595 A.D.), Durvinița was ruling in Mysore and Simhaviṣṇu in Kāṇcī. It seems that Dāmodara lived with Viṣṇuvardhana for a short period, say about a year, and at the age of twenty, he lived in the court of Durvinița. This event may be roughly ascribed to c. 596-7 and Dāmodara's finally settling in the court of Simhaviṣṇu may be assigned to c. 597-8.

Now, as the story proceeds we know the following descention of Dāmodara:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simhaviṣṇu</th>
<th>Manoratha</th>
<th>Atilohana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dāmodara</td>
<td>Bhavadāsa</td>
<td>Simhaviṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several daughters

We can roughly assign the birth of Manoratha to c. 602-3 A.D., and his youngest son, Viṣṇadhāta, might have been born about 635. Dandin was the youngest child of Viṣṇadhāta, born after several daughters and so his birth might have taken place about 665. At the age of seven, after the investiture of sacred thread, he began his studies, but soon after he lost his father (c. 673-4) and in the meantime when Kāṇcī was besieged by enemies, he was forced to leave the capital. He wandered about different places studying in various gurukulas.

160. ASK. pp. 11-2; ASKS. I. 29-32.
and when normalcy was restored in Kāṇoī, he returned home.

Now we know from Gadwāl plates of Viṅgramādiya I Gālukya (655–81 A.D.) dated A.D. 674, that he captured Kāṇoī and destroyed the family of Mahāmalla and encamped at Uragapura (Uraiyur on the bank of Kāverī) on 25th April, 674. Thus the 'paracakraṇīḍā' referred to in the romance might be identified with the Gālukya invasion on Kāṇoī in 673–4. When the Gālukyas were defeated sometime after 674 A.D. and peace was restored, Dāṇḍin came back perhaps after completing his studies. This event may be placed about 690 when Paramēṣvaravarman I (670–680 or 695) or Nārasimhavarman II (Rājasiṃha) (680 or 695–722) was the reigning king of Kāṇoī. So Dāṇḍin may have lived roughly from 690 to 710 A.D. in the Pallava court under Paramēṣvaravarman and/or Nārasimhavarman II. His works may be assigned to precise periods in this way: Daśakumāra-carita: c. 690; Kāvyādāra: c. 695 (when some prince might have been taught the book by him); dviṣam-dhānakāvyā: c. 700 and Avantisundarī-kathā: c. 710 A.D.

161. Cp. ASKS. I. 36; in ASK. this portion is lost at p. 12.
163. Cp. ASK. p. 12; ASKS. I. 34.
164. In a battle in Uraiyur region, Paramēṣvaravarman is said to have 'made Viṅgramādiya, ...... take to flight covered by a ray'. It was a decisive victory which forced the Gālukyas to retire; cp. R.C. Majumdar: AI., p. 423.
166. The Imperative 'paśya' (KA. I. 5; II. 172) seems to support the guess.
The above conclusion regarding the age of the Avanti-
sundarikathā is corroborated by other evidences. The romance
refers to Bāṇa and Mayūra and alludes to the former's
Kādambarī which he summarises also later in the work.
It might be placed, therefore, after Bāṇa (606-47 A.D.) to
whose works it bears a close resemblance also in the matter
of social and cultural data.

Thus the date of the works of Dandin is determined, on
independent examination, to be the last quarter of the 7th
century A.D. and the great poet may be assigned to the period
from c. 665 to 710 or 720 A.D.

167. Cp. ASK. p. 3 (v. 19); p. 20; for Kāṇa's summary,
cp. ASK. pp. 243-6 (with beginning and end broken);
ASKS. 7, 112-49.