Though the extant works on Poetics are of comparatively later date, yet it can be definitely asserted that the Poetics, as a discipline, had its beginnings quite in early period. The fact is amply evidenced by (i) the casual references, in Vedic as well as in classical literature, to some of its concepts in the making, (ii) the origin and development of similar concepts in other disciplines, (iii) the early tradition of ornate poetry and the steady development of the kāvya style, presupposing a prior existence of some theory of Poetics, and finally (iv) the oldest surviving works on Poetics, including the XVII chapter of the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata, the developed doctrines of which suggest their existence in crude form at an earlier period.

Early references to the theory on poetry. We would here briefly discuss the references made to the rhetorical concepts in the making in the Vedic and earlier Sanskrit literature. The Vedas contain an inexhaustible number of fine gems of true poetry. Rgveda, the oldest of the four Samhitās, presents to us some highly poetical dialogues and discussions, and possesses various elements of poetic as well as dramatic conception. It must be admitted, however, that there is no indication or

1. Cn. the dialogues of Yama and Yami (X. 10), of Purūravas and Urvashi (X. 95), of Sāramā and Pānis (X. 103), of Viśvāmitra and rivers (III. 33) etc. For detail regarding poetic elements in this as well as other Vedas, see Kâsa: HSP. pp. 325 ff.
suggestion therein of a self-conscious existence of a definite theory or system, though the germs of it might have been there. The word 'upamā' occurring in the Ṛgveda simply indicates that the Vedic seer was familiar with the general idea of the element of similitude. The effect which it made on the account of the language cannot possibly make a case for conscious existence of the concept of poetic simile at the time, for it represents merely the grammatical aspect of the Vedic speech.

Again, there is no indication of the existence of a definite system of Poetics in the mention of a fresh and forceful verse in Ṛgveda or in the distinction made between the ordinary speech and the purified one. The word, kāvyā in the Ṛgveda has been used in ordinary sense of wisdom of prophetic inspiration, agreeing with its derivation, and the term 'gāthā' also has a simple sense of story.

Nor do we have in the Brāhmaṇas and the earlier Upaniṣadas any evidence which may serve as the basis of existence of a system of Poetics at the time. The occurrence of the words ākhyāna, ākhvāyikā, and alaṃkāra in the Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka and Upaniṣadic literature cannot prove anything substantial, for the technical application of the words may well be doubted.

3. Op. (a) I. 143. 1; (b) X. 71. 2.
4. Op. (a) III. 1. 17; IV. 3. 16. The word is < Kavi (ν ku'to sound') - a wise man or seer; op. MW; (b) VII. 6. 43.
5. Op. (a) SBr. XIII. 3. 2; Ait. Br. VII. 18. 10; (b) Saitt. A. I. 6. 3. (c) SBr. III. 5. 1. 36; XIII. 8. 4. 7; Ch. Up. VIII. 8. 5.
in these places. It is significant to note that the Vedāṅgas, which include Grammar and Prosody into their scheme, do not know of Poetics which, again, is absent in the ancient lists of the subjects of study. As a matter of fact, the theory on poetry seems to have originated sometime during the long gap between early Vedic texts and the ornate works of the classical Sanskrit writers, for, as Dr. S.K. De rightly observes, there must necessarily be a long step between the unconscious employment of poetic figures and the conscious formulation of a definite theory.

*Early grammarians and Poetics.* The first glimpse of the theory on poetry in its elementary form is observed in the field of grammar which also influenced, to a great extent, some of the concepts of Poetics. It is noticeable that the grammatical speculations which began very early in Pāṇini, included, in their scope, an analysis of the forms of speech, though, of course, from linguistic point of view. Nighantu, the first important lexico-grammatical work in Sanskrit, enumerates twelve varieties of simile defined and illustrated in the Hirukta of Yāska who recognises and expressly refers to the significance of the concept. He employs the term upamā in the sense in which

