SECTION II

BHATTIKĀVYA
ASA MAHĀKĀVYA
CHAPTER 2

The Form and the Subject-matter of Bhattikāvya

In its external form, Bhattikāvya is a mahākāvya, but it is not just a mahākāvya of the usual type. As a mahākāvya it narrates the life of Rāma, but at the same time, it also serves as a Śāstrakāvya, illustrating the topics of Sabdasastra and Kāvyā-sāstra. Hence Bhattikāvya should here be reviewed both as a Mahākāvya and as a Śāstrakāvya.

Form

As regards the form of literature, Rāvanavadha or Bhattikāvya falls under the category of a mahākāvya. In Sanskrit literature the mahākāvya was one of the most popular forms for the Sanskrit poets.

Before the Maitraka period (c. 470 A.D. to 788 A.D.), the Sanskrit poets had contributed at least four Mahākāvyas. Thus Asvaghoṣa composed Buddhachārīta and Saundarananda, while Kālidāsa wrote Kumārasambhava and Raghuvamśa.

Poet Bhaṭṭi composed his Mahākāvya between 570 A.D. and 628 A.D. during the Maitraka period. He is not known to have written any work on poetics. But Bhāmaha, the author of Kāvyālaṃkāra, and Daṇḍin, the author of Kāvyādarsa, both of whom have given the characteristics of the mahākāvya in their works, seem to have flourished not much earlier or later than Bhaṭṭi.
The author of *Visnudharmottara Purāṇa*, who also has laid down the definition of a mahākāvya, seems to have lived, according to Dr. Priyabala Shah, even earlier than Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin.

The author of *Visnudharmottara Purāṇa*, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin must have derived these characteristics from the then known specimens of mahākāvyas before them.

Therefore it is interesting to analyse the characteristics specified by these three and to examine how far they apply to Bhattikāvya.

The author of *VDP* has not laid down anything as regards the extent of a mahākāvya or the number and the length of its cantos. He even takes as granted the characteristic 'Sargabandha' and does not mention it in the definition.

However he makes it clear that the composition should not be in prose devoid of metres.

On the other hand, both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin begin the definition with the characteristic 'Sargabandha'. It means that a mahākāvya should be a composition in cantos.

---

2. Ibid., Vol. II, Introduction p.25: If any inference is permissible from the above divergences, one may say that our text represents a tradition of poetics older than those embodied in Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādaraśa* and Agnipurāṇa.
3. Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, I, 18:

```
| सर्गिलक्ष्यं महाकाव्यं न मृत्युं महृद्य सन् |
```

4. Dandin, *Kavyādaraśa* I, 14:

```
| सर्गिलक्ष्यं महाकाव्यमुच्यते नस्य तक्षणम् |
```
Neither Bhāmaha nor Dandin specifies the minimum or the maximum number of cantos. Bhāmaha says that the mahākāvya should be 'Mahat', while Dandin puts it negatively by saying that it should be 'asamksipta'.

But afterwards Viśvanātha, the author of Sāhityadarpasa, fixed the lower limit that the cantos of a mahākāvya should not be less than eight.

As regards the number of cantos in the mahākāvya, it may be noted that

(i) Saundarananda extended over 18 cantos,
(ii) Buddhacharita is known to have originally 28 cantos,
(iii) Kumārasambhava in its present form contains 17 cantos,
(iv) Raghuvaṃśa consists of 19 cantos.

1. Ibid., I, 18.
2. Viśvanātha, SD, VI, pp. 532 ff.
3. S,K. De, History of classical skt. literature, p. 73
   Buddhacharita in its original form containing 28 cantos was known to I-tsing and to the Chinese and Tibetan versions, but in Sanskrit only two to thirteen exist with only three quarters of the first and first quarter of the fourteenth.
4. Ibid., p. 127: "The poem contains 17 Cantos, but only 8 Cantos are genuine. The remaining 9 Cantos form a supplement composed by some later zealous admirer."
Over and above these earlier Mahākāvyas, we may also take into consideration, Kṛṣṇānuśaṇa of Bhāravi, whose renown as a great poet was already established in or before 634 A.D. Bhāravi's Mahākāvya contains 18 Cantos.

Thus the number of cantos in most of these mahākāvyas varies from 17 to 19.

Bhāmaha does not say anything about the quantum of cantos. Dandin states that the cantos of mahākāvyas should not be too long. The author of Sāhityadārpana lays down that the cantos in a mahākāvya should not be too short or too long.

The minimum and maximum number of verses in the cantos of the Mahākāvyas under consideration are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Mahākāvya</th>
<th>Minimum verses</th>
<th>Maximum verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saundarananda</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhacharita</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārasambhava</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghuvamśa</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirātārjunīya</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhattikāvya</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Kavyadarśa, I, 18:
3. Visvanātha, SD, VI, p. 532:
The comparison of the above figures indicates that the minimum number of verses in the cantos of the earlier mahākāvyas ranged from 41 to 53, while it came down to 38 in Kirātārjuniya and 23 in Bhaṭṭikāvyā. The maximum number of verses in the cantos ranged from 73 to 121 in the earlier mahākāvyas, that in Kirātārjuniya comes to 81, while the longest canto in Bhaṭṭikāvyā consists of as many as 143 verses. Thus Bhaṭṭi has crossed the normal minimum and maximum number of verses in the cantos. The ratio between the minimum and maximum number of verses is 1:2 or 1:3 in the earlier mahākāvyas, and even in Kirātārjuniya, while it rises up to about 1:6 in Bhaṭṭikāvyā.

Contents

The poem Bhaṭṭikāvyā is otherwise known as Rāvaṇavādha. Rāvaṇavādha is the culminating episode of the poem, but it does not cover the entire subject-matter.

The poem covers almost the entire account of Rāma's life. It commences with an introduction to King Dasharatha and his capital. Then follows the account of the King's sacrifice for getting sons, the birth and growth of Rāma and other sons; and Viśvamitra's taking Rāma and Laksmana with him for the protection of his sacrifice (Canto I). Canto II narrates the exploits of the princes in the forest, Rāma's marriage with Śitā and their return to Ayodhya.

Canto III is devoted to the banishment of Rāma, the death of Daśaratha and Bharata's visit to Rāma. In the next Canto (IV)

1. Only in the case of Buddhacharita.
the poet describes Rāma's visit to the different hermitages and destruction of several hākṣasas. Canto V narrates the destruction of Khara and Dūśana, Sūrpanākhā's instigation of Rāvana, the episode of the golden deer, the abduction of Sītā by Rāvana and his combat with Jaṭāyu. Canto VI is devoted to Rāma's lamentation for the loss of Sītā, his search for her, his alliance with Sugrīva and the killing of Vālin. Then Rāma urges Sugrīva to send his followers in search of Sītā, Āṅgada's party including Hanūmat moves southward (Canto VII). Hanūmat flies across the ocean to Laṅkā, finds out Sītā and conveys Rāma's message to her. Canto VIII ends with the narration of the havoc created by Hanūmat, which extends over the next Canto (IX) and ends in the early part of Canto X. Hanūmat returns and conveys Sītā's message to Rāma who then marches towards Laṅkā (Canto X). The next Canto (XI) is devoted to the description of the love-pleasures of the rākṣasas. Canto XII narrates the deliberations in Rāvana's council at Laṅkā and Vibhīṣaṇa's leaving Rāvana and joining Rāma. Then Rāma becomes angry at the Ocean, who then presents himself to Rāma and advises him to build a dam. The monkeys build a dam and they cross the sea. The poet describes Rāma's army which is eager for the coming battle (Canto XIII). Canto XIV gives the description of Rāvana's army. Laṅkā is well guarded by Rāvana. The fighting starts. Many prominent rākṣasas are killed. Angry Indrajit overcomes Rāma and his army with Nāga-Pāśa, Garuḍa arrives and breaks it. Dhūmrākṣa, Prahasta and others are killed. Canto XV narrates the awakening of Kumbhakarṇa and his going to the battlefield.
In the beginning monkeys are afraid of him. A murderous fight starts. He makes innumerable victims, but at last he is killed by Rāma. Rāvana’s sons are killed by Āṅgada, Nīla and Lākṣmaṇa. In the next Canto (XVI) Rāvana mourns over the death of Kumbhakarna. He resolves to extricate the monkeys and is hopeful about the results of the battle. In Canto XVII Indrajit comes to the battle-field. Vibhiṣaṇa discloses the secret of killing him. They go to the place of sacrifice. Indrajit scolds Vibhiṣaṇa for being unfaithful. Lākṣmaṇa kills Indrajit. Rāvana gets enraged and starts fighting. A fierce struggle ensues between Rāma and Rāvana. Rāvana hurls the Raudra-weapon. Rāma counteracts it by Brahmā-weapon and kills Rāvana.

The next Canto (XVIII) narrates the mourning by Vibhiṣaṇa for Rāvana. He regrets that all the powers conquered by Rāvana win back their freedom and then he thinks of self-immolation. He is consoled by Rāma and advised to administer the rites for Rāvana. Canto XIX narrates the performance of the funeral rites of Rāvana by Vibhiṣaṇa and Rāma’s advice to Vibhiṣaṇa for just administration. Then Hanūmat runs to Śītā and conveys her the good news of Rāvana’s defeat. Vibhiṣaṇa takes her to Rāma, but Rāma is suspicious about her chastity and repudiates her. Śītā undergoes the fire ordeal. The next Canto (XXI) represents Agni assuring Rāma about the purity of Śītā. Rāma justifies his stand. Brahmā approves of Rāma’s conduct. Śaṅkara acknowledges Rāma as Viṣṇu. Rāma accepts Śītā.

In the last Canto (XXII) Rāma asks Hanūmat to go to Ayodhyā and directs his journey. While returning to Ayodhyā
in Puṣpaka, Rāma points out to Sītā the places over which they fly. Rāma enters Ayodhyā and performs Asvamedha sacrifice.

Thus Bhāṭṭi's Rāvanavadha narrates the life of Rāma till the performance of the Asvamedha sacrifice after his return to Ayodhyā.

**Sources and treatment**

As regards the source of a mahākāvya the author of the **VDP** means that Itiḥāsa rendered with the didactic element is known as a Kāvya.¹

Bhāmaha makes no remark about the source of a mahākāvya.

Dāndin becomes more precise and lays down that it should either be taken from historical narratives or otherwise. Thus the subject-matter of a Kāvya was preferably drawn from historical narratives.²

The subject-matter of Saundarananda as well as that of Buddha-charita cannot be traced to historical narratives, in the Brahmanical sense, but as the subject-matter of these Mahākāvyas is pertaining to Buddhist traditions, the source should be examined in that light.

---

1. VDP, III, XV, 2:
   मौक्ष्य प्रतिपन्नयसः इतिहासः स उच्चस्ति |
   तदेव काव्यस्मित्युर्जोपेश्व विना क्रमः ||

2. Dāndin, Kāvyādārsa, I, 15:
   इतिहास कपोलनिमत्तहि कहाप्रथमिः |

3. Generally, the Sanskrit commentators take the term Itiḥāśakathā as denoting narratives from Mahābhārata or Rāmāyaṇa or Purāṇas.
The source of the subject-matter of Saundarananda can be traced to Mahāvagga and Nidānkathā. As regards, Budhacarita, Asvaghoṣa has drawn from the ballads and episodes as presented in the earliest portions of Lalita-Vistara¹. Thus the term Itihāsa-Kathā specified by Dandin should be taken in a wider sense.

The theme of Kumārasambhava has been evidently taken from the then floating Purānic traditions, but we cannot say exactly from what source Kālidāsa derives his material.

In Rāghuvamśa, similarly Kālidāsa seems to have drawn the subject-matter from the Epic and Purānic traditions prevalent in his times.

The Mahākāvyya Kirātārjunīya can be traced to the Āranyaka Parva of Mahābhārata.

Our poet, Bhāṭṭi also walks on the beaten track and derives his theme from Rāmāyana.

The subject-matter of Rāghuvaṃśa extends over a long dynasty, that of Budhacarita and Kumārsambhava covers almost the whole range of known episodes of an individual, while that of Saundarananda and Kirātārjunīya is confined to a particular episode.

The subject-matter of Bhāṭṭikāvyya covers the entire life of Rāma, excepting the event subsequent to his performance of Aśvamedha sacrifice. It corresponds to

Vālmīki's Rāmāyana excluding the Uttarākanda of later origin.

In this manner, he has followed Vālmīki in narrating the life of the hero till his ascendancy. The later tragic incident of the repudiation of Śītā supplemented in the Uttarākanda of Rāmāyana is not included.

As stated above, the great Epic Rāmāyana seems to be the main source of the subject-matter of Bhattikāvyā. Even as a poet, Bhaṭṭi is not expected to follow the great Epic entirely as the form of the mahākāvyā requires certain distinct characteristics. In view of the double purpose, intended by the poet, many modifications became necessary.

To determine the extent of the poet's indebtedness to the Great Epic, the contents of our Mahākāvyā may be analysed as follows with special reference to the corresponding portions in Vālmīki-Rāmāyana:

**Corresponding passages in Vālmīki-Rāmāyana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhattikāvyā</th>
<th>Vālmīki-Rāmāyana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Dasaratha and his capital Ayodhyā – and his Queens.</td>
<td>(Dasaratha is Saiva)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10-16</td>
<td>X – XVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice for getting sons; birth of Rāma and his brothers; their study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I, 17 - 26. Visit of Visvāmitra; his request to Dasāratha; Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa set forth with Visvāmitra.


II, 20-29. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are taught Jaya and Vijaya; the destruction of Tādkā; they receive arms; protection of the sacrifice.


II, 32 - 35. The dialogue between Rāma and Mārīca.

II, 36 - 39. Rāma drives him away; ascetics are pleased.

II, 40 - 48. Visvāmitra and the princes leave for Mithilā; the breaking of the bow, marriage of Rāma.
II, 49 - 55.
Rāma's encounter with Parasurāma and return to Ayodhyā.

III, 1 - 5.
Preparations for the consecration of Rāma.

III, 6 - 18.
The banishment of Rāma.

III, 19-35.
The dejection of the King and the citizens; the death of Dasaratha, Bharata's arrival; Dasaratha's funeral rites.

III, 36 - 55.
Bharata leaves for Chitrakūṭa and his visit to Rāma.

IV, 1.
Rāma goes to hermitage of Atri.

IV, 2 - 3.
Rāma attacks Virādha.
IV, 4 - 14.
Rāma's visit to Sarabhānga and Sūtikṣaṇa. His stay at various hermitages.

IV, 15 - 32.
Sūrpankha episode.

IV, 33 - 45.
Sūrpankha urges Khara to kill Rāma; Khara sends Rākṣasas; Rāma destroys them all including Trisīras.

V, 1 - 3.
Rāma kills Khara and Dūṣana.

V, 4 - 29.
Sūrpankha reports to Rāvaṇa and urges Rāvaṇa to abduct Sītā and to take revenge on Rāma.

V, 30 - 47.
Rāvaṇa goes to Mārīcha and succeeds in getting his assistance.

V, 48 - 52.
Mārīcha assumes the form of a deer; Sītā is enchanted; Rāma chases it and kills it.
V, 53 - 60.
Sītā forces Lakṣmaṇa to run to Rāma's help.

V, 61 - 95.
The abduction of Sītā by Rāvaṇa.

V, 96 - 108.
The combat between Rāvaṇa and Jaṭāyu; Rāvaṇa reaches Lāṅkā.

VI, 1 - 4.
Sītā rejects Rāvaṇa's entreaty to marry him; he keeps her in Aśokavana.

VI, 5 - 39.
Rāma's apprehension of the loss of Sītā and his lamentation. He is angry on finding the vestiges of Rāvaṇa's encounter with Jaṭāyu. He threatens the world with destruction.

VI, 40 - 43.
Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa happen to meet Jaṭāyu who after giving the news of the abduction breathes his last.
VI, 44 - 57.
Their encounter with Kabandha.

VI, 58 - 72.
Their visit to Sabarī.
They reach Pampa.

VI, 73 - 84.
Description of Pampa and Rāma's reaction at its sight.

VI, 85 - 103.
Their meeting with Hanūmat.
He takes them to Sugrīva.

VI, 104 - 117.
Sugrīva and Rāma pledge their alliance; Sugrīva seeks Rāma's assistance against Vālin.

VI, 118 - 124.
First and second combat between Sugrīva and Vālin; Vālin is struck by Rāma.

VI, 125 - 143.
Vālin reproaches Rāma; Rāma's justification. Death of Vālin; Sugrīva is enthroned as a King.
VII, 1 - 14.
Rāma's description of the rainy season.

VII, 15 - 27.
Rāma sends Lākṣmaṇa to remind Sugrīva of his alliance. Lākṣmaṇa reproaches Sugrīva.

VII, 28 - 34.
Sugrīva assembles all his forces and calls on Rāma.

VII, 35 - 50.
He sends Aṅgada's party with Hanūmat to the southern direction giving instructions. Rāma hands over his signet-ring to Hanūmat.

VII, 51 - 52.
He dispatches three other parties each under one leader in the east, west and north.

VII, 53 - 70.
Aṅgada's party searches in vain for Sītā in the Vindhya region; Their entry into the cave and their meeting with Svayamprabhā.
The party's inability to keep to schedule; its resolve to fast unto death. Sampaṭi's appearance; His information encourages the monkeys to continue their search.

VII, 102 - 108.  
The monkeys go towards Mt. Mahendra. Their sight of the ocean. They send Hanūmat across the ocean.

VIII, 1 - 27.  
Hanūmat flies over the ocean; conversation with Maināka. Hanūmat's encounter with two Rakṣasīs. His entry into Laṅkā.

VIII, 28 - 58.  
His observation of Laṅkā and search for Śitā. He sees Puṣpaka and the harem of Rāvaṇa.

VIII, 59 - 102.  
He goes to Asokavana, finds Śitā there, overhears Rāvaṇa's conversation with her.
Hanumāt's visit to Sītā. He gives her the token-ring. Sītā gives him crest - jewel in return.

Breaking of Pramadavana by Hanumāt. He cuts down the pleasure - grove.

The Rākṣasās report to Rāvana; Rāvana sends warriors; Hanumāt kills them.

Rāvana sends Aksa; Hanumāt kills him. Hanumāt determines to finish off his enemies. He is proud of his achievements.

Rāvana sends Indrajit. After a fierce battle, Indrajit binds Hanumāt in Brāhma Pāsa. Bound Hanumāt is presented to Rāvana.

Rāvana plans to kill Hanumāt, but Vibhīśaṇa dissuades him. Hanumāt pleads Rāma's cause and requests Rāvana to surrender Sītā. Rāvana orders Hanumāt to be burned.
X, 1 - 17.
Hanuman sets the place ablaze.
Disastrous result for the whole city. Hanuman revisits Sita.

X, 18 - 30.
Hanuman traverses the ocean. Successful Hanuman makes the monkeys happy.

X, 31 - 42.
He comes to Rama and presents to him the crest-jewel. Rama regains hope. Hanuman reports about Sita and Rama weeps.

X, 43 - 44.
Hanuman takes Rama and Lakshmana to Mt. Mahendra.

X, 45 - 50.
Description of Mt. Mahendra

X, 51 - 75.
The monkeys see Lankā and the ocean between. Rama is love-sick. Lakshmana urges Rama to be firm.

LIV, LV, LVI (1 - 22)
LV (23-51), LVII, LIX
Yuddhakanda
IV (1 - 41)
XI, 1 - 47.
The description of the Rakṣasās awakening after a love-night.

XII, 1 - 6. Vibhīṣaṇa's mother appeals to him to persuade Rāvaṇa to give back Sītā; Vibhīṣaṇa promises.

XII, 7 - 12. Vibhīṣaṇa goes to the court.

XII, 13 - 20. Rāvaṇa seeks the advice of the assembly; Prahasta advises him to crush the monkeys and the princes.

XII, 21 - 54. Vibhīṣaṇa implores them to be reasonable and give back Sītā.

XII, 55 - 67. Kumbhakarṇa and Mālyavāna agree with Vibhīṣaṇa.

* But this occurs in the North-West version Sunderakānda, ( XXV ).
XII, 68 - 75.
Vibhīṣaṇa points to the
dismal omens and horrible
prospects.

XII, 76 - 87.
Rāvaṇa insults Vibhīṣaṇa
and kicks him. Vibhīṣaṇa
goes to Rāma.

XIII, 1 - 14.
Rāma is angry at the ocean.
The Lord of Waters bows to
Rāma and advises him to
build a dam.

XIII, 15 - 30.
The monkeys set to work.
They fetch rocks, Nala
arranges them. The dam is
completed. The ocean is
crossed.

XIII, 31.
The army climbs Mt. Suvela.

XIII, 32 - 43.
Description of this spot.

XIII, 44 - 50.
The description of Rāma's
and Rāvaṇa's armies.
XIV, 1.
Rāvana deludes Sītā with a fictitious head of Rāma.

XIV, 2 - 14.
Rāvana sends out his army to fight. The war-music; the gestures of the impetuous warriors; Bad omens.

XIV, 15 - 16.
Rāvana guards the city on all sides.

XIV, 17 - 21.
Rāma advances, Monkeys show up.

XIV, 22 - 35.
Initial fighting. Death of Prajaṅgha and other Rākṣasa heroes.

XIV, 36 - 53.
XIV, 54 - 60.  
Powerless Rāma shown to Sītā. She mourns, Trijātā comforts her.

XIV, 61 - 69.  
Rāma and the monkeys rouse themselves. Rāma is anxious about Lakṣmaṇa. Sugrīva promises himself to kill the Rākṣasas, Rāma on the advice of Vibhīṣaṇa remembers Garuḍa who arrives and breaks the Nāga-Pāsā.

XIV, 70 - 81.  
The monkeys are eager for battle. Rāvana loses courage. He sends Dhūmrākṣa; Battle between Dhūmrākṣa and Hanūmat. Hanūmat kills him.

XIV, 82 - 113.  
Kumbhakarna is awakened.
Conversation between Rāvana and Kumbhakarna, the latter sets out. Monkeys flee.


Rāvana weeps. He is upset. His sons go out to the front. Lakṣmaṇa kills them all.

Indrajit comes to the battle-field and attacks. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa swoon. Vibhīṣana sends Hanumat to fetch healing herbs. Total recovery of all. Laṅkā is set on fire.

XVI, 1 - 42.
Lamentation of Rāvaṇa.

XVII, 1 - 19.
The preparations of the Rākṣasas for going to the battle-field. Indrajit attacks. He wounds many.

XVII, 20 - 46.
Indrajit strikes a fictitious Śītā with his sword. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are desperate.
Vibhīṣaṇa discloses the trick of killing Indrajit. Rāma goes to the place of sacrifice.
Conversation between Vibhīṣaṇa and Indrajit. Struggle between Lakṣmaṇa and Indrajit. Lakṣmaṇa kills him.

XVII, 47 - 70.
Rāvaṇa wishes to kill Śītā, but is withheld. The Rākṣasas prepare themselves. The battle begins. Rāma kills many Rākṣasas.
XVII, 71 - 95.
Rāvana starts and begins to fight. Sugrīva kills many Rāksasas. Rāvana attacks Rāma.
Fierce battle between Rāma and Rāvana. Lakṣmana crushes his chariot. Rāvana pierces Lakṣmana. Rāvana leaves the battle-field. Lakṣmana healed with Hanūmat's herbs.

XVII, 96 - 112.

XVIII, 1 - 36.
Vibhisana mourns for Rāvana. All the powers conquered by Rāvana get back their freedom. He considers self-immolation.
The wives of Rāvana and citizens of Lanka start mourning for Rāvana.

Rāma advises Vibhīśaṇa to stop lamenting and to perform the rites for Rāvana.

Vibhīśaṇa is grateful to Rāma. He orders the courtiers to make preparations for the funeral ceremony of Rāvana.

Vibhīśaṇa conducts the obsequies. Rāma anoints him as King of Rākṣasas.

Rāma advises him to be a good King.

Hanūmat runs to Sītā and tells her the good news. Sītā wants Rāma to come.
XX, 8-20.  
Hanumāt delivers Sītā's message to Rāma. Rāma asks Vibhīśaṇa to fetch Sītā.
XX, 21 - 37.  
Rāma sends Sītā away on account of her stay with Rāvaṇa. Sītā assures Rāma that she has been faithful to him. She orders to prepare a pyre and enters it.
XXI, 1 - 20.  
Agni refuses to consume Sītā, and reproaches Rāma and testifies her purity. Rāma tries to justify his conduct. Śiva acknowledges him as Viṣṇu. Rāma recognises his father and Indra.
XXI, 20 - 23.  
The description of Mt. Suvela.  
Hanumāt goes ahead from the hermitage of Bharadvāja.
XXII, 1 - 17.  
Rāma tells Hanumāt to go to Ayodhyā the next day and describes to him the route of his journey.
Rāma invites Sugrīva and Vibhīṣana to accompany him to Ayodhyā. They agree to the proposal.

