

On Rudraṭa and Rudrabhaṭṭa.

By

Hermann Jacobi.

When reviewing, in the *Literaturblatt für Orient. Philologie* III, 71 ff., PISCHEL's edition of Rudra's Śṛiṅgātilaka, I had not yet received Rudraṭa's Kāvyaḷaṅkāra, edited in the Kāvyaṃālā. I was therefore not in a position to examine in detail the question whether Rudraṭa and Rudrabhaṭṭa are but two names of one author, as AUFRECHT, BÜHLER, PETERSON, PISCHEL, WEBER, and some native writers assert, or are two distinct authors, as the editors of Rudraṭa's Kāvyaḷaṅkāra maintain on the diversity of the names Rudraṭa and Rudrabhaṭṭa. Having since read Rudraṭa's pleasant exposition of the Alaṅkāra, I have become convinced that he can not be the same person with Rudra. For in the Kāvyaḷaṅkāra the former entertains, on some points, opinions different from those of Rudra in his Śṛiṅgātilaka. In order to prove my proposition I shall discuss the whole question at length.

Those who hold that Rudraṭa is no other than Rudra, will point to many verses which, but for the different metre, are nearly the same in both works. Here are two instances

अन्यां निषेवमाणे तु यदि कुर्यति सा प्रिये ।

रोदित्यस्त्रायतः स्वल्पमनुनीता च तुष्यति ॥

आकृढयौवना मध्या प्रादुर्भूतमनोभवा ।

प्रगल्भवचना किञ्चिद्विचित्रसुरता यथा ॥

With these verses (S. T. 1. 56, 58) compare the following (K. A. 12. 20, 21.)

अन्यां निषेवमाणे सा कुप्यति नायके ततस्तस्य ।
 रोर्दिति केवलमये मृदुनोपायेन तुष्यति च ॥
 आरूढयौवनभरा मध्याविर्भूतमन्मथोत्साहा ।
 उल्लिन्नप्रागल्भ्या किञ्चिद्भूतसुरतचातुर्या ॥

But it should be borne in mind that in these and like cases definitions are given, and that definitions having been fixed by previous authorities admit of little change in words and phrases. Hence they are expressed by different authors almost in the same words. Hindu scholars did not try to establish their claim to originality by altering the words of their authorities; it is in the deviations from the opinions of his predecessor that we must look for the originality of an Indian author. Whoever has studied a Śāstra must have been struck by the great agreement and likeness which characterises the works of different authors on the same subject. But if he looks beneath the surface, he will detect many points of difference, may be unimportant ones in our eyes, yet important enough for the Hindus to look on two such authors as members, or perhaps heads of different schools. Tried by this standard Rudraṭa appears as an original teacher of poetics, while Rudra, at his best an original poet, follows, as an expounder of his Śāstra, the common herd.

Rudraṭa's Kāvya-lāṅkāra covers the whole ground of poetics, while Rudra singles out only a part of it; yet he gives also the general outlines of the system. The key-stone of it is the theory of the *rasas*. The common opinion, shared by Rudra, is, that there are nine *rasas* (Ś. T. 1. 9. *nava rasâ matâḥ*). But Rudraṭa admits ten *rasas*, viz. the nine common ones (which however he enumerates, and treats of, in an order different from that followed by Rudra) and *preyān*. After enumerating them he pointedly adds: *iti mantavyâ rasâḥ sarve* (K. A. 12. 3).

Rudra (Ś. T. 3. 52 ff.) treats of the four *vṛttis* (Kaiśikī, Ârabhaṭī, Sātvaṭī, Bhârati). This term properly belongs to dramatics, and denotes

different modes of representing actions. Rudra, however, extending the original meaning applies this term to lyrics. Rudraṭa has nothing like the four *vr̥ttis* of Rudra, though he uses the same word in a different technical sense. His *vr̥ttis*, of which he enumerates five (K. A. 2. 19. *madhurā*, *prauḍhā*, *parushā*, *lalitā*, *bhadrā*) refer to the diction and depend on the sounds of the words, used in a verse.

Again a generally adopted tenet of the *gaya ciencia* of which our authors claim to be masters, is that there are eight *avasthās* of the *nāyikās* (svādhinapatikā etc.). Rudra describes and illustrates these eight classes (Ś. T. 1. 131 ff.). But Rudraṭa admits only four classes (K. A. 12. 41—46). This innovation seems to have revolted the general reader. Hence 14 stanzas, stigmatized as *prakshipta*, are inserted before the passage just adverted to, and in these spurious stanzas (spurious, because irreconcilable with what follows) the eight *avasthās* are described in the usual way.

I will mention some, at least, of the minor discrepancies between both works. Rudra (Ś. T. 1. 92) enumerates three occasions for the girl to see the beloved one; Rudraṭa (K. A. 12. 13) adds a fourth viz. *indrajāla*. Rudra (Ś. T. 1. 115) says that the girl when seeing her sweetheart betrays her inward joy by shutting her eyes (*chakshur milati*), Rudraṭa however says (K. A. 12. 37) that the girl's glances become fixed (*nishpandatāranayanā*). Rudra (Ś. T. 2. 49) declares the lover guilty of a "middle crime", if he is detected in conversation with some other girl; but Rudraṭa (K. A. 14. 10) adds that the crime becomes heavy in case the girl herself catches her truant lover taking such liberties. Rudraṭa has some practical hints (K. A. 14, 22—24) how to put off an offended girl to whom an eavesdropper has given information against her lover; but Rudra, the reprobate rogue, does not seem to have been much disturbed by such crosses, as he has no advice for the like emergencies. But he eloquently praises courtesans (Ś. T. 1. 120—130), while Rudraṭa (K. A. 12. 39, 40) blames them in strong terms. Rudra says (Ś. T. 2. 53. 59) that the weight of trespasses in love depend on *deśa*, *kāla* and *prasaṅga*; Rudraṭa (K. A. 14. 58) adds a fourth — *pātra*.