---

6. Op. the lists in Ch.Up., III. 1. 2. 4; Yājñ. I. 3 etc. Jāja-
   ṣekhara ( c. 900 A.D. ), however, speaks of a tradition acc. to which Poetics constitutes the seventh Vedāṅga.
7. Co. HSP., I, p.3.
9. Op. I. 19; III. 5. For his other references to the concept,
later rhetoricians take it, defining it, according to Gārgya, as comparison of an object with a dissimilar one having similar attributes. Again, he refers to the general rule that the standard of comparison should be superior to the object thereof, though he also admits the opposite case. He discusses simile with laudatory (puja) and derogatory (kutsā) senses, which find an echo in the prasāmopāma and nindopāma of Bharata and Daṇḍin. To the earlier twelve varieties of Nighaṇṭu, Yāsaka adds a few more like (i) karmopāma (a comparison with yathā in respect of a common act), (ii) bhūtopāma (where the word 'bhūta' is used), (iii) rūpopāma (comparison with the word rūpa, where the object of comparison resembles the standard in form), (iv) siddhopāma (comparison, with vat, with an unquestioned standard) and (v) luptopāma or arthropāma (equivalent to the metaphor of later times). The elaborate discussion of the figure in him amply evidences the fact that in his time (c. 7th century B.C.), the concept had already established itself in a somewhat developed form, though in a field different from that of Poetics.

Pāṇini (5th century B.C.) the great grammarian, uses, perhaps for the first time, the technical terms, upamita, upamāṇa and sāmānyavacana, along with the general expressions

like upamā, upamāya and upamārthe. He discusses, in about fifty sūtras scattered all over his work, the influence of the concept on language in various spheres of suffixes, primary and secondary derivatives and compounds, and, above all, in the accent. The exposition of simile in Patañjali (c. 150 B.C.) provides us with perhaps the nearest form of its technical conception in Poetics. Pāṇini and his followers paved the way for the grammatical sub-division of upamā into direct ( śrāutī ) and indirect ( ārthī ) varieties, as well as the forms based on the suffixes of the primary and secondary derivatives, which we notice as early as Uḍbhāta’s time (8th century A.D.). Though these speculations and references of the grammarians cannot positively prove the existence of a definite system, yet they afford an important link in the study of the origin of some of the poetic concepts inasmuch as they throw an interesting light on them in the making.

15. Co. III. 15-8; for (ii) cp. rūpaka in KA. II. 66.
14. Co. (a) II. 1. 56; (b) II. 1. 55; III. 1. 10; 2. 79; 4. 45 etc.; (c) II. 1. 55; 56; VIII. 1. 73.
15. Co. (a) II. 3. 72; (b) I. 4. 79; IV. 2. 113; (c) VIII. 2. 101 etc.
17. Upamāna, acc. to Patañjali (on Pāñ. II. 1. 55), is approximate to the māna, and it determines the thing approximately; the only difference is that it naturally lacks the charm which characterises a poetic simile (to which Uḍbhāta in I. 32 specifically refers).
18. For the influence of grammar on some of the basic concepts of poetic theory relating to speech in general, cp. De: H3P.
Philosophical Schools and Poetics. The system of Poetics received inspiration from some of the doctrines of the philosophical schools also. The concept, for instance, of similitude implying the general idea of analogy (upamāna) which forms the one of evidences (pramāṇas), occupies an important place in the different systems of philosophy and its influence, however indirect, on the origin of poetic simile may well be presumed. The idea of secondary meaning, technically termed gaṇa or bhākta or lākṣaṇika sense, appears to have been definitely taken from the philosophical systems. But while the philosophical speculations may be said to have directly or indirectly influenced the course of development of some of the poetic theories, they cannot perhaps be taken as the basis of a conception of Poetics in its origin, because the system at the formative stage betrays no trace worth the name of a direct impact of philosophical schools, and it is only the comparatively later writers who are indebted to them. Daṇḍin, for instance, borrows the three-fold division of karman and fourfold classification of non-existence (abhāva) from philosophical schools to which he is also indebted for his treatment of the fault nyāyavirodhi. Bhāmaha also was influenced by them in his treatment of the

---

20. Op. KA. II. 240 and 246 ff. respectively; cp. below.
21. KA. III. 163. For the terms jāti, kriya, guṇa and dravya, (KA. II. 97), however, he is indebted to grammar rather than to philosophy.
logic of poetry and the expressive functions of words. But these writers in fact do not represent the system of Poetics in the making.