They mount the Puṣpaka. Rāma points out to Sītā the various places on their route.

Concluding remarks.

Treatment in Bhattikāvya

A survey of the above analysis already indicates that most of the topics narrated in Bhattikāvya have a corresponding basis in Vālmīki's Rāmāyana. However, Bhaṭṭi seems to have made some abridgements and omissions and a few modifications and additions as well.

While reducing the contents of the Great Epic comprising 20,540 verses (excluding the Uttarakāṇḍa) into a Mahākāvya composed in about 1,625 verses, Bhaṭṭi had naturally to condense the subject-matter of the Epic to a large extent.
However, he has somehow abridged certain episodes to a far larger extent, though they afforded full scope for vivid description.

For instance,

(i) He has given the marriage episode of Rāma in just 7 verses, while it covers full 8 adhyāyas in Vālmīki's Rāmāyana.

(ii) In the same way, preparations for the consecration of Rāma are described rather summarily in 5 verses while they cover full 6 adhyāyas in Vālmīki's Rāmāyana.

(iii) The instigation of Kaikeyī by Mañtharā, Kaikeyī's request to the king to grant her two boons, Dasāratha's granting the request, Rāma's bidding farewell and leaving for the forest - all these occupy 33 adhyāyas in Vālmīki's Rāmāyana, while Bhaṭṭi sums up all these in 10 verses.

(iv) Similarly the incidents beginning with the lamentation of King Dasaratha and ending in his death, Bharata's arrival and performance of the funeral rites of his father are summarily treated by Bhaṭṭi in 16 verses, whereas Vālmīki narrates them in detail in 20 adhyāyas. Moreover Bhaṭṭi has dealt with Bharata's visit to Rāma in forest in 21 verses, while Vālmīki has narrated it in 29 adhyāyas.
In the same way, Bhaṭṭi has treated cursorily the incidents beginning with the lamentation of Vibhīṣaṇa and ending with the return of Rāma to Ayodhyā in 5 short cantos, while Vālmīki has devoted full 30 adhyāyas to these incidents.

As out of the vast Epic, Bhaṭṭi had to carve a Mahākāvyya of limited scope, he had to leave out many incidents of lesser importance.

Some of the noteworthy omissions made by Bhaṭṭi are as follows:

(i) Bhaṭṭi does not refer to the Asvamedha sacrifice performed by Dasaratha.

(ii) He also does not stop to describe the marriages of three younger brothers of Rāma.

(iii) Bhaṭṭi ascribes the turning-point in Kaikeyī's attitude to whisperers in general, but does not specify the name of Maṇtharā in particular.

(iv) Similarly Bhaṭṭi omits the reference to the earlier episode of the curse received by Daśaratha from the parents of Sravaṇa.

(v) He has omitted the episode of Rāma's and Bharata's meeting with Güha.

(vi) Unlike Vālmīki, Bhaṭṭi drops the description of the journey from Ayodhyā to Chitrakūṭa in the
case of Rāma and reserves it in relation to Bharata in order to avoid repetition.

(vii) The poet does not refer to Bharata's stay in Nandigrāma during the exile of Rāma.

(viii) In the description of Rāma's meeting with the sages one after another, Bhaṭṭi has dropped his visit to Agastya which is given in detail in Vālmīki-Rāmāyana.

(ix) Rāma's meeting with Jaṭāyu before the abduction of Sītā does not occur in Bhaṭṭikāvyā.

(x) Bhaṭṭi does not send Angada for the final diplomatic discourse with Rāvana for averting the impending war.

(xi) Likewise Bhaṭṭi does not dwell upon the lamentation of Tārā and that of Mandodari.

(xii) Bhaṭṭi also omits the efforts made by Mandodari to persuade Rāvana to give back Sītā and to avert the war.  

When a poet recasts the whole epic story into a different form, certain modifications become inevitable. As we have seen, Bhaṭṭi has not introduced any major changes in the story of Rāmāyana. Some minor changes are as follows:

1. It may be here noticed that this episode does not occur in the Southern recension of Vālmīki's Rāmāyana, but this may be an accidental coincidence.
(i) Bhatti presents Dasaratha as a devotee of Siva. As this reference cannot be traced to any work pertaining to or including the life of Rama and composed prior to Bhattikavya, it is hardly possible to trace its original source. The reference occurs in Sivapurana which is obviously later than Bhattikavya. The Purana emphatically states that Dasaratha followed Saivism zealously.

(ii) In Ramayana, Prajapatya Purusa himself makes manifest and gives the Payasa to Dasaratha, while in Bhattikavya the poet has presented the episode of the sacrifice rationally. No god figures there. Moreover Payasa is here replaced by Hutochchhista (Burnt ablations).

(iii) The lores imparted to Rama by Visvamitra are 'Balä' and 'Atibalä' in Valmiki-Ramayana, while Bhatti has given 'Jaya' and 'Vijaya' as the names of the lores.

(iv) In Valmiki-Ramayana, Janaka while introducing the Saiva bow says that Siva had wielded it against the gods for asserting his own share after the destruction of Daksa sacrifice, while later in

---

1 Sivamahapurana, IV, 37, vs. 30 - 38.
2 BK., I, 13:


3 BK., II, 21.

4 Valmiki-Ramayana, II, LXV, 9 - 10:
the encounter with Rāma, Parasurāma refers to it as having been given by the gods to Śiva when he set himself to destroy Tripura\(^1\). The variation in the two versions may be explained by assuming that Śiva used the same bow at both occasions. As Śiva is said to have received the bow at the later occasion, the bow seems to have been originally associated with the episode of the killing of Tripura. As for Bhatti, it is appreciable that he represents Janaka as introducing the bow as wielded by Śiva while destroying Tripura\(^2\). Among other works on the life of Rāma, works like Rāghuvamśa (XI, 44) associate the bow with the episode of the Dakṣa sacrifice,\(^3\) while other works like Padmapurāṇa\(^4\) and Rāmākīyana\(^5\) associate it with the episode of the killing of Tripura.

(v) In Vālmiki-Rāmāyana, Rāma alone kills Khara, Dūṣaṇa, and other 14000 Rāksasas, while Bhattikīyana attributes the exploits to both Rāma and Lākṣāmana\(^6\).

(vi) Offended by the false attribution of evil motives by Sītā, Lākṣāmana departed cursing her that she would fall into the hands of enemies (V, 60), whereas Vālmiki represents Lākṣāmana as turning a

---

1. Vālmiki-Rāmāyana, II, LXXIV, 12:
   अनुसूची सुरैरैं आभकाय वुदुस्वये त्रिपुरांलं नरत्रेश्वरं भगवं नाकुलस्य यत्तथा
2. BK., II, 42:
   अजिंग्राहं न अवस्तो धनुसंदर्भ भोजनाति दातित्से पिताभी |
3. XI, 44:विद्वद् भन्ते उसस्विनिः येन याणमस्माट् वृत्तिविद्यत
5. Dr. Bulcke, Rāmakathā, p. 360.
6. BK., IV, 40; V.3.
...deaf ear to Sītā's futile charges and leaving her under divine care. Bhaṭṭi makes his treat her with a due sense of justice as implied by the attribute 'vasī'.

(vii) In Vālmīki-Rāmāyana, the account of the council of Rāvana is given differently in different versions; the Southern version reports about two councils, while the North-Eastern version refers to only one, and the North-Western version alludes to the second council cursorily. Bhaṭṭi refers to only one council. Here he probably follows the North-Eastern version.

It seems that our poet had the Northern version of the Epic before him rather than the Southern one, because in certain respects, he definitely seems to follow the Northern version.

(a) In the beginning of Canto XII (vs.1 - 6), Bhaṭṭi has presented Nikāśa asking Vibhīṣaṇa to persuade Rāvana to give back Sītā. This dialogue between Nikāsa and Vibhīṣaṇa occurs in the Northers version of Vālmīki-Rāmāyana, while it is entirely missing in the Southern version.

(b) In the Southern version, Rāvana abuses Vibhīṣaṇa, therefore he leaves Rāvana and joins Rāma. In the

1. BK, XII, 13.
2. Vālmīki-Rāmāyana, Yuddhakāṇḍa, XVI, 1-16.
Northern version Rāvana kicks Vibhīṣaṇa and then Vibhīṣaṇa abandons Rāvana. Our author has followed the Northern Version, as he also represents Rāvana as kicking Vibhīṣaṇa.

(Viii) Valmīki as well as Bhaṭṭi mentions twice the killing of certain Rākṣasas bearing the same names, while Bhaṭṭi refers to the killing of two other Rākṣasas (bearing the same names, Virūpākṣa and Yūpākṣa), though Valmīki refers to them only once. Apparently this seems to be a sort of discrepancy, but it is more probable that the poets here probably referred to two distinct persons bearing the same name in each case.

(ix) In Valmīki-Rāmāyana, Brahmā reminds Rāma after Sītā's fire ordeal that he is none other than Nārāyaṇa while in Bhaṭṭikāvya it is Sāṅkara who reminds it to Rāma.

1. Ibid., Sundarakāṇḍa, XI, 3.
2. BK., XII, 80:

3. Prof. C. Hooykaas notices these points and takes them as irregularities - C. Hooykaas, The Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, Verhandelingen, pp. 61 f.
4. Certain names are so common in vogue that they get repeated even in small groups. For instance, the list of the 44 donees mentioned in Navalakāki plates of King Silāditya I of Valabhi dated 605 A.D. includes three names applying to two donees each - Epigraphy Indica, Vol. XI, pp. 174 ff.
5. BK., XXI, 16.
(χ) In Vālmīki- Rāmāyana while returning to Ayodhyā, Hanūmat travels with Rāma and others up to Bharadvāja Āśrama in Puṣpaka Vimāna and then Rāma sends him ahead to inform Bharata of their return, while Bhaṭṭī sends him ahead right from Laṅkā.¹

As Bhaṭṭī has to abridge the contents of our Epic, he has little scope for amplifications and additions. However as the author of Mahākāvya, he could introduce the vivid description of certain topics, as well as narration of certain dialogues. Such additions may be expected more from the author who has undertaken a double purpose.

Nevertheless, Bhaṭṭī has introduced only a few additions, the significance of which is easily explicable.

The outstanding additions are as follows :-

(i) He has added the description of the autumn at the beginning of the second Canto (1–19), while describing the journey of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa with Viśvāmitra.

(ii) Bhaṭṭī has introduced the dialogue (II, 22–35) between Rāma and Mārīcha at their earlier, and this is not found in Vālmīki- Rāmāyana.²

---

¹. This modification is obviously intended to facilitate the poet to use the forms of the First Future in quite a good number of verses in Canto XXII (1–17).

². Bhaṭṭī omits the dialogue of Rāma with Khara narrated by Vālmīki in Aranyakāṇḍa, 29.
(iii) Bhāṭṭi has introduced the description of the love-pleasures of Rākṣasas in Canto XI. This description is not found in Vālmiki-Rāmāyana1.

(iv) The elaboration of the description of Mt. Suvela in Canto XIII (32–43) is obviously due to the requisite of Mahākāvyya devoting a canto to the illustrations of Bhāṣāsama and to the description of the mountain as well.

(v) The narration of the instructions given by Vibhīśaṇā to the ministers for the preparation of the funeral of Rāvaṇa introduces an interesting dialogue (XIX,7–13).

(vi) The narration of Rāma's instructions to Vibhīśaṇā (XIX, 23–30) for administering the Kingdom of Lāṅkā as befitting an ideal ruler is added by Bhāṭṭi2.

Thus Bhāṭṭi seems to have drawn his subject-matter mainly from Vālmiki's Rāmāyana, and represented it in an abridged form on the whole, along with an amplification in the narration or description of certain topics to suit his composition of Mahākāvyya.

1. Bhāṭṭi treats the observation of the Aare of Rāvaṇa by Hanūmat cursorily. Probably he reserved it for a vivid description for a future canto - Poet Pravara-sena gave a similar treatment in Canto X of Setubandha, but the comparison of the two descriptions indicates little bearing of the earlier work on Bhāṭṭikāvyya.

2. The introduction of both these speeches is obviously intended to illustrate the various uses of 'Liṅ'.
Another characteristic set forth in the definition given by both Bhāmaha\(^1\) and Dāndin\(^2\) is that it should have well formed joints. VDP makes no mention of Sañdh times among the characteristics of mahākavya.

The term Sañdhis used here is taken in different senses\(^3\):

1. in the general sense of joints i.e. occurring at the end of the previous canto and suggesting the subject-matter of the succeeding canto,

2. in the sense of junctures (सुरुव ग्रामाभव, वीम विम निवेदन ) cited in the Nātyasāstra, and

3. in the sense of euphonic junction or coalition ( in grammar ).

Among these, the third meaning is hardly tenable, as it would apply to any literary composition irrespective of form.

The first meaning can well apply to Bhāttikavya, as the concluding verses of the cantos generally suggest the subject-matter of the succeeding ones, e.g. the last verse 131 of Canto VIII suggests the subject-matter of the next canto, viz. the adventures of Hanūmat at the court of

---

1. Bhāmaha, Kavyaśāṅkara, I, 20:
2. Dāndin, Kavyādarsa, I, 18:
Rāvana or the verse 123 at the end of Canto XV suggests the ensuing victory of Rāma over the Rākṣasas or the verse 112 of Canto XVIII suggests the subject-matter of Canto XIX, viz. the lamentation of Vibhīṣaṇa over Rāvana's death.

However it is clear that in the times of Visvanātha, the author of Sāhityadarpana the term Sandhi was applied to the Mahākāvya, in the sense of Sandhis cited in the Natyasāstra.

But in the absence of any annotations pertaining to the times of Daṇḍin, it is difficult to decide, whether Daṇḍin also used the term Sandhi in the sense of the (Nāṭaka) Sandhis.

However assuming that the interpretation made by Visvanātha was based on an earlier tradition, we may try to trace the five Sandhis cited in the Natyasāstra to Bhāṭṭikāvya.

The first point that strikes us in this context is to decide the exact Kārya or the object of this poem. At the outset, it would appear that the object of this Mahākāvya is Rāvana's 'vadha' as its title indicates. But the Mahākāvya does not terminate with the episode of Rāvana's vadha; it extends over five

---
1. SB, VI, p. 532:  
2. N.S. (G.O.S.), XIX, 39:  

cantos more and ends with Rāma's performance of the
Asvamedha sacrifice after his return to Ayodhya and
his coronation with Śītā.

The real object of the poem should therefore be
taken to be the concluding incident rather than
Rāvaṇa's 'vadha'.

Accordingly, the portion narrating incidents from
Kaikeyī's demand to Daśaratha for Rāma's banishment to
the forest up to his departure may be taken as representing
Mukhasandhi, as it contains the origination of the Bīja.

As for the Pratimukhasandhi, the cantos depicting
Rāma's sojourn in the forest represent the development
or manifestation of the Bīja. The abduction of Śītā by
Rāvaṇa and Rāma's endeavour for her search seem to
make it imperceptible or veiled.

The episodes of Rāma's battle with Rāvaṇa seem
to represent Garbhasandhi as Rāma's attempts for his
victory and the consequent attainment of Śītā, manifest
a further stage in the development of the Bīja, which
the hero gains and which he frequently searches
everytime it is lost.

1. N.S. (G.O.S.), XIX, 39: यत्र ब्रजस्मुन्य ज्ञानाधीनयेषस्यस्यस्मिन्यः
कथे श्रीरामणुर्य तन्मुखं परिधीलिनिः
2. Ibid., 40: ब्रजस्मुपाहारणे यथा सूर्यनाथकर्मिः कर्मिः
मुनयज्ञस्तयस्य सयेज नैव प्रतिमुखं स्मृतम्
3. Ibid., 41: 
उद्धेदक्षस्य ब्रजस्मु प्रक्ष्यप्राप्तिनिर्ययः या
मुनयज्ञानवेश्ययं यत्र समेः इस्य स्मृतिः
After killing Rāvana in the battle, it would seem that Rāma would attain Sītā unhindered and return to Ayodhyā, but the possibility of the attainment of the object is hindered by the unforeseen obstacle in the form of the non-acceptability of Sītā. The obstacle is surmounted by the fire-ordeal, out of which Sītā emerged successfully. This portion can well be taken as representing Vimarsasañdhī.\(^1\)

The last Canto narrating Rāma’s happy return to Ayodhyā along with his whole retinue, his coronation with Sītā and the performance of Asvamedha sacrifice obviously represent Nirvahañasanādhī\(^2\). However it is uncertain whether Bhaṭṭī had this conception of the Sandhi in view in the composition of his Mahākāvya.

---

1. *Ibid.*, 42:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{गम्मितिस्मित्री बीजायो विलोभन्नकृत यशोः} \\
\text{प्रेतवचसन्नो वापि स विमश्र इलि स्मृतः} \\
\end{array}
\]

2. *Ibid.*, 43:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{समानयत्वे मायायां मुख्यायां सबीजिनाम्} \\
\text{नानोमायीत्तराः सुदेवेन्नक्षृतराः न नान} \\
\end{array}
\]
CHAPTER 3

The Poetic Treatment of Bhattikāvya

Beginning of Bhattikāvya

Neither the author of VDP nor Bhāmaha gives any requisites as to the opening of the Mahākāvya, but Dandin specifies particulars regarding the opening of the Mahākāvya. It should begin with benediction, a salutation or naming of the principal theme.¹

Among the earlier mahākāvyas, Āśvaghoṣa at the beginning of Saundarananda introduces the Buddha. Of course, the verse cannot be taken as indicating the plot, but if we accept the wider denotation of 'Vastunirdesa' according to which the plot can even be implied through the introduction of the hero or some other principal character of the story, the opening of the Mahākāvya can fall under the category of 'Vastunirdesa'.

Buddhacharita starts with a salutation to the Budha, who was as good as a favourite god to the poet Āśvaghoṣa. Kumārasambhava starts with the description of the grandeur and divinity of Himālaya, one of the main characters in the poem. If Mallinātha be accepted, this verse can be said to introduce the subject-matter

¹. Dandin, Kāvyādārsā, I, 14:

आशीर्वद्यज्ञानसिद्धिः वस्तुनिर्देशी वापि नमःकरम्
through implication.\(^1\) In *Raghuvamsa* the poet starts with a salutation to God Siva.

As for the beginning of *Kirātārjuniya*, it also does not start with a benediction or a salutation nor does it indicate the principal theme, but it seems to introduce the theme impliedly through the reference to Yudhishṭhira, a principal character of the theme.

As regards *Bhāttikāvya*, its opening verse says that the eternal God himself chose virtuous Daśaratha as his father for the welfare of the world\(^2\). Apparently this does not seem to contain any benediction or salutation directly. However, as Jayamangala suggests\(^3\), the verse can be taken as containing a salutation impliedly. As the verse also introduces the God’s incarnation as Rāma, the verse can also be taken as making ‘Vastunirdesā’ through the introduction of the hero of the theme. Thus by making a reference to God Viṣṇu as well as his:

1. Mallinātha, Comm. on *Kumārśāmbhava*, I, 1:

2. *Bk*, I, 1:

3. Jayamangala, Comm. on *Bk*, I-1:

---

\(^1\) Mallinātha, Comm. on *Kumārśāmbhava*, I, 1:

\(^2\) *Bk*, I, 1:

\(^3\) Jayamangala, Comm. on *Bk*, I-1:
incarnation as Rāma, the poet probably intended a double purpose in the opening verse.

Thus though Daṇḍin refers to three types of the opening of mahākāvya, the type of benediction occurs in none of the mahākāvyas, composed up to his time, the type of salutation occurs only in Buddhacarita and in Raghuvamsa, that in Bhāttikāvya being implied, while the opening of the remaining Mahākāvyas including Bhāttikāvya can be taken as indicating the subject-matter only impliedly.

Characterisation

As the narration of a story, life or episode forms one of the outstanding characteristics of the Mahākāvya, it lends importance to characterisation, especially that of the hero.

As Bhaṭṭi has drawn the subject-matter principally from Rāmāyana, the attributes of its different characters had been fixed long ago.

Nevertheless an accomplished poet can yet put something original in it. But as Bhaṭṭi aimed at interweaving a composition of a double purpose, he naturally had a limited scope for it.

The works laying down the general characteristics of the Mahākāvya allude to the characterisation of the hero alone.
The author of the VDP emphasises that the hero should be dharmavijayi and should resort to the path followed by good people. The author of VDP does not specify any technical type of the hero.

Bhāmaha simply says that the mahākāvyya should deal with the great and the virtuous. He also does not specify the type of the hero. Both the author of VDP and Bhāmaha however make it clear that the poet should lead the hero towards glory and should not depict his fall, to highlight the ascendancy of another character. The former recommends that the poet should also describe the attainment of heaven in the case of a hero who may have attained it even physically.

Rāma

In dramaturgy also, Dhīrodātta figures as one of four types of heroes. The Dhīrodātta hero is defined in

1. VDP, III, XV, 6;
2. Kāvyālaṅkāra, I, 16;
3. VDP, III, XV, 7;
5. An example of such a case occurs in Ramayana and in the life of Rāma, narrated in Raghuvamśa.
the Dasarūpaka of Dhanan̄jaya.

The noble and virtuous character of Rāma as delineated by Bhaṭṭi, pervading the whole poem from the beginning to the end and attaining ascendancy, quite fits in with the various requirements laid down by the author of VDP, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin for the hero of the Mahākāvya.

The poet has concluded his poem by depicting the destruction of the Pratināyaka and triumphant return of the hero.

The hero of the original portions of Rāmāyana seems to be a great human hero, while he got more and more deified in course of time. In the time of Bhaṭṭi, Rāma appears to have attained outstanding deification.

Bhaṭṭi begins his Mahākāvya by introducing King Dasaśaratha as chosen by the Eternal God as Rāma's father. As indicated above, the poet commences his composition by an indirect reference to God. Thus at the very outset, Bhaṭṭi introduces Rāma, the hero of his story, as Eternal God:

\[ \text{गुणोऽविचारितकृप्तेऽन्म सन्तानः पितर्पुपागमन स्तवम्} \]

- I, 1.

1. Dhanan̄jaya, Dasarūpaka, II, 4:

2. Buicke, Rāmakathā, pp. 129 f.
Again, the sage Sutīkṣṇa, tells Rāma that the former sustained his existence till the latter came and now he would now like to take the course earned by the religious merit attained through his holy sight:

\[ \text{ты годы са́мшьяча́твима́мка́та́рмйа́} \text{шьан} \text{дане |}
\]

\[ \text{тру́пра́: кш́ са́тивьо} \text{дьа́мам; с́вапу́швича́твам} \text{гатий} ||
\]

- IV, 6.

In Canto X, Laks̐́manapplies to Rama not to feel dejected saying that it does not behove him, who was the sole refuge of the worlds:

\[ \text{कुत́ ри́пу́чча́т а́ннहи́ ро́кан ку́ чан} \text{гаран н́аганам} \text{भवан कु मोहः} |
\]

- X, 72.

Again in Canto XII Mālayaṇa tells Rāvana not to mistake Rāma for a mere human being and points out that gods often create such anthropomorphic beings with supernatural powers:

\[ \text{कृत्वा́विरत्सूनमयं} \text{सक्त्वे; स्तन्त्विन्ति} \text{रा́त्रिचरसयायधि} |
\]

\[ \text{नराः} \text{सूत्रविविद्य जान्नां} \text{अगत्युपद्धो} \text{विहितों} \text{ब्युपायः} ||
\]

- XII, 57.

The Lord of Waters presents himself to Rāma and hails him as the cause of the universe:

\[ \text{कु] गरिभवर्तिता} \text{अगमेन सा]त्वों} \text{समीकर्ष्यो रस्सहस्ती |}
\]

\[ \text{अहिमो} \text{रविकिरणगणों भाया संस्मारकरण} \text{ने परमा} ||
\]

- XIII, 9.
Again in Canto XIX, after the fire-ordeal of Sītā, Sāṅkara acknowledges Rāma as Nārāyaṇa, because of his excellent deeds:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{प्रणमने ततो साम् मुनक्षालिनि राजुः |} \\
\text{किं नास्यमात्मनं नाभोत्स्थते स्वामनस् ||} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- XXI, 16.

Thus the poet delineates Rāma as a human incarnation of the Supreme Being.

