SECTION I

DANĐIN AND HIS WORKS

Danḍin occupies an important place in Sanskrit literature both as a rhetorician and as a writer of prose-fiction. He is one of the oldest exponents of Sanskrit Poetics, while his place in the field of prose comes with Subandhu and Bāṇa whom he follows chronologically. He also succeeds the poetry of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi, besides that of Aśvaghōsa and Bhāsa. Thus he enjoys the privilege of inheriting the great traditions of Sanskrit kāvyā which he, on his part, enriches profusely with his precious contributions in the sphere both of kāvyā and the science of kāvyā. It is unfortunate, however, that we do not possess much information regarding his age and life and personality. What is still more deplorable is that there is no unanimity even with regard to his writings. While, on one hand, a number of books are attributed to him on slender grounds, on the other, the common authorship of the works traditionally ascribed to him is doubted by some scholars who propound thereby, directly or indirectly, the theory of more than one Danḍin. We shall discuss below the problem of the identity of our author, which has a great bearing on the question of his works, his period as well as his personality, to a reference shall be made subsequently.
CHAPTER I

IDENTITY OF DANDIN

Tradition ascribes, as we shall see below, the composition of the Kavyadarsha, Daśakumāraracita, Avantisundarīkathā and a dvisamādhāna-kāvyā to Daṇḍin. But some scholars doubt the common authorship of all these works on various grounds, and are inclined to hold that there were more than one Daṇḍin. Of course, there is nothing which may preclude the possibility of the existence of three or more authors bearing the name Daṇḍin. Besides, the name itself, which is employed to designate a religious mendicant of a certain order, can be taken, as Mr. S.K. De suggests, as a title capable of being applied to more than one person. But the question is whether there is ample ground for doubting the traditional ascription or there is any substantial evidence in support of the existence of authors holding the name or title of Daṇḍin. According to Mr. Agashe, there were three Daṇḍins, (1) Daṇḍin, the critic, better known as Ācārya Daṇḍin, (2) Daṇḍin, the author of Daśakumāraracita and (3) the poet, Daṇḍin. In his view, the author of Daśakumāraracita could not have been the same Daṇḍin who wrote the

Kāvyādāsa, because the two works are widely divergent in style and purity of language and in general tenor and in this contention, he is supported by Mr. K.P. Trivedi and Dr. S.K. De.

4 Mr. Asashe argued that the author of Kāvyādāsa was a fastidious critic who had refined notions about style and its functions in poetry and was a literary purist who warned all aspirants of poetic fame against connivance at even the most trivial flaw which he compared to 'a spot of white leprosy on the beautiful person,' while in Daśakumācaratīta, we come across numerous faults in the matter of grammar and poetics and as regards the general tenor of the stories. He cited a number of instances of faulty grammar, irregular syntax and unfamiliar use and misuse of words, and made an elaborate plea for his contention. But, as Dr. A.B. Keith pointed out rightly, most of the alleged errors may easily be defended or at least are of the type which other poets permit themselves. In fact, such forms as āhlādiṣata and āsvādayītum, such constructions as enam anuraktā and such syntax as in Mariciṃ veṣakrohrād utthāya punaḥ pratitaptatapahprabhāva-

5. See KA., I. 7.
6. Cp. below, sect. III, chap. IV.
8. DKC. pp. 138 and 194 respectively; the latter is A. of X class.
9. DKC. p. 57; cp. Apte, Dict. (new ed.), giving
pratyāpam adityacakṣasam upasāṅgamyā tenāsmyevāṃbhūtaḥ

