CHAPTER V

INFLUENCE OF DIÑNĀGA ON OTHER POETS

Diñnāga also influenced other poets. The later writers and the rhetoricians are influenced by Diñnāga. They quote some portion from the KM.

In Vallabhadeva’s Subhāsitāvalī, five verses are attributed to Diñnāga. It is an indicator of Diñnāga’s impact upon later writers.

The author of ND and SD also are found frequently referring to Diñnāga. Kālidāsa also mentioned the name of Diñnāga in Meghadūta. The KM is mentioned in Adhikāra VI of the Bhavaprakāśa of Sāradātanaya. The work of Diñnāga is mentioned by name in the Kāvyakāmadhenu and by Bahurūpa Miśra. The Śrīgāraprakāśa of Bhojadeva and the Mahānātaka quote the verse from the Kundamālā.

1. KM. Jagadish Shāstri, p.iii
2. diñnāgānāṁ pathi parihañan sthulahastava lcpān MD. Pūrvamegha 14
3. kundamālātra suślistā sandhi pañcaka samyutā
4. KM IV,p. (iv-v)
5. dyūte pañāḥ praṇayakeliṣu kaṇṭhapāsāḥ
   kṛṣṇāpiṣramaharaṁ vyañjanaṁ ratānte
   śayyā niśṭhakalahe harinēkṣaṇāyāḥ
   prāptaṁ mayā vidhivasādidadamuttāryaṁ
   KM. IV. 20
INFLUENCE OF OTHER POETS UPON DIÑNĀGA

Diñnāga is found to be much influenced by the writings of noted poets who preceded him.

At first it may be said the author expresses his indebtedness to ‘Vālmīki’, the ‘ādikavi’. The story is taken from the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. In most places the author has not made changes of the original episodes. In some places however, he makes certain changes. As for example, the event of Rāma listened to the Rāmāyaṇa through Lava-Kuṣa’s song is there in both of the books. But the Rāmāyaṇa is a Śravya Kāvyā and the KM is a drama.

Diñnāga is influenced by Kālidāsa also. In Sanskrit literature, it is observed that many a later poets are influenced by Kālidāsa. Diñnāga borrowed two characters also viz. Kaṇva and Kaśyapa. Again he has taken some line from various writings of Kālidāsa. As for example in the KM, Diñnāga uses ‘naiva sthātum na yātum sachakitacaraṇāh sāratheḥ pārayantah’.6 It is found in Kālidāsa’s Kumārasambhava. For example – sailadhirājatanayā na yayau na tasthau.7 In another context Diñnāga uses as Rāma’s speech ‘vāsavasyāpi suvyaktāṁ kunṭhāṁ kuliśakotayaḥ’.8 It is

6. KM. IV. 25
7. KuS. V. 85
8. KM. V. 14
found in Kālidāsa’s Kumārasambhava as – वर्त्रस्या हंतुह कुलिशर्वा
कुल्हितस्त्रीवा लक्ष्याय.

9 Again ‘रामब्धिहानो हरिरित्युवाच’ of ‘Raghuvaṁśarī’ is used as ‘व्यक्तारी योःयमुपागतो वानामिरानी
रामब्धिहानो हरिः’ in the KM. ‘व्यायाम-कथिनाः प्राण्षुः
कार्यंत्यः-तोलोकानां व्युद्धरस्को महाबाहुर्व्यक्तारी दाशरात्मायह’ is
used in Raghuvamśa – बुधरस्को व्रशस्कंदहस्य
शालप्राणशर्माहनाह्युहाय.
11 In Act I it is found ‘एते रुदान्ति हरिनाः’.

Kālidāsa’s specialty lies personification of the nature. Diṅnāga also
exhibits his expertise in personification of natural phenomena. Kālidāsa is
found to have allowed Śakuntalā to proceed to her husband’s house with
approval from the natural surroundings.14 Here according to the poet
nature bears the authority to permit. In the KM also Diṅnāga presents
Lakṣmana, who requests the natural objects for protecting lonely Sītā in
the dark forest.15 There may be a reflection of the proneness for

9. KuŚ. V. 20
10. KM. 3.15
11. RVM. I. 13
12. KM. I. 18
13. AS. IV. 12
14. पातुम्ना प्रथमार्थ व्यावस्याति …
15. जाताश्रसांम कमालगंधकृताद्विवासायिः …

AS. IV. 9
KM. I. 22-25
personification by Dirṇāga, which in all probability, might have been
derived from Kālidāsa.