Irrespective of his divine character the life of Rāma displayed several outstanding merits even as a human hero. Rāma was a pious man devoted to religious practices.

Rāma performed the usual religious rites even during his exile:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{अङ्गोऽनुषवर्णीयानां सामान्यं तत्सम्बैष्ण |} \\
\text{उपेते देवस्थानं क्योकु घुल्मस्य च हृत्यां ||} \\
\text{आतिमय्यू अपनं सन्ध्यो एक्क्रान्तमायतनीवमम् |} \\
\text{प्रातस्वरं पतिः रेखेः प्रशुशस्त्रमेन रक्षित ||} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- IV, 9, 14.

In his sojourn at the hermitages during the exile, he always thought of the well-being of ascetics:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{परिश्रयं दुर्वेशु रन्धेशु अर्थोपि चिन्यतं |} \\
\text{पुजेष्वयौ मुनिर्द्राणा प्रियंमेवृक्तमगम्यं ||} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- IV, 13.
Sīta speaks highly of this aspect of Rāma before Rāvana:-

अर्थवर्ष्यितिः पाला पुत्री कर्मसु सर्वेदा ||
पीतु श्रोणयोगात्मते हित्या यो रघुजागमस्य वनस्त । 

- V, 79.

He did not abandon religious rites even after his separation from Sītā:-

नयानिः पि क्रियां धर्मसि म काले नामुचनु कृपिन ||
महानं हि क्रिया नित्या छिद्रे नैवायस्यतिः । 

- VI, 24.

When he visits Sabari, Rāma asks her whether she is able to perform the rituals unhindered:-

अवश्य पाद्यं पवसः कुञ्जनः च यं देवन्यागरं ||
आसात्यमात्वो नैः हिते कृत्यनमस्यसि । 

- VI, and also vide 65-67.

As a human being, Rāma is conscientious and dutiful to all.

Rāma is an obedient son. He does not utter a single word when, instead of being enthroned, he is ordered to go into the forest. He requests the citizens not to grieve for him:-

किं श्रीचन्द्रमें हुम्मतदेहि बलद समानं नियोगलाभिन्न पितुः कृत्यन योः ||
अमृतस्य श्रीम्तं अधिच्छायससिद्धुः यः सर्वदाः समानपुष्पयो यज्ञोवरम ||
महीपकारस्य किमस्ति नस्य नुस्तेन यज्ञेन बनस्य मोक्षः । 

- III, 12, 13.
He again persuades Bharata to return to Ayodhya and take charge of the realm in accordance with the wishes of their departed father:

\[ \text{अस्माकमुक्तं भृ बनय्यसे चैत्यकथिषे तां न मधिः क्षिते च} \\
\text{जलुक्ष्यति भृ न्यायिश नातिवाळे नहीं राजा क्रम राजिः पृथ्वीम} \]

- III, 53.

Though elder to Laksāmaṇa, he pays due heed to his words of advice:

\[ \text{हृ त प्रकोष्ठ निकिषे हि यल खवा न सुधे रंके वा ने निमितमय्युनिलपियेन} \\
\text{नम्बरानभ तब सुधे रंके रंकें चर्ची सूगै घरणे मान साविते वकुम} \]

- X, 74.

He hugs Laksāmaṇa heartily when the latter kills Indrajit:

\[ \text{परिवर्जते सौभिष्टे मूर्त्तेज्ञित्र राधे} \]

- XVII, 47.

Rāma consoles Vibhiṣaṇa mourning over the death of Rāvana and advises him to perform the funeral rites of Rāvana and to take over the reins of the kingdom of Lankā:

\[ \text{शेषविद्वते न समृद्धि ज्ञाने समं भवादुगम} \\
\text{कि न पथसी सर्वक्ष्यं जनसामायमबलम्} \\
\text{र्महेषि शानुरतनन्तराणि कहै जनस्थास्म च शोभेद्विम} \\
\text{दुन्भि विन विक तयदिर रज्ज्वारूपो मन्त्वंत्यन: कण्डदायंनर} \]

- XVIII, 41 – 42.

The poet does not give an idea of Rāma’s love for Sītā in his company. He rather chooses to delineate their
love in separation. On finding Sītā missing from their hermitage, Rāma feels the pangs of separation intensely:-

On learning of her abduction, he feels himself helpless:-

On hearing about the sad plight of Sītā from Hanūmat, he is overwhelmed by despondence:-

Rāma's ardent love for his beloved wife becomes manifest when, on getting the news about the killing of pseudo Sītā by Indrajit, he falls unconscious:-
But Rāma valued Rājadharma higher than even personal affection.

From a very young age, Rāma was conscious that his first duty as a Kṣatriya was to protect the subjects and punish the wicked. This consciousness is seen in his dialogue with Mārīcha at the time of their first encounter:

- II, 35.

As a noble prince, he encourages the ascetics to perform sacrifices:

- II, 28.

This Rājadharma was the cause of his killing Vālin and repudiating Sītā, the two queer episodes which have given rise to controversy.

When Vālin accuses Rāma of a despicable act in killing him unnoticed, Rāma contends that he killed Vālin because the latter had committed violated his younger brother's wife. This course of conduct was highly condemned by those well-versed in the Vedas. The aged and the religious persons have enjoined the penalty of death for those who commit such a crime. Therefore it was his duty to finish Vālin.

- VI, 136.
In the observance of this Rājadharma, one has to be harsh even towards one's own near relatives.

This idea compels Rāma to reject Sītā as she had stayed in Rāvana's house and that was not befitting the renowned lineage of Raghu. He asserts his utter firmness against her acceptance:

रावणांश्च परिवर्तितहि नन्दपति नमः

सति अभावान सुप्रीवे रामसेनं गुहाण वा ॥

- XX, 22 and also vide 23, 24.

As the poet has concluded his narration with a reference to Rāma's coronation after his return to Ayodhya, along with a passing reference to his performance of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, he has little scope to depict the career of Rāma as an ideal ruler.

But Rāma's concept of an ideal king can be inferred from the various instructions given by him to Vibhīśaṇa with respect to the latter's royal duties in Lāṅkā:

अवसेयाः प्रमुख धर्मणः पुरुषास्त्राम

अनुसरं क्रिया राजन सदा स्वेगतं जने ॥

- XIX, 28 also vide 29, 30.

The first and foremost duty of an ideal king was the protection of his subjects. This duty naturally presupposed adequate prowess and courage in him.

1. Nevertheless he compassionately suggests her to choose Sugrīva, Vibhīśaṇa, Bharata or Lākṣmaṇa as her consort or to go at her sweet will.
As princes, the sons of Dasaratha were all trained in the use of weapons:

Among them Rama and Lakṣmaṇa distinguished themselves as virile heroes, when they were taken by Visvāmitra to protect his sacrifice against the oppression of the demons. When Visvāmitra comes to Dasaratha to ask for Rama and Lakṣmaṇa, Dasaratha hesitates to send the young princes for such a difficult task, Visvāmitra, a great seer, asks the King not to worry because he foresaw that:

Visvāmitra equipped Rama with many weapons and taught him two vidyās, so that he could kill all the Rākṣasas efficiently:

Being equipped with divine missiles, Rama along with Lakṣmaṇa encounters oppressing Rākṣasas. In this encounter Rama slays Tādakā and forces Marīcha to flee from the battlefield.
Next he breaks asunder the bow of Siva given to him by Janaka:-

अलिग्रहतान्त्य जनको धनुस्तदू योना विद्वैत्यपरं पिनाकी ||
जितासमानो वल्मिक्य आहू हृद्द भाभी ध्रुवसन्दनन ||
- II, 42.

Again he accepts the challenge of Parasurāma and bends his mighty bow:-

धनुधिकाशी मुरुभाणगरी लोकानिधिप्रियोजनय नस्य ||
- II, 53.

Sītā fails to understand how Rāvaṇa did not know Rāma whose prowess was renowned:-

दीर्घामाने विनान्त वाणानस्थमानं महामादि कः
निम्नानं शान्तवान् समे कष्ठे त्यं नायगच्छिसि ||
- V, 81.

Rāma fully convinces Sugrīva of his prowess by piercing the seven tall trees at a time:-

निर्णये रक्षितस्त्राणां समो न्यूनतिधिः कः
अभिनन्द्रिष्टपरम्यै सपत वेमस्मृतस्तरस ||
- VI, 116.

Hanūmat tries to convince Rāvaṇa that it is in his interest to surrender Sīta rather than make enmity with Rāma whose exploits were well-known:-

अमसूपधुवधोपतिः विमुज्ज्व वधिविग्रहः
सीतामपेय नन्वाये कोशांडया सस्मृतंम् ||
- IX, 136.
The prince was amiable to the subjects on account of his heroic deeds:

आदर्भ भविष्यमारम कुमारः फिस्मिष्णुमि स यम्य नास्तिका ||
- III, 1.

With the help of Laksmana, he kills fourteen thousand Rākṣasas as well as Khara and Dūṣaṇa:

तै निष्णुस्त्वतः निःशीलिनिः।
परस्परविध धानुःकशातिकाः कलितोऽवित्तं ||
- IV, 40.

Even Sūrpanakhā who was intolerably offended by Rāma, does not help appreciate Rāma’s prowess while reporting his exploits to Rāvana:

रामो यज्ञदृष्टि तव फालकमपशिवीरवः।
- V, 13.

Mārīcha also praises the adventures of Rāma before Rāvana and tries to convince him that Rāma is considerably stronger than he:

भवनां कार्तिकीयाः यी फैमानिकर्मीकरसये।
जिगाय तस्य हुमारे स रामः सार्वत्तौकिययुभः।
- V, 33.

Vibhīṣaṇa, too, pays his best compliments to Rāma, when he advises Rāvana to avoid a conflict with Rāma, which he likens to the conflict of a foot soldier with the elephant:

प्रकृतिविशयः परिमुख बन्धुकृष्णिकाँ मित्रो बिगुणीप्रेतः।
सा पादःयुधे द्विद्वेदः कार्तिकीय मित्रविद्युतः प्रणालोप्यकुराम ||
- XII, 39.
Even Mālyavān draws Rāvana's attention to the superhuman power of Rāma displayed through his amazing exploits:

एकः पदाति: युरो धनुजमान् येकनेक्यत्थानि विघटनाति
चारा: साहसाणि चन्द्रेण ५५ दीनः का तन्र यो मानुषामात्र ग्यृहृ ||
- XII, 56.

Rāma plays a prominent role in killing Kumbhakarṇa:

वाय्यास्मृणि ते पाणि रामे यौग्यसीत्र सख्युध्यम ||
अहेतु नकहसोऽसऽवधावाहिनिः श्रीरित्सपयम ||
- XV, 67.

When Rāma shoots hundreds of arrows with his bow, neither his soldiers nor his opponents could realise his aim. The great archer slays hundreds and thousands of warriors of different corps:

ततोऽवछिरोतास्मृणि धनुजाध्यायिनः महत ||
रामः समीदित्ते तस्य नाचलेन्तस्ये न वापरे ||
लक्षे च दु: पदानीतां साध्यवेण धनुमहत ||
अनीयनाखष्ट्रे भागे दिवसस्य परिसत्यम ||
- XVII, 64, 68.

The battle with Rāvana was the real test of Rāma's valour. Both proved to be almost an equal match to each other:

मण्डलामयमानो चित्रमचित्यानां राक्षसंहितां ||
ञगुष्मामाप्येनाः तस्य न च विसावसीत्तान ||
- XVII, 84.
The heroic career of Rāma was crowned by his performance of the Asvamedha sacrifice, which established the supreme sovereignty of the performer:

अन्धे तुरंगाध्यरण युध्द कृतसम्मारविधि: य चति: प्रजानाम ॥
- XXII, 31.

In view of the righteousness, amiability and heroism of Rāma, it seems quite natural that he came to be regarded as an incarnation of God Viṣṇu in course of time.

Lakṣmanā

The character of Lakṣmanā is renowned for his devotion to Rāma.

Lakṣmanā was so much a part and parcel of Rāma that even Viśvāmitra remarks that Rāma along with Lakṣmanā will kill the Rākṣasas:

तानि विभर्षीय निराकरिष्णस्तु राम: सह तृस्मणेन ॥
- I, 19.

Lakṣmanā served Rāma from his very boyhood:

अयातुरः कृत्सन्निता सत्त्रशस्त्र: सत्येषु रतः: श्रेयसि तुर्मणोऽभूत ॥
- I, 25.

Lakṣmanā is a great solace to Rāma during his separation from Sītā.

1. Vide verses VI, 73 - 84.
Again when Rāma on hearing the news of Sītā from Hanūmat and seeing the moonlight becomes desperate, it is Lakṣmaṇa who reminds him of his divinity and requests him to overcome sorrow and take action.

This ardent and constant devotion of Lakṣmaṇa to Rāma was naturally rewarded by reciprocal feelings of Rāma. Thus Rāma is much worried when the latter is rendered breathless by the Sākti of Rāvana. His joy knows no bounds when Lakṣmaṇa recovers by the herbs brought by Hanūmat:-

उद्जीवल्लुमित्रामेव भृताः ॥ श्रीच्छवानामः ॥
समृंधुः मूर्तिच्छुपाविन्दूवं निरामयम् ॥

- XVII, 95.

The temperament of Lakṣmaṇa is in contrast to that of Rāma.

Lakṣmaṇa is highly susceptible to suspicion and anger. When he saw Bharata coming to Chitrakūṭa with his retinue, he suspects him of some evil design. He gets angry with Sūrpanakha at her horrid advances and cuts off her nose:-

असि कौशिकस्यामय्यच यकारस पलसं मुस्वस ॥

- IV, 31.

Again, when Sītā abuses him, he cannot tolerate that attitude and runs to Rāma cursing her:

मुद्रोऽव नवदन्तैं तां मात्यवधो श्रस्तीम ॥
निरान्ति शारुतं त्ये प्रस्थतिस्ति शपथस्ती ॥

- V, 60.

1. Vide III, 47.
But at the same time, he acts as a controlling influence, when Rāma loses his temper after the abduction of Sītā, and threatens the destruction of the world:

\[ न्ययानयतु सुमिन्रम् भूस्तों विचिन्तु जगत्समु्त | \]

- VI, 40.

Even Rāma pays compliments to this keen sense of patience in Lakṣāmaṇa, while conversing with Sītā on return to Ayodhyā:

\[ आवां सीने वनानं सह कृत्तवृत्तिना लक्षमणेन स्तपने || \]

- XXII, 28.

As the younger brother and constant companion of Rāma, Lakṣāmaṇa also possesses the virtue of valour.

During their stay in the hermitage of Viśvāmitra, Lakṣāmaṇa alone kills several Rākṣasas. He also helps Rāma in killing the fourteen thousand Rākṣasas and Khara and Dūṣaṇa.

Lakṣāmaṇa kills Virūpākṣa and helps Rāma considerably in the killing of Kumbhakarṇa:

\[ सन्नःक्षानमवाधारि सत्यं व वनवासिनम् | \]
\[ अच्छोदि लक्षमणोऽय क्रीर्ति कृत्यं तथा || \]

- XV, 64.

It was he who killed Atikāya, a mighty ally of Rāvana.

2. IV, 40, V – 3.
3. XIV, 35.
4. XV, 94.
His supreme achievement was his killing of Indrajit:

रामा तनो श्रद्धा समाप्ते महान्द्रे लक्ष्मणो स्मरत।
नीतागम्यन बौद्धिक विश्राम्यादित्यं दिनः।

- XVII, 46. also vide 43 - 45.

Rāma is so much pleased with this heroic act that he eulogises hugs and fondles Laksmana:

परिवर्तयति सौमित्रो मूर्ध्यनिधिः रघुवरः।

- XVII, 47.

The outstanding characteristics of Laksāmaṇa may be summed up as follows, in the words of the poet, who describes him while approaching Sugrīva for reproach, with some significant attributes:

मुमरी भूसर्प्रसः गृहीत्वा भसुरं धनुः।
विदुर्विज्ञवाय: प्राप एक्षमणो गत्यसानं कपिल।

- VII, 22.

Sītā

The author introduces Sītā to us with a series of similes:

हिरण्यकशीरो मात्रतनेव जडुक्षक्षा न्युता दिय: मृत्युर्विवारिच्याचिरप्रभे।
शशाकान्नेयरविधीवतः कृत्व: सुदा दैव तस्म तुलय सैवित्तिक।

- II, 47.

Wedded to Rāma, Sītā is represented as the splendour of the Raghu lineage:

लक्ष्मणां तनो विश्वजनीयसमात्मनीन्द्रसम्मुदयोऽमः।
सदन्नमुन्द्रयात् भर्म शोभा समव हृत्ती रघुराजसम्मतम्।

- II, 48.
Then Sītā does not figure prominently until we hear of her excellent beauty from Sūrpanāchā who intends to instigate Rāvana to abduct Sītā:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yośiśuddhānirākṣa tasyā dṛṣṭvā īśvagamiṇī} & | \\
\text{Dvīyā kāṇḍamīva rāma Śyāmā śyāmāṭhaḥparimudaya} & |
\end{align*}
\]

- V, 18, 22.

She falls a prey to the vicious plot planned by Rāvana. She is tempted by the golden deer roaming near her cottage and wants its skin:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nājarātīghaṃmaṇो ṣaṣṭi āvairanāsthyāṃ मृगः} & | \\
\text{yaṣa(m)uṣhāṇ: sītāṣya: uṭçavye bhū loḥbhyaḥ} & |
\end{align*}
\]

- V, 48.

Again after hearing the dreadful shrill of Mārīcha she fears that Rāma is in danger. Therefore she urges Lakṣamaṇa to go to his help. In spite of Lakṣamaṇa's repeated assurances that nobody can do any harm to Rāma, she speaks harsh words to him:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kāmyakṣamāippi kāmaḥ sā manuṣṭhānasā namā} & | \\
\text{ēçbhyā: kāmpitūḥ tae maniśvāṇām āgāḥ te te} & |
\end{align*}
\]

- V, 59.

This unseemly behaviour of Sītā is obviously caused by her overanxiety for the safety of her husband. The poet has given a vivid pathetic picture of Sītā staying in Asokavana, as Hanumāt saw her:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na pasajñānānāḥ sā śīrṣe raktā saḥsaṁnaḥ} & | \\
\text{anābhādānāḥ kṣīmāmī tātānām mātāñjāmsām} & |
\end{align*}
\]

- VIII, 71.
The poet represents her splendour as if sprung from the Sun:

- VIII, 72 also vide IX, 84 - 86.

Even the attendants of Rāvana admire her as a paragon of women:

- V, 72, also vide IV, 85 - 89.

Rāvana comes to Sītā in the guise of a Parivrājaka and tries to win over her heart by praising her beauty:

- VIII, 75.

Sītā gets enraged by the words of Rāvana and advises him to follow the path of righteousness, keeping before his mind the example of Rāma:

- VIII, 88.
She warns Rāvana that in no time Rāma would be in Laṅkā and slay Rāvana:-

कुलोऽधियान्तसं कूर निन्नन्तेन पलिनिं ||
- VIII, 90.

Though Hanūmat had conveyed to Sītā every movement of Rāma's daily life, like a loving and devoted wife she asks him again and again how he ate, how he slept, how he talked etc, and only after satisfying herself, allows Hanūmat to go:-

रामस्य शरीरं अनलं अलिनं इति स्वप्नम् ||
प्रकोणं च मुः त्वम् हनुमानं व्यस्तन्यानं ||
- VIII, 125.

When Sītā is shown Rāma lying unconscious (because of the serpent-missile) she is overwhelmed by grief:-

प्रणा द्वेषिः स्नात तस्मात मे प्रिये हृते ||
उच्चश्रवस्य विसर्जनं दीना स्वादुहस्य शरसं ||
- XIV, 55.

She remembers that Rāma had left no stone unturned to bring her back and she feels wretched:-

उच्चरित समुद्रं च मदयैत्रीसिंहं ||
समस्ये वातनिधोरं मां धिम्मा जीवितलघुकुलाम ||
- XIV, 57.

When Hanūmat asks her to allow him to kill the Rākṣasīs, who guarded her, she says: that they are not
guilty inasmuch as they had harassed her under the order of their master and not of their own accord:

उपशाम्यतेन दुःखि: निर्मोऽविशंशारिः
निधुसस्तिस्ते दैवी 5 ा: नन्दुक्ते, किले: सलोऽसकी।

- XX, 5.

This shows not only her magnanimity but also her sense of justice and her ability to correctly assess the behaviour of dependants.

When Vibhīṣaṇa brings Sītā to Rāma, she poignantly remembers the pangs of separation:

लक्ष्मण नातायिन्योऽऽत्र सकरक्षा दिबुत्ता
साजस्त्र गत्विनिन्यं पञ्चिंक्ता र्गुरुवत्वसोऽऽवत्सी।

- XX, 20.

But on approaching Rāma she, to her utter surprise, is told by him that he is not prepared to accept her:

इच्छा मे नादेव सीता त्यामुङ्ग्य गम्यमतमय।

- XX, 21.

Sītā asserts that she was abducted per force by Rāvaṇa and that she has always thought of Rāma. Then she invokes the Gods to bear testimony to her purity:

विदम्भुर्षु सामुद्रो देवाः सत्यमिदं वचः

- XX, 28.

She proposes to undergo the ordeal of fire to establish her purity:

मां दुःखा क्षितनिःपु: पुमाणा वही स्वरसमानहिन्दूच्य तथा
एषांसु: अतुभुते कसौष्ठोऽश्चाय्यां प्राण्या विद्विशिवेर्यादिनमुऽऽवः

- XX, 37.
God Agni lifts Sītā out of fire and scolds Rāma for rejecting her. He asks Rāma whether he has not known her character during his long stay with her:-

\begin{align*}
& \text{चयः दृष्ट्यन्ति नाम्य: रीत्यं संबसना धिरम:} \\
& \text{अदरिष्ट्यन्ति या येष्या: कालैनं बहुनां न किमः} \\
& \text{- XXI, 5.}
\end{align*}

Brahmā and Śaṅkara also present themselves and attest the chastity of Sītā. The advent of Dasāratha implied his confidence in her character.

On getting thus assured of her chastity Rāma accepts her. He sets out on the long return journey to Ayodhyā, pointing on the way the various sites to his beloved.

Thus Sītā suffers heavily for a major part of her life, and her noble character provides one of the best examples of an ideal and devout wife.

\textbf{Hanūmat}

Hanūmat held an important position among the trusted companions of Sugrīva. It was Hanūmat whom Sugrīva selected to inquire about the two unknown visitors and the nature of their mission:-

\begin{align*}
& \text{शरद्देष मात्राः दृंतं विषमस्यः कपिल्योगम्} \\
& \text{शोकात पनुद्यम्यः प्रायुक्तः कपिकुक्तरः} \\
& \text{- VI, 88.}
\end{align*}

Knowing fully well that Hanūmat will at any cost find Sītā, Sugrīva sends him to the southern direction in
the belief that there is every probability of tracing Sītā:-

\[ \text{VII, 36.} \]

Hanūmat was often chosen as an efficient emissary.
The mission was executed quickly and intelligently. Rāma
too gains this confidence from Sugrīva and he gives him
his own signet-ring, as the token to be given to Sītā:-

\[ \text{VII, 49.} \]

Hanūmat succeeds in knowing the whereabouts of
Sītā, but before visiting her, he does not fight with
Rāvana whom he directly finds offending Sītā:-

\[ \text{VIII, 113.} \]

His efficiency as an emissary is well displayed in
his intelligent talk with Sītā:-

\[ \text{VIII, 123, and also vide 121,122.} \]

As he wants to visit Rāvana personally he breaks:

Asokavana:-

\[ \text{IX, 128.} \]
Hanumāt can judge things rightly. After coming to Rāma he gives a correct assessment of the whole situation:

\[ \text{Hanumāt can judge things rightly. After coming to Rāma he gives a correct assessment of the whole situation:} \]

\[ \text{He is not afraid of Rāvana at all and tells Rāvana that he should surrender Sītā, otherwise he would have to suffer the consequences:} \]

\[ \text{When infuriated by this advice, Rāvana orders that Hanumāt be set on fire, the latter burns the city of Laṅka. When his intellect fumbles, he controls the situation through his physical prowess:} \]

\[ \text{Sincerity of purpose makes Hanumāt a great devotee of Rāma. Among the new allies of Rāma, he surpasses even Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa in his unflinching devotion to Rāma.} \]

He devotes himself wholeheartedly to the work entrusted to him by Rāma. He does not allow himself to relax until his mission is over. He requests Maināka not to detain him (VIII,19). He does not remain to see any entertainment in Laṅka:-

\[ 1. \text{X, 10.} \]
He worries that:

निरक्षर्थेऽनं चेदानो सीताया विलधेय नः अकल्प्यतुष्टिः सवी इत्र्मानित्यचिन्दनं || - VIII, 69.