10. tvaddārāṇam avaṇamitaḥ, etc. are grammatically faultless, while some other errors can plausibly be taken as scribal mistakes. The use of plural for singular in 'dayīta naḥ Kanakalekhā' has been made deliberately and helpfully by the author in order to avoid the labial māma in the seventh uucchvāsa which is his tour de force. A few errors like aham okāme etc. are, of course, serious. But we should not expect an absolute purity of language from poets who must be given some licence. Even Daṇḍin, the so-called severe critic, while describing the grammatical fault (sabdaḥīna), gives some concession to the poets 'whose minds are naturally inattentive to the rules of grammar', and declares that their incorrect usages like 'dāksināder upasaran' for 'dāksinādrim upasaran,' do not spoil altogether the charm of their poetry. As regards the unfamiliar use and misuse of words, it may be pointed out that the author of the romance, who possessed a realistic outlook towards language as towards

and Loc. with anurakta; also cp. Śāk. VI; Hṛech. I; Mudrā. I. etc.

10. DKC. p. 100-1. In this sentence 'upasāṅgamyā' could better be replaced by 'upasāṅgataḥ '. But the sentence, as it is, is not so objectionable.

11. S. g. cumbayitum (DKC. p. 55 ) for cumbitum; upagūhya (p. 154) for upagūhya; asukhāyīgata (p. 138) for asukhāyīgata. The faulty usage rameyam ( p. 112 ) is abs. in the v.1. In the sentence, priyasakhīm etc. (p.10) Vasumatim might have followed priyasakhīm, and in aham etc. (p. 107 ), there may have been avadam pratikṛtīm.

12. DKC. p. 177.
The second argument of Mr. Avashe is that Dandin of
the Kavyādārśa regards the force ( ojas ), consisting in the
employment of lengthy compounds, as the soul of prose,
while the author of Daśakumāracarita seldom uses long compounds,
except while describing the personal charms of heroine or some
particular pose or when depicting some picturesque scene.

13. Cp. ib. p. 126 ( where the use of Perfect in I Person
is faulty ).
14. KA. III. 150-1; it may be noted that Dandin quotes, as
grammatical faults, such obvious mistakes as avaite for
avati, bhavate bāhuḥ for bhavato bāhuḥ and mahārāja for
mahārāja; cp. ib. III. 149.
15. Cp. below, sect III, chap. IV for such usages as praṣta
(DKC. p. 64 ); praṣaṇīya ( p. 130 ) and upari ( p. 168 )
etc.
17. The current PP. and PVD. indicate this fact which might
be acc. to the original text; cp. PP. p. 42; PVD. p. 155.
The word, therefore, has been used in the sense of 'a
bṛāhmaṇa in name only', and not in the sense of 'a
kṣatriya pretending to be a bṛāhmaṇa,' as Avashe thought.
Here it may be noted that the phrase samāsabhūyastva really means the use of a large number of compounds, and not necessarily, of lengthy compounds, and we come across a considerable number of them in the romance scattered beautifully all over the work. It may be recalled here that Daśādī notices, in various pieces of prose kāvya prevalent in his time, different varieties of samāsabhūyastva according as the compounds occur in abundance, rarity or in a mixed number.

Besides, he remarks that the Vaidarbhas prefer that quality of force (ojas) which is not confused with lengthy compounds. This is exactly what we find in Daśakumāra-carita.

Mr. Agashe further argued that the author of Kāvyādārśa could not have indulged in the literary tour de force, of which the seventh uccvāsa of Daśakumāra-carita is a notable example. In this regard, it may be said that the literary feat of the romance is quite in keeping with the dictum of Kāvyādārśa which, while describing the citrālamākāras in detail,
refers to the feats of restriction of the places of articulation of sounds (sthāna-niyama) in poetry and cites a verse without labial letters, nāma along with those without cerebral and labial syllables, without palatal, cerebral and labial letters and a verse containing only the guttural ones. As a matter of fact, Daṇḍin was fond of employing such literary feats, and in his other writings also we find fine examples of such stupendous feats.

The next argument advanced by Mr. Agashe is that the author of Kāvyādāsa was a purist both in style and sentiment and, according to him, a kāvyā should deal with a good subject (sadārāya), bearing the fruit of the fourfold objects of life and should depict a noble hero. Further, it is the absence of vulgarity of expression which formed in his view the essence of poetic delight. But contrary to the above dicta, the predominant incidents in the stories of Daśakumārakarita consist of gambling, burglary, impersonation, murder, abduction and illicit love, and the romance contains a number of passages which savour of bad taste.

