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RASAMAÑJARI - A DETAILED STUDY

The contribution of Kerala to commentorial literature is very great. Rasamañjarī of Pūrṇasarasvatī offers a criticism in the light of discriminating good and bad and forming an integral view. The discussion on aesthetic theories, dramaturgy, poetics, history of Sanskrit classical and lexicographical literature, Kāmaśāstra, Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa, Sāńkhya and Yōga raises the commentary to the level of criticism.

Characteristic features of Rasamañjarī commentary

Rāsamañjarī, plays a pivotal role in pushing open the doorway to the wonderful world of erudition and imagination. The commentator reveals his intellectual capabilities and knowledge in almost all the branches of ancient learning by closely reading and interpreting views of the author of Mālatīmādhava.
The sheer lyricism of his words, the simplicity of his poetic idiom and the sharp insightful comments brought out reputation and inspired a legion of admirers. Here an attempt is made to point out the salient features of Rasamañjarī as also the remarkable poetic qualities of Pūrṇārasasvatī.

**Erudition**

Pūrṇārasasvatī considers his work, Rasamañjarī, monumental one in the realm of commentorial literature. So he wants the readers to accept his work which has given a detailed description of the prakaraṇa, the Mālatīmadhava. He knows that his commentary is too voluminous. To bring out the sense fully as intended by the playwright, he had to explain in detail and so the work became large. He requests the readers to ignore this defect:

```
वकु शक्योधर्यांक्तरो न विना विस्तरं मिराम।
अत: प्रथनदीविंस्मिन् सदा सहस्ते स्वयम् ॥
```

It is necessary that the commentary need to be more elaborate to bring out the whole meaning. So the enlightened readers are requested to disregard the flaw of its being voluminous one.
Even though the commentary is vast and elaborate it cannot be considered as a defect. Actually it is informative, educative and thought provoking since every word that emerged from his genius carries the spark of intelligence. That is why he himself calls his work, a prakaraṇatilaka.²

Pūrṇasarasvatī’s comparisons are very beautiful as that of Kālidāsa.

The following verse proves the statement true.

भवसमभवभूतिप्रात्यचेतर्म्यसोपिनि
प्रकरणतिलकेःस्मिन् भालतीमाधववाहे।
विभरणकृतिताप्पि करुनाहि विगाहें
तनुसरणानाहास्तत्र संतो रमन्ताम्।।

Both Bhāva (Lord Śiva) and Bhavabhūti stand on equal terms; with regard to the dramaturgy; the former was progenitor and the latter its propagator by writing plays. Hence this comparison has a grace of its own.

Pūrṇasarasvatī has a rare capacity to use beautiful words.

In the verse at the beginning of the commentary:
The same word is repeated as Dhanañjaya and dhanam jayam in different senses.

While commenting upon the sentence³:

अन्तःस्तं च यात्राभुव्यप्रभवतिस्य महतः पौरवेगमणस्य सञ्ज्ञ्यलेन विषयिताया तस्या आगमोऽस्मि,

Pūrṇasarasваті points out the meaning of Naigama as vaṇija, merchants. In support of his view he has quoted Amara and Vaijayantī:-

निगगे भवं: नेगमः पत्तनवत्तिनो वण्जाः।
पूर्ण सुरी पुरीगणया वा पत्तनं पुट्ठेवैनाम् स्थानायं निगम: इत्यमः।
निगमो निश्चये वेदे पुरे पाध्व वण्जक्यवे इति वेजवती।

The former is not of much use. The second quote is useful to support his explanation especially the portion vaṇिकपमथेः which means nigama (street of merchants). This shows that Pūrṇasarasваті is acquainted with several works in k०śa literature.

Pūrṇasarasvatī shows uncanny knack in clarifying certain ideas precisely expressed by Bhavabhūti by using plural number
etc. These ideas become clear to the reader only through the words of Pūrṇasarasvatī. It seems that other commentators are silent on this aspect. The following examples prove his efficiency in explaining such suggestions beautifully.

1. The word vadanavidhutayaḥ in the Nāndīsloka is explained as mukhakampanāni.

Pūrṇasarasvatī comments that the actions to prevent impediments are intended by the plural,

2. bahuvacanēna ēkasyārthasya prārabdhasya anēkārthānubandhitvaḥ dyōtyate

3. prītayaḥ parasparaprēṇa nibandhanāni sukhāni.

bahuvacanēna viṣayabāhulyam sūcyate.

Multiplicity is indicated by the plural.

4. Bahuvacanēna dvāraikyē sarvātmanā pidhātum prayatnaḥ kriyate, api sarvatō dvāratvē kā pratīkārāpratyāśēti dyōtyate.

Who can close the doors opened by the fate? Only god can. Plural suggests the multiplicity of the ways.
5. Bahuvacanēna bahumukhatvaṁ manōrathasya vyajyatē.

The plural usage indicates the diversity of the desire.


Frequency is suggested by the plural.