The Epics and the early inscriptions. We came across some of the more general terms of Poetics like kāvyā, nāṭaka, kathā and ākhyāyīkā in the Epics, and thereafter, from about the second century A.D. onward, the epigraphic records as well as the classical writings abound in frequent references to such terms. The Gītā inscription of Ādudrāman (150 A.D.) mentions the division of kāvyā into prose and verse, and alludes to poetic excellences, like sphuta-(tva), madhura-(tva), kānta and śīlā udāra-(tva) which roughly correspond to prasāda, mādhurya, kānti and udārataṁ respectively of the Poetics proper. The term alāmkṛta appears here in its technical connotation of poetic embellishment. In the sphere of literature, at about the same period, Āvaghoṣa refers to rules of Poetics (kāvyadharma) and employs the terms, upamā, rasa, hāva and bhāva in their technical meaning. He also certainly knows the figures, utprekṣā, rūpaṅka, yathāsaṁkhyā and aprastutapradānasā. It is needless to explore the works of Kālidāsa and his successors in poetry and drama in this connection, for in the period in which they flourished, the system had already established itself.


in literature, and a little later, it emerges in a somewhat
developed form, both in theory and practice, in the writers from
seventh century onward.

Tradition of ornate poetry. The tradition of ornate
poetry in Sanskrit goes back at least to the time of Patanjali
(c. 150 B.C.) who mentions by name three prose fictions of
the ākhyaṅkā class, viz., Vāsavadattā, Sumanottarā and Bhaima-
rathī, besides a Vāraruca kāvya. The tradition naturally
evidences the fact that the rules and devices of the art of
poetry developed into a system, however of elementary nature,
at an early date. The love of ornamentation, especially chara-
ccterising the Indian mind, supplied the original motive force
and the early tradition of ornate poetry brought about the
development of the theory on poetry into a definite system.
The tradition continued in unbroken chain onward, and as early
as the second century A.D., we meet with the literary works of
Āśvaghoṣa whose style in its developed form indicates that by
his time, a definite poetic style had been established. The
inscriptions of the period also present a somewhat mature form
of style and diction, the study of which not only proves the
existence of highly elaborate compositions in prose and verse
written in ornate kāvya style during the early centuries A.D.,
but also attests to the fact that the writers of inscriptions
were well-equipped with the rules of Sanskrit Poetics. In

25. Op. on vārttika on Pāṇ. IV. 3. 87; cp. also Dei HSB.
I, p. 12 and fn.; Keith: HSL. p. 45 f.; for Vāraruca kāvya,
cp. MBhāṣ. IV. 3. 101.
the 4th and 5th centuries A.D., which form the creative period of Sanskrit language and literature, a highly finished style in prose and poetry made its appearance under the Gupta patronage which gave us the masterly works of Kalidāsa, along with a number of fine inscriptions. The development of Poetics must have proceeded apace, though we do not possess today the early attempts. The developed kāvyā style of the Gupta period warrants not only a conscious existence of the theory of Poetics, but also its considerable development in the age.

Evidence of the oldest extant works. Unfortunately, the course of the early development of the theory on poetry is totally shrouded in darkness, till it makes its appearance in a more or less developed form in Bharata's kātyāsastra which chiefly deals with Dramaturgy and refers, only incidentally, to certain important elements of poetry as means of embellishing dramatic speech, in chapter XVII. Although for evident reason, the treatment is brief, yet the doctrines, prakāsa propounded herein in somewhat developed form, presuppose the prior existence of the system in the making, for, as De justly remarks, we cannot start with the work as the absolute beginning of the science. We know, but only by names, a few writers on Poetics who preceded Bharata, and we shall refer to them subsequently. After Bharata, it is the work of Ćaṇḍin in which,

26. Cp. IA, XIII, pp. 29 ff. (Ghate's trans. of Bühler's Die Indischen Inschriften) for detail. The insc. of Rudradāman itself is written in prose with long compounds and alliteration and other devices of ornate style.

for the first time, the different topics of Poetics have been systematically arranged and discussed. A study of his work, which contains highly developed doctrines, underlines the fact that the Poetics in his time had already established itself as an independent discipline with a long and sustained tradition. Thus the beginnings of Sanskrit Poetics can be traced much earlier than the existing works including those of Bharata and Dandin, though it cannot be said definitely when the system actually came into being. Unluckily, Bharata's date, which could be helpful to us to some extent in this matter, is indefinite. He may, however, be roughly assigned to first century B.C., and we may justly place the early attempts in the sphere of Poetics between the first century B.C. and first century A.D.