In this respect, it may be said that Daṇḍin who in his

23. KA. III. 83-91; cp. below, sect. II also.

24. Cp. the story of Somadatta in ASK' (cp. ASK3. VII.15-43); the DSK, a lost poem in double entendre, also must have been a good example of literary tour de force; see below for detail.

25. KA. I. 15; cp. below, sect. II also.

26. KA. I. 62-3; also I. 95.

27. Cp. esp. DKC. cp. 99; 115; see also sect. III, chap.III.
Kāvyādārśa reiterated the precepts of his predecessors on Poetics, perhaps adopted, along with Bhāmaha, the definition of kāvya also from previous works, and it is noteworthy that the word sādāsraya occurs both in Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. It is not, therefore, fair to apply the definition of kāvya of the theorist to his romance in all its details. It is, however, worthwhile to note that Daṇḍin, the theorist, declares such subjects as drinking, amorous pleasure and abduction of a girl as incidents to be depicted in a kāvya. A good number of examples given in Kāvyādārśa refer, directly or indirectly, to sexual enjoyment, illicit love, confidential whisper and nail-mark in amorous play and the love sport of pigeons. There are, in fact, numerous instances in the work which can be labelled as being as offensive as some of the passages of Daśakumāracarita. Agashe particularly refers to the passage, tvām ayaṁ etc. of Daśakumāracarita, and equates it with kāgya kanye kāmayamānām etc. of Kāvyādārśa, which the writer cites as an example of indecent expression. But it may be noted that he gives the succeeding verse, kāmahi kandarpa etc., which contains the same idea, though expressed in good manner, as an instance of decency of sense. What he seems, therefore,

29. KA. I. 14-5; also op. Kal. I. 19.
30. KA. I. 16; 23; 65.
31. Co. (a) KA. II. 107; 287; 264; 289; 297; III. 32; 41; 76; 103; 119; 121 etc., (b) ib. II. 286; 297; III. 74; 75; 109; 134; 187; etc., (c) ib. III. 11; (d) ib. II. 289; (e) ib. II. 10; op. also DKO. II. p. 94.
to emphasise is that the ideas should be expressed by the
suggestive method and not in a rough manner. The depiction of
Apahāravarma spitting on the wall after chewing betel-leaf
for making a painting, to which also Agashe refers, is, of
course, indecent, but the act may be excused on the plea that
the hero could not help doing it, as he was strongly urged by
the passion of love and was eager to paint the cakravāka
couple, the symbol of constancy of love, in the reddish
hue which he might not have found in the colour-box lying near-
by.

Mr. Agashe's next argument appertains to the alleged
long gap between the composition of the two works, for he holds
that Daśakumāra-carita was written as late as 12th century A.D.,
while Kavyādārśa is a much earlier work and can be assigned
roughly to the close of 7th or the beginning of 8th century
A.D.

The date, however, assigned by him to the romance is
simply untenable as we shall see below, and no scholar today
patronises the theory of such a late date of the work. It may