He solely thinks of Rāma whose emissary he was:

राधवानेम् गिन्यं दूसरक्तयोग्यहिन्निः सुयन्ति विद्वतः || हि नोरभवन्ति रामस्य कः किं दूसरेत्र राजस्य: || - VIII, 130.

He praises Rāma wholeheartedly before Rāvana.

汉umat is also renowned for his matchless might. His prowess in crossing long distances is supernatural. He crosses the ocean as if he were flying through the sky.

The poet compares his speed to that of the eagle, the Sun and the wind.

अत्यंतरतं तवैः संपूर्णम् कक्षामकुलाः ||
पुषपं लक्ष्मणवशयं द्वैतेनावै विना ||
गन्तुकुलसद्वै भेकी किरिकिन्त किमुन वानरः || - VIII, 1, 109 and also vide X, 25.

1. IX, 151 - 135.
2. XX, 2 - 3.
It is Hanūmat who is selected for fetching the divine medicinal herb, from the slopes of the Himalayas:

- XV, 104.
- XV, 105.

He not infrequently distinguishes himself as a mighty warrior.

Hanūmat's exploits during his first visit to Lanka upset even Rāvana. Singlehanded he defeats the mighty Rāķasas who report it to Rāvana.¹

He kills Akṣa dispatched by Rāvana against him.²

Even the councillors of Rāvana had to acknowledge these extraordinary exploits of Hanūmat.³

Hanūmat performs extraordinary feats of strength on the battlefield. He kills Jambumāli⁴, Dhūrmākṣa⁵, Akampana⁶, Devāntaka⁷, Nikumbha⁸ and Trisirasa.⁹

Through these exploits Hanūmat contributes to the victory of Rāma, but his main role is that of an emissary.

When Rāvana has been killed and Vibhīṣaṇa crowned in his place, Hanūmat approaches Sītā to carry the good news to her (XX, 1).

1. IX, 15.
2. IX, 58.
3. XII, 5, 15, 24, 38.
4. XIV, 32.
5. XIV, 81.
6. XIV, 86.
7. XV, 81.
8. XV, 121.
9. XV, 84.
Again Rāma sends Hanūmat to Bharata to intimate him of their victorious return (XXII, 1-13).

Bharata

As Bhaṭṭi has abridged the story of Bālakāṇḍa and Ayodhyākāṇḍa to a great extent, we find only glimpses of Bharata's character.

From the beginning he is found to be devout to Rāma.

His anger knows no bounds when he learns that Kaikeyī was at the root of Rāma's banishment:

\[
\text{आद्यभूमीं कुक्तिबिमेकुः सैक्षीयमानां कुषंडलनेत्रः} \\
\text{उँचौतानं के कक्षीं-य शोके मुहुर्थविरतं अयोध्यागी} \\
\text{- III, 30.}
\]

After performing the obsequies, he refuses to be crowned as the king and decides to meet Rāma and bring him back:

\[
\text{प्रत्याभिनिधीविनिधैन सां स्मृतीर्यं भरतं समीरः} \\
\text{- III, 36.}
\]

He requests Rāma to come back and rule the kingdom. He reminds him of the Isāvāku tradition according to which a younger brother should not supersede the elder one in succeeding to the throne:

\[
\text{अज्जिस्वरं हस्तिनरुपबौद्धर्जनसत्त्वस्मिनि रज्ञासि के राजमाधिनि} \\
\text{राजस्यं सैनेषु सितेन्द्रस्तवधि किभये स्मार्ययं शान्तसेनन} \\
\text{- III, 55.}
\]

At last he agrees to take the reins of the realm as
Rāma's regent and carries Rāma's pādukās with him as a symbol of his sovereignty:

इति किंगिनिवन्त राज्यसंघर्षं जगाद
उजः भरत! मृत्युविदित केवलं नाशं सहिष्णुं।
स्थनिनिविवेस्यते इस्मानो जनोधियः।
संकल्पवेषभारतं काश्याकस्मनमंते। - III, 56.

Poet Bhaṭṭi makes no reference to Bharata's stay in Nandigrāma. Instead in Bhāṭṭikāvyā Rāma dispatches Hanumāt to Bharata in Ayodhyā. Bharata seems to have become reconciled with Kaikeyī, when along with the mothers, he receives Rāma on his return:

सान्नद्यशुमितेऽन्तन: प्रकृतिनिमिति साधुं चाहनि: पुर:।
सम्मानन्तो भरतं सम्मानिंशतु नः सम्म मानमिति। - XXII, 29.

Rāma anoints him as the crown prince:

प्रजायां धृति परः अन्नां युवराजं भरतं तनोद्विनिच्छ।
जघं तुरगाभ्यर्थं यद्य कृतं समामन्तविधिः पलिः प्रजानाम। - XXII, 31.

Sugrīva

Sugrīva is an offended soul. His elder brother Vālin has appropriated his wife1, and has expelled him from his kingdom:

उग्रमपूष्ण सुग्रीवस्य भ्राता विरागः। - VI, 100.

1. आत्मे स्मरनुस कालायु हृताया भालिना क्रिपः। - VI, 52.
Several persons tell Rāma that with Sugrīva's help, he will be able to achieve his objects:

_Sugrīva, though a mighty warrior as he proved it later on, is afraid of the invincible might of Vālin:_

_He is so overpowered by Vālin that he cannot imagine that anybody can be stronger than the latter. Hence he desires to test Rāma's prowess:_

_He is afraid of Vālin, he enters into an alliance with Rāma._

_The installation of Āṅgada as his heir-apparent indicates his liberal and sympathetic attitude towards the son of his deceased brother._

_But, when his outstanding aim of recovering his lost wife and kingdom is achieved, he devotes himself to pleasure. As soon as offended Lakṣmana scolds him, he sets out to discharge his duty by dispatching the monkeys:_

1 _VI, 105._
He proves himself a good organiser when he dispatches the different parties of Vānaras in the four directions:-

तनः कौशिकावाहं मेके निर्मायस्मागतम् | उपाध्याय इवास्मां सुग्रीवो खेलान्तिष्टिम् || - VII, 34.

He instructs them as to how they should carry on the search.

Once he has made friendship with Rāma, he is faithful to him. Even the enemies praise his steadfastness and his righteous conduct:-

ते भाष्यादेवान्तिष्टिम: कौशिको न राधवं येन भक्तिमित्रः | स्थितम्: सना वत्तनिल उद्धारण्यः प्रतिपिन्य सौंभवगमयिम् || XII, 48.

He lends his utmost support to Rāma in his battle against Rāvana:-

प्रतिनिधिः स्वयं येव सुग्रीवो रक्षसां वर्धम् || - XIV, 64.

He gives a good fight to Kumbhakarna. Sugrīva cuts off the ears and nose of Kumbhakarna and manages to escape from Kumbhakarna's fast grip.

Sugrīva contributes much to the victory of Rāma by slaying Kumbha, Virūpākṣa, Yūpākṣa and crushing many other Rākṣasas.

On his return to Ayodhya, Rāma naturally invites Sugrīva to accompany him.

1 VII, 36-46
2 XV, 59
Sābarī

Sābarī, the old pious woman, is considered auspicious as Puṣya constellation.

Her austerity and piety are described thus:

The performance of the religious duties was regarded as the main function of her life. She is represented as having controlled Kāma and Moha. The poet enumerates the various religious rites through the query of Rāma in detail.

She is a very hospitable woman. She receives Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa with great regard and offers arghya and fruits.

She vanishes after forecasting that Rāma will soon meet Sugrīva and form an alliance with him.

Vālin

Vālin was a Vānara of great prowess. Hanumāt tells Rāma that Vālin could defeat even the Sun:

---

VI, 59.

VI, 60 and vide 61.

VI, 71.

VI, 99.
Stigrīva himself praises Vālin and tells Rāma that Vālin was matchless in strength. (VI, 108, 114, 115).

Hanūmat reminds Rāvana of his humiliating defeat by Vālin:

अन्यायसङ्कर्ष्य यद्वीर्यं न मयं स्मरसि वालिनः ।

- IX, 135.

As a warrior, he proves to be more than a match for mighty Rāma. On regretting for the arrow shot by Rāma from a concealed position, he scolds Rāma severely:

मांं त्यता भवतां कारि विंशिवं पापुस्वलनं ।

- VI, 129.

However, as Rāma contends in defence for his stealthy action, Vālin could hardly justify himself for fair warfare, since he was guilty of appropriating the wife of his younger brother:

अहं तु समुद्रान भ्राता स्त्रियं नुकं कर्निधसा ।

उपेशिय्यं मनुष्यान्म निनिरिष्ठसं जनामुगः ।

- VI, 136.

Rāvana

In Bhattikāvya, we first meet Rāvana, when Sūrpanakhā complains to him about the exploits of Rāma. He boasts about his past exploits, especially that of smashing Indra and remarks that Rāma was nothing before him.  

1 V, 23 - 39.
To Mārīcha who tries to dissuade Rāvana from offending Rāma, whose adventures were well known, Rāvana answers that they were no adventures. He runs down every exploit of Rāma, whenever anyone praises it, whether it be Mārīcha\(^1\), Sītā\(^2\) or Hanūmat\(^3\).

\begin{verbatim}
अधानी ताड़का तने नज्ञानीयजिमेषुणा | 
क्षणने यदू नस्यायं धिम्म लोक नुस्भानसम् ||
राजसनान बुद्धरेव शिष्योऽत् 
(निःस्ववान) |
राधासे कुपमाण्डकिति! 
तपतालिनि क्रमः प्रयः || 
- V, 40, V, 85.
\end{verbatim}

Vibhīṣaṇa too criticises this trait of Rāvana:-

\begin{verbatim}
प्रभासानिविं राजश्रीदिः स्म स्वविक्रमम् ||
- XVIII, 15.
\end{verbatim}

He is overconfident and he looks down upon Rāma as a mere human being:-

\begin{verbatim}
त्यज नक्कल्याचरात्! सैमेव वाचोदिर! रावणी भ्राह्म ||
- V, 23.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
हेता परेकत युधि नेष्यमानस्तु तथ नन्यत न उलस्यन्यन्तः ||
- XII, 77.
\end{verbatim}

Rāvana, like a true hero, cannot bear to hear any praise of his enemies by his own persons. Therefore he accuses Mārīcha of his inferiority complex:-

\begin{verbatim}
गुणोभापतिः स्याभो स्तौपि रूपं न स्वदाः ||
- V, 44.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \(1\) V, 39 - 43.
  \item \(2\) V, 77 - 82.
  \item \(3\) IX, 120, 124, 125.
\end{itemize}
He kicks Vibhishana, because he cannot tolerate his own brother praising the enemy.  

He would have pardoned Hanuman for breaking Asokavana, but he is enraged when Hanuman not only praises Rama but advises him to seek conciliation with Rama. He cannot tolerate this piece of advice as it hurts his self-respect. Hence he orders to burn the Vāna as a sort of severe punishment:

परिजलमभिनो विलोक्य द्वारेः  
दशावन्दे प्रियदेशा वानस्य ||  

- IX, 137.

From the beginning, he looks down upon Rama and thinks that a battle with Rama, a mere human being, is degrading:

अनुलयमहसा सार्थि रामेना नम वेगः  
वपश्चरस्तयाक्षेण यनिष्येत नदविविगः ||  

- V, 29.

मानुशी नाम पत्नानि राज्यानि उस्मानाशिनाम्  
योधविकृति संग्रामे देव्यासांसुक्ष्मम् ||  

- XVI, 26.

To him, friendship with men and monkeys was absurd:

ब्रूहि द्रविषित्वानां मुक्षि रीक्रियान्  
हनुमनः कृपोऽसत्यं सर्वमेन नववानसस्ताम् ||  

- IX, 123.

Nevertheless, in the heart of hearts, he is afraid of Rama:

probhimāya-vakaśaḥ ca kāgraśadāpaśādine ||  

- VI, 2.

1 XII, 79 - 80.
Otherwise he would not have awakened Kumbhakarna:

प्रतिक्षेप्येन बौधाय कुम्भकर्णस्य राजस्मान् ||
- XV, 1.

Rāvana could not tolerate such a strong opponent; therefore, in order to give some excuse to Rāma, he abducted Sītā. While persuading Mārīcha to help him, he does not say that he was tempted by Sītā’s beautiful form. This remark deserves special notice in view of the fact that Rāvana had no reason to conceal his thought from Mārīcha. He frankly tells Hanumā that he did not expect any material gain from enmity with Rāma, but he only wanted to satisfy his own ego, which was of supreme importance to him:-

अभिमानकर्तव् आनन् महान्म कथयुक्तान्।
रत्नदितिनिग्रहमल्ल्याण्ड्रामविग्रहम्॥ - IX, 121.

Vibhīśaṇa in his lamentation refers to that very aspect of Rāvana:-

हृदेष्ट्री प्रायो सुन्दभ्यो यहन् न निन्दयुग्धि कस्मिन्।
वैराको भूर्वविग्रह शीघ्रन व्रजमार्गिपि॥ - XVIII, 9.

Revenge upon Rāma for his unseemly behaviour towards. Sūrpankhā was the main cause for Rāvana’s undertaking the abduction of Sītā. After seeing Sītā personally he became enamoured of her. His passion for Sītā consumes him:

ओषोंपकार कामविदेरकायात्रामहानिशान्।
- VI, 1.
He is not ashamed even when Sītā rejects him, nor does he violate her, because he only craves for her love:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{न सिद्धान्तस्य सीतामथ्येष नसिति,} \\
\text{काम्युजी विमेशास्ते च देवेष्टः प्रसिद्धे भ्रष्टम्} \\
\text{— VI, 3.}
\end{align*}\]

He courts Sītā very gently and flatters her by describing her beauty, because he wants to win her heart:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{तत्तथेऽस्मृत्रया ससिद्धितःधिक्यका} \\
\text{भानुमतिस्य सीताय नास कृद्यन्त्राप्या} \\
\text{— VIII, 75.}
\end{align*}\]

He attempts her by describing his prosperity:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{समुद्रपतिका हैमी पवित्रत्विल्लित्या} \\
\text{रत्नपारायण नाम्ना उँहूँ नम भैरविति} \\
\text{— V, 89.}
\end{align*}\]

When Sītā turns a deaf ear to his entreaties for love and rebukes him contemptuously, he apparently threatens her:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{चिराणुगुमं औषधः प्रतिपतिसरसुकरी} \\
\text{न मासे प्रतिपत्तासे मा चेतनतोक्ति मैयाः} \\
\text{— VIII, 95.}
\end{align*}\]

But in his heart, he feels deep sympathy for Sītā. He tries to persuade Sītā that Rāma will not make her happy:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{य: पश्चो दैविका पाधारं स रामां विषयसुप्राय} \\
\text{— VIII, 82.}
\end{align*}\]

He gives vent to this feeling even during the absence of Sītā while lamenting over the death of Kumbhakarṇa:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{अमरं भ्यः सर: सीतामां साधयः कामधिध्यने} \\
\text{पुनर्राज्यानि चुवं भावम् किंकिते साधव्यास्यनि} \\
\text{— XVI, 21.}
\end{align*}\]
Nevertheless on the death of Indrajit, his fury knows no bounds and he rushes to slay Sītā:

\[
\text{मैथिल्य याशप्राप्ते नं प्रक्रमत यातुः} \quad - \text{XVII, 48.}
\]

In abducting Sītā, Rāvana has not violated the code of the Rākṣasas. He makes it clear to Sītā:

\[
\text{इशिन्यं परस्त्रीनिधि: स्वरूपं रक्षमानयम्} \quad - \text{VIII, 76.}
\]

He again clarifies it to Hanumāt:

\[
\text{परस्त्रीभौगद्वरणं धर्में एवं नवशिलान्} \quad - \text{IX, 122.}
\]

This remark of Rāvana reminds us of the Rākṣasa form of marriage, which is based on capturing the bride\(^1\).

Thus Rāvana was a person of self-respect and self-confidence and claimed to have not violated any rules governing the Rākṣasas.

Rāvana was also a good administrator. He always believed in summoning the council whenever any serious issue arose. Though he himself wanted to punish Hanumāt to death, he accordingly consulted the council:

\[
\text{आमन्त्रयत संसुक्खः समिति स्त्रेष्ठम् पति:} \quad - \text{IX, 9.}
\]

In the assembly, specially summoned for deliberation of the encounter with Rāma, Rāvana addresses it thus:

\[
\text{शाखे: सुङ्गर्द: पारिश्चर्य रामानीतिमलिङ्गु भविष्यद्:} \quad - \text{XII, 14.}
\]

\(^1\) Manusmrti, III, 33.
However, it may be noted that Rāvana lacked in real sense of judgement by weighing the pros and cons of the issue under consideration, inasmuch as he endorsed only that line of thinking which he liked and paid no heed to the other side of the problem. He is happy when Prahasta and others support his policy of fighting with Rāma\(^1\). He did not like the advice of Vibhīṣaṇa who pleaded for conciliation with Rāma by surrendering Sītā\(^2\).

Vibhīṣaṇa also laments that Rāvana paid heed to the words of those people who were not adept in polity:

\[ \text{मले जानू वदन्येश्तासैं नानद्यनुमन्यसे} \] - XVIII,16.

Anyhow, Rāvana was a virile warrior and a good organiser of defence\(^3\). Fighting with a match was something in his blood. In his encounter with Jātayu he proves to be more than a match for him. He is conscious that he has followed the wrong path:

\[ \text{दशग्रीवस्य दुर्रक्षितं विनाशं राक्षसं कुलम्} \] - XVI,14.

In the great battle with Rāma's army, he slew many vānaras, defended the Rākṣasas and compelled enemies to flee away:

\[ \text{ततोऽक्रणादः रामीवः कुष्ठः प्राणान् वनौकसम्} \] - XVII,80.

He beats Lākṣaṇa with Aṣṭaghaṇṭa:

\[ \text{अष्टग्नं भास्तिकृतम् धृतराष्ट्रभर्तराम्} \]
\[ \text{रामानुजे नागविर्धधनु स मही वसुमास्मन्} \] - XVII,92.

---

1 XII, 16–20.
2 XII, 21–54.
3 XIV, 1, 15–16, XV, 20.
He covered the chest of Rama with hundreds of arrows:

Indra also was doubtful whether Rama would win. Only with the powerful weapon, fashioned by Brahma could Rama vanquish Ravana. We have to regard Ravana as having been nearly equal to Rama:

Vibhishana too mentions that all the Gods were afraid of Ravana¹.

The poet wishes us to regard Ravana as a truly great person, not despicable, not hateful, not worthy of our contempt as it comes out strongly in his comparisons. He had an awe-inspiring personality, which caused terror even when he cast a glance amicably:

At last, we may pay tribute to this great warrior in the words of Rama:

---

¹ XVIII, 31.
Kumbhakarna

Kumbhakarna, the brother of Rāvana, was almost equal to the latter in prowess. However, he had a better insight into the practical application of polity.

In the council, summoned for discussing the encounter with Rāma, he refers to the five limbs of the deliberation. He exhorts Rāvana that he had exhausted his heap of merits:

\[
\text{क्रियासमर्पणं भूत्वा नृपः सम्मतिः देवेऽकालं}
\]
\[
\text{विद्यातीकारसुतारसिद्धिमेघु मौलानि बलिनि पत्रं} \]

- XII, 62.

He knew it very well that it was very difficult for Rāvana to overcome ego:

\[
\text{अविववेत्ता त्यजन्यसत्यम् भानुः सैन्यं निवायामस्यवा हिंसं} \]
\[
\text{अनन्तं भुवनाच्छन्नी मनं न माने लिखितान्यायं} \]

- XII, 64.

Again when being awakened during the battle, he reproaches Rāvana saying:

\[
\text{प्राइयाक्षात्मन्यमंस्यं मृतवेक्ष्याम्बौ स्विधा} \]
\[
\text{अर्धगीतः राजस्त्राणि प्रत्यपत्या हिं न सं} \]

- XV, 14 and also vide 15.

Yet he knows it fully well that Rāvana is not going to pay heed to his words of advice. However, once he gets involved in the battle, fairly or unfairly, he carries out his duty with sincerity. He proves true to the great
reliance placed by Rāvana on his mighty help:

Kumbhakarṇa is a warrior of immense prowess. His very presence in the battle-field threatened the Vānara army of Rāma. His towering personality frightened even the Rākṣasas:

His abnormal might was naturally associated with his long-lasting sleep and insatiable hunger.

While introducing Kumbhakarṇa to Rāma, Vibhīṣaṇa eulogises his outstanding achievements as follows:

He was much more than a match to the Vānaras:
Sugrīva a mighty warrior was overwhelmed by him:

अलौकिकत्र कर्तव्य दीर्घात्मकानि यायस्य सुस्वरूपः

तमाद्यात्मयायत्निष्ट् भयोक्षितं च राजसः

- XV, 56.

Kumbhakarna was so powerful that all the enemies united together to kill him:

अच्छे दिः उदयः गोलितं कर्तव्यं तथा ||
अस्मैदं च य शरीरं ध्यानं विरोधं निशाचरं ||
अस्पर्धिषितं च राजः नैनयोऽऽर्धकालिन्यायं ||

- XV, 64, 65 and also vide XV, 66 - 69.

Fully confident of Kumbhakarna's matchless might, Rāvana is immensely astonished at finding the former slain by Rāma, is shocked at the demise of the mighty hero and laments much over his loss:

इति रक्षसानि राजां न कर्तव्यं नैन्यायः
अस्मैदं द्वारकायोऽऽर्धचिस्म भूतं यासिस्मिन्यायं परस् ||

- XV, 71.

Vibhīṣana

Just as the character of Lakṣmanā is mainly in contrast to that of Rāma, the character of Vibhīṣana also is principally in contrast to that of Rāvana.

In matters of policy, Vibhīṣana not infrequently differs from Rāvana and boldly expresses his dissenting opinion.

For instance, he dissuades Rāvana from killing Hanūmat, who was a messenger:

प्रभिज्ञानीहि हनुमन्ते दूल्हा दौष्टे न सत्यचि ||

- IX, 100.
Vibhiṣaṇa is well versed in the science of politics. He knows what is right and what is bad. He pleads with Rāvana that according to the sound principles of politics, it was better for them to seek conciliation with Rāma:—

अतिं उभेड़न दाहिः मुखः यथास्य देहेऽऽत्मकोक्षि स्यायोक्षि - XII, 24.

He knows that at present the position of Rāvana is comparatively weak:—

एकैन बाली निःस्तं शारण सुहृत्तमस्तैः रचितश्च राजः ||
वशेर्व सुभीक्रपः परेण नवेव कार्यं भयंतो विनिष्ठम ॥ - XII, 37.

Conciliation appears to be the best policy to both the parties, as both are equally harassed:—

रास्तेन्द्रप्य दाहिः पन्नो वर्ण हृदे कर्णाराजान्नदूपतः ||
तप्तश्च नपनेन यथा वस्त्रसे न: सार्क्कु: परेण अस्व विस्वुः सीताम ॥ - XII, 40.

He again points out that it is impossible to create dissension among the monkeys, the friends of Rāma:—

फलाग्रीवः निःस्तं कुस्मानोऽधिकर्ष्यं विद्धायुक्तानुसरणाधिकाः ||
न्याग्जातिः राजवर्गं नलेश्वा मुखः कपीनामपि नोपञ्चायाः ॥ - XII, 49.

He points out to the bad omens:—

निभिष्ठस्याः स्थानिता रज्ञों दिशैं महानिर्मितिकृताः विनिष्ठाः ||
स्वेताहिनैं मृगानिष्ठोऽधिकाः: क्रृत्ययाः भवेतरिविभिषिक्षाः ॥ - XII, 69.

Evenethically the conduct of Rāvana is very contemptible:—

न त्याजयन मै प्रिङ्गः तारुमाण्डले पिनुस्वयः ||
प्राणावेद्याये देशेऽऽक्षमामि मयार्गमयाः ॥ - XVII, 37.
Therefore he requests Rāvana to give back Sītā:-


But Rāvana intent on subduing Rāma misunderstands him: and kicks him:-


Vibhīṣaṇa, however, does not lose patience and leaves it to chief councillors to decide as to which of the two brothers should be deemed contemptible:-


Even Rāvana later on realises that unfortunately the words of Vibhīṣaṇa have come true:-


Now Vibhīṣaṇa stands by the side of Rāma whole-heartedly.