Again, the form in which the system emerged in the beginning or the topics which it dealt with are unknown to us. Probably it appeared, in the first instance, in the form of a series of advice to the aspiring poet in his art and technique, and prescribed certain rules for the practical working out of poetry. It might have pointed out, for instance, certain defects to be avoided and certain excellences to be attained. The excellences might have included, apart from the poetic gunas, certain figures of speech also as means of poetic embellishment. The above contents make their self-conscious

28. See below fn. 43 for his date.
appearance in the works of Bharata and Dandin. The term alam-
kāra which is applied to denote the discipline in general and
the poetic figures in particular indicates the fact that Sanskrit Poetics originally began with a theory of embellish-
ment which mainly included, within its purview, the poetic figures. And the presumption is strengthened by the fact that the figures of speech form the main topic of discussion in the oldest surviving works from Dandin to Rudrāṭa.

It is difficult to determine, in the paucity of evidence, whether the formulation of theories on drama preceded those on poetry or vice versa. It is possible that the two systems proceeded together, if not originated contemporaneously. It may be presumed, however, that the principles of Dramaturgy were conceived earlier than those of Poetics, for while Pāṇini is silent with regard to the Kāva- or Alamkāra-sūtra, he does mention the Nāṭasūtras which might have represented the elementary form of Dramaturgy. Any way, the two systems proceeded together, and inspired and influenced each other in the long course of their development.

Traditions recorded by Pāṇini and Hājāsekha. According to an old tradition recorded by Pāṇini, Kṛṣṇaśva and Śrīlaṇa wrote some Nāṭasūtras which are now lost to us. The tradition which is reliable beyond a grain of doubt, affords us a scope to presume that, like Bharata, the authors of Nāṭasūtras also entered the arena of Poetics, and, to some extent at least,

covered the theories which are common to both the systems. The writers referred to by Pāṇini lived much before Bharata who had certainly a long line of teachers before him and drew upon them profusely.

Rājaśekhara (c. 900 A.D.), while giving an account of the divine origin of the science of Poetics, refers to seventeen ācāryas who composed separate works on its eighteen different branches, two of them being ascribed to one teacher. Thus, as he records, Sahasrāśa wrote on the secrets of a poet (Kavirahasya), Uktigarbha on the science of speech (auktika), Suvarpanābha on diction (ṛiti), Prācetāyana on alliteration, Citrāṅgada on yamaka and verbal feats (citra), Śeṣa on verbal pun (nabdasleṣa), Aupakāyana on simile (upamā), Parāśara on exaggeration (atiṣaya), Utathyā on ideal paronomasia (arthasleṣa), Kubera on the poetic figures which refer both to the word and sense (ubhayālaśkāra), Kāmadeva on the amusing figures (vainodika), Bharata on drama, Nandikesvara on sentiments, Dhiṣaṇa on doṣas, Upamanyu on guṇas and Kucumāra on Upaniṣad-like secret aspects of the science (aupaniṣadika).

The legendary character of the account, which contains curious names smelling of alliteration, is more than evident, and there is hardly any evidence of such an early systematic study of the science divided into amazingly numerous branches which

32. The fact is evidenced by his ānuvaṇya verses. One of such verses is ascribed to Vāsuki in Bhāvaprakāśana (pp. 35-6).

33. Cp. KMīm. I.
It appears that a number of names which are either mythical or imaginary have been associated with the various branches with a view to vesting them with unchallengeable authority. Nevertheless, the record cannot be wholly discarded, for it is highly probable that it represents partially a current tradition. We know some of the names like Suvarpanābha and Kuomāra from other sources also, while Bharata, referred to as an authority on drama, is the well-known author of the Mātyādāstra. The name of Nandikesāvra mentioned as an expounder of rasa is associated with a number of works on Music, Erotics and histrionic art. It is possible that he might have written a treatise on sentiments also. Of other teachers recorded in the tradition, nothing is known, and many of them, as remarked above, may be fabulous figures.

