CHAPTER I

LIFE, DATE AND WORKS OF RĀMACANDRA

AND GUNACANDRA

PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE AUTHORS: 1

Our present work Nātyadarpana is an outcome of the joint authorship of two Jaina monks - Rāmacandra and Gunaacandra whose names are mentioned in the colophons at the end of each of the four chapters of the Karikās as well as the commentary over them.

As regards the personal history of Rāmacandra we are not completely left in the dark. All the same, the information that we get is meagre and not so satisfactory. So many questions appear before our minds when we think of our author - namely, where was he born, in which family was he born, what were the names of the parents, where did he study, where, when and how did he accept asceticism and so on. Most of those questions are likely to remain unanswered. Still an attempt is made here to gather whatever information is available and to present it as systematically as possible.

The chief sources from which we get the glimpses into the life and incidents of Rāmacandra are as follows: 2

1. While writing this chapter I have utilized the introduction to the Nalavilāsa (published by G.O.S.) by Shri L.B. Gandhi.
2. Prof. Pandit Bechardasa Doshi in his work Hemacandraśārya refers to the pupils of Hemacandra but we do not find any special noteworthy information about them.
1. His own works.
2. Prabhavakacarita of Candraprabhasūri (1277 A.D.)
3. Upadesatarāṅgini of Ratnamandiraganī (1460 A.D.)
4. Prabhāndhacintāmaṇi of Herutungasūri (1310 A.D.)
5. Kumārapālaprabandha of Jinasamandaraganī (1435 A.D.)
6. Prabandhakosa of Rājasekharesūri (1348 A.D.)

At the outset from the Nātyadarpana itself we are given to understand that he was the disciple and the chief disciple (Pattadhara) - of Hemacandra who flourished in the days of Kumārapāla. Due homage is paid to the learned preceptor Hemacandra by our authors in the concluding verses at the end of the work.²

That he was the chief disciple of Hemacandra is also known from the following works of his own :-

1. Prelude to Halavilāsa
2. Prelude to Satyaharidiscandra
3. Prelude to Mṛbhayabhīmavṛyoyoga
4. Prelude to Raghuvilāsa
5. Prelude to Kaumudīmitrāṇanda

The Prabhavakacarita of Candraprabhasūri relates to an incident where once Siddharāja Jayasiṃha out of sheer curiosity inquires of Hemacandra as to whom he considered to be his main disciple, whereupon the latter names Rāmecandra of excellent virtues, the best among the blessed.

1. According to Shri P.V. Kane the date is 1307 A.D.
2. ND. p. 215.
ones to be fit for inheriting and maintaining his place. Once he showed an eulogy to the king composed by Rāmacandra which was quite original and heart-captivating. This was—

"The victorious do not tolerate any other person to exceed them even by an inch. So may you, O lord of the earth, supersede the Lord of Dhārā." The king was highly impressed to hear this.

Truly Rāmacandra was the chip of the old block. It was quite in the fitness of things that the learned preceptor reckoned him to be the chief of his pupils. His deep and mature learning of all sciences, clear thinking, excellent mode of representation, lucid, perspicacious and dignified style are exemplified by the ND and his other works. That he has tried various forms of drama also points out that he is not merely a learned critic but is a dramatist and a poet as well. He has thoroughly imbibed the principles of dramaturgy which he has theoretically discussed in his work on dramatics. His mastery over language and his handling of different topics deserve appreciation.

READY-WITTEDNESS OF RĀMACANDRA:

Rāmacandra was given the title of Kavikaṭāramalla by Siddharāja Jayasimha as he was pleased by the ready-wittedness in poetry of this poet ever since his early age. An account is found in Upadesataraṅgini of Ratnamandira, the author of Bhojasprabandha. The story runs as follows:

Once the king Jayasimha surrounded by seventy two feudal kings went to the pleasure-garden. The summer season had set in. On his way he met Rāmacandra. With a view to testing the knowledge and ready-wittedness of this young poet Jayasimha put to him the following question: 'Why are the days so long in Summer?'. To this, ready-witted Rāmacandra instantly retorted that the days were long because the horses of the sun could not resist the temptation of tasting the Dūrvā grass grown on the banks of the heavenly Ganges, which had become muddy on account of the wind-driven dust which arose from the earth which was pulverized by the harsh hoofs of the running horses of the heroes as they marched for world-conquest.¹