32. Cp. KA. I. 97; II. 266; 297; III. 32; 109; 119 etc.
33. Cp. DKC. p. 39; KA. I. 63;
34. Cp. KA. I. 64; also cp. Kane: HSP. pp. 94-5.
35. DKC. p. 99.
36. Cp. Ragh. III. 24; red hue also signifies love (anurāga); the painting of the picture is in conformity with the dictum of Kām.Ś.
37. Cp. DKC., intro. pp. xxxvi-xlvi; see below for the discussion of his arguments.
be noted that Dr. S.K. De who otherwise supports Agashe's hypothesis of the two works having come from different pens, holds that Daśakumāra-carita belongs to a period much earlier than what is possible to assign to the Kāvyādāsa. Dr. De's opinion on the date of the romance is based on Mr. M. Collins' theory that the geographical \textit{āśa} date of the Daśakumāra-carita reveal a state of things which existed in a period anterior to the date of Harṣavardhana. But as Dr. V.V. Mirashi has shown on the basis of the historical \textit{āśa} data contained in the last uchvāsa of Daśakumāra-carita, the work might have been composed in the second half of the seventh century A.D., a date assigned by Mr. Agashe to Kāvyādāsa. Dr. De places Kāvyādāsa, on the presumption that Bhāmaha preceded Daṇḍin, in the beginning of 8th century, a date not far off from the period which we assign to the romance. In fact, even on independent examination of the two works, we arrive approximately at the same date, viz., the end of 7th century or the commencement of the next century A.D., for their composition.

The argument that the Kāvyādāsa mentions a collyrium which makes one invisible, while Daśakumāra-carita speaks of an ointment possessing the property of making the user look like an ape, and that in the former the idea is put elegantly...
and grammatically, while in the latter, the same is expressed clumsily and ungrammatically, carries little weight, for we know of collyriums having different properties and there is nothing inelegant or ungrammatical in the passage from Daṣakumārakaritā. What is interesting to note is that there is close resemblance of reading in the relevant passages of the two works which may point to their common authorship. Besides, there are numerous instances where verbal resemblance is so close and striking that there can be little doubt that both the works belong to one and the same Daṇḍin.

Daṣakumārakaritā, though exhibiting some of the characteristics of Sanskrit prose Kāvyā, does not conform strictly to all the requirements of the theorists. This disregard of convention in practice is quite in keeping with the precept of Kāvyādarsa which makes a strong plea for the obliteration of distinctions between kathā and ākhāyikā, and the fact

42. Cp. HSL., p. 209.
43. See below, chap. III for the discussion of the question.
45. Cp. PP. p. 36 for siddhāṣṭana enabling the eyes to see the desired spots; op. ASKS. VI. 50; also op. PP. p. 53.
47. See App. I.
48. See below, sect. III.
49. Cp. KA. I. 25; 23; also cp. below, sect. II.
supports the identity of the authors of the two works. Again, the adoption of Vaidarbha mārga in Daśakumāra-carita accords well with the high exaltation of that style in Kāvyādāra. That both the works display intimate familiarity with southern places and definitely belong to the South also points to the same conclusion.

It is admitted that the general tenor of Daśakumāra-carita is not sober or serious and the romance seems to advocate the theory of ends justifying means. But in this respect, it may be remarked that a poet is not expected to follow necessarily his precepts in practice, if perchance he is a theorist also. Even if the style and tenor of the work do not concord in all details with some of the rules of Kāvyādāra, yet, as we have seen, the actual disparity is not very great, even if it refers, as Dr. De would say, to niceties of diction and taste and general outlook. And this negligible divergence, too, can be explained away if we bear in mind the bare fact that there must needs be a gulf, however small, between precept and practice — a fact which has been admitted by all literary critics. As pointed out by Dr. Kane, Mahimabhāṭṭa says: 'One should not doubt how a critic, himself without a restraint in his poetic compositions, can preach others. Because a physician, himself taking an unwholesome diet, prevents others from

50. Cp. Kā. I. 41; 42; 60; 83-4 etc.; for Vaidarbha diction in DKG, see below, sect. III.


52. See DKG. p. 122; cp. below, sect. III, chap. III.
Moreover, it is perfectly possible or rather probable that *Dasakumāracarita* came from the youth of Daṇḍin, naturally interested in the charms and follies of romantic love, but not a consummate writer, while the *Kāvyādāra* was composed in his later life of richer studies and riper judgment. This supposition is borne out by the fact that while the colophons in *Kāvyādāra* and also in *Avantisundarīkathā* mention the author as Ācārya Daṇḍin, those in *Dasakumāracarita* have simply Daṇḍin.