He guides Rāma and his allies at critical moments:-


He reveals to them the counter remedy for the serpent-missile:-
He again discloses the witchery of Indrajit and makes it clear that he could be killed only before he completes the sacrifice:

- XIV, 65.

His act of joining hands with Rāma, proved to be highly controversial. When accused by Indrajit, Vibhīṣaṇa defends his behaviour by attributing it to the unrighteous conduct of Rāvana:

- XVII, 26.

and also vide 38-40.

Though Vibhīṣaṇa breaks off from Rāvana, once for all, he is naturally overpowered by grief at the death of Rāvana:

- XVII, 37

- XVIII, 2

vide 3-36.

On losing Rāvana he, however attains the constant guard and guidance of Rāma, who anointed him as the King of Lanka, advised him to administer his kingdom justly and even invited him to Ayodhyā on his return.
Indrajit

Indrajit, the renowned son of Rāvaṇa, is a mighty warrior.

Indrajit encourages Rāvaṇa by reminding him of their past exploits (XVI,36-40).

He is very angry at Vibhīṣaṇa for joining hands with the enemy and giving them the secret:

\[ इस्तीव ईंबेच जे कर्मानुपालया कुषम् \]
\[ लापस्तः पाणिमाथे ते अनुधत् नाप्यपीताः || \]

- XVII,33

also vide 34-35.

When the mighty Rākṣasas including Akṣa fail to defeat Hanūmat, Indrajit wounds Hanūmat with a continuous shower of arrows and then bind him with a divine noose (IX,74,75).

After the death of Kumbhakarna, Indrajit leads the army and showers havoc over the opponents especially through his supernatural tactics (XVII,16-18.)

He seems expert in witchcraft. He is capable of being invisible:

\[ छन्दस्पर्सत्स् कर्तीयद्विषाण्ड रावणविविध्वाल् \]

- XV,97.

He makes Rāma and Laksmana unconscious by his witchcraft:

\[ निर्घन्ते रावणः कुः राघवो न भयौ मुहंत || \]

- XV,98.

He again kills pseude-Sītā in the presence of Rāma:
When these tactics are overturned by the foes,
Indrajit leaves for performing a sacrifice in Nikumbhila.
He believes much in the efficacy of the sacrifice:

- XVII, 30.

But Rāma learns of it through Vibhīṣaṇa and dispatches
Lakṣmaṇa to obstruct his rites. In the skirmish that follows,
Indrajit proves more than a match to Lakṣmaṇa:

- XVII, 43 and also vide 44.

Indrajit is killed only when Lakṣmaṇa hurls the
Mahendra weapon:

- XVII, 46.

On his demise, Vibhīṣaṇa pays the following tribute
to him:

- XVIII, 13.
Sūrpanākhā

Sūrpanākhā plays a key role in the story of Rāma as she induces Rāvana to abduct Sītā.

The poet has given a fine picture of Sūrpanākhā's beautiful form:--

\[ \text{दध्यान बलिमें मध्यें कर्णजाहुरिलौचना | वल्कूल्कूलचेनातिसर्फेन चन्द्रनैन्खेद पकातीं} \]

- IV,16 and also vide 17,18.

She makes horrid advances to Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, but she is sent away by Rāma to Lakṣmaṇa and by Lakṣmaṇa to Rāma. She is aflame with passion:--

\[ \text{सौमित्रे! मातुप्रयंतस्यां कन्यामिच्छविशंवदाम् |} \\
\text{यत्तैः भौगिनां सहस्यसेवाकूः उष्णाःसंयुक्तम्} \]

- IV,20.

Lakṣmaṇa loses patience and disfigures her:--

\[ \text{असि श्रीश्रीमुद्यम्य खकासं पनसं युक्तम्} \]

- IV,31.

She decides to take revenge upon them and instigates her brothers to avenge her humiliation. When Khara and Dūṣaṇa fail, she approaches Rāvana, the mighty King of Lankā. She first taunts him, hurts his self-respect and then fills his heart with passion for Sītā by giving an exaggerated description of her beauty. She corroborates her appeal by a shrewd reference to maxims of polity:--

\[ \text{न ते पश्चायिः यस्याः सोः भक्ते स्वदेशस्या मनोः |} \\
\text{श्रीलोकेनासनिः चित्तत्स्यं तदा क्रीत्या सुख्नीभव} \]

- V,21.
Thus Sūrpankhā becomes instrumental in giving rise to hostility between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, but fortune does not favour her at the end.

Other characters

Other characters do not play any prominent role in Bhattikāvyā. The poet gives but a glimpse of their outstanding characteristics.

Dāsaratha is portrayed as a good king and an affectionate father.

Kauśalyā and Sumitrā are simply referred to by name. Even Kaikeyī is disposed of in one verse. Jaṭāyu's skirmish with Rāvaṇa is narrated in brief. He scolds Rāvaṇa for his unrighteous act and sympathises with Rāma as the son of his friend.

Āngada helps Rāma actively on the battlefield. He kills Kampana and Akampana. He proves to be a powerful opponent even for Īndrajit and Kumbhakarṇa.

Elements of the Nature like Mt. Maināka and the Ocean are here personified as in the Epic. Maināka during the fight of Hanūmat figures as a loving friend.

On getting offended, Rāma hurls the Fire - Arrow at the Ocean, and the Lord of Waters appeases Rāma by lending his and his followers a free passage to Laṅkā.

Khara and Dūṣaṇa, the brothers of Sūrpaṇakhā, are mighty warriors, though they are ultimately defeated at the hands of Rāma and Laksmaṇa.
In his first encounter with Rāma, Mārīcha explains the moral code of the Rākṣasas whereby they devour Brāhmaṇas, slay worshippers of gods, render the City into a cemetery and do not perform Vedic rites (II, 34.). But he seems to have estimated the capacity of Rāma in true colours, because he dissuades Rāvana from offending Rāma.

It is in consequence of the vehement threat held out by Rāvana that he is forced to become his ally and assist him in the abduction of Sītā.

Prahasta is a valiant Rākṣasa. He advises Rāvana to crush the monkeys and the princes. True to his conviction, he fights wholeheartedly for Rāvana.

The other prominent warriors on Rāvana's side are Devāntaka, Atikāya, Trisīras, Narāntaka, Kampana, Akampana, Virūpākṣa, Dhūmrākṣa, etc.

Principal Rasa - Vīra; its accessory Bhāvas

The author of Visnudharmottara Purāṇa lays down that the Mahākāvya should exhibit the nine Rasas - Śṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Karuṇa, Vīra, Raudra, Bhayānka, Bībhatsa, Ādhiṣṭhāna and Sānta1.

Bhāmaha2 also has considered the depiction of sentiments as the main requirement of a mahākāvya, but he does not

1 VDP., III, XV, 14: श्रृङ्गार्रकस्यकरणारौद्वीरबिम्बालके। श्रीमतसाधुनराणाद्येऽरसः काथ समन्विततम्।
2 Bhāmaha, Kāvyālankāra, I, 21: युक्ते लोकस्यच्छेदलेल रसेऽत्त्व सकलेऽपुष्पकृतः।
specify their number and names. *Daṇḍin*¹ says that it should be 'Rasabhāvanirantaram' i.e. it should be pervaded all through with poetic sentiments and emotions.

Neither Bhāmaha nor Daṇḍin has laid down in the definition that the principal Rasa should be either Śṛṅgāra, Vīra or Sānta as Visvanātha has specified². Accordingly *Bhattikavya* also contains certain Rasas, out of which Vīra Rasa is the predominant one³.

From the beginning, Bhatti has suggested that the main purpose of the incarnation of Rāma is to promote the well-being of the world, which is achieved as Jayamangala explains⁴,

---

1 *Daṇḍin*, *Kāvyādarsa*, I, 18:

अत्रुप्तसंवक्षिप्तं रसेनेव निर्लक्ष्यं |
श्रउते रविरशम्तनामेकोशी रस इम्भले ||

2 *Visvanātha*, *SD*, VI, 31:

श्रउते रविरशम्तनामेकोशी रस इम्भले |
अनुमित सार्वभौम रसा: सर्व नाटकसङ्क्यः ||

3 This implies that this characteristic regarding the predominant Rasa was inserted in the definition of Mahākāvya in later times: obviously through the generalisations drawn from the actual examples of the Mahākāvyas.

4 Jayamangala, the commentary on I-1: तत्त्व-खलेन व्याजेन सुवन-खिलच्छलेन | इदानि रायणादिकावन्त कोऽक्षरणात |
through the killing of Ṛavaṇa and others. This is further corroborated by the title Rāvanavadha. Almost all the episodes of the poem gradually lead to this purpose, i.e. the killing of Ṛavaṇa, which obviously is represented as the predominant episode of the Mahākāvyā.

The culminating episode is preceded by a long and vivid description of the terrible battle between Rāma and his army on the one hand and Rāvaṇa and his army on the other hand. This covers three entire cantos (XIV, XV, XVII).

The life of Rāma is resplendent with heroic deeds right from his boyhood, when he was taken by Visvāmitra to protect his sacrifice against demons and especially through his exile in the forest.

Hence its narration naturally affords ample scope to Bhaṭṭi for depicting the heroic exploits of Rāma. On almost all occasions, Rāma was accompanied by his devoted brother Lākṣmāna, who played an eminent role as his associate. In his battle with Rāvaṇa, Sugrīva and his army participated fully on Rāma's side and defended his cause vigorously. In the depiction of these exploits, the poet has:

1. The killing of Ṭāḍakā. II, 23.
2. The fight with other Rākṣasas. II, 30-32.
3. Defeating Trimūrđha, Khara and Dūṣana. IV, 40-45, V. 1-3.
got ample scope for manifesting Vīra Rasa through the vivid
description of the heroic deeds of Rāma and his allies, as
well as those of his opponents such as Rāvana, Kumbhakarna,
Prahasta and Indrajit in particular. The story of Rāma also
contains some episodes, wherein Rāma is not directly
involved, but which are related to him indirectly, for
instance, Jātāyu’s encounter with Rāvana and Hanumān’s
exploits in Laṅkā during his visit there for the search of
Sītā. The depiction of these episodes yields Vīra Rasa.

Bhaṭṭī also portrays certain other Rasas occasionally,
but the Vīra Rasa depicted in the narration of the heroic
deeds of Rāma and particularly of the battle between Rāma
and Rāvana, obviously seems to be the predominant one in
comparison to other Rasas.

The attribute वीरसांतोकारम् which Bhaṭṭī
applies as an attribute to परमलम may be applied to his
composition as well.¹

Bharata has classified Vīra Rasa into Yuddhavīra,
Dānavīra, and Dayāvīra².

¹ Bh., XIII, 47.
² NS., (G.O.S.), VI, 99:

दानवीरे धर्मवीरे पुजवीरे तथाॅय च |
रसं जीतमणि प्राणं भृक्ष्य प्रविधमेव ||
According to this conception the Vīra Rasa depicted in Bhattikāvyya is evidently of the Yuddhavīra type, which is in fact the real type of Vīra Rasa.

The different types of its Bhāvas may be traced to Bhattikāvyya as follows: The sthāyībhāva of Vīra Rasa is Utsāha which gets manifested in Rāma and other characters in several occasions.

Note his assertive address to the ascetics in the hermitage of Viśvāmitra:-

The poet, has expressed the joy of Rāma and the monkeys at the completion of the dam on the ocean:-

1 Ibid., VI,82. p. 325:
The zealous fight of Rāma with Rāvana's army is described thus:

दस दूसरिसहस्राणि रथिनां च महातमम् ||
चतुर्दश सृष्टिराणि सारोऽर्थाणि च वाजिलम् ||
उत्स ये हृद पदार्थानां साध्वेण धनुर्मेति ||
अनीयन्ताञ्च मे भैरो विद्वस्य परिष्कर्षम् ||

- XVII, 67-68.

The enthusiasm of the monkeys is manifested in their zealous restless movements expressing eagerness of war:

श्रेष्ठेश्वर युद्धस्तु रश्मिनां समुद्भुतिविशेष: निषेदः ||
आस्फोतियो कर्मभिमाणे: रेण्यमुद्रितम् सत्यू: ||
ने सार्वेण सर्वभो सरिच्छति ज्योतिष्ण: रणसमारम्भे ||
रक्षा लहुवर्तविश्वेषरुपितमुलकालसा धीररक्षम ||

- XIII, 28, 48.

On Rāvana's side also Rākśasas are full of enthusiasm:

अर्ण्जुःणकृतुः गुरु राष्ट्रयुक्तिवर्षे परे: ||
ब्रम्हुपदुखृतिवराणि सन्ते: परिविशिष्य: ||

- XIV, 7.

As given by Bharata, Vīra Rasa is produced by Vibhāvas such as अस्मोद्यक्षवसाय, नग, विनम, बल, पराक्रम, शक्ति, प्रताप

1 अस्मोद्यक्षवसाय

2 Abhinavagupta, comm. on NS., VI, 82, p. 325:

अस्मोद्यक्षवसायो हि वप्तुत्तमनिर्विवलय इति मन्त्रशक्तिन्द्रियाः
is expressed in the deliberation in Rāvana's assembly, wherein Vibhīṣaṇa compares their position with that of Rāma and remarks that their welfare lay in conciliation with Rāma:-

पश्चादिनि समादृतिकृत समय वा नान्य विरोधे समुपवःस्य

dūnā varā saññuśaśā: स्वयम्भुर्लिप्तविधिः इयेताः बिन्दुः || also vide

- XII,51,52,54.

Kumbhakarṇa also disagrees with the policy of Rāvana:-

न लेख्यता य क्रिया मुमुखीयादिशु येहानिर्माणः

स प्राणन्यायमन्नर्वः न माली कचने बिन्दुः कण्ठदार्षिद् \ || - XII,63 also vide 64.

Nāyā is given full scope in Canto XII in the deliberations of Rāvana with Prahasta, Vibhīṣaṇa, Mālyavān, Kumbhakarṇa and others:-

अनुवादगणरूपयुक्त: कलामुक्त: सुधिप्रदक्षा परमदिव: | 

उपेक्षाभियो सप्ताधिकं साधि कामान्तेषु दुःखिताधिकैः ||

सधृष्ठे स्त्रियाः वा अनन्त्युवमुक्ती इन्नां यथा वोपलित्वायोः: |

आत्माधृतिरहस्य अनं परमे विद्याः कुप्योद्धीवनस्यिन्म || - XII,28,30.

This is also illustrated in the alliance of Rāma with Sugrīva:-

उपात्मकोऽनुक्रीत वस्मयमन्नर्विन्यासः स्रियः | 

षोभं राजि चार्यानि नमालोकाचरतांतः ततः \ || - VI,105.

1 Ibid.,

सर-भादिगुणां सम्यक्ष्येवो नयः
'Vinaya' is noted by the poet in the restraint of Vibhīṣaṇa, when kicked by Rāvana:-

The well-weaponed and awe-inspiring bala of Rāvana has been described rather picturesquely in the last portion of Canto XIII and in the beginning of the next Canto:-

Parākrama3 is expressed by Rāvana when he sends his army to fight:-

1 Ibid., p.326.
2 Ibid., p.326.
3 Ibid., p.326.
The march of Rāma is described in:-

सुरश्रव रामस्तत्त्वसः फ्रान्तिध्वे च समीक्षः।
विवर्ताराजस्वारसः चेतनाः य च भ्रातः॥ - XIV, 17.

Sakti\(^1\) is expressed in the speech of Viśvāmitra predicting great victories for Rāma:-

धातिक्षते तैन महान विपस्तः स्थापित्ते तैन रणे पुरुषानां।
मा मां महास्तमलं परिच्छ अथवे न महिद्धी भव्यानी भारसभ्यः॥ - I, 22.

Rāma himself has dispelled the doubt of Sugrīva as regards his fighting power by demonstrating the power of his arrows:-

विज्ञानोऽभिन्नत्वाय सप्त भव्यौषधसङ्करः॥ - VII, 16.

Pratāp\(^2\) of Hanūmat is reflected in the speech of the frightened Rākṣasas reporting to Rāvana their misadventures:-

एक्षेत्रभवनः गृहनः स्वभिषकारः प्रममनवः।
वैमुख्यं चक्रमेण्युज्यति चुदेरः मुक्त्यालिके॥ - IX, 15.

Pratāp\(^3\) of Rāma is evident in the speeches of Vibhīṣaṇa, Mālāvān and others during the deliberations:-

एकः पदाय: उस्मोऽथुभानो योऽस्तेर्कमावाने विन्दुपालि।
रा:स्तहस्राविन्य: चूण्डेरः स्वतः का नस्वे मानसमाग्राशाश। - XII, 56.

1 Ibid., राज्यी: अवस्फलद्वृहादर्शोऽस्माद्भ्रेत।
2 Ibid., p. 326: प्रतापः गात्रिकिष्य सत्तापावहिरी प्रत्सिद्धः।
Terror of Kumbhakarna making innumerable victims

is described as under:-

उद्दी चालस्थिती नांक पातालमिलनं
आक्रमण: सर्वीन्धुना, प्रकल्पितंतासिधं \- XV,50.

'Prabhāva' of Rāma is reflected in the speech of Vibhīṣaṇa, when he describes to Rāvana, Rāma's faithful allies like Sugrīva, Aṅgada and others:-

कन्यारिणो निषेधकुश्मेवो दिव्यालाकानुपवानारमिः
न्यायानिति रत्नसरसक्षेत्राये मुर्थ्य: कन्यामिति सौधज्ञः \- XI,49,50.

The futility of the resources of Rāvana is clearly indicated by Vibhīṣaṇa as follows:-

द noreferrer कौशिकं य सन्यस्तं येन प्रकृतमन्त्रमस्तरस्याशि
निस्त्रयं पुर्णेन वृथा विनाशा: पुर्णिः भूतवे यह हीयते िु \- XII,46.

Vīra Rasa is manifested by the anubhāvas such as 'Sthairya', 'Dhairya', 'Saurya', 'Tyāga', 'Vaiśāradya', and others\(^2\).

'Sthairya\(^3\) is evident in the firmness with which Jaṭāyu reviles Rāvana:-

अ हिमालय न अद्यत्न न प्रकाश न विज्ञे \- V,102.

1 Ibid. p. 326: प्रेमाव: अत्यजेर्तिता पातालमिलनम्
2 Ibid. p. 325: मयं स्पष्ट्य श्रेयं सायिकामाग वैशाराण|| प्रमक्षे मानिः||
3 Ibid. p. 326: स्पष्ट्य श्रेयं मच्चलनम् ||
It is further illustrated in Hanumāt's immovable stand against the Rākṣasa warriors in Asokavana:

\text{विषय: राक्षस: कुण्डे: रात्रिजालमयाकिन:}  
\text{यः ब्रह्मचर्येद्यादि कुण्डे: परिवार: नन्त्}  \text{- IX,73.}

'Dhairya\textsuperscript{1} can be shown in the monkeys going to search Sītā:-

\text{नन्त: प्राणयजनास्त्रेण्ड्रे महैः वानरा दुन्ते}  
\text{सर्वेन फिनकिल्लखन्तो ध्येये वाणिज्ञानास्त्रिष्कुम्}  \text{- VII,102.}

'Saurya\textsuperscript{2} is evident in Hanumāt's attacking the Rākṣasas in Asokavana and destroying all of them:-

\text{भयसेष्ट्रोमणास्त्वस्त्रेण परिचित्विन्न:}  
\text{सगोन्त श्रीणविक्रमाण: कविनास्तेष्ण स्यम्}  \text{- IX,22, also vides 19-21.}

The bravery of Rāma is eloquent, when he brandishes his bow and creates havoc among the Rākṣasas:-

\text{तस्यां त्वं पदार्थो साधोरण धनुर्धिताम्}  
\text{अन्यनन्तरम् भोगे दिवसस्य परिःपत्यम्}  \text{- XVII,68.}

1-2. \textit{Ibid.}, धैर्य गृहमनिष्क्रम संयमम् | शौर्य वृद्धिकिंचित्तम् |
The ‘Saurya’ of Rāvana is displayed when he attacks Rāma and assails Lākśmana:-

आसक्तुभन्मणे बाले रायंक्रामम् ने बुस्मात्।
रामण्मेत्वन्तिन्युरुक्तानुकृष्टिः।। — XVII,82.

Vaisāradyā' gets scope in the deliberations of Rāvana with his brothers and relatives.

Read for example, how Vibhiṣana pleads for conciliation on the ground that dissension between Rāma and the Vānaras was impossible:-

कन्दिनी नित्तिर कुक्माजी दिश्याइत्वन लांगुरसानमिः।
न्यान्यो रान्यवेलैमेघा सुख्या: कपीलनाथी लेप्जनन्य।। XII,49.

Rāvana pursued the policy of danda towards Hanumāt, when the latter caused havoc in the Asokavana:-

प्राधानिन्यन रसायन पेनात् पापावि यस्मि मम।
न प्रदृशम् कर्क पाप वद प्रप्योपकारणम्।। IX,102.

At last Rāvana orders to burn Hanumāt:-

स्वर्गसण्मपाश्यत्युग्म: सदृश महक्तन्यैं भाग्यमाणं।
परिजनलसिन्य विहारक्य दौँ दश्यदन: प्रविष्टं वानरस्य।। IX,137.

1 Ibid., p. 328:
बैशार्धं सान्याधुपाय चलुक्यस्येक द्वितिशभिष्कुस्तरादिकैषैयं—
विषयं नित्याञ्जनम्।
The Vyabhichāribhāvas of Vīra Rasa are Dhṛtī, Mati, Garva, Avega, Augrya, Amaras, Smṛti, Romāńcha and Pratibodha.

Dhṛtī is illustrated in the equipoise of Vibheśa, who on the advice of Rāma stops lamenting and is happy to have Rāma as a friend:—

स एव धत्तब्रेत्त श्रागापृणोति हस्त्यमिन्द्रवे
भवेदाध्यक्षस्य यथा सुखद्यन्ति भवावद्वरः ||

- XIX, 4.

Mattī is expressed in the request of Vibheśa to Rāvan to pay heed to the words of those proficient in politics:—

अंगलघेण: कुक्षतेऽधार्मिक्षः जितालेपभावश्च जना विद्यिताः
कथे ने अन्ते कुक्ष प्रकटं मा नीविवेजैर्मुख्योऽधमधवम् ||

- XII, 25.

Then Vibheśa discusses the pros and cons of the matter in hand i.e. whether to fight with Rāma or not, and ultimately concludes that in the present circumstances, conciliation is the best policy:—

रामेपि दारान्लेण नपत्ते यथि इते बस्तुपिरङ्गस्तुमुखः
नपस्या नपत्तेन यथास यथा नासंधि परिणा नसु बिमुखो सीताम् ||

- XII, 40.

1 Ibid., p. 364: धृतिनिम—गौरवविद्या सवित्वोऽवाच्यरुपसन्तोऽसन्यासस्यथपरस्योऽनुयायिनिमृत्यमन्याचरये: सत्यपायने ||

2 Ibid., p. 374: 
मतनिम—नाना शास्त्रविविधा सत्यमन्याचरये: सत्यपायने ||
He forecasts serious consequences in case the policy to be adopted is not that of conciliation:

Garva\(^1\) is expressed in the speech of Rāvana, who consoles Sūrpanākhā by drawing her attention to the fact that, he is (invincible) Rāvana and will fight with Rāma, thus giving vent to his conceit:

\[\text{र्यः नक्तस्वरी! शोभेम आचार! रावणो छोरा।} ||\]

\[\text{अनुवधमहसा कार्ये रावणा नम विग्रहं।} \text{स्रावकर्स्या अयोध्य अतिशी मानिनिघाई।} \] \(\text{- V,23,29.}\)

Hanūmat, after defeating the Rākṣasa warriors in Asōkavana, asserts confidently, that he would vanquish even Rāvana himself if the latter chooses to confront:

\[\text{यथः कर्मस्यत्मिनाणि यों रसः चन्द्र: स्मायु!} \]

\[\text{नमः कर्मस्यमेऽहे अविच्छेदचतुरं कपिः।} \] \(\text{- IX,44.}\)

\[\text{‘Avega’}^2\] is clearly seen in the speech of Rāvana, when

---

1. Ibid., p. 369.
2. Ibid., p. 367.
he laments over Kumbhakarna's death and resolves to take full revenge:

मार्शिन्यमि वेदिन्ते स्वाधिश्रमि राहस्ये।
भूमी च नित्यलििन्यमि बिध्वंसक्यक्य कारणम्। — XVI,22.