Siddharāja was highly delighted and rather astounded at the extempore versification of Rāmacandra which revealed his poetic genius, his high imaginative power and the devotion to the king himself. So he again asked Rāmacandra to describe the town instantly. Instantly Rāmacandra gave a poetic and ornate description of the town in a verse containing a charming Utyrekgala whereupon the king was so much pleased that he conferred upon Rāmacandra the title of Avikataramalla in the presence of all.²

1. Upadesatarāgini p. 62. An almost similar account is found in the Trubandhacintāmani (p. 63) also.

2. The verse runs as follows:

उपदेशारागिनी प. 62. एक अनुमान भाषा में शुभद्र सूत्र की है कृपया इसे हिंदी में अनुवाद करें।
The Prabandhacintāmani of Merutunga briefly refers to this discourse between Rāmacandra and Siddhārāja as follows - One day Siddhārāja asked Rāmacandra why the days were long in summer, whereupon Rāmacandra said, 'O, Lord', etc. ¹

Merutunga refers to another interesting episode which took place in the court of Kumārapāla, where Rāmacandra gives a very apt retort to Pandit Viśvesvara of Benaras, as he tried to cut a joke at Hemacandra comparing him with a shepherd who too had a blanket and a stick.²

Such a great poet like Rāmacandra was highly diligent in writing. In his prelude to Raghuvilāsa he refers to himself (through Sūtradhāra) as acumbitakāvyatandra, i.e. one who has never been idle in composing poetry. In prelude to Kaumudīmitrāṇandā also he refers to himself as "Visirnakāvya-nirmanatandra". This points to his love for poetry and his zeal in poetic composition.

RĀMACANDRA LOSES HIS ONE EYE:

The Prabhavakacarita gives an account of Rāmacandra's loss of the right eye. The work, having provided the reader with general information about Siddhārāja and Rāmacandra proceeds as follows - When Hemacandra introduced Rāmacandra to Siddhārāja, Siddhārāja asked him to be one sighted i.e., concentrated (ekadrṣṭi) in Jain law.

1. Prabandhacintāmani, p. 63.
2. Ibid p. 89. Viśvesvara said:

Paṇu oṁ aṁjoseṇa: kālaṁ kṝṇāpālō
whereupon Rāmacandra completed the verse as under:

ṇṇaṁ paṁgōṣṭhiṁ vārasyoṁ aṁjoseṇe II

and thus turns the verse as a glorious tribute to Hemacandra
Consequently Rāmacandra lost one of his eyes the very moment.¹

Merutungasūri gives another account for the loss of one eye of Rāmacandra. He states — all learned people were called to see the Sahasralingaprasasti by the poet Śrīpāla, engraved on a stone. On account of courtesy towards Śrīpāla and considering the king's regard for the same, all those who were present said that the poem was quite nice and specially appreciated a verse beginning with 'Kosenāpi' etc.² Rāmacandra found out faults of grammar in the very verse and so one of his eyes was lost.³

There are two legends with regard to this loss of eye. According to one, Rāmacandra was unruly and was taken before the sage Jayarāja. He made him have a single eye to the propagation of the Jaina faith. Thus Rāmacandra lost one eye. Another legend goes that Rāmacandra passed criticism on the poem of Śrīpāla inspite of the warning of his teacher. This loss of eye came as a punishment for the above sin.

1. Prabhāvakacarita verses 137 to 138.
2. Kośenaṇi yutam dalaipuracitam nocchetumetatksamam
   Svasyāpi afūtakantakavyatikaram puristvam ca dhatte nahi;
   Tko'pyeṣanā karoti kośarahito niṣkantakari bhūtalem
   Atvaiyair kamalam vihāya komalam yasyāsimśādiṇiyat.
   Rāmacandra points out two faults — (i) the word 'Dala'
   indicates 'army' (ii) the word 'kamalam' is neuter gender.
3. Prabandhacintāmani, p, 64.
In several stotras in praise of Jinas composed by Rāmacandra we find a suggestion of this particular incident of the poet's loss of an eye. The poet supplicates the Jinas to bestow the eyesight upon him. Of course the general meaning would be, according to the context, that the poet urges for spiritual eyesight to enlighten the path of salvation, which is darkened by the blindness of ignorance. But a repeated urging of this type appears to be significant and possessing double meaning. The demand of eyesight from Lord Jina may conveniently be referring to the loss of the physical eye as a true votary of the Lord would naturally approach him in times of difficulty. So it is quite in the fitness of things that the poet should demand it from the Lord (Jina).