When Dr. De contends that there is nothing immature in either work, he means that the disparity between the two works represents definitely two different minds, both mature. But as a matter of fact, when we observe the close affinity on many points between the two works with, of course, a slight divergence in the matter of purity of diction and general tenor, we arrive at the natural conclusion that the works represent two distinct stages of literary and intellectual development of one and the same author, the romance exhibiting the earlier and more jovial mood and the *Kāvyādāra* displaying the later and more serious and refined state of mind with a fuller mastery.

55. Vyaktiviveka, p. 37; op. Kaner; HSP. p. 94.
56. AVC., kārīkās 20-1; 33; 35.
over style, language and diction. The hypothesis, therefore, of the non-identity of the authors of Kāvyādārā and Daśakumārācarita does not stand a critical examination.

As noted above, Mr. Agashe recognised also a third Daṇḍin, a poet whom he differentiated from the theorist as well as from the romancer. According to him, it was this poet Daṇḍin who wrote the trio of works, referred to by Rājaśekhara.

His main arguments with regard to this theory are:

(1) Some citations ascribed to Daṇḍin in Śrīpāratilaka, Saduktikarpamṛta, Subhāṣītamuktāvalī and Padyavāṇī, which we do not come across in Kāvyādārā justifying the inference of a poet named Daṇḍin.

(2) The verses illustrating the literary conons in Kāvyādārā, apart from the fact that most of them are not originally his, cannot entitle their author to be recognised as a great poet. At least, they do not merit the high-flown encomiums we meet with in references to Daṇḍin.

(3) A famous verse refers to, alongwith the peculiar excellences of Kālīdāsa, Bhāravi and Māgha — all poets, Daṇḍin's quality of felicity of words. The reference here must be to a poet Daṇḍin, other than the author of Kāvyādārā in which we cannot find this quality. Nor prose work could have been meant, Bāha's works claiming superiority to Daśakumārācarita.

59. Cp. for detail, ibid., pp. liii-lvi; op. App. V.
60. Op. below, sect. III, chap. IV.
The colophon of Kāvyādārśa describes the author as Ācārya Daṇḍin, an appellation which all subsequent writers have confirmed by tradition to distinguish him from his name-sake, the poet.

These arguments, however, do not point to a separate Daṇḍin. Even if we admit that the Kāvyādārśa and the romance do not deserve the high panegyrics referred to above, there is no denying the fact that every author is known to have written works of varying degrees of excellence and perfection, and in the present case, it is more plausible to argue that the same Daṇḍin as wrote the above two works also composed some other work or works, now lost, on which the high eulogies might have been based. Fortunately, we know of a lost work, a poem in double entendre (dvisaṃdhānakāvya), ascribed to Daṇḍin by Bhoja in his Śrāgāra-prakāśa, and modern scholars have accepted it as the requisite third work of Daṇḍin.

It may be pointed out here that the literary feats expounded in Kāvyādārśa and employed in Daṇakumāracarita well befit his authorship of the poem in double entendre. It must be this kāvya of Daṇḍin from which some verses have been quoted in

61. Cp. below, sect. III, chap. IV.
63. Cp. also Kale, op. cit., p. x.
64. Cp. Śr.P. VII and IX Prakāsas; cp. S.L. Katra; IHQ. XXIV, p. 117; Kane, op. cit., pp. 100-1; Keith; HSL., pref. p. xvi fn; see below also.
65. Cp. KA. III. 78-95; DKC. VII; also see above; cp. J.H. Sastri, ASKS., intro. p. v.
anthologies, and which, taken with his other works, elicited the words of high praise, especially referring to his felicity of expression, from his admirers who ranked him with Kālidāsa. We need not, therefore, embark on the unwarranted theory of a separate Daṇḍin, the poet, as distinct from Ācārya Daṇḍin and Daṇḍin, the prose-writer. It may be important to note in this connection that the poetess Ganga-devi eulogises Daṇḍin, the Ācārya, as a poet of a high calibre, indicating thereby that Ācārya Daṇḍin is the same as Daṇḍin, the poet. Again, the colophon of Avantiṣuṇḍarīkathā, mentioning its author as Ācārya Daṇḍin, points to the tradition of recognising Daṇḍin and Ācārya Daṇḍin as identical. On the other hand, Daṇḍin, the Ācārya, has been referred to simply as Daṇḍin also by later poets and writers on Poetics, and not always as Ācārya Daṇḍin, as Mr. Agashe thought.