Moreover most of the Acts are picturised in the hermitage in AS.
Similarly the KM is also having the natural habitats of the sages, at the
background of almost all the events of the KM. Hence, it may be drawn
that Dirṇāga was influenced by the writings of Kālidāsa to a great extent.

Dirṇāga is influenced by Bhāravi and Bhavabhūti also to a certain
level.

Bhāravi’s specialty of the complexity of meaning is also followed
by Dirṇāga in a few cases. He has the interest in Yamaka and Anuprāsa
also. But these are lucid, simple and charming.

Most of the critics^{16} say that Dirṇāga is influenced by Bhavabhūti
and some of the critics hold the opposite view.

But there are many similarities and dissimilarities in the KM and the
URC of Bhavabhūti. These are discussed below –

(1) Both of the stories are taken from the Rāmāyaṇa.

(2) The ending is happy in both of the plays

(3) The two authors make Sītā as an invisible lady

(4) Nature is found as active in both of the plays

^{16} Bhavabhūti Mirashi, V.V., p. 299
(5) Dīnāga and Bhavabhūti mentioned the weep of Rāma for Sītā’s banishment in the dramas. But there is some dissimilarities in both of the dramas.

(1) Dīnāga is expert in dramatic technique and Bhavabhūti is expert in poetic expression.

(2) Dīnāga does not avoid the truth on the other hand Bhavabhūti has faith in imagination.

(3) The KM is full of Vaidarbhī style and Prasāda guṇa, whereas the URC is full of Gaudī Rīti and Ojaḍ̄Guṇa.

(4) The KM is full of Karuṇa and the URC is full of Karuṇa and Vīra.

(5) In the KM Sītā terms Rāma as ‘Niranukroṣa’ which is appropriate in the context. But in the URC Sītā does not use any harsh word to refer to Rāma.

(6) In the KM, Sītā is introduced by the foot-prints and reflection in water. On the other hand Sītā is introduced by the air and touch in the URC.

(7) In the KM, Vidūṣaka is present, which is important in case of a play. But Vidūṣaka is not there in the URC.

(8) The story of the KM comes to an end with the coronation of Kuṣa and Lava, but it is not the case with the URC.
According to V.V. Mirashi, Bhavabhūti flourished in the first quarter of 8th century A.D.; and Dhīranāga must be placed later than A.D. 750.¹⁷ So it may be gathered that Bhavabhūti’s works, especially the URC, made significant impact upon the KM.

EXAMINATION OF THE LANGUAGE FROM THE LITERARY PERSPECTIVE

Sanskrit rhetoricians provide distinct guidelines in respect of the language to be used in a literary composition. The poetic merits (Guna)¹⁸, which are no other than Rasadharmas, i.e. attributes of poetic sentiments, depend very much on such linguistic variations. The Guna is said to be mainly of three¹⁹ types, namely Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda. A writer is expected to be adopting in employments of words suggestive of the Gunas, in his work in consonance with the contextual sentiments, which require a total command over the language on the part of the writer. The proper presentation of the Gunas in a literary work indicates the command of the writer over the language.

That Dhīranāga possesses firm control over the language can be seen by observing the fact that he maintains accuracy in the use of the language in respect of the contextual Rasa. The KM bears the delineation of various

¹⁷. 'Bhavabhūti', Mirashi, V.V., p. 305
¹⁸. rasasyāntvamāptasya dharmāḥ sauryādayo yathā gunāḥ SD, VIII. 1
¹⁹. mādhuryamo'tha prasāda iti te tridhā  Ibid
‘Rasa’ like pathetic (karuṇa) and erotic (śṛṅgāra). The author chooses appropriate words for various contexts causing variations in the language used.