A paronomastic reference to this demand of eyesight we find in Hemiṣṭava - the devotional song in praise of Lord Neminātha, one of the 24 Tīrthāṅkaras. The verse runs as follows:

"O Hemi, lovely and brilliant like a creeper - like sharpedged sword, O God, bestow upon me eyesight having pure brilliance like that of the moon, so that the enveloping heaps of darkness may instantly be dispelled and immediately there may flash forth eternal light."

We clearly find here an indirect suggestion to the above incident. Another similar verse is found in the concluding verse of each of the sixteen Sādhāraṇa Jīnastavas.
"Highly delightful Lord, a desire-yielding tree for endless fruit, who makes the whole world bend low (before him with respect) on account of his life as pure as the moon, whose lotus-like feet are worshipped by Indra, a God, may you be pleased with me; in this multitude of difficulties, shower mercy, and bestow the eyesight upon me."¹

Vystirekadvātrīmśikā too refers to this blinenss of Rāmacandra in the concluding verses.²

DEATH OF HEMACANDRA:

More books than one declare that Hemacandra, the preceptor of Rāmacandra, died in Vikrama Samvat 1229 (i.e. 1973 A.D.). The king Kumārapāla of Caulukya dynasty who was a devout votary of Hemacandra was deeply shocked at this. This despondent king was consoled by Rāmacandra and others. The above account is found in the Kumārapālacarita written by Jayasiṅha sūri dated Vikrama Samvat 1422 (i.e. 1566 A.D.). The account goes as follows:

"On account of the death of Hemacandra the Caulukya king (Kumārapāla) confounded as it were, on all sides, did not know what to do at all. Then learned men like Rāmacandra and others advised him daily and after some days any how lessened his grief.

¹ Jaina-Stotrasālā, pp. 1-2-120.
² Cf. अधिनिः पृथ्विधीधिनियोजितम्
   विविधतानवशस्त्रनुविदिकं
   - Vystirekadvātrīmśikā, v.31.
In the Vikrama Samvat 1230 (i.e., 1174 A.D.) when not more than six months had passed after the death of Hemacandra, the king Kumārapāla being affected by the poison given by his nephew Ajayapāla, called Rāmacandra and asked him to perform "Paryantārādhana".

The verse in the Kumārapālacarita runs as follows -

"Then the royal sage (Kumārapāla) having called the great sage Rāmacandra started to perform 'Paryantārādhana' according to the sacred precept."

DEATH OF RĀMACANDRA:

This great poet who was held in high esteem by king Kumārapāla and others and who was reckoned to be the author of one hundred works met a sorrowful death. The "prince of the learned" was put to death in an inhuman manner by the wicked king Ajayapāla. An account of this is found in Arabandhaclintamani of Scrutungosūri as follows:

As Rāmacandra, the author of one hundred works, was made to sit on the heated piece of copper by that wretched king, he uttered the verse - "That hour of the day (i.e., the sun) who cast his feet on the surface of the entire earth consisting of animate as well as inanimate objects should set within no time." With these words he committed suicide by cutting the tip of his tongue by his teeth. Yet he was again put to death by the cruel king (in spite of the fact that he was dead).

The above work gives the account of the death of Ajayapāla who performed evil deeds like killing a great poet sage Rāmacandra as under:

In accordance with the authoritative lines viz.,
"The doer of a very sinful or meritorious deed achieves the fruit (of his action) here (i.e. in this world) only within three years, three months, three fortnights or three days," that bad monarch was killed with a sword (kṣurikā) by a servant named Vayajaladeva and he perished having experienced hell daily being devoured by worms as he committed sin even at sacred places. From Vikrama Sāvat 1230 (i.e. 1174 A.D.) onwards Ajayadeva ruled for three years.

Prabandhakośa of Rājaśekhara sūri states as under:

Thus as the time passed on, the king Kumārapāla as well as Hemacandra grew old. In the group of pupils of Hemacandra, there was rivalry. The group of Pratāpamalla and Bālacandra happened to be on one side and Bālacandra on the other. The latter developed intimate friendship with Ajayapāla, the nephew of the king.