The discovery of Avantiṣuṇḍarīkathā in 1919 has given the whole problem a new turn. Now, when we have already got the required number of the works of Daṇḍin as referred to

67. Op. Viśajakā (in Sarasvati I. 108); vrthaiva Daṇḍinā/Sarasvati; op. KA. I. I; sarvaṇuka etc.; Siyabasa-lakara I. 2; Namisādhu on Rudrata L. 2; Pratīhāreṇdurīja in ASS., p. 23; Abhinava in AB. VI; Pratāp L. 10 f.
Dh. A. L. III. 7; Māṇikya-Andhrā on KPr. (Mysore ed. p. 292) Vārṭha in Kāvyāmsāmanvṛtti, p32; Visvanātha (SD. VI 336) mentions him both as Daṇḍin and Daṇḍyācārya; Jayadādhara on Mālat. refers to him as Daṇḍin as many as six times.
68. First published in 1924. A fuller MS. of the work has been published in 1954 from Trivandrum; see Bibliog.
by Rajaśekhara, some difficulty is felt as to how to accommodate a fourth book in the list. We will refer to this question later while discussing the works of Daṇḍin. But suffice it to say here that the difficulty is not at all real. Some scholars, however, do not accept the common authorship of Daśakumāracarita and Avantisundarikāthā on account of the great difference in style between them. According to Dr. S.K. De, 'even the most careless reader of the Kathā and the Daśakumāracarita should have been struck by the extraordinary difference of style between the two works, the Kathārivalling unsuccessfully the worst mannerisms of the Harṣacarita and Kādambarī.' Following De, Dr. Keith opined that if a Daṇḍin wrote the Avantisundarikāthā, he was assuredly not the author of the Daśakumāracarita.

The argument advanced by Dr. De is merely based on the style of the composition of the two works and, when, with good reasons, we can account for the divergence of style between the two works which have been categorically attributed to Daṇḍin by tradition, the theory loses much weight. It can be plausibly urged/Daṇḍin, who started his literary career with Daśakumāracarita, as we have seen above, might have elaborated, in his ripe age, the story of Avantisundari

70. Cp. HSL. pref. p. xvi.
71. Cp. below, chap. II; also see sect. III, chap. IV.
72. Cp. the colophons of AKṣ. and DKC.; also cp. below, chap. II.
in somewhat more ambitious and laboured style which represented the general tendencies of the age. This is supported by the fact that, in spite of the apparent disparity in the manner, there is an intrinsic resemblance in the style between the two works, apart from the common theme in both of them. The difference of style cannot be said to be extraordinary. It may be remarked, on the contrary, that both the romances of Daṇḍin represent Vaidarbha diction with its ten qualities as enumerated in Kāvyādārśa. Again, like the rhetorician, the author of Avantisundarīkathā pays his compliments to the Vaiderbha mārga and makes a hint that he has followed that path in the work. This diction of the Vaidarbhas possesses, besides other excellences, the quality of force ( ojas ), characterised by the use of a good number of compounds, but not confused with lengthy ones. The following illustration of the excellence represents the general form of diction adopted in the two romances with, of course, a difference with regard to the details of the guna: payodharataṭotsaṅgalagnasāṁdhyātapāṁsukā, kasya

