CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The name of Dīnāga is a respectable one in Sanskrit tradition. He is said to be a logician and a poet. The *Kundālā* (KM) is attributed to his authorship. In the case of the name of the author, there exists some sort of controversy.

Dīnāga, Dhīranāga, Vīranāga and Nāgayya are considered to be the alternate names. However, Dīnāga is more popular and acceptable. The KM is a play of six Acts, the story of which is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Here the poet deals with the later part of Rāma's life. The story of the banishment of Sītā, and also the reunion of Rāma and Sītā are found to be presented here in a dramatic manner. The poet here has deviated from the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmiki in various places. The incidents which are narrated in Act II-IV do not have any reference to Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa*. So these can be treated as the poet's innovations. The drama begins with the scene of Sītā in advanced pregnancy who is being led into exile by Lakṣmaṇa. In Act II, the twin sons of Sītā are named as Kuśa and Lava by Vālmiki. They study the *Rāmāyaṇa* composed by the sage. In Act III, the poet presents Rāma in a very pathetic condition. Rāma is coming to the
hermitage of Valmīki. Having reached the bank of the river Gomati, he takes notice of a garland of Kunda (a kind of jasmine) flowers. The title of the drama has its base on this event. The 4th Act starts with the conversation between the female ascetics, namely Yajñāvedī and Vedavatī. The fifth Act begins with the announcement from the Vidūṣaka of congregation time of the ascetics. Act VI opens with the entrance of Rāma in the audience hall. Here the dramatist has utilized the opportunity of the reunion of the hero and the heroine. This Act ends with the usual Bharatavākyā.

In the present dissertation the topics are discussed into two sections in chapter I. The first section starts with the description of Sanskrit Kāvyā, Drṣyakāvyā and Sravya Kāvyā, varieties of Drṣyakāvyas, specialties of Nāṭaka and various important plays based on the Rāmāyaṇa. Total thirty two names of the Rāmāyanic play are mentioned here.

The second part deals with the description of Dirīṇāga and his parentage and date and a brief note on the works.

There are many views, which indicate that the KM is attributed to Dirīṇāga, Dhīranāga, Viranāga, Nāgayya, Ravināga etc. But it can be said that Dirīṇāga is the name of the author of the drama which is mentioned in the Mysore Mss and other books. He lived in Arāralapura or Anuparādha, which is situated in southern India, and more precisely in Śrilankā. About
his date, most of the evidences make it prominent that Dīnāga was an ancestor of Bhavabhūti and he flourished sometime between the 7th century AD and the 10th century AD.

The contents of the Kundamālā, its source, deviation from the original, innovations made by the dramatist, probable reasons for deviation and innovations are discussed in the second chapter. Dīnāga is a writer having commendable ability of creativity. It is observed that Vāmīki’s epic is a Śravya Kāvyā, whereas the KM is a Drśyakāvyā. Both the two are different means of expression of literary thoughts. Both the genres have their advantages and disadvantages. The dramatist is supposed to utilize his own innovative skill to make of his or her writing a successful one and it is the case with the KM also.

Chapter III deals with the topic like literary estimate of the play: ‘Gunā, Rīti, Alamkāra, Rasa’, Principal sentiment, metrical structure of the verse portion of the play, various types of prose, estimate of the prose lines as dialogues of the play, Kavisamayas, characterization, description of nature and the super natural elements, use of Prākṛt, examination of various elements of the Nāṭaka in the play. In the case of Gunā, Dīnāga’s play contains all the three gunas but Mādhurya attains prominence and as the rīti the drama holds is undoubtedly the Vaidarbhī. It is observed that like a typical classical Sanskrit poet, Dīnāga also
possessed some sort of the inclination towards the use of various 
Alāthkāras. The dramatist is found to have more interest in using 
Arthālāmākāras, which indicates at the spontaneity of his literary exercise.
The author used both the sambhoga and vipralambha types of Śṛṅgāra. 
Diśnāga mostly uses the śloka or Anuṣṭubh metre in the verse portion of 
the KM and he also uses all the types of prose. In case of the 
characterization Rāma is the hero. Eleven male characters including the 
Sūtradhāra are delineated here and seven female characters are drawn by 
the author successfully. Here, Vāsumatī is the only female character who 
uses Sanskrit.

Chapter IV deals with the religious and philosophical elements in 
the play. Moreover, social order, dress and decoration, family life, habits 
and customs, information of various flora and fauna and geographical 
elements, are also brought into the purview of discussion.

Chapter V deals with the topics like examination of the language 
from the literary perspective, influence of other poets upon Diśnāga and 
influence of Diśnāga on other poets. A note on the variant readings of the 
text is also incorporated herein.

It is found that the KM of Diśnāga is occupying a significant 
position among the Rāmāyanic plays in Sanskrit. The dramatist possesses 
genuine literary skill and the play becomes an interesting one with the
perfect blend of poetic talent and scholarship. The present dissertation has attempted to deal with some of the important aspect of this drama. It is hoped that the work will be of some use for further research on Rāmāyanic plays in general and on the KM of Dirināga in particular.