Rhetoricians hold that when the sentiment is either śṛṅgāra of both types, or Karuṇa or Śānta, there exists the Guna called Mādhurya which demands use of softer sounds free from compounds or with lesser number of compounds if they exist at all. All the Acts of the KM contain verses as well as a few prose sentences also, which are characterized by Mādhurya. For example, in the verse ‘taraṅgā vijante’ etc. there are fine employment of sounds ‘ṅga’, ‘ṅta’ which are found to be appropriate for effective suggestion of this ‘Guna’. Contextually, this is a description of nature’s affection towards Sītā. So, the language herein is suited to the

20. sambhoge karuṇe vipralambhe śānte’dhikaṁ kramāt SD. VIII.2

21. mūrdhni vargāntyavarnena yuktāstathādadhihānvinā raṇau laghu caṭadyaktau varṇāḥ kāraṇatāṁ gatāḥ avṛttirpalavṛttirvā madhurā racanā tathā. SD, VIII. 3, 4

22. tarṅgā vijante sajalakanikāṁ sitamaruta

stathaite sangītāṁ dadhati kalahāṁsāḥ kalagirāḥ

sakhiva cāyeyāṁ ramayati pariśvajya hṛdayāṁ

vane śūnye’pyasmin parijanavatīvā’trabhavati ... KM. I. 7
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occasion. Again in the verse ‘jātaśrasāṁ’\textsuperscript{23} etc. wherein is described the humble request of Lakṣmaṇa to nature for protecting. Sītā in the dark forest, there occur the soft sound like \textit{rīdhā, śra, ka, ma, ńga}, which provide scope for suggesting \textit{Mādhurya}. ‘Ye kecidatra’\textsuperscript{24}, ‘eso’\textit{nālirviracito}\textsuperscript{25}, ‘bho bho hirṇsra’\textsuperscript{26} one can get the taste of \textit{Mādhurya}. Again in the words of Lakṣmaṇa there is found the use of \textit{Mādhurya}. ‘bhāgirathī śikara’\textsuperscript{27}, here is found the repetition of \textit{śi}. Lakṣmaṇa consoles Rāma using the word ‘\textit{hanti}’ repeatedly by the verse ‘\textit{pramādah saṁpadarīn}’\textsuperscript{28}

Again in Lakṣmaṇa’s speech, the sound ‘\textit{ma}’ is used\textsuperscript{29} The verses ‘\textit{marakata}’\textsuperscript{30}, \textit{muktāhara}\textsuperscript{31} may be pointed out in support of our observation. Where the poetic sentiment is pathetic, the

\begin{verbatim}
23. jātaśrasāṁ kamalagandhakātdhivāsaih  
kāle tvamapyaṅgrhāna taraṅgavātaih  
devī yadā ca savanāya vigāhate tvāṁ  
\textit{bhāgirathī !} praśamaya ksanamambuevam \textsuperscript{Ibid. I. 22}
24. Ibid, I. 23
26. Ibid, I. 25
27. bhāgirathīśikaraśītalena \textsuperscript{Ibid. I. 11}
28. Ibid, III.2
29. Ibid, III.1
30. Ibid, III.5
31. Ibid, III.6
\end{verbatim}
requisite norm for Madhurya. It may be added in this context that in the prose portion also, at least partially, certain sentences contain the elements for suggesting Madhurya. In the prose portion, narrating the wait of Vālmīki for Rāma in the Āśrama, there is a sentence showing the repeated uses of ma, ka, etc. which are suggestive of Madhurya. It may be added in this context that in the prose portion also, at least partially, certain phrases contain the elements for suggesting Madhurya. More such phrases are found elsewhere in the work.

Thus, obviously Diṅnāga’s language is found to be soft and charming which suits the tender emotional states like love, pathos and tranquility of mind. On the other hand, when there arises the scope for presentation of sentiments like ‘Vīra’ or ‘Raudra’, the language becomes harsh and forceful. The words come to be compounded in an unusual

32. parisamāptasakalakarmā bhagavān vālmikirājasyāgamamana-
mudvīkṣhamārastiṣṭhāti

33. rāma (yilokya) nuñam...