34. Also op. De: HSP. I, p. 1; Kane : HSP. p. 1.
35. Op. Kam. S. I. 1; 13; 17; for Suvarpanābha, also op. I. 5. 23; II. 2. 23 etc. It may be noted that Kuomāra is credited with the authorship of the same upaniṣadīka branch (of Erotics).
36. The colophon of Bh. NS. (KM. ed.) connects Nandin with Bharata as co-author of the section on music. Rice (Mysore and Coorg Cat., p. 292) mentions a work on music called Nandibharata. Also op. Sārmadeva (13th cent.) in Sam. R. I. 1. 17; also Kam. S. I. 1. 8; Fanc. S. I. 13; Rati. I. 5. Abhinayadarpana, a work on histrionic art, is attributed to Nandikesāvra. Other works ascribed to him are Nandikesvarme Tālādhvāya, Bharatānava and Nāṭyārṇava.
37. It may be noted here that Abhinava, a rasa theorist (Ab. IV), quotes Nandin's views on certain matters which are, however, not directly connected with rasa. He also quotes from a work called Mandimata (which he identifies once with Tandumata). Mandimata has been quoted in
Writers referred to in Bharata's Nātyasāstra. The Nātyasāstra of Bharata makes a reference to a number of ancient writers. Of these, Tarḍū, whom Abhinava identifies with Handin, has been mentioned as the preceptor of Bharata, while Jāndilīya, Vāśya, Kohala, Dāntiła, Bādarāyaṇa and a host of others have been referred to as Bharata's preceptors. Some of these teachers find mention elsewhere too in literature, and their existence, therefore, should not be doubted. Among such writers, Kāśyapa has been mentioned by Abhinavagupta as also by the commentators of Dāndin and the writer of the Siyabasakara as an ancient ācārya who preceded Dāndin. Another ācārya, Mandissvāmin by name, finds a mention in Vādijāghāla's commentary on Kāvyādārśa. He may possibly be identified with Handin or Sandikeśvara referred to above. The name of Varaṇaruci also has been cited by many writers as an old theorist.

Unfortunately, we possess nothing, except the name, of these ancient writers, nor do we know whether they wrote on

Bharatabhāṣya of Māṇyadeva.

38. Cp. I. 26 ff; for Taḍā, also cp. Bhāvasvakāda III.
40. Cp. on Bharata XXIV, p. 394; cp. AB. (CGS, ed.) II, intro. p. x; Hrd. on KA. I. 2; II. 7; for Siyabasakara's quotation, cp. L.D. Barnett: JAA3, 1905, p. 841. Other writers who mention him are Kallinātha (on Śāṅk. K. II. 2. 31), Māṇyadeva, the author of Pañcasayaka (IV. 19) and the author of Agni-P. (336. 23). One Kāśyapa is known to Pāṇini (III. 4. 67) and a grammarian Kāśyapa is cited by Mādhava who might be some different author; cp. De: HSP. I, p. 68.
Dramaturgy or on Poetics or on both, though with regard to Kātyāyana, Nandīśvāmin and Vararuci, who have been referred to as Dandaśin's predecessors by his commentators, it may plausibly be presumed that they did write on Poetics, even though they might have written on Dramaturgy, too.

The Nātyaśāstra of Bharata. Although Bharata's Nātyaśāstra is essentially a work on Dramaturgy, and not on Poetics, yet it devotes one full chapter (XVI in HM. ed., but XVII in GhSS.) to the doctrines of the latter. This chapter may be taken, in the absence of an independent work on Poetics of the same antiquity, to be the oldest existing work on the science. It may be pointed out that the substance of Bharata's outline of Poetics is older than the earliest extant kāvya writings at least in its material existence, if not in the present form. Again, it is older than the substance of the outline of Poetics given by Dandaśin and Bhāmaha. The date of the Nātyaśāstra, however, is uncertain and various scholars assign it to different periods ranging from second century B.C. to third century A.D. Most probably it was composed in 1st century B.C.

42. Op. Mataya-P. (X. 25) which refers to him as one versed in Nātyaveda. Märkdaneya (Prākṛtasarvasva, intro. v.3) mentions him with Bharata, Kohala and Bhāmaha etc.; also op. Hrd. on KA. I. 2; II. 7. The grammarian Vararuci, however, might be different.

43. De (HSP. I, pp. 28-31) assigns the presumed sutra text of Bharata to the last few centuries B.C., while the kārikā text followed, acc. to him, much later. Acc. to Kane (HSP. pp. 41 ff.), it cannot be assigned to a date later than about 300 A.D. Manomohan Ghosh concludes that the date of the work must be between 100 B.C. and 200 A.D.
We meet with a somewhat developed form of theory of Poetics in the aforesaid chapter of Nāṭyaśāstra, which deals with the ten excellences, the same number of poetic faults and thirty-six lakṣaṇas besides four poetic figures, namely, simile, metaphor, dīpaka and yamaka. Of the five varieties of simile, which the work mentions, the laudatory (prāśāmsopamā) and derogatory (nindopamā) forms get acceptance in Dāṇḍin, while the name of kalpitopamā lingers in Vāmana. No varieties of metaphor and dīpaka have been referred to. The ten varieties of yamaka have been elaborately dealt with, most of which survive in Bhaṭṭi and Dāṇḍin at least in name, if not in gist. Although Bharata relates the figures chiefly to drama (nāṭakāśraya), yet he regards them as figures of poetry as well.