One night king Kumārapāla, preceptor Hemacandra and Ābhada entered into a secret council. The king respectfully asked the learned preceptor as to whom he should entrust the kingdom with after his death, soulless as he was. The preceptor (Hemacandra) advised the king to give the throne to Pratāpamalla, the son of his daughter, in order that the religion may be well maintained and pointed out that
Ajayapāla was going to destroy the religion founded by the king. Here Abhada opined that howsoever a man may be, one who is personally related should be preferred. Hemacandra re-asserted that under no circumstances should Ajayapāla be made the king. With this secret counsel, the three persons dispersed.

The secret talk was overheard by Bālacandra and was narrated to Ajayapāla. Consequently Ajayapāla bore enmity against Rāmacandra and other favourite pupils of Hemacandra and loved Abhada.

After some time, Hemacandra joined the majority and on the thirty second day after his death, king Kusārapāla too breathed his last being poisoned by Ajayapāla. Ajayapāla acquired the throne. Out of hatred for Hemacandra, Ajayapāla tortured his pupils viz., Rāmacandra and others to death by forcing them to sit on a heated iron seat. Many of the Jain Vihāras (convents) in the domain were levelled with the ground. Having called young Jain monks (Laghukṣa-llakas) he made them practise hunting every day with a view to deriding them as they followed formerly the order of Jain convent (Caitya).

Bālacandra, the root-cause of this calamity, met the fate which he deserved. He was looked down upon by all Brahmins pointing to him with the words: "Here is the killer of one's own family." He was so much ashamed that he left for Mālava country and died there.
Puratanaprabandhasamgraha gives the account as under:-

Rāmacandra and Bālacandra were the pupils of Hemacandra. The preceptor imparted special learning and honour to Rāmacandra having reckoned him a worthy pupil. Being infuriated by this Bālacandra went away. He made friendship with Ajayapāla. When the latter became king, he asked Rāmacandra to impart all learning which he received from Hemacandra to his friend Bālacandra. Rāmacandra said - How can the learning of the preceptor be given to an unworthy person?". Then the king ordered him to sit on fire ....... Rāmacandra while sitting on fire having cut his tongue, composed Dodhakapraśasti.

PERSONALITY OF RĀMACANDRA.

Rāmacandra, the author of Prabandhasat, was a man of great learning. He himself proclaims his proficiency in the three science - grammar, logic, and poetics. He must have been well-versed in other sciences also.

Rāmacandra was proud of himself and his learning. He thought highly of himself. In the ND also he criticizes the unworthy critics whose only work is to criticise.

1. Purātanaprabandha-samgraha p. 49.
2. ND, p. 215.
3. His fault finding in the Sahāralingaprasāasti of Śripāla does suggest his learning but at the same time it also hints at his lack of modesty.
In the prologue of all his plays he eulogises himself and tries to establish his superiority to other poets like Mūrāri, and others.

Rāmacandra is equally fearless. He refused to succumb to any threats. He refused to impart knowledge to Pālacandra whom he considered to be an unworthy pupil, even at the order of king Ajayapāla and preferred death to surrender. His end was really worthy of a hero.

He loved freedom. In the MLV he occasionally refers to the pleasures of freedom. In his Nīrbhay, as well as the Satya, he reckons freedom to be the shower of joy. In the Bharatavākyā of the Nīrbhay, the MM, the Satya, the YMM, etc., there is a prayer for freedom.

Temperamentally he must have been jovial as compared to his co-pupil Gunacandra who appeared to be rather serious and sober. In his dramas he tries to create humour by humorous speeches and cutting jokes.

Rāmacandra was a devout monk, which is testified to by a great number of the devotional songs that he has composed. He very much respected his religious preceptor Hemacandra.

1. Puratansprabandhasamgraha, p. 49.
2. Cf. MLV- "If there be freedom as long as one lives, useless is the magnificence of heaven and earth" (II, 2). Also Cf. "A free man does not know the agony of a dependent" (VI, 7) Even in the final verse of the play there is a desire for freedom (SwatantraPhava- VII, 13).
He did inherit the learning and erudition of his great 'Guru', but he did not have the tact of winning popularity which Hemacandra had, otherwise he would not have met with such a tragic death.