34. vargaśyākraṭṭīyābhyāṁ yuktau varṇautadantimau

uparyadho dvayorvā sarefau tathādhaṇḍhaiḥ saha

śakaraśca śakāraśca tasya vyaṇjakataṁ gataṁ
tathā samāso bahulo ghaṭanauddhatyaśālinī
lengthy manner. Such a form of the language is a prerequisite for the emergence of the ‘Guna’ called ‘Ojas’. The KM is free from this Vīra sentiment and the ‘Ojah’. But in the first verse of the KM there is noticed the occurrence some harsh words. It is the case with the verse ‘jvāledvordhvavisarpini…’ Dīnāga’s play bears very little scope for delineation of the sentiment called Vīra and consequently the Guna called the Ojah. The language of the KM is easily understandable in almost every place. This is a feature which give rise to the Guna called Prasāda. It is also supported in the ‘Dhvanyāloka’. This Guna is said to be existing in a work irrespective of the sentiment. The verse ‘laṅkeśvarasyabhavane’

35. ojaścittasya vistārarūpaṁ diptatvamucyate

vīrabibhatsaraudresu krameṇādhiyamasya tu  \[\text{Ibid, VIII, 4, 5}\]
diptyātmavistṛṭherheturojo virarasasthiḥ  \[\text{KP, VIII. 69}\]

36. KM, I.1

37. Ibid, I.2

38. cittam vyāpnoti yah kṣipraṁ sūskendhanamivānalaḥ sa prasādaḥ

samāsteṣu rasesu racamāsu ca sābdāstadvyaṇjakā arthabodhakāh

śrutimātaraḥ  \[\text{SD.VIII. 7, 8}\]

39. samarpatakātvam kāvyasya yattu sarvasasānpatrī

sa prasādo guṇo jñeyāḥ sarvasādhāraṇakriyāḥ  \[\text{DhL. II. 10}\]

40. KM, I.3
etc. may be pointed out in this context, here it may be found the word 'parikarṣati' an easy word. Similarly, the prose passage 'tadālaṁ viśādena samprāpta eva vayam' appeals to the reader for being devoid of strain in understanding the meaning. Again, 'atyanta viśrānta', 'prapadamās-thāya', 'mānuṣasatīn-pātaḥ', 'lakṣmaṇonaḍrṣyate', 'aho kimiti tasya mahārgha', 'prathamamanaparāghāṁ taṁ samutkṛṣya', 'abhinavara-citāni', 'ta-devaitadrekhākamalaracitaṁ', 'mūrḍhānaṁ vyavadhāya', 'kamaḷa racitāṁ cāru tilakam', 'ḥa vanavāsasahāyinī',

41. Ibid, I, p. 10
42. Ibid, I, p. 12
43. Ibid, I, p. 12
44. Ibid, I, p. 28 l. 3
45. Ibid, I, p. 35 l. 5
46. Ibid, II, p. l. 2
47. Ibid, III, l
48. Ibid, III, 7
49. Ibid, III, 11
50. Ibid, III, 8
51. Ibid, III, 8
52. Ibid, III, 78 l. 6
'stimitadarśanam'\textsuperscript{53}, 'adya saptamedivase'\textsuperscript{54}, 'sampātītabhi'\textsuperscript{55}, 'citrakūtāṁ pariśayo'\textsuperscript{56}, 'mama praṇītaṁ'\textsuperscript{57}, 'niḥśreyasāya vanameta-
dupāśrayante'\textsuperscript{58}, 'sannidhānena sambhāvayami'\textsuperscript{59}, 'mayā seβiti vikshitā'\textsuperscript{60}, 'rāmaṁ kathāṁ spṛṣati'\textsuperscript{61}, 'na punaḥ paridhānakaṁ'\textsuperscript{62}, 'māyāvatīā pradaṁśitaṁ'\textsuperscript{63}, 'pañḍurāṇaṁ gandārāṁ'\textsuperscript{64}, 'athavā vilokyate'\textsuperscript{65}, 'athavā vilokyate'\textsuperscript{66}, 'kathamupasrutya'\textsuperscript{67}, 'asucyamāsi?'\textsuperscript{68}, 'tvam devimantarena'\textsuperscript{69},