Again, he affiliates the excellences and faults to kāvyā by referring to them as kāvyagunās and kāvyadāsas respectively. Similarly, lakṣaṇas have been named kāvyalakṣaṇas. His treatment of these elements shows that in his time the lakṣaṇas were more prominent than the figures, though in later theory the position became reverse.

op. for detail, Kane: HSP. pp. 41-2; IA, xlvi, 1917, pp. 171-83.

44. Op. KA. II. 30-1; Vāmana IV. 2. 2.

45. Op. XVII. 41; 43.

46. XVII. 95; 96. Though Bharata uses the word, kāvyā frequently to signify drama, but in this chap., he appears to make a distinction between the two; cp. De: HSP. II, pp. 2-3.

47. Op. for detail, V. Raghavan: SCAS. pp. 1-47; De: HSP. II, pp. 4-5; see below also.
Due to his peculiar viewpoint, Bharata subordinates all these elements of poetry to the principal purpose of awakening the sentiments in drama, and it is only with reference to the rasas that he discusses them. Nevertheless, it is definite that these elements formed the main contents of Poetics in its infancy, and the age of the Nāṭyaśāstra may be regarded as the first known period in the history of Sanskrit Poetics.

The post-Bharata period. A wide gulf follows Bharata, till we come to the works of Dandin and Bhāmaha. The history of this long gap is in the dark, but the fact remains that the science of Poetics made remarkable advancement during this interval which envisaged the establishment of the prominence of poetic figures and a steady decline, in importance, of the laksānas. Though the number of doṣas remained the same, notable changes followed in their appellation and conception. The gūṇas retained their old names also, but their conceptions changed radically, with the consequence that they were now related to mārga or poetic diction. Thus there is a long step from Bharata to Dandin in every sphere of the science and it can hardly be conceived that Dandin created, with entire originality, the whole system he represents. It should also be noted here that certain fundamental concepts, such as mārga, gūṇa, doṣa and vakrokti appear in Dandin without a preliminary intro-

48. अखंडवाण्तकः: The laksānas were conceived, along with sandhyāṅgas etc., within the scope of poetic figures; cp. KĀ. II. 367. Bhāmaha and most of the later theorists have altogether left the treatment of laksānas.
duction, which fact indicates that they were traditional and well-known. The comparatively developed form and treatment of the main contents of Poetics in Dandin also signifies a long course of development that preceded him after Bharata. Had the intermediary stage been preserved to us, we would have closely known and fully understood the early writers like Dandin and Bhāmaha in the making. We may, however, discern, on the suggestion of Jacobi, the different stages of development of the science of Poetics in general and of poetic figures in particular during the long gap. As he pointed out, Bhāmaha arranged the poetic figures in a peculiar and suggestive way which, if closely examined, indicates different stages in their growth. Thus, his first group of figures, comprising anuprāsa, yamaka, rūpaka, dīpaka and upamā, which correspond to the figures of Bharata, excepting anuprāsa (which in fact is a subdivision of yamaka), represents the first stage. The second stage is exhibited in Bhāmaha's work by the next group of six figures, namely, ākṣepa, arthāntaranyāsa, vyatireka, vibhāvanā, samāsokti and atīśayokti. The third stage seems to be represented by the figures, hetu, sūkṣma, leśa, yathāsaṁkhya, utprekṣa and svabhāvokti and fourth stage by the twenty-four figures beginning with preyas and ending with āsis, dealt with in one group in a separate chapter in Bhāmaha's work. The


50. Op. for the groups (1) Bh. KAl. II. 4; (2) Ib. II. 66; (3) ib. II. 88; 83; 92; (4) ib. III. 1-4.
development of these stages may be corroborated by the works of Bhaṭṭi, Danḍin and Udbhata inasmuch as they deal with the figures almost in the above order, though they do not divide them in groups as Bhāmaha does.

