

chandas. He may, perhaps, be identified with the writer of the Kosha; chiefly on account of the many artificial metres which he uses, and which no other lexicographer has taken the liberty of employing for such a dry subject as a string of synonyms. The editor has, however, discovered no allusion to the Kosha in the only copy of the *Mṛitasamjivini* at his command. Nor do the four names of Amaradatta, Vararuci, Bhâguri, and Vopâlita, to whose works the author acknowledges himself indebted in the introductory verses to the Kosha, afford any clue to his own age. In the absence of direct evidence, we are, therefore, compelled to be contented with the secondary testimony of other writers. The mention of Halâyudha by Ujjvaladatta, Mallinâtha, and the Medinîkara, is sufficient proof that he lived before the thirteenth century. Mallinâtha in his various commentaries cites Halâyudha far more frequently than the *Abhidhânacintâmani*; but from this fact no inference can be drawn as to the greater antiquity of Halâyudha, for the orthodox scholiast might have preferred a coreligionist to a Jain infidel. Halâyudha is quoted besides, by Kâṭavema on the *Çâkuntala*, Jayamangala on the *Bhaṭṭikâvya*, Narahari in his *Cûḍâmani*, Nârâyaṇa on the *Uttararâmacarita*, Padmanâbhadatta on the *Bhuvaneçvarîstotra*, Bharatasena on the *Bhaṭṭikâvya*, Bhânujîdîkshita on *Amara*, Ranganâtha on the *Vikramorvaçî*, Râyamukuta in his commentary on the *Amarakosha*, Çivadatta in the *Çivakosha*, and a number of other scholiasts.