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, III. 80.l. 12
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, IV. 81.l. 5
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid, IV. 81.l. 6
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, IV. 92.l. 6
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid, IV. 92.l. 8
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid, IV. 5
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid, IV. p.104
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid, IV. 14
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid, V. 3, p. 129
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid, IV. p. 114.l. 2
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid, IV. p. 114
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid, V. 2
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid, V, p.128
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid, V, p.128.l. 1
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid, V, p. 133
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid, V. 5
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid, V, p. 134
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kakapaksagrāhāṇa, sitkāralakshitamadhu-ram, vardhayanti svamukhena, parikramanti, bhavabhyaṁavahita, parinīto yamārthaḥ, ātitheyam, tasyocchavasitāni, saṅgkrānto, antikādyava-nikāya, niskrantamapadyate, ayujyamanamiva, māmativhyati, akṛṣtamapi, all these are the example of the prasāda gīta.

These appeal to the reader for being devoid of strain in understanding the meaning. Such a characteristic feature of the language undoubtedly speaks of the literary ability of the poet.
In connection with the evaluation of the language of the work from the literary point of view, it is also felt that Diṅnāga takes undue interest, in certain cases in using compounds. For instance, in the introductory verse of the work the phrase ‘jambhārīmaulīmandāramālikāmadhucumbinaḥ’ is compounded in an unexpected manner. Same is the case with the verse ‘jvālevordhvavisarpīnī’ etc. Similar compounded words occur in the portion ‘sukhesvapyaparicchadatvādasyaścyamāśicciramātmanīva’.

In most of the cases Diṅnāga avoids the long compounds. He uses some short and sweet compounds, as for example – ‘kalaṁsā kalagirāḥ’, ‘nīlakṣaṇa laksmanah’, ‘vijane vane’ etc. This style is appropriate in the case of an ideal play where in the effect of the lines or verses used as dialogues, plays an important role in making the drama a success.

84. Ibid, I. 1
85. Ibid, I. 2
86. Ibid, V. 5
87. Ibid, I. 7
88. Ibid, I, p. 14, I. 5
89. Ibid, I, 20
VARIANT READINGS

The texts of the KM in four different editions were gone through.

These are:

KM (1) edited by Jagadish Shastri,
KM (2) edited by Lokmoni Dahal
KM (3) edited by Kalikumar Dutta and
KM (4) edited by Kailash Nath Bhatnagar.

Four editions of the KM are consulted and it is found that there are some variations in reading in a few places. These are mentioned below:

Verse 2 line 3: (1) (2) and (4) editions mention as sandhyevādra mṛṇāla komala tanorindoh sadāsthāyini but edition (3) mentions the last word as sahasthāyini. Sadāsthāyini appears to be more preferable. It is the description of Harajāta.

Page (4), line (5) edition – (2): The word ‘sahāyamiva’ is mentioned in the edition (1), (2) and (3); but edition (4) mentions differently as ‘sahāyakamiva’. The first one can be preferred.

Page (5), line (6), edition (2): The word ‘sthāpanā’ is used in the editions (1), (2) and (4)’ but edition (3) uses this word as prastāvanā. According to the dramaturgy, prastāvanā is more applicable than the sthāpanā.
Act. I

Page 10, line (2), edition (2): Editions (1), (2) and (4) used this line in prākrit as – tā aggado bhaviaṁ vīvehi kīsadūre bhavaibhāirai vattaikipati but edition (3) used this as bhangvia nīrvehi.

Page 12, Verse 6, line 1: 'vāmena nivāralatāṁ' is mentioned in the editions (1), (2) and (4). But in edition (3) it is mentioned as 'vāmena vānīralatāṁ'. Here, the first one is more applicable.

Page 17, line 7, ed. 2: 'ayya kosalahipa' is mentioned in the edition (1), (2) and (4), but in edition (3) it is applied as 'ayya kosalahiva'.

Page 20, line 9; ed. 2: The 'annisutthiṣāṁkittāṇa' of editions (1), (2) and (4) is applied as 'aggisudhi' in edition (3). The 2nd one is more suitable becauseaggi is the prākrit form of agni.

Page 21, line 1: In editions (2), (4) and (1) mention as 'pasaa'. This word is mentioned as 'pasavo' in edition (3).