Pūrṇasarasvatī discloses the charm of the scene intended by the dramatist. In act VI, Mālatī decides to commit suicide and tries to get the assent of Lavaṅgikā. Then a situation is created according to which Mādhava, who was also there unnoticed by Mālatī, takes the place of Lavaṅgikā. Mālatī embraces him thinking him to be Lavaṅgikā and says

इत्यादिनिः

दर्शनं पुनः बायोत्योधेन प्रक्षणया अपरिचितम न लभ्यते।

Here Pūrṇasarasvatī comments that the union or even touch of the beloved, though imaginary, gives joy of a particular level. He adds that the reason for trickling down of tears may be the memory of her relatives or because of the assent being got.

It is worth mentioning that every word or every syllable that emerges from his pen carries the spark of a luminous intelligence. His capacity to quibble is evident in the verse at the beginning of the commentary,
Let that Guru, Purnajyotis be present in my mind who is capable of explaining everything in the world, who is a devotee of Krishna by whose advice I am devoid of all the darkness of ignorance and who has attained salvation.

This verse can also be explained as follows:

Let the handsome supreme dwell in my mind by whose advice Arjuna lost all his ignorance and later attained salvation who himself is everything in the world.

Another example for his capacity to quibble can be seen in the following verse at the beginning of the commentary.

Please receive happily this bunch of amusable ones spreading the fragrance of the Malati flowers and the
spring season. This verse has a prabandhakāṭakṣa, a reference to his own work.

Please accept happily this Rasamañjarī commentary which explains the joy of Mālatīmādhava.

Here it is likely that Pūrṇasarasvatī hints at the characters by the word Mālatī which is the name of the heroine and using the word Mādhava which denote the particular period, spring season or the time of union of the hero and the heroine. Another indication is that Mādhava, the spring season should be presented for the development of Mālatī (which stands for love). Cupid is powerful in the spring season. So he is called vasantasakhaḥ. He is powerful in spring season and the active participation of cupid is necessary wherever love is to succeed. The verse throws light into his deep insight and aesthetic sense.

The commentator’s discussion about the employment of particular words deserves special attention. The explanation of the following verse proves this.

वे नाम के चित्र्द न: प्रयवन्वथवः
ज्यातिति से किमः पात्र प्रति नेष यतः।

191
Those who are publicly disparaging me knew very well that I have not written my work for them. Someone of my disposition (who is qualified to appreciate this composition) may be born hereafter or may even be living now; for time is endless and the earth vast.

The sense of the word \textit{tu} is interpreted in a different way. He says that using a sentence having the indeclinable \textit{tu} which normally denotes a difference. Here if we take the sentence to convey the literal sense, it indicates pride which cannot be appreciated as a good quality. Actually the commentator has two options here, either to take the literal sense or switch on to indicate the playwrights good qualities. He has chosen the latter.

In order to substantiate his view, he quoted the śruti-

\textit{Ācāryavān puruṣō vēja.} One who is having a real preceptor acquires the knowledge of Brahman and consequently he himself becomes Brahman who is eternal. Such a person needs nothing else and he cannot be self conceited. What Pūrṇasarasvatī means
is that the expression utpatsyatē tu mama kōpi samānadharmā made by Bhavabhūti who had a preceptor of high rank is to be taken as an outflow of confidence. The above idea is clearly stated in the very beginning of the commentary.

वस्त्र्य भाषा जगदभाविक मदुभासा भावि तन्महाः।
अविद्याविविद्ये तस्मी श्रीपृण्याःतीति नमः॥

I salute that guru, Sree Pūrṇajyothis who is the destroyer of all ignorance, by whose blessings all the worldly things are known to me and by which enlightenment, I attain the supreme.

Thus the commentator ignores the unpleasant sense of arrogance and resorts to a meaning which is quite befitting to qualify a great poet like Bhavabhūti.

The explanation of the following verse shows his rational thinking.

मा गृह्वत् खलु भक्तमन्यञ्जनम्
मा ते मलोमसदिकारयना मतिप्रूपः।
इत्यादि नमिष निरर्थकणेव यस्मिन्
कामशर्च जुम्भितगुणो नवयौवं च॥ (1.35)

Let not the self-born god (Kama) infatuate you, let not
the judgement be thickly overclouded with impure passion, this and the like advice is verily no avail. Kama and budding youth have already exerted their influence.

Here the word ca is repeated. Pūrṇasarasvatī observes that:

चकारभाग्यं ज्वलनपत्वं शौरिव तुल्ययोगे परस्मरोपयायक्लबत्
दुनिवारल्यं घोर्वते।

He means that as fire and wind influence each by increasing the heat caused by the other so do cupid and the young age. Even the presence of either of them is enough to make advices futile, when both of them are strongly present, it is clear that advices are no more useful.

The following verse shows the commentator’s special interest and efficiency to draw whatever expression the dramatist has in his mind from the very word used by the dramatist.