Bhaṭṭi (c. 590–610 A.D.), in the tenth and twelfth cantos of his Hāvaṇavadha, illustrates, in all, thirty-eight figures, twenty-three of which tally in name as well as in order with Bhāmaha's list, with, of course, a few minor variations. The remaining fifteen figures correspond generally in name, though slightly vary in sequence. It is probable that Bhaṭṭi, who was not a theorist himself, made some convenient changes in order and dropped a few of them. His work, therefore,

51. A comparative table of the figures of Danḍin and Bhāmaha shows that their order of enumeration is almost the same. Danḍin's beginning with svabhāvokti, a figure of the third stage in Bhāmaha, is purely a personal trait; then follow the three figures, in the same order in which they occur in Bṛhatā. Bhāmaha here deviates from the sequence by dealing with upamā after rūpaka and dipaka. Danḍin expressly leaves yamaka for subsequent treatment, while his āvṛtti is virtually a variety of dipaka and it has been regarded as such by later theorists (see below). Then Danḍin has 6 figures, from ākerna to atiśayokti, in the same order as they are in Bhāmaha who includes them in the second group. Next follow 5 more figures which form the third group in Bhāmaha. Here the order is slightly different in Danḍin who puts upprakṣā in the beginning. Lastly come the 23 figures of Bhāmaha's last group, almost in the same order with a few minor differences. The figure, upameyupamā, has been treated as a variety of upamā by Danḍin, while Bhāmaha gives it independent status which it retains in later time. De. (HS2, II, op. 27; 30 and fn.), curiously enough remarks that by the time of Danḍin a large number of poetic figures had been recognised, and in the time of Bhāmaha (whom he places earlier than Danḍin; see above), the number was comparatively less, and that Danḍin arranges them in his own way. But, as we have seen, Danḍin's list does not vary much in order from Bhāmaha's, nor the number is larger in him. Udbhata,
which supplied one of the missing links in the history of Poetics anterior to Dandin and Bhama, may be taken as representing the fourth stage of growth of poetic figures.

We do not know the writer whose work formed the basis of Bhatti's illustration of the figures, but most probably he belonged to a tradition which did not substantially differ from that of Dandin and Bhama.

Besides this unknown author, there are some other writers who are known to have written in the interval. The author of the Visnudharmottarapurana is one of them. The date of the upapurana is uncertain, but it can be plausibly placed in the period between Bharata and Bhatti, for it deals with the most of the figures of the first three stages and only a few of the fourth one which may have been in the process of growth in the period in which the work was written. Other authors of the intermediary period are known only by name. Medhavin is one such writer who wrote probably in the interval between Dandin and Bhama who refers to him twice. He has

followed Bhama, deals with the first three groups in chaps. I-III and the fourth group in chaps. IV-VI.


53. HSP. I, pp. 51-2.

54. From internal evidence, it cannot be placed earlier than 400 and later than 500 A.D.; op. A.C. Hazra: SU. I, pp. 147-218; also op. De: HSP. I, pp. 95-7; Kane: HSP. pp. 69-72.

55. Strangely enough, it leaves such important figures as upama, dipaka, aksepa and samasokti of the first three
also been mentioned by Rājaśekhara (c. 900 A.D.), Rātanārī-57
jñāna (c. 908 A.D.) and Namisādhu (1069 A.D.). Another
writer, Rāmasārman, who wrote Acyutottara probably on poetic
riddles, finds a mention in Bhāmaha’s work as well as in the
Rātanārī commentary of Kāvyādāra. One Brahmadatta has been
mentioned by Vādijanghāla, a commentator of Dāndin, as the
latter’s predecessor. Nothing can be said definitely re­
garding the date of these writers who probably belong to the
long gap between Bharata and Dāndin.

There might have been a number of other writers whose names
even have not come down to us. Dāndin follows these known and
unknown writers in his Kāvyādāra, wherein we come across, for
the first time, a definite scheme of Poetics, more or less
systematically arranged.

stages; of the fourth group, it has only 5 figures, viz.,
sleṣa, visesokti, nidadana, virodha and ananvaya.

56. Bh.Kāl. II, 40; 88; op. sect. I, ch. III.
50; 92; II, p. 30 fn. Namisādhu on Rudraṭa: I, 2; II, 2;
XI, 24.
58. Op. Bh. Kāl. II, 19; Ratna. on KA. II, 7. Acc. to ASK,
( p. 17 ) Dāndin had a friend in one Rāmasārman. But it
is difficult to identify the two.