Agreement and disagreement of CP with Vidyadhara, Mallinatha and Narayana.

In this chapter, an attempt is made to compare certain points of agreement and disagreement of CP with other three important commentators, and to bring out the excellence of CP.

Under I.134, the word sacitra-vairakya - krpam is explained almost similarly by all the four with a few changes. V. explains citra as 'स्त्रान्तत्वप्रवति' and N. explains 'अनुरुपा' - 'वापण्यातिल'. All of them have justified the word by saying that because it is the speech of a bird in a human manner, the king is astonished. Only N. gives optional meaning which has a fault called 'दुराधावय' of the word 'हेमापाक्ष' i.e. golden wings from I.130.

Many a times, wherever there is an opportunity, CP. clearly explains the intention of the poet by giving a syllogism. While others offer simple explanation. Thus the word 'त्रियानालत्व' (IV.77) is explained by CP with the syllogism as under:-

\[
\text{अन्यानुसार} \quad \text{अन्यामाल} \quad \text{अन्यामित्र} \quad \text{अन्यानान्वित} \quad \text{अन्यानान्वित} \\
\text{अन्यानुसार} \quad \text{अन्यामाल} \quad \text{अन्यामित} \quad \text{अन्यानान्वित} \quad \text{अन्यानान्वित}
\]

CP. prefixes the honorific word 'Sri' to the names of the gods etc., while others give only synonym. Thus under III.32 the word 'मर्द' (V.M. Bhava, N. Hara) is explained by CP as 'मर्दसया' = 'Sri महादेवया', while Vandip say 'Bhāṣya' and N- 'Harasya'.

Under IXI.75, the word 'सिखो' is not given due justice by V.M. and N. even with the proper and exact synonym. Only CP explains it 'मर्द' in details as one of the five brothers viz.
Vaisvanara, Ghapati, Yavistha, Pāvaka and Sātvika. The word sikhi refers to the last one i.e. Sātvika. To corroborate this meaning, CP quotes Rgvedānukramani and Brahaddevta, with the full mythology of the disappearance of Sātvika fire. This is not irrelevant, because the poet refers to it with the words विविधस्य न्यितिः: and CP seems to do better justice to the poet.

The siglum ananda of the poet is brought out, first of all by CP. V. is silent over this. M. corroborates the word with the dictum of शाबांश्यायकराः सहायतादीति सहायतादीति etc. N, clearly points out that अनित्य स्वस्तिताणित्य अनन्तः अनन्तकामिविद कालम्! Thus N, reiterates the statement of CP.

The exactness also an outstanding feature of CP. The words like cikitsā (V.85), anikṣā (VI.43) are explained by him with exact connotation. Cikitsā is the medical treatment (ausadhopacarat) V. explains it as only treatment (upacārah)

M. does not say anything. N on the contrary explains it as remedy (Pratikāya)

Similarly the word anikṣā is explained by CP as an non-observance (anikṣanam) as well as non-seeing (anavalokanam). V. gives both the words viz. anikṣanam and anavalokanam but not in its meaning. He only uses them in different places on synonyms. M, calls it as anirikṣa, while N. explains it as anavalokanam.

In case of neuter forms wherever there is a possibility of confusion regarding the subject and the object the singular forms of nominative and the accusative (e.g. being similar) CP adds the word विनिर्देशित etc. Thus under I. 19, कथा निद्रितहस्यानजसि -४५, योगमन्त्र; | | is explained as अर्थात् अस्वागत योगमन्त्र विनिर्देशित। एवं तथा et. V. and M. are silent on this. But N. explains it in a similar way N. takes the above explanation as the second one, while the first one is शोभा कर्त्तव्योऽवधारणा विनिर्देशित etc. (Vide II.27).
The word bandha (III.124) is explained by as the particular love postures (karana) such as pañkajāsana, Venudārīta etc. as described by Vātsyāyana etc. in their works on erotics. V. explains it like CP but without any reference to Vātsyāyana. N. omits the word Venudārīta and calls it surata-bandhas. Only M. differs here and explains it as love-postures like uttāna (or uttānaka).

Some peculiar grammatical forms of words are not explained properly by V. M. and N. e.g. the word ganeṣa (III.60) is explained fully by CP by giving detailed grammatical steps of its formation. V. is silent, because he does not want to make his commentary an arena of scholarship. M. and N. simply explain it with the viz. 1. vide chap. 3, sect. vyakaraṇa.

Under X.34, the word anyonyabhāsa, is explained by V. and CP, as the language of the different states such as (V. omits Gurjara), while M. and N. do not mention the name of any state.

The mythology of Sarasvatī XI 64 is being a sort of Lord Visnu is given in the āgama. V and N are silent and do not comment on it. But CP and M make the point clear.

1. Vide chap. 3, sect. vyakaraṇa etc.

2. देवी परिवर्तनालुकुलाधारायां इति.

3. अग्नि श्रीद्राक्षरसमथोऽविनिरापत्ता परिवर्तनेति।

4. उपमेतत्सरसवत् हि देवस्य दिविनावहारश्चिं इत्यादिमः।

5. वद्दिद...
Thus CF is more precise in giving appropriate meanings and thereby does better justice to the poem.

In the beginning of each canto the introductory remark given by CF relate the preceding canto with the canto at hand. V and M. are silent on this style, while N. gives only a single sentence to introduce the canto at hand. CF. gives longer introductory remarks to introduce the canto on hand properly.

The word naisthika XVII·113 is explained by CF in a traditional way with the etymological meaning न यस्तक्षमेन (one who leads his entire life, i.e. till his death, with the teacher) and quotes आकाशलह्नस्य (II.49) etc. to support his explanation. Here M. explains it as भाज्यजनी श्रन्नस्य अवतिप्राकार.'

N. explains it as शुद्धकालमिदः and quotes the same verse.

In case of the readings, CF does not accept any reading which is not grammatically correct or requires—ought.

The reading bhajata under XI.24 and kusurasnusu under XII.66 are not correct ones. Even though V. accepts bhajata (and not tyajata). N. accepts both under XI. 24, though N. mentions the reading tyajata for bhajata. Both these readings are accepted by M.

Thus V. and CF. xii accept the reading vroiti X.18 and not bhajeta which is accepted by M. and N.
The verse X. 33 has alternative stanza which is given by CP as अस्मिन्तपुरस्तिम्य . V. is silent. M. comments this verse viz. अस्मिन्तपुरस्तिम्य etc. N. again accepts this second reading as the another reading.

The reading of navaloka (XII.62) is accepted by CP. and M. while N. accepts varaloka. At the same time, under XVI.75, CP's reading is nyadhustamam, and he gives another reading vyadhustamam, which is accepted by V. and M.

As far as the discussions on various topics and explanations in various ways are concerned, CP is unique because V. gives importance to the literary aspect in his commentary. M. thinks himself satisfied by quoting various lexicons. While N. makes the poem an arena of hair-splitting and far-fetched explanations. Handiqui K.K. Nc. "The commentary of Mallinatha is particularly rich in lexicographical quotations" Intro. P.XXXV.

Wherever CP. records variant readings, N. accepts CP's variant reading as the main reading. Many of his explanations are borrowed verbatim by him from the commentary of CP.

I end this chapter with the remark of Handiqui - "Candu-pandita seems to have realised that Naisadha was essentially a learned poem, and must be approached with the full equipment of the traditional learning."