74. See I. 40-102; cp. sect. III. chap. IV.
75. KA. I. 41; 42 etc.; ASK., intro. v. 15. The use of 'vartman' for mārga is noticeable here; KA. also uses this word (vide I. 42; 92), along with its equivalents 'mārga' and 'paddhati'; cp. sect. II.
76. Cp. KA. I. 80; 83.
kāmāturaṇā oṣṭo vārunī na karisyati. The author of Kāvyā-
darśa divides ojas into different forms according to the use
of compounds which may be either frequent or rare or of
moderate occurrence, with the remark that these varieties may
be noticed in various species of prose-kāvya, and as a
matter of fact, he has employed the different varieties of
ojas in his prose works. It seems that while in Daśakumāra-
carita, his earlier work, Daṇḍin adopted the quality of ojas
with rarity of compounds, in his later and more ambitious
work, Avantisundarīkathā, he preferred to employ the guṇa
consisting of compounds in abundance or rather in their
different forms. The worst mannerisms of Bāna's works said to
have been followed in Avantisundarīkathā could scarcely
have been termed as such in the age of Bāna and Daṇḍin, which
was essentially characterised by the so-called artificialities
of style and diction. Nor is it fair to say that the work
represents this peculiar tendency of his are unsuccessfully.
In spite of the fragmentary nature of the text, one cannot fail
to see Daṇḍin here in sweet diction, picturesque characterisa-
tion and other features which one comes across in Daśakumāra-
carita. Besides, the writer here does not always indulge
in effecting elaborate diction; of course, there are long
sentences strung with a number of epithets and compounds and


78. KA. I. 81. It may be noted that Vādijaṅghāla hereon
mentions Śudrakācarita and ASK, as instances, indicating
thereby that in ASK, the sammāsabhūyastva of different
varieties was employed.
a series of puns, but we also notice at places a simpler diction as also the charm of sententious expressions and vivid descriptions and picturesque scenes charged with rapidity of action.

As in his other works, Dāṇḍin employs here also a tour de force in its last portion in the story of Somadatta who, stricken with fever, tells his tale in soft twenty-four letters only, as is evidenced by its summary in verse. Further, it is important to note that like the earlier romance, the Avantisundarīkathā also does not comply strictly with the rules of an ākhyāyikā or with those of a kathā and this accords well with the dictum of Kavyādarśa which regards the fine distinctions between the two forms of prose-kāvyā as futile. We cannot agree, therefore, with Dr. S.K. De who opines that the fact that Avantisundarīkathā, which is called a kathā, really conforms to the requirements of an ākhyāyikā shows that its author has apparently confused the characteristics of the two forms, for in fact the blending of the features of the two species in the romance is not the result of confusion, but it has been effected deliberately, and it reflects the


80. Cp. ASKS. VII. 14; KA. (III. 83; 92-5) refers to the feat as varṇāniyāma ( restriction of letters); cp. sect. II.

81. See below, sect. III, chap. III; it may be noted that in ASK. (p. 17), the author employs āvākhyā with reference to kathā.

82. Cp. KA. I. 23; also see sect. II.
author's clear view in this regard, as indicated above. The theory of the common authorship of the two romances finds an additional support from their mutual resemblance in idiom, diction and contents. Such points of affinity can also be noticed between Kavyadarda and Avantisundarikathā.

From the foregoing discussion, we come to the conclusion that the theory of the existence of more than one Dandin, in support of which there is no positive evidence and for which there is no ample ground based on irrefutable arguments, is simply untenable. Of course, traditional ascriptions are sometimes erroneous, but we cannot always go by the presumption that they are never reliable independently. In fact, we are justified to doubt the tradition when it contradicts evidences which are more reliable in nature. In the present case, there is no sufficient ground to doubt the traditional ascription, and rather the internal evidence is in favour thereof. Therefore, until some strong reason is advanced on the basis of further research or discovery, the theory of the identity of the authors of Kavyadarda, Dasakumāracarita, Avantisundarikathā and a dvi-samādhānakāvya, a lost poem of double import, which is supported by internal as well as external evidence, should be regarded as established.

84. Op. App. II.; for contents, see sect. III.