CO-PUPILS OF RĀMACANDRA:

Hemacandra on account of his towering personality had a great band of votaries and disciples. Rāmacandra obviously was the most favourite of them all. The names of other seven who must have been favoured by Hemacandra more than the remaining huge lot of ordinary pupils are given below. These can safely be regarded as the co-students of Rāmacandra, one of whom was Gunaacandra, in the partnership of whom Rāmacandra wrote serious and scientific works such as Nātyadarpana and Bravyālāmākīra. The names of those seven pupils of Hemacandra other than Rāmacandra are as under:

1. Gunaacandragni - He seems to have been a great favourite of Rāmacandra, being rather equal in knowledge and merits to himself and that is why the latter wrote two above-mentioned works in the joint authorship with him. Of course we do not come across any independent work of Gunaacandra and so possibly he might not have written any work independently. It appears that he was a man of sobre and serious nature, more inclined to serious study and learning and less inclined to writing or earning fame and reputation by contributing something by himself. But
Rāmacandra was conscious of the deep learning of his co-student and that is why such a voluminous writer as Rāmacandra was, he preferred to seek the aid of his friend and the fruit of this co-operative effort is our ND. A reader of the work cannot but be impressed by the erudition of the authors and the clarity of expression which indirectly reflect the personality of the authors. Guṇacandra also joined hands with Rāmacandra in writing a philosophical work called Dravyālāmākāra.

2. Mahendrasūri - He has written detailed commentaries on Abhidhānacintāmāni and Nighantūkośa of Hemacandra. He also wrote a commentary called Anekārthakairavākaumudī on Hemacandra’s Anekārthasangraha and ascribed to it the authorship of Hemacandra.

3. Vardhamāna Geni - He has written a commentary on Kumāravihāraprasāasti, where he draws one hundred and sixteen meanings from that poem. This reflects upon the great scholarship of the commentator.

4. Devacandra muni - He has written a Prakaraṇa type of drama named Candralekhāvijaya in about 1207 A.D. He is also said to have written another work called Rānamudrābhāṣījana but it is not available at present.

---

2. For details - See Jesalmer Bhāndāra sūci, page 46.
5. **Yaśasćandra** — He find his name mentioned in *Prabandhacintāmanī* (Vikrama era 1361). He is also referred to in *Prabhāvakacarita* (verse no 737) and *Kumārapālaprabandha* (p. 188). No work of his has still been discovered. Shri K.M. Munshi and Shri Ramalal Modi consider him to be the writer of a *prakaraṇa* named *Mudritakumuda* but Shri Bhogilal Sandesara points out that their view is wrong.

6. **Udayacandra** — No work of his is available at present but it is said that his preachings inspired many others. Being inspired by him Devendra wrote a commentary named *Katicidḍurgopadavyākhyā* on *Siddhahemabṛhadavṛttī* and another work called *Upanśitiprapaṇākathāsarodādha*. Dr. Bühler considers Devendra, the commentator of *Hemabṛhadavṛttī*, as a pupil of Udayacandra. Prabandhacintāmanī (p. 147) gives an interesting episode of Udayacandra’s mastery over grammar. Once Udayacandra was reading the *Yogāṣṭhā* of Hemacandra in the presence of king Kumārapāla. There he corrected the original reading of the line *Dantakesānakhasthitvaṃgraṇāṃ grahanamākare* by putting ‘Romnum’ in place of *Romnāṃ*. Being questioned by Hemacandra he pointed out that *dvandva* compounds, with limbs of animals, musical instruments etc. as their members, govern singular number. All were pleased with this explanation.

1. Page 133 and pages 143-144.
2. *Gujarat and his literature*, p. 47.
7. **Balacandra** - The last member of this group is Balacandra. He does not appear to be a worthy pupil of such a great Ācārya as Hemacandra. He envied the high honour and prominence which his preceptor gave to Rāmacandra. He was a rival of Rāmacandra. He was formerly a friend of Ajayapāla. He poisoned the ears of Ajayapāla against Rāmacandra and was the cause of the tragic death of Rāmacandra which is referred to earlier.

He is supposed to have written a prayer named Snātasyā.

Prabandhakośa (p. 98) states that the Brahmins condemned him before the king Ajayapāla as the killer of one's own family. Bālacandra, being ashamed, went to Mālava where he breathed his last.