The instances of divergence in doctrine between both authors might easily be multiplied, but those given above will do for our purpose. I shall now show that Rudra and Rudraṭa are not of the same religious persuasion. PISCHEL says that they are both Śaivas. That Rudra was a votary of Śiva is evident from Ś. T. 1. 1; 3. 85. But Rudraṭa does not name Śiva among his *ishṭadevatās*: Bhavānī, Vishṇu and Gaṇeśa (K. a. 1. 1. 2. 9; 16. 42). Three times he declares Bhavānī the highest deity, without even mentioning Śiva; for a devotee of Durgā need not also choose for his tutelary god her divine consort. Rudraṭa, for one, places Vishṇu higher than Śiva, since he names Vishṇu among his *ishṭadevatās* (K. A. 16. 42) and makes him the first god in the Trimūrti (K. A. 7. 36). Every true adorer of Śiva gives him the precedence in the Trimūrti, as Kālīdāsa (Kum. S. 2. 6) and Bhāravi (Kir. 18. 35) do, and an adorer of Vishṇu places that god first, as does Māgha (Śiś. 14. 61). Therefore Rudraṭa cannot have been a devotee of Śiva, while Rudra certainly was one. From their difference in religion as well as from that in their science, if science it be, follows that Rudraṭa and Rudra are two distinct writers.

All that PISCHEL says on the probable age of the author of the Śrīṅgāratilaka, has reference not to Rudra but to Rudraṭa. With regard to the latter I hope to be able to add something to the results arrived at by PISCHEL. It is all but certain that Rudraṭa was a native of Kashmir. His very name points in that direction in as much as the suffix *ṭa* is found in many names of Kashmirians; instance: Kal-laṭa, Chippaṭa, Bhambhaṭa, Bhallaṭa, Mammaṭa, Lavaṭa, Varṇaṭa, Saṅkaṭa, Sarvaṭa, nearly all taken from the Rājatarāṅgiṇī. Besides this, it is a fact pointed out by PISCHEL that Rudraṭa is first quoted by Kashmirian authors on poetics, — Mammaṭa and Ruṃyaka. PISCHEL has shown that Pratihārendurāja, who quotes Rudraṭa, flourished in the first half of the tenth century. Hence Rudraṭa must have lived earlier. Again, as PISCHEL has pointed out, Rudraṭa is always named after Udbhata who lived under Jayāpīḍa 779—813 A.D. Rudraṭa therefore must have lived between, say about, 800 and 900 A.D. Now Rudraṭa gives an

example of the *vakrokti*: (K. A. 2. 15): *kiṃ Gauri mām* etc. which was clearly prompted by Ratnākara's *Vakroktipañchāśikā*, for it contains the same raillery between Śiva and Gauri displayed in Ratnākara's admirable poem. I therefore make no doubt that Rudraṭa imitated Ratnākara in his example of the *vakrokti*, a poetical figure not yet defined in the same way by the older writers on *Alaṅkāra*, as far as I know. As Ratnākara flourished under Bālabrihaspati and Avantivarman, Rudraṭa must have lived later, either under Avantivarman (857—884), or, as I shall try to prove, under Śaṅkaravarman (884—903). It is true that he is not mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. This omission is probably due to the fact that Rudraṭa was not patronised by the king of his time. For that can be made out from Rudraṭa's own words K. A. 1. 5—10: 5. "Time will destroy the temples of gods and other monuments raised by kings: their very name would fade away if there were no good poets (to immortalize it in their songs) 6. Is the poet not indeed a benefactor who thus makes last and grow, and endears to all people, the fame of another man? 7. All truly wise men agree in this that *merit* is acquired by benefitting others. 8. Riches, liberation from calamities, utmost happiness, in short whatever he desires, gets the poet by beautiful praises of the gods. 9. Thus by praises of Durgā some have overcome insuperable disaster, others were freed from disease, and others again got the desired boon. 10. From whom former poets have promptly received the desired boons, those gods are still the same, though the kings be changed."

Such language can be used but by a man who despairs of winning the king's favour. The blame thrown on the king that he, and the poet's boast of unselfishness in praising others would not suit the courtier who touched the king's golden mohurs. The blame would be untrue, if Avantivarman, the patron of arts, was to be understood. But in every way it fits Śaṅkaravarman 'who in his country set an example for despising the learned' (*Rājat.* v, 183). Hence I think it most probable, that Rudraṭa was a contemporary of Śaṅkaravarman.

Kalhaṇa says about the poets in Śaṅkaravarman's time (Rājatar. v, 203):

'Since he (Śaṅkaravarman), fearing the expenses involved, did not care to associatē with men of merit, poets like Bhallaṭa and others (*Bhallaṭādayaḥ*) had to choose lower professions. Good poets received no salary.'

Bhallaṭa¹ whose Śataka has been printed in the Kāvya-mâlâ of 1887 is the only poet mentioned by name. But there were 'others' besides him. One of these probably was Rudraṭa.

Very little can be made out about Rudra. Some of his illustrations are quoted, in Anthologies by Vâgbhaṭa, Viśvanâtha and twice by Hemachandra. The latter seems to be the oldest writer who knows the Śṛiṅgâratilaka. We can for the present say no more than that Rudra lived before the twelfth century A. D., but probably not much earlier.

¹ Many stanzas of Bhallaṭa, taken from the Śataka, were known from other sources. But PETERSON and the editors of the Śataka have overlooked the above quoted passage of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī which settles the question about that poet's age.