'Ugrata' is very clearly manifested in the order given by Rāvana to burn Hanumāt who was advising him for conciliation:

परिजनमितो विलोक्य दाउ दशवदनः प्रदीतेश वानरस्य। — IX, 137.

'Amarśa' is clearly manifested in Rāvana's indignant address to Vibhishana:

बुमदुमथाय विहाय धैर्य विभीतः भीषण वस्चृः।
गिरे जगादौग्रंहधुमदुः स्व स्ववयन्न सर्वनिर्वार्त। प्रथमवयम्।— XII, 76.

'Amarśa' is expressed in the speech of Rāvana when he gets angry at Rāma, because many of his warriors had been killed:

अमराश्च मे पर: सीतार राजयाः कमायिष्यने। — XVI,21.

1 Ibid., p. 374:
उसुलान्यो नास भीष्मद्वृः नारायणसत्तुर्तुवाद्विभिववेये समुस्तपदने।

2 Ibid., p.372:
अमराश्च मे विन्धुग्र्भर्य बलधिकमि राधिकमन्ययायमानितस्य वा समुस्तपदने।
'Smṛti' is found in the speech of Indrajit who consoles Rāvaṇa, grieved at Kumbhakarna's death and instigates him to fight boldly by reminding him of their conquest of Heaven:

नाभिन्ना ने महराज अत्यावः शकुफ्कलिम्
देवदेवगणपीपिमाय सई सुरानयम्

- XVI, 36.

On the eve of confronting Rāvaṇa, Mātali reminds Rāma of the weapon, fashioned by none else than Brahmā:

ततो मातलिना ग्रस्त्रसमयत महीपनः
याधव रागश्चौं सच्चात्मकेशुपाण

- XVII, 109.

The narration of the battle between Rāma and Rāvaṇa in Bhattikāvyya does not contain any expression of 'Romānīcha'.

'Pratibodha' is the same as 'Vibodha' which is best presented in the awakening of Kumbhakarna on the eve of the great battle. Witness the furious but futile efforts of the Rākṣasas to awaken Kumbhakarna:

कृपालसूचिमुद्यस्य मद्यान्त गर्भप्रचकमनाः
शोभेषचित्तस्तोयेरस्यायाधिकतमः

- XV, 3 and vide 4.

---

1 Ibid., p. 364:

2 Ibid., p. 372:
On the eve of the great battle, Rāma awakens from sleep and immediately sets forth his line of action:

इत्सावत्त्रकृष्ण सैनिकित्वनुजसी बालानि च ।
नम्मयकर दैवेद्या पर्यावलयु मुनिण्य च ।

- XIV,18.

Other Rasas:

Besides this predominant Rasa, Bhaṭṭi has also depicted other Rasas such as Raudra Rasa, Bhayānaka Rasa, Bībhsata Rasa, Śringāra Rasa and Karuṇa Rasa.

Next to Vīra Rasa, Bhaṭṭi has given importance to the depiction of Raudra Rasa, because it is closely allied to the former. However, Raudra Rasa occurs independently of Vīra Rasa on certain occasions such as follows:

1. Bhārata is indignant and reproaches Kaikeyī for her injustice to Rāma:

आद्भुतीम पुष्करी विभिन्न: सैनिकित्वयुक्तरूपको应有的
उद्देश्यांलक्ष्य स कृष्णों च श्रीकृष्णद्वारिष्टे न्यायिक्षाहेन ।

- III,30.

2. On hearing the news of Dhanurbhanga, angry Parasurāma challenges Rāma:

उद्वैर्सी रघुवमाहङ्गोऽद्धुः सम्बन्धा क्रृष्ण महाविश्वासी ।
पराक्रमण: विभ्रसतितिस्त नगर: शिवीन्तीशुभविनीपुराणे ।

- II,51.

3. Rāma goes to the mountain in search of Sītā and, on finding vestiges of a battle, becomes angry:
On hearing the news of Sītā's abduction, Rāma's wrath knows no bounds:

\[ \text{VI, 35 also vide 36, 37.} \]

This Rasa is also manifested in the indignant behaviour of Rāvana. On Marīcha's reluctance to assist Rāvana in the plot of abducting Sītā, he scolds him furiously:

\[ \text{V, 45.} \]

Rāvana threatens to kill Sītā, because she is adamant in her refusal:

\[ \text{VIII, 94.} \]

The occasions for Raudra Rasa related to Vīra Rasa occur frequently:

\[ \text{IX, 88.} \]
Notice the fury of Rāvaṇa, when Hanumāt pleads Rāma's cause and advocates the surrender of Sītā:-

\[ \text{रावणं वै यो झटक्कले द्रोहबुद्धिकूला सन्यासा सन्यास:] \]

- IX, 118.

Rāvaṇa loses patience when Vibhīṣaṇa pleads for giving up Sītā and accuses the latter of faithlessness and kicks him:-

\[ \text{धिकृतं च गृहं ते भधि दुस्थुचिदिविषिकं नस्य दयो स पायिन्तं}] \]

- XII, 80.

Rāma gets angry with the Ocean for not helping him in reaching Lāṅkā across:-

\[ \text{नम्भो वासरांवै भीमो रामो नवरावधिनलिङ्कवासे}] \]

- XIII, 2.

Behold the fury deep-set in the minds of the warriors at the time of fighting:-

\[ \text{क्षत्रियि दुर्घ्रीधो भीरकब्जैन तन्यजे}] \]

- XIV, 41.

In the same way the anger of Nīla and Prahasta attained the climax:-

\[ \text{संदुर्धेश तन्ये: केह् परस्माने रास्त्रङ्गत्राघण्यः}] \]

- XIV, 109.

Rāvaṇa gives vent to his anger, when Kumbhakarna remarks that, in order to keep his pride intact, Rāvaṇa did not follow the policy of conciliation and brought in the
When Angada kills Narantaka, all the other sons of Rāvana become violent and rush towards him:

When Angada kills Narantaka, all the other sons of Rāvana become violent and rush towards him:

Angry Sugrīva kills the Son of Kumbhakarṇa:

Angry Sugrīva kills the Son of Kumbhakarṇa:

The harsh reproaches of Indrajit to Vibhīṣaṇa illustrate "vākparusya:"

The harsh reproaches of Indrajit to Vibhīṣaṇa illustrate "vākparusya:"

Read how angry Rāvana started to crush the Vāharas:

Haughty Rāvana showers hundred thousands of arrows on the chest of Rāma:
Bhatti has also depicted Bhayānaka Rasa on certain occasions.

When Lakṣmana cuts off Sūrpanākhā's nose, she assumes a terrifying form:

\[
\text{परशुरामसिन्ह सितिन्र बहुध्वनिमत्तम} \| \text{अविस्फोट निन्दुवन्द्र लक्ष्मीकरं मुखीं} \| - \text{IV,33.}
\]

Marīcha bellows dreadfully when Rāma hits him:

\[
\text{सर्वदशरालक्षाल्पुर्व रामविजयतप्यम} \| \text{सर्वद्राक्षरामश्चतिर विषमानथ्यप्रसाद} \| - \text{V,52.}
\]

A terrifying Rākṣasī approaches Hanūmat, when he reaches near Lāṅkā:

\[
\text{परीलिनुभुप्राप्ति राक्षसी तस्य विवर्धम} \| \text{कीर्तमाक्रमणेऽऽन्तितारा निष्क्रिय} \| - \text{VIII,23.}
\]

When Hanūmat goes to Rāvana's palace, he finds an awful guard protecting the palace:

\[
\text{रामाक्रमणस्वामिर्मग्न रक्षसं कपिः} \| \text{कदिहरे वे कुतालोकिपि निधेत्ताः साधु भीषणम्} \| - \text{VIII,37.}
\]

Not less terrifying are the Rākṣasīs employed by Rāvana to subdue Sītā:

\[
\text{प्रायुक्त राक्षसीनिमां मणिराध प्रियिन्तान} \| \text{भवानि वद सीताय सवा युग्मं कृते मम} \| - \text{VIII,96.}
\]
Hanumat attacks the Rākṣasas who were much frightened of him:-

After meeting Sītā and destroying Asōkavana, Hanumat assumes such a dreadful form, that even the monkeys get terrified when he returns to them on Mt. Mahendras:-

The army of Rāma climbs Mt. Suvela and is frightening Rāvana:-

The description of the terrible battle also contains Bhayanaka Rasa:-

When angry Kumbhakarṇa hurls a mountain at Sugrīva, the Vānaras get afraid:-
The depiction of Adbhuta Rasa naturally gets more than usual scope in Bhāṭṭikāvyya as it deals with the deeds of the supernatural beings like Rākṣasas.

Rāvaṇa hastens to Mārīcha by flying high up in the sky:

Hānūmat flies over the ocean:

The Rākṣasas, who frightened even Indra, are amazed by Hānūmat's exploits:
In the struggle between Indrajit and Angada, the allies of the latter rejoice and praise his valour highly. The world gets astonished and even gods speak highly of him:

In this way the world was astonished by Indrajit.

- VIII, 42.

Indrajit is seen in the air slaying the fictitious Sītā with his sword:

The fight of Nāma and Rāvana astonishes the world:


Rāvana, by his supernatural powers, produces fictitious heads:

- XVII, 84.

Bhaṭṭi has also depicted Bibhatsa Rasa in Bhaṭṭikāvya. Naturally it gets scope on comparatively fewer occasions.

Surpanakhā approaches Laksmana to woo him, but he cuts her nose off:
The description of the Rākṣasas wounded by Hanumat is also full of this Rasa:-

\[ \text{Iśāśvaramīśrā} \text{ राक्षसों की दुःखी अपनी राज्यों } \]

- IX,10.

The poet has described the terrific preliminaries of the great battle as follows:-

\[ \text{द्वादश भूमियों राक्षसों गोपर्व वधणं च } \]
\[ \text{मूना: उस्तन्तुच्छारिम् रवगड़स्युकुरिये सुमन्ता } \]

- XIV,20 and also vide 21.

The description of the nameless and initial fights also is replete with this Rasa:-

\[ \text{सन्तोमुनु: क्रमविधिः प्रोहः} \text{ शोणितलोकम् } \]
\[ \text{तैरू मेरायमः प्रश्नालिः धक्षेऽ: प्रेमैर्यावरसे } \]
\[ \text{सन्तोमुनुबुलुस्मुम्बुभेदु पुलुधिरी क्षणाः } \]
\[ \text{दुसर्गद्धे केवलु रस्ते तन्तुस्तेनोदारे भाग् } \]

- XIV,27, 30, also vide 40.

In the battle between Dhumrakṣa and Hanumat, the blood oozes from the body of the wounded warriors:-

\[ \text{राङ्ग प्रचुमुनुः भुजण:} \text{ शिष्ठियुब्धश्रीविश्ताः } \]
\[ \text{अस्तमां दुसुष्युब्रोणां भूमा:} \text{ सादुवाल्लगुम्बय: } \]

- XIV,79.

or again in the battle between prahasta and Nila,

\[ \text{निम्बूः राङ्ग इस्तहार्य राक्षसाट्टां निनिभिव्यः } \]

- XIV,100.
Kumbhakarna's hunger is not quenched, while he devours the Vanaras:

प्राशीलाचानूपन कुरु: भुज्ञाप्याब्रह्मद्रुमाः ||
अथादृ वस्मार्गासीलु रक्षितं वनवासिनाम् || — XV, 29.

Indrajit's many victims vomit blood:

प्राकृतिला ब्याधियति परितो रक्तस्थितम् ||
परायणध्रुवंप्रय कृताजीवार्प्रमाणम् य य || — XVII, 18.

While lamenting over Rāvana's death, Vibhīṣaṇa regrets to observe that:

कृष्या: कुण्यवलिन मासालिना भूमि: पिललिन शशितम् ||
वस्मीवसासनमीना समवक्यालिनां रवगण: || — XVIII, 12 also vide 13, 14.

Śṛṅgāra Rasa also finds its proper place in Bhaṭṭikāvya.

Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra comes naturally, when Rāma is separated from Sītā.

After killing Mārīcha, Rāma finds Sītā missing in the hut and laments:

आः कर्तः तन ही चिंत्र हृं मानिर्पवालिः थिनकुः ||
हः पितः! कृषिकां है सुप्रवृ! बहुवें बलवाप सः || — VI, 11.

Rāma finally swoons:

इह सा भलिपुरुषः स्नानििक्षर्भ्यपिच्छिन्तामुः ||
इहसं हृदरंभाई नां स्मरणेऽवें सुमोद सः || — VI, 21.
Again the loveliness of the lake Pampa makes Rāma afflicted by the pangs of separation:

उत्सासिने जलेजालिनुज्ञनायक्षिनधित्योऽननम् || - VI,74.

देहानरसि मधुनसिद्धायतपवस्रृंश्यो गितिः || - VI,82.

The advent of the rainy season augments his feeling of separation:

एतादैवालोकितनेयो देहिन्येव दयारमिषाम् ||

पीलुकुलिनां धारां पवनीयो नुलकारिणम् || - VII,9 also vide 3,8.

The poet has described the lovesickness of Rāma:

अशाकार्यवसि कनो निस्मौ शिवाय रमस्यमस्तस्यशुद्धावन ||

इति मदनबसी चुहः शाश्वेकु रथुत्तन्यो न व च प्रविंकष्य चन्द्रम् || X,68.

The early days of the married life of Rāma and Sītā would have given scope to the poet for depicting 'Saṁbhoga Śṛṅgāra' but neither Vālmiki nor Bhaṭṭī availed themselves of the opportunity.

Did the poet refrain from depicting the Saṁbhoga Śṛṅgāra on account of the deep reverence for Rāma, who is regarded as the incarnation of the God Viśnū?

The sublime solemnity reflected in the depiction of Vipralambha Śṛṅgārā pertaining to their separation probably corroborates this assumption.

Nevertheless the poet continues to depict Saṁbhoga Śṛṅgāra.
by introducing the description of the amorous acts of the love-lorn Rākṣasa couples, during the last prahara of the night.

The impending moments of separation compelled proud wives to conciliate their husbands:

Their terrible infatuation with love is described in:

Their insatiable longing for amorous acts is described thus:

The suspicious nature of the lovers is finely portrayed in the following verses:

These beloveds are figuratively pictured as victorious warriors:

Because, they were ashamed of the marks of their amorous acts in the presence of the elders, they tried to conceal the
wounds of their nails and teeth:

The pathetic tinge of the story of Rama and Ravana gives Bhatti enough scope for depicting Karuṇā Rasa on certain occasions:

The queens mourn the death of Dadaratha:

Ravana, on hearing the death of Kumbhakarna, resolves to die or to conquer:

He mourns over the demise of Kumbhakarna:

He pathetically remembers that Vibhīṣaṇa was right and that Prahasta fought because he had no other go:
Rāvana then becomes desperate and hopes against hope:

Vibhīṣaṇa feels sorry for Rāvana as he has invited his own destruction by ignoring the advice to give up Sītā:

He regrets that now all powers conquered by Rāvana in the past regain their freedom:

Vibhīṣaṇa becomes conscious that he is still alive while Rāvana is dead, and therefore wounds his own body:

The climax is reached when he feels missing his brother so much that he thinks of self-immolation:

Thus Bhattikāvya contains two heart-stirring lamentations, which cover an entire canto each.
Hasya Rasa is conspicuous by its absence except in the dialogue of Rama and Laksmana with Sūrpanakhā. The two brothers who knew who she really was, in order to befool her, play a good-humoured jest with her by each telling her to approach the other.

Lastly, it may be noted that Bhattikāvya hardly contains the depiction of Sānta Rasa.

**Descriptive Topics**

The author of *Visnudharmottara Purāṇa* prescribes that a mahākāvya should contain the march of armies, the sending of war messengers, fighting and the ultimate victory of the hero.

The poem should also describe the regions, cities, kings, seasons, mountains, rivers and women.¹

In his *Kāvyalaiṅkāra*, Bhāmaha prescribes that a mahākāvya should contain deliberations, sending of an envoy, a march, a battle and hero's triumph.²

---

¹ VDP., III, XV, 5-6:

चरणेऽन्तराय देशपातां नारीसिध्यं पारिधिः

सदृशोऽन्तराय नाथार्थेऽवै नारीसिध्यं पारिधिः

चरणेऽन्तराय नधेर्वाच्याशु दानकार्यं नारिकेष्वः

नारिकेष्वः ध्येयिज्ञानी सतास्थानाश्चिनिः

² Bhāmaha, *Kāvyalaiṅkāra*, I, 20:

मन्त्रिङ्गुद्धयात्रानायिंनयाकारपुद्देस्तत् यत्
Dandin has given many more topics of description to be required for a mahakavya. According to him, a mahakavya should contain description of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons, Moon-rise and Sun-rise, sports in the garden or water, festivities of drinking and love, separations, marriages, the birth and rise of princes, and likewise state-counsel, embassy, advance of an army, battle and the hero's triumph.

We can see that among the topics prescribed for description by the author of VDP, Bhamaha and Dandin, the following are common topics:

The march of armies, the sending of war-messengers, the fight and the ultimate victory of the hero.

We find that most of the common topics mentioned in all the three sources are also found in Bhattikavya.

The march of armies is described in detail in Cantos XIII and XIV of Bhattikavya. We do not find here the sending of war-messengers.

1 Dandin, Kavyadarsha, I, 16-17:

2 BK., XIII, 44-47; XIV, 1-14.

3. The episode of Angada-Visti is conspicuously missing here.
Fighting is described in detail in Cantos XIV, XV and XVII. The ultimate victory of the hero is certainly depicted in Bhattikāvyā, by Rāma's conquest over Rāvaṇa followed by the attainment of Sītā, Rāma's happy return to Ayodhyā and his performing the Āsvamedha sacrifice.

The description of seasons, mountains, and cities form common topics between the author of VDP and Daṇḍin. Among these the description of the autumn¹ and the rainy season² occurs here in the beginning of Canto II and VII respectively.

The description of Mt. Mahendra and Suvela is given in Cantos X, XIII and XXI respectively³.

The description of Ayodhyā⁴ occurs in Canto I.

The common topic between Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin is Mantra. This topic is here illustrated in Canto XII, which narrates the long deliberations between Rāvaṇa, Prahasta, Vibhīṣaṇa, Mālyavān and others. (In this context, it is interesting to note that Kīrātārjunīya (I, II, III.) and Māghakāvyā (I, II.) commence with similar deliberations.

The uncommon topics prescribed by the author of VDP are regions, kings, rivers and women.

1 BK., II, 1-18.
2 BK., VII, 1-3.
3 BK., X, 45-50; XIII, 31-43; XXI, 21.
4 BK., I, 5-7.
Bhāttikāvya hardly contains the description of regions and rivers. As for kings, Daśaratha is described in Canto I, (1-4) and Rāvana in Canto XII, (9-11).

Among women, Śūrpaṇakhā¹ and Sīta² are described in particular in Cantos IV-V and VII-VIII respectively. The depiction of amorous sports given in Canto XI also contains some general description of Rākṣasīs.

The topics specified by Daṇḍin above are as follows:

- the ocean, Moon-rise, Sun-rise, groves, water-sports, drinking, gay festivals, separation, marriages and the birth of a son.

The ocean³ and the Moon-rise⁴ are described in Canto X. The Sun-rise and water-sports are not described here.

Asokavana⁵ and drinking⁶ are described in Canto VIII.

The gay festivals occur in the description of the love-sports of Rākṣasas and Rākṣāsīs in Canto XI. The separation⁷

---

¹ BK., IV, 16-18.
² BK., V, 18-20; VII, 71-72; VIII, 84-87.
³ BK., X, 52-63.
⁴ BK., X, 67-70.
⁵ BK., VIII, 61-64.
⁶ BK., VIII, 39-41.
⁷ BK., VI, 10-21.
(of lovers) is described in Canto VI. Similarly the lamentation over the death of the brothers and other relatives given in Cantos XVI and XVIII may fall under the category of separation taken in the wide sense of the term.

The description of the Pampa lake given in Canto VI, 72-75, can be considered as one of the topics for description, though it is not taken up by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Broadly speaking, it may be put under the category of topic of description of rivers and the ocean.

1 In his Sāhityadarpana VI, Viśvanātha also recommends similar topics to be described in a mahākāvyya. Many of the topics mentioned by him correspond to those given by Daṇḍin.
CHAPTER 4
The Poetic Treatment of Bhaṭṭikāvya (Contd.)

Metres

The author of Visnudharmottara Purāṇa indirectly enjoins that metres form the essential characteristic of a mahākāvya, which distinguishes it from the prose.\footnote{VDP., III, XV, 9: चन्द्रो विरहितं गम्यम् |}

Bhāmaha does not mention metres as the essential characteristic in a mahākāvya. He may be implying it in the adjective Ṛddhimat,\footnote{Kāvyālankāra, I, 20: नातिन्यात्मकम्योऽदितः |} while Daṇḍin holds that a mahākāvya should also be composed in metres.\footnote{Daṇḍin, Kāvyādarśa, I, 19: सर्गेरमतिक्षरसङ्ग्रहं: अभ्यूतेऽऽसुभिषिते: |}

Naturally the poets composed its different cantos in various metres. But when the poetic genius got exhausted in course of time, the variety of metres became one of the outstanding characteristics of a mahākāvya. In other words, it became an end rather than a means to the production of a mahākāvya.

For exhibiting proficiency in the use of the variety of metres, the poets vied with one another in using an increasing number of metres and including rare and obscure metres among them.

In this context, it will be interesting to compare the number of metres used by Bhaṭṭi with those used by Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidās on the one hand and Bhāravi and Māgha on the other hand.
Principal Metres in Individual Cantos

Metres used as principal metres in individual cantos are 5 and 4 in *Saundarananda* and *Buddhacharita* respectively, 5 in *Kumārasaṃbhava* and 6 in *Raghuvaṃśa*, 3 in *Bhaṭṭikāvyā*, 12 in *Bhāravi* and 16 in *Māgha*. Thus Bhaṭṭi has used the minimum number of principal metres.

1. Eight metres, if Cantos IX to XVII are not taken into consideration.

Here Gāthāvṛtta and Chitrachmarkṛti are accepted as the metres of X, 14 and XXII, 35 respectively.

As noticed above, Bhatti uses three metres as principal ones in individual cantos. Their relative frequency may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metre</th>
<th>Canto</th>
<th>verses</th>
<th>Canto</th>
<th>verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Anuśūpa</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1 - 43 = 43</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>1 - 41 = 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1 - 107 = 107</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>1 - 111 = 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1 - 142 = 142</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1 - 41 = 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1 - 107 = 107</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>1 - 29 = 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1 - 130 = 130</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1 - 36 = 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1 - 136 = 136</td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>1 - 20 = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2 - 112 = 111</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>1 - 23 = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1 - 122 = 122</td>
<td></td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Upajāti</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2 - 25 = 24</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1 - 55 = 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1 - 5, 7 - 18, 20 - 46</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1 - 36, 39 - 45 = 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48 - 54 = 51</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1 - 85 = 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Āryāgīti</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1 - 25, 29 - 50 = 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anuśūpa metre has had a long evolution as regards the characteristics of its constitution. Pīngala's Chhandah-sāstra treated it as Pathyā variety of Vaktra, which requires a ya-gana after the fourth syllable in odd quarters and a ja-gana in even quarters¹.

¹ Pīngala, Chhandah-sāstra, V, 13 - 14.
Moreover the gāṇa succeeding the first letter should be any gāṇa except sa-gāṇa, na-gāṇa and ra-gāṇa in even quarters and any gāṇa except sa-gāṇa, na-gāṇa and ra-gāṇa in even quarters\textsuperscript{1}. In other words the first letter may be followed by any one of the remaining six gāṇas (ma, ya, ra, ta, ja, bha) in odd quarters and any one of the remaining five gāṇas (ma, ya, ta, ja, bha) in even quarters.

As seen above, Bhaṭṭī has used this metre in 1199 verses. Here he has observed this rule almost invariably. However we come across a few exceptions. For instance, the occurrence of na-gāṇa in odd quarters in IV,9;V,70;VII,99 (a and b) and sa-gāṇa in odd quarters in VI,2. Similarly there is occurrence of sa-gāṇa in even quarters in VII,31 and VI,126.

In this context, it must be noted that the poet has nowhere used ra-gāṇa in even quarters.

Generally the poet has well observed the rule about gāṇas to be used after the first letter. An analysis of the gāṇas used by him in this position clearly indicates that he has all of the six admissible gāṇas in the odd quarters and the five admissible gāṇas in the even quarters.