**DATE OF RĀMACANDRA AND GUNACANDRA:**

'History is the one weak spot in Indian literature,' says Macdonell, the celebrated Sanskrit scholar of the west. The dates of some of the greatest of our poets and dramatists, like Kālidāsa and others remain unfixed. But it is not so, fortunately, in the case of our authors. The date of our authors can be fixed with precision.

Both Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra are known to be the pupils of the great Jaina Ācārya Hemacandra. Even in the ND, our authors have paid a glorious tribute to their learned preceptor. So, undoubtedly both of these authors were contemporaries. It is likely that Rāmacandra might have been

---

a little older than Guaacandra as the former was the chief disciple of Hemacandra who had nominated him as his heir. About Hemacandra's date there is no controversy at all. He was born in 1085 A.D. and died in 1172 A.D. His life history indicates that he had witnessed three royal successions. He flourished in the reign of Jayasimha Siddharāja and Kumārapāla. Prabandhacintāmaṇi and other works mention some incidents relating to Rāmacandra and Siddharāja. Siddharāja ascended the throne in 1094 A.D. and reigned upto 1143 or 1145 A.D. He was succeeded by Kumārapāla who died in 1172 A.D., soon after the death of Hemacandra. Kumārapāla was succeeded by Ajayapāla in the year 1172 A.D. and soon after his coronation he put Rāmacandra to death.

Thus Rāmacandra died an unnatural death in about 1172 A.D. or 1173 A.D. i.e. immediately after the death of Hemacandra and Kumārapāla. The fact that he was given the title of Kavi-Katāramalla by Jayasimha goes to suggest that he had earned a name as a poet by that time. Thus Rāmacandra can be said to have flourished between C. 1125 A.D. to 1173 A.D. and might have written the CB in the latter half of the twelfth century (C. 1150 A.D. to 1170 A.D.).

1. Struggle for Empire, p. 76.
2. Struggle for empire, p. 77.
3. Ibid, p. 78.
Gunacandra also being his co-student can be put in the same time i.e. twelfth century. He may have lived longer than Ramacandra as he is not known to have the misfortune of meeting a premature death as Ramacandra had. Of course we are completely in the dark regarding his end.

WORKS OF RAMACANDRA.

Ramacandra's name is preceded by the appellation Prabandhasatakartamahakavi - a great poet and a writer of the hundred works. This title is mentioned by Ramacandra himself in the introduction to some of his own works.\(^1\) Merutuniga also refers to him as "Prabandhasatakarta"\(^2\). From these references we can reasonably infer that he must have written about one hundred works.

The word Prabandhasatakart which Ramacandra used for himself can also be taken as the "author of Prabandhasata" (a work of that name). This work is mentioned in Brhatippanika and this view is stated by Shri Punyavijayaji in his preface to the Kaumudi. It has been stated that this work dealt with dramaturgy. This view though quite plausible is open to the following objections:

1. (a) Prabandhasatavidhananigatatubuddhin - Kaumudi.prologue.  
   (b) Prabandhasatakartamahakavi-Ramacdrasaya - Nibhayabhima.
(1) No such work as Prabandhaśata has been still discovered. Had it been such an important work that he could pride himself in as he refers to in the prologues of the Kaumudi and the NBh, we should find some traces of such a great work. Rāmacandra apparently refers to this fact with pride which will mean that the work must be of a very high calibre and must have earned him wide reputation.

(2) It is also stated that the work deals with dramaturgy. It is difficult to understand why one and the same author should undertake to write two works on the same subject which though not unlikely in modern age was not common in early days.

(3) The name too is rather perplexing and does not give any idea about the nature of the work. It is still more perplexing as to how it can be dealing with dramaturgy.

(4) No where in the ND Rāmacandra ever mentions this work. Had it been such an important work, the authors should have mentioned it or quoted from it as they have done from other works. Moreover, the ND treats of the subject so elaborately that another book on the same subject is bound to be redundant.
Thus it is difficult to understand how the word Prabandhasata can be taken as the name of a work and that too dealing with dramaturgy. On the contrary, it is not necessary to take the word as a proper noun at all when the word can be interpreted in the simple sense that Rāmacandra was a voluminous writer and several of his works have been found. As many as forty five of Rāmacandra's works are known at present, and it is possible that Rāmacandra should have written a number of works which might have been nearly one hundred, if not actually hundred. Even Satakas that we have today in Sanskrit do not have actually a hundred verses only. The practice of exaggerating things is not rare with Sanskrit writers and so the capacity of Rāmacandra to write a number of works might have earned him this title. The word 'hundred' should not therefore be taken literally but rather metaphorically to mean "good many," or "nearly hundred." The word 'Sata' has been used by Rāmacandra himself in the sense of "nearly hundred" as can be seen from the title of his Kumāravahāra Sataka which contains precisely one hundred and sixteen verses.