Page 26, line 1, 2: In editions (1), (2) and (4) mention as 'kaham', 'sotti', 'bādussarīre'. These three words are used as 'kahim', 'saṁti', 'bhāduassa sarīre' in edition (3).

Verse no. 18, line 4, p. 27: The 'manusyaḥ' is used in edition (2). This word is mentioned as 'maṁnusyaḥ' in edition (3). Again in edition (1) and (3) it is found as 'manusyaḥ'. The last one is more applicable.
Verse no. 22, line 1, p. 32: The word ‘kamalagandhakṛtādhivāsaiḥ’ is used as ‘kamalagarbhakṛtādhivāsaiḥ’ in edition (3). The first one is more meaningful.

Verse no. 23, line 4, p. 32: The word ‘bhagavatīyanukampanīyā’ is used as ‘bhagavatāmanukampanīyā’ in edition (3). ‘Vanadevata’ must be used in feminine gender. So, the first appears to be more appropriate.

Page 35, line 3: The prākṛt word ‘parittā a abhidehiti’ of editions (1), (2) and (4) is used as ‘parittā antu abhido bhīdie’ in edition (3).

Page 41, line 3, 4: In editions (1), (2) and (4) the ‘abhiniuttomi’ is mentioned as ‘abhiniuttemi’.

Verse no. 32, line 2: In editions (1), (2) and (4) the word ‘pacyante’ is used as ‘vartyante’ in edition (3).

Act. II

Interlude, line 2, p. 44: The editions (1), (2) and (4) mention as rāmaccāma duve puttaā jaā. But in edition (3) mentions as ‘rāmavahūe jama duve puttaā jā ā. The first one is more meaningful.

Page 45, Line 8: The word ‘pathataḥ’ is used in editions (1), (2) and (4) but in edition (3) that word is mentioned as ‘pathati’. In prākṛt the grammar is not followed like classical Sanskrit. So, the second one is more applicable.
Page 46, Line 1, 2: The word ‘sāntaravāsinīs’ is mentioned in editions (1), (2) and (4). But ‘sāntaravāsio’ is mentioned in edition (3).

Page 50, Line 8: ‘Rāmasadarassa’ is used in editions (1), (2) and (4) and ‘Rāmassa’ is used in edition (3).

Page 52, Line 4: ‘adippasitto’ is used in editions (1), (2) and (4) and ‘adippasidho’ is used in editions (3).

Page 54, Line 7: ‘vadanena’ is used in editions (1), (2) and (4) and ‘vaanena’ is used in edition (3).

Verse No. 2, Line 1, p. 56: ‘paripūrṇarūpā’ is used in editions (1), (2) and (4) and ‘paripūrṇarūpān’ is used in edition (3).

Verse No. 2, Line 4, p. 57: ‘utajānganesu’ is used in editions (1), (2) and (4) and ‘utajānganesu’ is used in edition (3). The first one is more applicable according to rule of ‘natva vinḍhi’.

Act III

Verse No. 11, Line 4, p. 71: The 1st, 2nd and 4th edition uses the word ‘devyā’ in place of ‘devyāh’ which is mentioned in edition (3).

Act. IV

Verse No. 4, Line 4, p. 98: The ‘yantraṇāyā’ is mentioned in edition (1), (2) and (4) but it is mentioned as ‘dhaanyaṭayā’ in edition (3).
Verse No. 22, Line 2, p. 195: The word ‘jātamālye’ is used in editions (2), (3) and (4) but ‘jātamālyain’ is used in edition I.

Verse No. 26, Line 1, p. 202: The word ‘nāgabhuvanāt’ is used in edition (1), (2) and (4) and ‘nāgabhavanāt’ is used in edition (3).

Verse No. 35, Line 4, p. 209: The word ‘vadhya vitate’ is mentioned in editions (1), (2) and (4) and ‘bandhavitate’ is mentioned in edition (3).

It is thus seen that there are a few variant readings in the text of the KM. As put in the preceding lines, the alternative reading in certain cases appear to be more appropriate. However, it is also a fact that the first readings of those alternate readings are also not at all irrelevant or inappropriate.