As regards the general use of ya-gāṇa after the fourth syllable in odd quarters, Bhaṭṭī has used it almost invariably. The Chhandah-Śāstra also permits the use of bha-gāṇa, ra-gāṇa, na-gāṇa and ta-gāṇa in place of ya-gāṇa\textsuperscript{2}. It seems that the use of these options is restricted. Halāyudha, the commentator,

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., V, 10-11.
\item Ibid., V, 19: \texttt{भरो भलौं च्य।}
\end{enumerate}
interprets cha' in sūtra V, 19 as etc. and adds ma-gaṇa to this list. He also quotes the use of sa-gaṇa from Parāśāraśāraṇi. This means that ya-gaṇa in odd quarters can be substituted by any of the other gaṇas except ja-gaṇa.

The exclusion of this gaṇa is obviously intended for avoiding the non-differentiation of odd quarters from even quarters, wherein ja-gaṇa is essential. The varieties of Anuṣṭūp wherein any of these optional gaṇas are used, are known as Vipulās. Like other great poets, Bhaṭṭi also has used vipulās sparingly. The use of vipulās seems to be mainly a question of individual taste and style.

The different vipulās are named after the gaṇas used therein, such as na-vipulā, bha-vipulā, ma-vipulā, ra-vipulā, ta-vipulā and sa-vipulā. Modern critics like Keith have analysed the vipulā in classical mahākāvyas and given the numbers of half-stanzas, wherein na-vipulā, bha-vipulā, ma-vipulā and ra-vipulā are used. They have styled these vipulās as the first, the second, the third, and the fourth type respectively.

The proportion of vipulās in Anuṣṭūp is 11:7 in Aśvaghoṣa's kāvyā.

He likes the first vipulā very much. Out of 159 vipulās, in all, he has used the first vipulā 128 times. In the first vipulā

---

1 Halayuḍha, Chhandah-śāstra, p. 104:
3 For an odd quarter is covered by a half stanza.
4 A.B. Keith, History of Sanskrit literature, V. p. 421.
also, he uses the first form 119 times. Asvaghosa has used the second vipulā and the third vipulā 15 and 16 times respectively, while he has not used the fourth vipulā at all.

Kālidāsa uses the vipulās to a less extent in comparison with Asvaghosa, the proportion being 8:15. Like Asvaghosa, he shows greater leaning towards the first vipulā, especially in its first form\(^1\), while he uses second vipulā 27 times and even the fourth vipulā once.

In Bhāravi, the percentage of vipulās in Anuṣṭup increases and 10% of his ślokas are vipulās. His favourite vipulā also seems to be the first, because he has used it 15 times, while the numbers of the second and third vipulās are 8 and 2 respectively. Following the general practice, he also has not used the fourth vipulā form\(^2\).

The first vipulā seems to be Māgha's favourite also, as he uses the first vipulā 47 times, but he has also used second vipulā 44 times and the third vipulā 34 times\(^3\).

Another striking feature of his vipulās is that he has rather more cases of the second form of the first vipulās. In other words, he differs from Asvaghosa and Kālidāsa, in having no special leaning towards the first form.

Bhaṭṭi has used 100 vipulā forms out of 2398 half stanzas, the percentage being about 1:24. The figures for the first three vipulās are 36, 9 and 51 respectively, showing that the third vipulā is his favourite. Bhaṭṭi has also given 4 cases of

---

1 A.B. Keith, History of Sanskrit literature, p. 108.
2 Ibid., pp. 115 f.
3 Ibid., p. 131.
sa-vipulā. He has not used the fourth vipulā nor has he made any use of ta-vipulā.

The eighth syllable in the odd and even quarters of Anuṣṭup is generally expected to be long, however, we come across a few exceptions which are naturally more rare in the case of even quarters\(^1\).

On examining Anuṣṭup verses in Bhaṭṭikāvya, we find that Bhaṭṭi has well-observed this rule. The eighth syllable is found to be exceptionally short, only 384 times in odd quarters out of 2398 ones and only 142 times in even quarters out of 2398 ones. Of course the final syllable in a quarter, even though being short in its apparent form, is treated as a long one in recitations.

Bhaṭṭi has used Upajātī metre in 258 verses. In 1032 Pādas, he has used 661 Pādas of Indravajrā and 371 Pādas of Upendravajrā. This shows that Indravajrā is his favourite metre. This inference is further collaborated by the fact that he has devoted as many as 39 stanzas to entire Indravajrā and only 7 stanzas to entire Upendravajrā.

Bhaṭṭi was the only author who not only used Āryāgīti, but used it as the principal metre in one of his cantos. Till now no poet had used it even in a single verse in a mahākāvya. The poet seems to have chosen it as the most suitable metre for illustrating Bhāṣāsama\(^2\). Āryāgīti is also known as Skandhaka.

The Āryāgīti is generally defined as constituted by the addition of one long syllable to the former half of Āryā, the

---

1 R.V. Pathak, Brhat Piṅgala, p. 560.
same being entirely repeated in the second half. Thus it is an extension of the Āryā in its former half, or better say, of the Giti.

All the 47 verses composed in the principal metre yield Āryāgīti of the regular type.

According to some writers like Sulhana, Āryāgīti is an Āryā extended by two Mātrās in each half so that its two halves have respectively 32 and 29 Mātrās in them¹.

The metre in XIII,41 may appear as an Āryāgīti of this type, according to the reading द्वितिष्ठकलुम्बन्धयिः, as its former half has 32 and the latter half has 29 Mātrās. But on scanning, the latter half is found to be violating the prescribed rule for chatuskas and ja-gaṇa². But the Ms. T2 amends the line with the addition of महुः after नपिः ³ and then the metre


² The rule is that the odd chatuska must have no ja-gaṇa, that the sixth chatuska must be a ja-gaṇa or a chatuska consisting of all short syllables and that if the seventh chatuska consists of all short syllables, the word must must commence with its initial syllable. - Chhandomanjari, V, 1-2, p. 152.

1 A few verses yield some metrical irregularities according to the readings given in certain editions, but on further investigation, the variant readings given in other editions or the MSS. yield Aryanjiti of the regular type, e.g.

i. ध्रुवानस्समस्यानिति in XIII,20 has got 28 Matras but the addition of स्वभावाद्ध्वम after संभावम suggested by the variant reading सहृद्य, समभावम, पद्म in MS. E3 (Op. Cit., Vol.II, p. 104, F.N.4) and supported by the commentaries makes the line regular.

ii. Similarly, the metre in the former half of the verse XIII,49 falls short by 3 Matras, when it is read as अल्पसन्नुस्सर्वसंस्कृतिसिद्धात्मिका विवाहालम्बम but the reading given in K.P. Trivedi's edition and in the Calcutta edition supported by the commentary of Mallinatha adds कृत्यम after भिन्नम and makes the line regular.

iii. The latter half of the verse XIII,50 lacks in one Matra for Aryanjiti, according to the general reading समास्स्तम् which is even cited in the commentaries. However the MS. T2 gives the variant सहस्सत्तम् which makes the line regular by the addition of one Matra. (Vide K.P. Trivedi, Op. Cit., Vol. II, p. 114, F.N.4.).
Among the metres of common use, Vasantatilkä is conspicuous by its absence in Bhättikävyä. As regards the metres of rare use, every poet in the group under review uses some special metres according to his personal choice. Accordingly, Bhätti chooses to use the following rare metres, which do not occur in the Mahákävyas of the other poets under review: Āśvalalita, Nandana, Narkuṭaka, Praharāṇakalikä and Tanumadhyä.

Metres at the end of cantos

The poets brought in a variety of metres, in a few concluding stanzas in each canto. The VDP which alludes to the importance of metres in a mahákävyä, takes no notice of this feature. But Daṇḍin specifically enjoins that a mahákävyä must have a variety of metres at the end of all cantos.

Like Āsvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa, Bhätti also concludes his cantos in metres different from the principal metres in the respective cantos.

In this respect, it may be noticed that the two cantos namely Canto I and Canto XIV also commence with a different metre, which occurs in one verse each.

---

1 Excluding a canto or two, wherein the variety of metres spreads over the entire canto.

2 Op. Cit., I, 19:

3 Exceptionally, the poet gives no variety of metre at the end in Canto XIII.
Canto II, which ends in the Mālinī metre used in one verse (II,55) has verses composed in Upajāti, Upendravajrā and Indravajrā at random. The interblending of these metres really indicates that they are here treated as varieties of one metre.

Curiously, the poet has interpolated the Vamśāstha metre in three different verses (II,6,19,47.) within the major portion of verses 1 - 54 of Canto II. Likewise he interpolates Vamśāstha also in canto XI wherein verses 37 and 38 are in Vamśāstha though the verses 1 - 36 and 39 - 45 are in Upajāti.

Similarly it may be noted that Bhaṭṭi has interluded a different metre (Upajāti) running in three verses (26, 27 and 28) in the midst of the principal metre Āryāgīti of Canto XIII.

As regards the metres varied at the end of the cantos, the maximum and minimum numbers of these metres in individual cantos of the Mahākāvyas under review, along with the maximum and minimum numbers of the verses covered by these metres are as follows :-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahākāvyā</th>
<th>No. of metres</th>
<th>No. of verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundarananda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhacharita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārsambhava</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghuvamsa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaṭṭikāvyā</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirātārjunīya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisupālavadha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparative tables indicate that among the five poets under review, Bhatti uses a good number of varying metres in a good number of verses, Bhāṭṭikāvyā standing just next to Raghuvamsa and Sisupalavadha in both respects.

As regards the varying metres, they may be enumerated as follows in the descending order of their frequency, the figures underlined indicating the varying metres at the end of cantos and the figures given in the brackets at the end indicating the total number of verses covered by each metre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poet</th>
<th>Metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puspitāgrā</td>
<td>IV, 44-45; V, 108; IX, 137; X, 31-32; 45-56, 58-73; XXII, 32; (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upajāti</td>
<td>X, 19, 23, 35, 36, 39; XIII, 26-28; XIV, 1; XIV, 113; XVIII, 42; XXII, 24-25 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālinī</td>
<td>I, 26, 27; II, 55; III, 56; X, 17, 30; XI, 46, 47; XV, 123; (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praharṣinī</td>
<td>X, 13; X, 74, 75; XVII, 112; XX, 37; XXI, 22, 23; XXII, 26, 27; (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anustūp</td>
<td>X, 7, 10, 20, 21, 22, 38; XXII, 33, 34; (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aupachchhandasika</td>
<td>X, 26, 28, 40, 41, 43, 44; XXII, 31; (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vamsastha</td>
<td>II, 6, 19, 47; X, 11; XI, 37, 38; (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundarī</td>
<td>X, 24, 25, 29, 33, 34, 42; (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhumvilambita</td>
<td>X, 1, 6, 15, 18; XXII, 30; (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pramitākṣarā</td>
<td>X, 2, 3, 8, 27; (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toṭaka</td>
<td>X, 4, 5, 9; (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanumadhyā</td>
<td>X, 12, 16; (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praharṇakalikā</td>
<td>XII, 86, 87; (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandākrānta</td>
<td>VI, 143; XIX, 30; (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārdūlavikrīḍā</td>
<td>XVI, 42; XXII, 29; (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruchirā</td>
<td>I, 1; (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prthvī</td>
<td>VII, 108; (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among these the first one, though not used as a principal metre, covers two fifths of Canto X, which is composed in several metres.

From the tables of the principal and varying metres, it evidently appears that the following metres are favourite to Bhaṭṭi: Anuṣṭup, Upajāti, Āryāgīti and Puṣpitāgrā.

In Rāghuvaṃśa, Kālidāsa enhances the varieties of metres to a comparatively large extent in one Canto (IX). Out of 82 verses in the canto, the first 54 are composed in a single metre (Drutavilambīta) as in the case of the other cantos; but he uses variant metres in as many as 28 succeeding verses, these metres numbering 12.

The later poets amplify this tendency by devoting one entire canto or two to the variety of metres. Among them Bhaṭṭi uses 15 metres in Cantos X, covering 75 verses. Bhṛavi devotes two Cantos (V and XVIII) consisting of 52 verses and 45 verses respectively, and uses 16 metres in each. Māgha, like Kālidāsa, introduces the varieties of metres in one entire canto (IV), and uses 22 metres in 68 verses.

It seems that the new feature of the polymetric canto was probably initiated by Bhaṭṭi and was followed and developed by the later poets like Bhṛavi and Māgha.
Metrical irregularities

The following metres used in Bhattikāvya deserve special notice. The metre, used in VIII, 131, is one of the longest metres consisting of 23 syllables in each quarter.

The verse as given in some of the printed editions reads as follows:-

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{रकुमरलिङ्गनारदहसुककुमार प्रशान्तकलिकापदारा कुसुमम्} & \\
\text{कुसुमसिन्धुपित्रवसुध्यं सशादनिपातदुमोकशकुमरम्} & \\
\text{राणविलोचनसध्वसति बनेमन पवालमों रिपुवनम्} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

But this reading of the verse is obviously faulty, as it contains one syllable more in the second foot and one syllable less in the third foot.

But the original reading which can be deduced from the commentary of Mallinātha and which actually occurs in some of the MSS. is found to be as under:-

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{बिलुचितपुष्परेषुकृपिः प्रशान्तकलिकापदारा कुसुमम्} & \\
\text{कुसुमसिन्धुपित्रवसुध्यं सशादनिपातदुमोकशकुमरम्} & \\
\text{श्रुकुमारलिङ्गनारदहसुककुमार 1 विलोचनाध्रवणेषुरिपुवनम्} & \\
\text{राणविलोचनाध्रवणेषुसध्वसति बनेमन पवालमों रिपुवनम्} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Mallinātha in his commentary on this verse, introduces

1 K.P. Trivedi, (ed.), Bhattikāvya, p.306, fn. 4: बिलुचितपुष्परेषुकृपिः तृशान्तकलिकापदारा कुसुमम्
T,G.,Com.

2 Ibid., fn. 5: बिलुचितपुष्परेषुकृपिः T₂,T,G.,Com.

बिलुचितपुष्परेषुकृपिः E₂,C.
the metre as Vaikrta Asvalalita and quoted its definition as follows:-

\[ \text{मद्व न नर्मो नु न्येन नु न्येन नु हन्तानुह्म} \]

The definition given by Bhattakedara in his Vrttaratnakara runs as follows:-

\[ \text{मद्व न नर्मो नु न्येन नु न्येन नु हन्तानुह्म} \]

- III,105.

The metre is also known as Adritanaya and defined in Chhandomanjari (II,217.*) as follows:-

\[ \text{नम्नम्नेमा भमो भुधुग्न भुधुग्न बहिनिनिनिन} \]

It contains a caesura at the end of the 11th syllable in each of its four feet. This metre seems to have been suggested by a combination of two short metres¹. The latter part of its foot is obviously Jaloddhatagati metre. As regards the former part of its foot, Prof. R.V. Pathak identified it with Narakuṭaka. The latter consists of 17 syllables in each foot and hence, here we have to exclude the two ja-gānas from it. But Asvalalita may better be taken as a metre of Tristup type akin to Drutapādagati metre, there being a difference only in the third gana. It is bha-gana in the Asvalalita metre of the verse under review, while it is ja-gana in the case of Drutapādagati.

¹ Brhat Pīngala, pp. 252 ff.
The metre used in the concluding verse of \textit{Bhattikāvya} is a peculiar one. The commentators like Jayamangala and Mallinātha are absolutely silent on the identification of this metre (but this may hardly be taken to imply that the verse is an interpolated one).

Prof. R.V. Pathak has ingeniously explained the metre as originated by the addition of a long syllable at the beginning of the odd foot of the Mālabhārini metre.

It may as well be taken as originated by the shifting of the concluding long syllable in the initial chatuska \textit{कल्पांगम} in the even foot of the Mālabhārini metre from the end of the Chatuska to its beginning. Anyhow the metre gets transformed from the ardhasamāvṛttta type to the samāvṛttta type.

In his edition of \textit{Bhattikāvya}, Pandit Śivadatta (p. 526.) has identified the metre as Chitrachamatkṛti, the definition of which is cited by him as follows:

\begin{quote}
'चित्रचमकत्कृतिं विद्यि भौ रघो चेत\|'
\end{quote}

The editor has evidently cited the definition from some old work on metrics, but he has not specified the name of the original work.

\begin{flushright}
\begin{tabular}{l}
1 \textit{क्षणिकम्} \textit{विद्वै} \textit{मथा} \textit{वनयं} \textit{श्रीधरसेननरैङ्गुलितलालाम्}\| \textit{वीरिन्द्रो} \textit{भक्ताल्पस्य} \textit{नयं} \textit{प्रेमकरः} \textit{शिविन्द्र} \textit{जनः} \textit{प्रजानाम्} ||

2 \textit{Brhata Piṅgala}; pp. 260-261.
\end{tabular}
\end{flushright}
Another verse (X,14) that deserves notice is as follows:

अष्ट लक्षित्य प्रिनारः सम्यक्षतिकालम्।
स वर्ष विविन्दस्ती सीतावर वर्षे। अगमालोम्।

The metre in this verse is Aṣṭa, but Aṣṭa should have 12 Matras in the first foot, therefore the final सूक्त is suggested to be taken as लघु rather than गुरु. 1 But to take it as short mars the Puṣya grapa, which is illustrated by this verse, because in the other three Padas, the syllables at the end are मालुम्. If we consider सूक्त as लघु, it gives rise to another difficulty. It would involve ja-gaṇa and would violate the rule that the odd chatuskas should not be in ja-gaṇa. 2

Bharatamallika thinks that the ja-gaṇa in the third chatuska does not necessarily discard the metre as Aṣṭa, and further suggests that nevertheless it is better to take the word preceding मालुं as प्रस्ति rather than पन्नित्रि. 3 This reading, though not supported by MSS. and commentaries, seems

---

1 Chhandamalari, I,11:

\[\text{sānuṣṭुवर्कर्त्वः दीर्घिस्त्रि निन्द्रीणे च सुरभेंति} |\n\[\text{वर्णः संयोगपूर्वकः तथा चाननागीर्दिष्टि वा} ||


3 Bharatamallika, comm. on Bhattikāvya, part II, X, 14:

\[\text{न लु विषयस्थस्त्रोपरि लक्षणबिवृत्तिः गायत्रा भजन्तिः सर्वत्रं| पत्रियस्तिअति पश्चे अर्थ हनकराधि: वेषस्कुर्माया} ||
Another instance is the verse XI,42 where the metre Upajjāti requires that the second syllable in the word श्रेणीकृतं should be short. Lexicographically श्रेणि and श्रेणी are both admissible. Commentators like Jayamangala, Mallinātha and Bharatamallika take the basic word to be श्रेणि but they all explain श्रेणीकृतं as a चिन्ता form. Accordingly ध in श्रेणि would necessarily be मक्का according to the sūtra (VII,4,26). In that case the form would involve metrical fallacy. The commentators however take no notice of it. The same is the case with Prof. K.P. Trivedi.

But Prof. R.V. Pathak remarks that it involves metrical

1 Prof. R.V. Pathak does not favour this variant, on the ground that Bhāṭṭi always uses पत्रम or पत्रम.

The editor of the Nirṇayasāgar edition (fn. p.266) suggests to take the metre as Gāthā which covers irregular and unspecified metres:

2 निकृष्टम निकृष्टम | निकृष्टम निकृष्टम | निकृष्टम निकृष्टम |

3-4 Mallinātha's Comm. on XI,42: अद्ध्रेणग्रं: अद्ध्रेणग्रं: कृतं:

-अद्ध्रेणग्रं: पत्रमीकृतं: // अद्ध्रेणग्रं: कृतं // इति व्याकरण: तत्स्रुधः //
discrepancy on the part of the poet.1

Many of the MSS. and printed editions read अङ्गिकृताः. However some MSS. read अङ्गिकृताः. 2

Shri V.N. Sastri, the editor of the Nirmayasagar edition of Bhattikavya also adopts the reading अङ्गिकृताः and observes that the form अङ्गिकृताः though, not in agreement with the चिद form, seems to have been adopted for avoiding (the fallacy of) खल्दीभद्र and in its corroboration he cites the maxim:

अङ्गिमार्गेन्निः तं च खल्दीभद्रेण न ज्ञाते

This indicates the predominance of Chhandah-sastra. The same is the case with Pandit Sivadatta, the editor of Venkateswar Press edition.

Here it is obvious that the poet has somehow overlooked the inconsistency between the grammatical form and the metrical form, and some of the scribes and editors have chosen to accept the metrical form and afforded to overlook its grammatical irregularity.

Thus Bhatti has used 25 metres in all, three of them being used as principal metres in the individual cantos.

1 R.V. Pathak, Brhat Pingala, p.34.

Prof. Pathak, however seems to have misunderstood Bharatamallika whom he takes as defending अङ्गिकृताः: by applying आभिधान नियामक to the expression given.

Prof. Pathak mentions that Bharata reads अङ्गिर but his commentary in the edition (by Yadunatha Tarkaratna, Calcutta, 1871) mentioned by Prof. Pathak has adopted अङ्गिकृताः: and not अङ्गिकृताः: in the text and the commentary as well. Prof. Pathak was probably misled by oversight.

Though we come across a few discrepancies, the poem on the whole leaves a good impression about the poet's proficiency in the use of different metres.

**Figures of Speech in Cantos other than X**

Bhāmaha and Dāṇḍin recommend that a mahākāvya must be endowed with alāṅkāras. As for the importance of alāṅkāras, the author VDP does not recommend it specifically, but it seems to have been hinted in his recommendation that a mahākāvya should be endowed with dexterity in the poetic art.

Bhaṭṭi has exclusively devoted an entire canto (Canto X) to the illustration of various alāṅkāras. But its main purpose is related to the illustrative aspect of the composition. Nevertheless he not infrequently uses alāṅkāras in the other cantos, where they are introduced purely from the poetic point of view.

As it will be noticed later on, the MSS. have identified the alāṅkāra illustrated in each verse of Canto X.

Jayamaṅgala also completely agrees with the identification of alāṅkāras by the MSS. Mallinātha has named and explained the alāṅkāra in each verse, where he discerned it.

But we should not accept his identifications in all cases, without examining them in the light of the concepts.

1 kāvyalāṅkāra, I, 19: अन्नम्यशद्यः मध्यः च स्वाधोऽवः सवास्यम्
2 kāvyādarsa, I, 19: काव्यं कल्पानन्दस्य ज्ञातम सदांतःकृति
3 VDP, III, XV, 15: काव्यं कल्पानन्दस्य क्रियाय धर्मेण वाचणि सवास्यम्
prevalent in Bhaṭṭi's time. For, as it will be noticed in
detail later on, in identifying the alāṅkāras in Canto X,
Mallinātha has committed some anachronism, because certain
alāṅkāras were not conceived in the times of Bhaṭṭi.

From the comparison of Bhaṭṭi's illustration of
alāṅkāras in Canto X and the treatment of alāṅkāras given
by Bhāmaha, it is obvious that the tradition followed by
Bhaṭṭi probably had a great semblance to that found in
Bhāmaha's work, while it differs considerably from the
tradition followed by later alāṅkārikas from whom Mallinātha
draws his identifications.

Mallinātha has committed an anachronism, in as much as,
of the 36 figures noted by him, the following eight figures
had not been conceived in the times of Bhaṭṭi: Ekāvalī¹,
Kāvyaliṅga², Drśtānta³, Parikara⁴ Bhṝntimān⁵, Viṣama⁶,
Sama⁷ and Samuchchayā⁸.

Mallinātha is justified in discerning Ekāvalī in
II,19, but this figure was not thought of by the earlier
alāṅkārikas. Kāvyaliṅga discerned by Mallinātha in V,42 and
43 would fail under Paryāyokta according to the tradition

---

1  II,19.  
2  V,42, 43; XII, 14; XIII, 11.  
3  XII, 82.  
4  XII, 49; XIV, 38.  
5  II, 9; XIII, 42.  
6  XI, 31.  
7  I, 5.  
8  I,2; III,22; V,1; XII,81; XVII, 1.
followed by Bhattacharya and Bhāmaha, because Ravana here wanted to convey that Rama was not at all brave and it was a mere accident that he could break the tottered bow of king Janaka and kill Khara and Dushana.

Two verses, XII,14 and XIII,11 are illustrations of Kavyalihga according to Mallinātha, but they would not show any figure of speech according to Bhattacharya and Bhāmaha.