Moreover it was not uncommon among the Jaina monks who perfectly devoted themselves to reading and writing to have written voluminously, e.g., Haribhadra is considered to be the writer of fourteen hundred Prakaranaḥ. Even

1. The practice of using the numerals in such a sense is as old as the RV. Cf. RV X 90, 1, where the word 'Sahasra' is used in the sense of 'many'. 
Hemacandra, the preceptor of our authors, is known to be a voluminous writer.

Even if we understand "Prabandhasaṭa" as a book of that name, it is also possible to understand it as "hundred works" considering the vast amount of dramas and poems that he has written. This view of Prabandhasaṭa meaning hundred works is accepted by most of the scholars.¹

He has tried hand in almost all important forms of drama such as Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā, Vyāyoga, etc. He has also written poems as well as Stotras in praise of Jaina Tīrthāṅkaras. He is known to have written two serious works - one on science of dramaturgy (ND) and one on Jaina Nyāya (Bravyālaṃkāra).

It is true that all of his works are not available. Many of them still remain to be searched out.² Here we enumerate those works whose manuscripts have been found and some of which have been published.

---

1. L.E. Gandhi, (Intro. to NLU), Prof. H.R. Kapadia (Jain Sāhityano Itihāsa); Muni Caturavijaya, (Introduction to Jainastotrasandoha) and others.
2. Shri Punyavijayasji Maharaja is soon to bring out six plays of Rāmacandra adding Mallikāmakaranda and Raghuvilāsa to the four already published.
His works are as under:

1. Balavilasa
2. Satyahariiscandranasa
3. Kaumudimitranandaparacara
4. Mallikemakaranandaparacara
5. Rohiniiriganaaparacara
6. Yaddavathyudaya
7. Raghavabhyudaya
8. Raghuvilasa
9. Yaduvilasa
10. Vanamaala nati
11. Nirbhayabhima vyayoga
12. Sudhakala
13. Dravyasankara (with Gunacandra)
14. Natyadarpana (with Gunacandra)
15. Komara hitasataka
16. Haimabhadvrittinyasa
17. Yugadidevadvatrisikā
18. Vyatirekadvatrisikā
19. Prasadadvatrisikā
20. Apanutidvatrisikā
21. Arthantaranyasadvatrisikā
22. Jinasutidvatrisikā
23. Drstantagarbhinastutidvatrisikā
24. Sanitidvatrisikā
25. Bhaktatisayadvatrisikā
26. Adidevastava
27. Nemistava

* The works marked with an asterisk (*) are not published.
Out of these forty five works the first eleven are different forms of Rūpakas. Rāmacandra refers to them as Svopajña, i.e., his own compositions, in the MD. Out of these numbers 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are Māṭakas, the most popular form of Rūpaka amongst all the twelve. Numbers 3, 4, and 5 are Prakaranaś. Number 10 is a Māṭikā - one of the popular forms of Rūpaka - which is reckoned to be an Uparūpaka by certain theorists. Number 11 is a Vyāyoga.

Numbers 13 and 14 i.e. Nātyadarpana and Dravyālaśkāra¹ are not his independent works. These works are of scientific nature and have been written in collaboration with Guṇacandra, one of his fellow students.

Numbers 12 and 15 are poems. No. 16 is a Nyāsa. The rest are stotras in praise of various Tīrthaṅkaras. They have been treated in details in chapter VII of this Thesis.

¹ Dravyālaśkāra is a work of Jaina Nyāya. It is divided into three chapters. The first chapter deals with Dravya, the second with Guṇa and the third with Paryāya. The work contains Sūtras and the commentary over them by the authors themselves. At present only two chapters (II and III) are discovered.
It is very probable that a large number of works of this voluminous writer (writer of one hundred works) still remains unknown being devoured by time the tyrant. Still whatever works are extant go a long way to give a fair insight into the literary talents of our author. The number forty five is enough to give him the title of a voluminous writer. His contribution to Sanskrit literature cannot, therefore, be overlooked.