Mallinātha is justified in identifying XII,82 as Drṣṭānta, but it is very similar to Hetu illustrated by Bhattacharya. Verses XII,49 and XIV,38 noted by Mallinātha as illustrations of Parikara, hardly illustrate any figures of speech according to the early ālāṅkārīkās. The same is the case with the two verses II,9 and XIII,42 noted by Mallinātha as illustrations of Bhṛantimān. But this figure was not conceived in the times of Bhattacharya. Therefore, these verses also may be considered devoid of any figure of speech according to the view of Bhattacharya and Bhāmaha.

It is better to identify Viṣama in XI,31 as Virodha, because in the times of Bhattacharya, other figures of contrast except Virodha, Vibhavanā and Viṣesokti had not been thought of.

Mallinātha has noted the figure Sama in I,5 but this was also not known to Bhattacharya. Therefore it can as well be called Taddhiṭṭhagā Upama as Daśaratha is described as रात्मन्वुकलम्: and Ayodhya as महेन्द्रोक्त्रिलिमा .

The five verses (I,2;III,22; V,1; XII,81 and XVII,1) noted by Mallinātha as examples of Samuchchaya hardly contain
any figure of speech according to the earlier अलंकारिकास.

Verse 1,3 has been noted by Mallinātha as समस्रृति of Upamā and समुच्छयaya, but we have to take it as Upamā alone.

Some of the figures illustrated by Bhaṭṭi and Bhamaha had ceased to be regarded as figures in later times as it would be noticed later on. For instance, in verse VI,61, we find an illustration of उपमास्लिःṭा as all the adjectives are स्लिःṭा and apply to भ्रुत्सपद as well as to साराः, the matter in hand.

Similarly, verse 26 of Canto XIX may well be considered as an illustration of अशि अलंकार as it expresses the blessings of Rāma to Vibhīṣaṇa.

Some other figures were interpreted differently in later times and hence Mallinātha has identified them differently. For example, Mallinātha has noted Upamā in verse III,19, but there is उपमारुपाका according to Bhaṭṭi and Bhamaha, as the verse contains Upamā in the main शब्द words and Rūpaka in the attributes राजत्व नवय नमाग्नि नमायता and शोकाद्वकारः कल्सर्वयंश्चता as well.

The same is the case with उत्प्रेक्षा discerned by Mallinātha in XI,20, which would fall under उत्प्रेक्षयायवāya according to Bhaṭṭi and Bhamaha.

Verse IV,44, is मालोपमाः according to Mallinātha and later अलंकारिकास but it is better to put it under इवोपमाः according to the early अलंकारिकास.

1 Vide Chapter 5.
2 Cf. X,56.
Some figures seem to have escaped the notice of Mallinātha, e.g. Ardharūpaka in verse I,20; I,23; VIII,60 and VIII,72. These verses obviously contain Rūpaka in words विप्रविठ्ठि, नापसकुक्त्तर, कपित्याधुर and कपिकुक्त्तर respectively. As the Rūpaka in these verses occurs only in a half of the respective verse, the figure should be identified as Ardharūpaka variety according to Bhaṭṭī, who illustrates it in a similar way in X,28.

Similarly verse V,23 illustrates the figure Ūrasvī, because therein the speech of Rāvana is replete with a high sense of pride.

Taking a clue from this, we should try to identify the alāṅkāras in cantos other than canto X according to the early tradition followed by Bhaṭṭī and Bhāmaha, rather than according to the later tradition (wherever it differs) followed by Mallinātha.

Accordingly, the poet seems to have used as many as twenty three figures of speech in all.

Five of these are illustrated in varieties. The alāṅkāras used in Cantos: I-IX and XI to XXII of Bhāṭṭikāvya may be enumerated as follows according to the descending order of the frequency of their occurrence, the number of verses being mentioned against the name of each alāṅkāra. The number of varieties is given in brackets, just after the name of the alāṅkāra, wherever they occur.

1 Utprekṣā 26
2 Upamā (4) 18
As it will be noticed later on, Bhattachariya has illustrated varieties of certain figures in Canto X.

He has illustrated Yopama, Yathopama, Taddhitopama and Luptopama, four varieties of Upama out of the six ones illustrated in canto X. In the case of Rupaka, he has illustrated the general (Savyava) Rupaka. Of the four varieties, he has illustrated Ardharupaka and Anvarthopama-yukta lalamaaka.
He has illustrated only Upamāśīṣṭa out of the three varieties of śīṣṭa. In Yamaka, he has illustrated two varieties, Pādamadhyānta and Kāṇchīyamaka out of twenty varieties. In Udāra he has illustrated the variety which describes enormous prosperity.

Illustrations

Some typical illustrations of alaṅkāras may be cited as follows.

The poet has illustrated the Pādamadhyānta Yamaka, while describing the wide hip of Surpanākhā:-

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{सुपारिष्ठिन्द्रनासनेन मूष्ठु पाणिनलकुड़िन।} \\
&\text{श्रीमानं द्वारानेन आपनेन घाने न।} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- IV,17.

Another variety, Kāṇchīyamaka, is found in Canto XXI, when the poet describes Mt. Suvela:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{धर्मरुपं कृतेल्यकुमुद्धिपुर्णपतेन।} \\
&\text{स्तम्भमधुसङ्गेतिनिमाशितंकुटकिं।} \\
&\text{शिशुरशिलं चलनलुपरित्रम्भवितयहु।} \\
&\text{समस्फुतिः सं वितलान सुवेलगिरिः।} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- XXI,21.

The poet compares the houses of Ayodhya to the summits of Mt. Meru:-

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{सदनमुरारामवनविभिन्नसंस्कृत्यमन्दनानि।} \\
&\text{स्त्रीमिति त्वमसर्वसंस्करितादिवै भिसरसीव गृहाणि अस्त्याः।} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- I,7.

Or, again another Upamā, when the poet has imagined the morning splendour as a loving friend who awakens the sky:
The Rākṣasas assembled against mischievous Hanūmān are described as under:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
कृष्णामेंध्रिधीरेण समग्रसत राक्षशः
वर्णसुद्धनोयांछ: नयुद्धेण विन्ध्यः
\end{verse}
\end{quote}

- IX, 6.

King Dāsaratha shone like a sacrificial fire:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
पुष्यो महाबुध्ध समृद्धुनन्त: सत्नपणो नाकुरसं लोगः
जन्यालु लोकिष्ठते स राजा भण्डर्ये वढ़िरिमिरिणितः
\end{verse}
\end{quote}

- I, 4.

The bee is compared to a dance-teacher through the employment of particle yathā in:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
विलोक्ताना चुङ्खि हस्तवेदेषु युवोपिभुषः समुद्ययमवितम
बिमिराणानां कृत्यं च घट्टेदा गुम्बेऽया नुस्विधीमि समादधि
\end{verse}
\end{quote}

- XI, 37.

'Kalpa', the taddhita particle, is used in the following Upamā, which compares Dāsaratha and Ayodhyā to Indra and the heaven respectively:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
स पुष्यंकीति: रत्नमल्युक्तयो महेंद्रलोकश्रेष्ठों समृद्धया
अध्यायस्य सदैवेकुरामोहामध्यालोकयानां श्रीमिरिद्यनोधे
\end{verse}
\end{quote}

- I, 5.

The description of the autumn contains two fine Upāntopamās:
In Cantos other than X, we find Rūpaka in general (which is called Savayava Rūpaka) and Ardharūpaka and Anvarthopamāyukta Rūpaka from the four other varieties.

The whole metaphor of sacrifice is here applied to the battle:

The poet uses a romantic metaphor, when he figuratively represents amorous women as warriors moving victoriously:

In verse VI,104 the poet has compared Rāma with the rainy season and Vālāzin with the Sun. The verse is an example of Anvarthopamāyukta Rūpaka, as here the Rūpaka is associated with the Upamā मधुरस्थितियांवाहिनीलमूं रामेः
Ardharūpakas as they are identified by the MSS. and Jayamāṅgala in Canto X, occur rather frequently in these cantos, e.g.,

कुर्च्यनूर चुक्लिं धक्ष्यति दुर्गविथिं धीस्यति सुनस्यति मां मन्यम्।

रामद्वैतसंदेशो आयोजितक्षुणिर्मिताम।

प्रेमकन्तोपाध्यायदपस्य उपिष्यनार।

- I, 23; VIII, 72.

Of the two varieties of Udāra, he has illustrated that variety, which describes the prosperity and splendour of the subject in hand. The verse in question describes the splendour of Lāṅkā:

आहो प्रविष्कया पपय मम सदनकालिन्मिः।

बलस्य-धरकर्मर्म च उने दण्डकोऽस मन्निधिः सदा॥

-V, 27.

Of the three varieties of Śīṣṭa, the poet has here illustrated Upamāśīṣṭa wherein this grammarian poet compares Śabarī to pragṛhyapada:

प्रमुष्कपदवन साध्विः स्पष्टस्मामविक्रियाम्।

अग्रह्यं वीकांलावध् ग्रुष्यामनिन्दिताम॥

-VI, 61.

Utpreksā is found to be the most frequent alaṅkāra in Bhaṭṭikāvyā. The poet seems to be especially adept in the use of this alaṅkāra. Corresponding to उपमा कृतिन्यास्य we can say: उन्नेत्रस्माभि।

In the description of Ayodhyā, given in the first canto, we come across a fine Utpreksā, which later alaṅkārīkas would call Svarupotpreksā:
The banks, on seeing their own glory stolen by waters through the riparian forests reflected therein, displayed as if in rage, the beauty of the water lilies by means of blooming land-lotuses:

The Utpreksā used in the description of Sītā contains fine imagery:

Rāma, separated from Sītā after the abduction, imagines that the garland of flowers hung on the branch was withering as if out of sorrow in Sītā's absence:

Again in the description of Laṅkā, the poet imagines that the Moon rose in the East as if desiring to see Laṅkā:
The poet imagines that the Moon sets before the ladies awoke, because the Moon disliked to be compared with the beautiful ladies, who possessed side-long glances and amorous speeches:

The Rāga (denoting redness as well as passion) located in the eyes being produced in the love-lorn mind, shone as if looking at each other's face out of curiosity:

The closing of the eyes in the case of lovers is imagined to be caused out of intolerance for the other sense organs:

A good example of Nidārāna is found in the speech of Rāvana, who points out to Sītā that one who can extract milk from stone can only achieve happiness from Rāma:

Sītā's answer to Rāvana also illustrates this figure:

Rāvana's haughty speech before the assembly also contains the same figure:
The description of Mt. Suvela which looked like Himavat too, contains Nidarsana:

\[ \text{गादसमिरणसुसूर्यभृत्रोनुसूर्यारिधरसूर्य-} \]
\[ \text{धवलजनवाहिमाला सम्ब्रह्मिहिमधरधरलीलूम} \]

-XII,77.

The poet while emphasising the continuance of Rāma's religious duties even in separation, gives a good Arthāntaranyāsa:

\[ \text{वयस्निति क्रिया धन्यो च काले नामवचनो क्रियान्} \]
\[ \text{महत्त्वो हि क्रिया जित्या छिद्रे नैवायक्षर्दिनि} \]

-VI,24.

Describing the insatiability of lovers, the poet remarks that satisfaction being contrary would not hold good in love:

\[ \text{सम्ब्रास्तुरी नैव तुलोश्च वौक्षण्णति प्रेमिण्यं कुनौ विरुद्ध} \]

-XI,11.

Vibhīṣaṇa's appeal to Rāvana to remedy the critical situation, contains a good illustration of Arthāntaranyāsa of the same type:

\[ \text{तस्मात् कुरु वं अल्पकारमसिद्धं सन्तहात मया रावणं भ्रात्यर्मणं} \]
\[ \text{वद्वितैं दुःखाविवृत्तेऽरिमाय पदरथे परिणमपराध्यम} \]

-XII,74.

In all these verses, Vīšeṣa is corroborated by Sāmānya.

Some fine illustrations of Vārttā are found in the description of the autumn given by Bhaṭṭi in Canto II.

For instance, the natural beauty of the paddy fields pleased Rāma:
The multitude of the deer amused Rāma:

On seeing Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa the people of Mithilā entertain doubts whether these two were Mitra and Varuṇa or the twin Aswins. Bhattī has given here a good example of Sasandeha:

Doubts of different kinds arise in the minds of romantic lovers, awakening after a love-night:

The poet while describing the speedy flight of Hanumāt over the ocean, gives a good example of Atisayokti:

Again, in the boastful remarks of Prahastā on the eve of the great battle, the same figure is found:

In Bhattikāvya, we find good examples of the figure Yathāsamkhya.
In the following speech, Rāvana ridicules Rāma's exploits one by one:

पुनः बालसिष्ये निष्ठल् कबन्धरवतनादकः।
तपस्यी यदि काव्यरः कौटुक कवयोऽणसति॥

-IX,120.

Again, another good example of the same figure is found in his speech, describing the destruction wrought by Rāma and Hanūmat:

हना अनस्यानसदो निकाया: कौला सितोन्वतान्भटुम्ना पु:।
सदासिं दम्मानि विशेषसिमित् यदूथुःना तदुर्दयुं नासिमल्॥

-XII,5.

Bhaṭṭi has given examples of Virodha in some verses.

The first verse of the poem refers to the eternal God, choosing (on being born as Rāma) Dasāratha as His father, under the pretext of doing good to the word:

अभृत्तः तुप्पो विपुलोरः परलाप: ब्रुनाक्षिनो दशरथ इत्युदाहन:।
गुणेष्वरे भवाकीतस्यादेन ये समान: पित्रमुपागमनः स्वयम्॥

-I,1.

The four princes of Dasāratha dwelt alike in the hearts of the people, though the latter were of different disposition:

बैकोऽकुयोशतिकवीत्रो ध्रुवाधिः शस्यांभयायमन्त निष्ठरागि।
ते नित्रष्टील्यपि मानसानि समं ज्ञातो: गुणिनोऽध्यात्म:॥

-I,16.

The author while describing the amorous ladies observes that the collarium was applied to the eyes, though they were (naturally) beautiful. The lip, though naturally red, was reddened by means of the betel leaf, and the mouth (naturally fragrant) was endowed with perfume:

चित्रंपि बालान्यपि योऽक्तानि नाम्बुख्नर्तकं च स्त्रामोदस्मणु।
कृर्षेन सत्सनं च सुगन्धिः बल्लेन चाचे जनं कैतलपञ्चापाम्॥

-XI,24.
The use of the सब्दालाह्कर्ण Anuprasa may be illustrated as follows:

II,45.

Sometimes the poet combines two (or more) alāhkāras in a single verse. For example, there is Samsrsti of Upamā and Virodha when the author describes Rāvaṇa's glance, which, though lovingly cast, inspired awe like the Lord of Snakes:

-XII,10.

Rāvaṇa is here described as subduing luminaries by means of his prowess, though his figure resembled the mass of darkness.

The following alāhkāras, though used sparingly, may be noticed in this context:
Miscellaneous Characteristics

The author of Visnudharmottara Purāṇa at the end of the chapter lays down that a poem should be endorsed with 'Dharma' and 'Artha'. He has not mentioned 'Mokṣa' deliberately, because according to him it is the subject of 'Itihasa'. He holds that 'Sāstra' is one, which preaches 'Dharma', 'Artha', 'Kāma' and 'Mokṣa'.

1. VDP., III, XV, 15:

2. Ibid.,2: मोक्षस्य योगोपन्यास इतिहासास्य उच्चाये |

3. Ibid.,1: धर्मथिथि काममोक्षाणां शास्त्रेऽप्रयोगमेवाद |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Term</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upamarupaka</td>
<td>(III, 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīsesokti</td>
<td>(II, 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udāra</td>
<td>(V, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyatireka</td>
<td>(V, 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samāsokti</td>
<td>(XI, 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetu</td>
<td>(XII, 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Īrjasvī</td>
<td>(V, 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utprekṣāvayava</td>
<td>(XI, 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamāśīṣṭa</td>
<td>(VI, 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Īśīḥ</td>
<td>(XIX, 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, Bhāmaha lays emphasis on the preaching of 'Artha' among the four Puruṣārthas, while Dāṇḍin simply mentions that it should depict the four ends of human life.

In selecting the story of Rāma as the subject of his Mahākāvyya, Bhaṭṭi seems to have laid emphasis on 'Dharma', as the purpose of incarnation of Rāma is to uproot the tyrannous rule of Rākṣasas and to establish the rule of righteousness. The Dharmaśāstra character of Rāmāyaṇa from which the poet draws his material corroborates this assumption.

The personal cause on the part of Rāma for his battle with Rāvaṇa is reattainment of Sītā abducted by Rāvaṇa. Accordingly, the abduction and reattainment of Sītā gives scope for the depiction of 'Kāma' (Love) in separation and in reunion.

Rāma's coronation on his return to Ayodhya and his performance of Aśvamedha sacrifice afford topics of 'Artha' in the form of the acquisition of the Kingdom and the ascendency of his power. Thus the character of Rāma embodies

1 Bhāmaha, Kāvyalāṅkāra, I, 121: चतुर्भोज व भिंत्रान्विति भृगवाण्यथादेशकृतः
2 Dāṇḍin, Kāvyādāra, I, 15: चतुर्भोज व भिंत्रान्विति च भृगवाण्यथादेशकृतः

In this context, it is worth noting that Dāṇḍin correspondingly incorporates topics of 'Kāma' with those of 'Dharma' and 'Artha' in his list of topics for description.
a unique combination of 'Dharma', 'Artha' and 'Kāma', which ultimately leads one to 'Mokṣa'.

The reattainment of the wife and the kingdom, appears to be the immediate motto of Rāma's undertakings, but the material aims are also intermingled with 'Dharma', embodied in Rāma's sense of duty of protecting the wife and the kingdom. In this sense, the pursuit of 'Dharma' becomes inseparable from 'Artha' and 'Kāma'.

The author of VDP lays down certain negative characteristics by specifying what a poet should avoid.

Accordingly, he points out that a poem should not be opposed to Sabdaśāstra (grammar) i.e. it should not involve usages contrary to grammar. This applies very favourably to Bhattikāvya, which is composed by a great grammarian.

The author of VDP lays down that a poet should not employ such words, the syllables of which are difficult to pronounce.

As a good poet Bhaṭṭi has avoided this blemish in many cantos such as those of the Prasannakāṇḍa.

But some usages of such words are unavoidable in illustrations of the rules of grammar, especially in Cantos V and VI. Such usages may be illustrated as follows:

1 VDP.,III,XV,9: छन्दोविन्दितं गयं शब्दशास्त्रविरोधं स
2 Ibid.: कृष्णदर्पद्यामणमोदितवचनाचिनतम्
The author of VHP makes it clear that it should not be endowed with obscene expressions. Probably the same characteristic is meant by Bhamaha in his expression अग्रान्य सब्द in the definition of a mahākāvyā.

In Bhaṭṭikāvyā, we can say that the author has observed much restraint even in portraying the sexual pleasures of Rākṣasas and Rākṣasis. He has nowhere crossed the limit of propriety.

The author of VHP enjoins that a poet should not use sentences, the meaning of which is difficult to guess.

2 *Kāvyālahākara*, I, 19: अग्रान्यसादनां च साल्क्विन सदासयम् ||
3 However in one verse, VIII, 40, the sandhi between 'surām' and 'alam' gives rise to the obscene word 'mala' which denotes an obscene object, but the obscenity lies only in the extraneous verbal form and not in the real sense.
4 *VDP*, III, XV, 10.
On the whole, Bhatti expresses his ideas lucidly. However, his expressions sometimes become rather obscure. This is mainly on account of the self-imposed additional aim of illustrating rules of Grammar and Poetics. For instance,

\[ \text{VI,67.} \]

There should not be uncommon words in a mahākāvya according to the author of VDP, but Bhatti cannot avoid this especially when he has to illustrate peculiar grammatical forms. For example,

\begin{align*}
\text{IV,10} & \quad \text{कण्ठरः} & \quad \text{VI,94} & \quad \text{नारिंध्रस्मान} \\
\text{V,38} & \quad \text{लूज्रः} & \quad \text{VI,128} & \quad \text{रघुचक्रुर्विन} \\
\text{V,56} & \quad \text{आधानकुर्वकण्ठस्य} & \quad \text{VII,58} & \quad \text{अनिव्विधप्रण} \\
\text{VI,64} & \quad \text{देवधानविहः} & \quad \text{VII,65} & \quad \text{निनिव्विधनकृच्छन} \\
\text{VI,66} & \quad \text{पुष्पाश्च्यिनिकांश्च} & \quad \text{IX,17} & \quad \text{कामधिनस्मान} \\
\end{align*}

1 VDP, III, XV, 10: तस्माद्विपया क्षक्षक्षत्रप्रियाभिधानवन्
The author of VDP further enjoins that a mahākāvyā should also be free from 'Punarukti', which is however allowed in such emotions as wonder, jealousy, fear, sorrow, hurry, joy, etc, in the speech of a messenger, in a dream-speech\(^1\), in the speech of a person who has come for some work and in other contexts where repetitions are desired. The poet should not make statements which are doubtful, irrelevant, inconsistent and irreprehensible.

On examining Bhattikāvyā from this point of view, it is found that this Mahākāvyā is entirely free from such blemishes.

The additional characteristics specified by Bhāmaha\(^2\) are as follows:

i. अध्ययनम्  
ii. नानियत्त्वत्त्वम्  
iii. युक्तं लोकस्त्रेष्यायन

the last one being also given by Daṇḍin\(^3\).

Here 'arthya' obviously means 'appropriate in sense'. This characteristic in fact applies to any good composition\(^4\).

---

1 VDP,III,XV,10-12. 
2 Op. Cit.,I,20-21: पञ्चमिः साधनोऽपि नानियत्त्वत्त्वम् || युक्तं लोकस्त्रेष्यायन रसैणम् सकाति: प्राथम् || 
3 Op. Cit.,I,19: सर्वश्र भिक्षुवृतोत्सर्वे लोकस्त्रेष्यायन || 
4 The enhanced aspect of this characteristic is known as Arthagaurava (depth of meaning) and is well known in relation to the poem of Bhāravi.
Bhattikāvyā, though involving a double purpose, hardly lacks in this merit.

As regards 'nātivyākhyeya', it may appear apparently that Bhattikāvyā is mostly inexplicable without the aid of a commentary. But when viewed as a Kathākāvyā, Bhattikāvyā is definitely not such as would require to be expounded excessively. Its 'vyākheyatva' in fact applies only to the illustrative aspect of the Mahākāvyā and that also especially in the case of the Prakāṇakāṇḍa and Adhikārakāṇḍa.

Bhāmaha lays down that a mahākāvyā should reflect the nature of the people ('lokasvabhāva') while Dandin holds that it should propitiate the people. This signifies that a mahākāvyā should reflect the nature of the people and propitiate their minds as well.

Bhāṭṭi's narration of the life of Rāma seems reflecting the nature of the people to a large extent and accordingly it seems quite appreciable in its aspect of Kathākāvyā.

1 Bhāṭṭi's remark (XXII,34) may here be taken as his self-expression about this peculiarity, but the real significance of this remark seems to be a different one, as well be seen later on.

2 Op. Cit., I,21:

3 Kāvyādarsā, I, 19.
The author of VDP, while giving the characteristics of a mahākāvyā, lays down in the end that it should be endowed with 'Kalākausāla'. Here 'Kalā' obviously means 'Kāvyakalā'.

A good poetic composition is expected to be replete with poetic art, which contains various aspects, but probably the Purāṇa means that a mahākāvyā should be endowed with dexterity in the poetic art, specially in the form of Guṇas, Alaṅkāras, Metres etc. This characteristic is comparable to one given by Bhāmaha, wherein he enjoins that a mahākāvyā should be 'rddhimat' i.e. endowed with magnitude or excellence. Probably 'rddhi' in this context corresponds to 'kalākausāla' in VDP. Here 'rddhi' seems to denote Guṇa (excellence) and Chhanda (Metre) in particular as they are not mentioned specifically anywhere else.

As Rasa is already given a separate treatment here, we take into consideration Guṇa, Alaṅkāra, Chhanda, etc. in this characteristic. On reviewing Bhattikāvyā from this standpoint, it may be remarked that the Mahākāvyā contains several Guṇas throughout, and devotes two entire cantos to the illustrations of Mādhurya and Bhāvikatva. As regards Alaṅkāra, we have already dealt with it before, as it finds

1 Op. Cit., I, 20:

2 VDP gives no separate treatment to Alaṅkāra as well, but Bhāmaha makes a reference to it in the definition.
specific mention in the definitions given by Bhāmaha and Dandin.

Similarly the metrical aspect of Bhāttikāvyya, is reviewed in detail before in the elaboration of the characteristic given by Dandin¹.

¹ However, this characteristic does not occur in the definitions given by VDP and Bhāmaha.