निश्च्योत्ततो सुतन्तु! कवरीविन्दवो यावदेते
याचन्यध्या स्तनमुकुर्ध्योगाङ्रेयभावं ज्ञाति।
यावत्कसन्यत्रस्तनमुकुर्ध्योगाङ्रेयस्यध्यभस्यमि-
स्तनदुर्गां चिरां सकृद्धोहकपालो प्रसीद।। (8.2)

Fair damsel, whilst these drops are yet falling from
your tresses, whilst the interval between your budding breasts is till moist and whilst your soft tender frame is yet blooming with bristling hair, be pleased, and give a close embrace at least once.

Here the word vitara is explained to suggest that you do not experience any difficulty in granting my request⁶. But as far as I am concerned, it is like obtaining a treasure.

Again the word tatastha in Act I verse 17, we may take it normally to mean the person who is not engaged, udāsīna. But the commentator takes it to indicate a secondary meaning, one who is standing on the bank and not indulge in the water. He says as if a crane sitting on the bank of a pond intending to capture fishes, swallows and keeps mum, so is the minister who is not in the scene but playing behind the curtain. This is an example of his insightful comment.

Dr. T.G. Mainkar in his ‘Studies in Sanskrit Dramatic Criticism’ quoting Pūrṇasarasvatī opines that there is no need for lakṣaṇa in this context. But the intention of Pūrṇasarasvatī seems to be otherwise⁷.
Pūrṇasarasvatī possessed remarkable mastery in poesy. The introductory verses of the commentary eloquently declare his poetic abilities. Even preface to Rasamañjarī is composed in verse-

प्रथमं प्रकन्धमुखक्षणेणिनं
परदेवतासमरणमद्विगलादि काँ।
रसिकान्त प्रति प्रकरणानि योन्मुखः
कविराद करीति भवभूतिराशिरम्।

Genuine reading

Pūrṇasarasvatī discusses different readings and states that his reading is correct by pointing out reasons in support of his view. The verse ‘kabālijta īva’ is accepted by earlier commentators as:

अभिरलिंगि दान्पता पौष्णकरिक नदः
स्नितं इव च दुस्थोलसा निर्भरेण।
कबलितं इव कृत्स्नशक्षुष्ण स्मारितेन
प्रसभमृतमेतेनेव सान्ृेण सिक्तः। (R1)

Pūrṇasarasvatī reads it as follows:
Here he gives reasons for accepting the second reading. When we use utprékṣa the reasons for it should be stated prior to the statement expressing the utprékṣa and the reasons for the utprékṣa can be seen in the first half of R2. Moreover the indeclinable ca being a conjunction holds together many things and in such cases ca is used at the end but not at the beginning parts. Here also snapitaḥ iva ca appears in the last line (R2 last line).

For e.g.: none uses as Rāmaśca Kṛṣṇaḥ but Rāmaḥ Kṛṣṇaśca. Though it may be correct to use any word at any place just because there is no grammatical rule regarding such uses, the usages are to be regulated by reason also. In his Mahābhāṣya Patañjali, the great Sanskrit grammarian, states that no rule regulating the use of a word prior to some other word or after some word is set. Words are derived and justified and placed
before the users. Those who use them are at liberty to use them at the places they like to. Unlike in English we may use पात्रमि आहारा or आहारा पात्रमि to indicate the meaning ‘bring the vessel’.

Rectification of blemishes

Rectification of poetical defects is another noteworthy feature of the commentary of पूर्णसरस्वति. The word murvarava in the नादीश्लोका, sānanda is incorrect. Rava is used to denote only the sound made by petty creatures like the frog as has been stated in the काव्यप्रासा. So it can be said that there is the poetic defect called prasiddhihatam.

So also the word bhavānīpatiḥ (P497). पूर्णसरस्वति has refuted the arguments of other commentators, bhavānīpatiśabdō bhanānyāḥ patanyantarapratītiṃ karoti. Here somebody has pointed out that the word Bhavānīpati indicates that there is another husband for Bhavāni. They say that the word Bhavāni itself means wife of Bhava i.e. Pārvatī. But पूर्णसरस्वति points out that where there are two senses denoted by the Yogaśakti or the sense of the particles conjoined or the
sense denoted by that word unknown to the common readers (rūḍhi) in such cases the latter is preferable to the other one. Here also Bhavānī can be taken as an equivalent to Pārvatī. He quotes the lexicon: śivā bhavānī rudrāṇī śarvani sarvamaṇḍalā. So there won’t be the defect pointed out by other commentators. Otherwise even in the word duhitṛpatiḥ, the sense, husband of a milking lady may be approved which is not at all acceptable. The word duhitṛpatiḥ means son-in-law.

**New meanings**

Elucidation of the originality of meaning is a unique quality which deserves special mention. In the verse

अपरस सम्भव ! दूरं

परिमलस्वलेलिनि केतकीकृलसुमे।

इह न हि मनुष्यगलाधि

भवति परं शूलमूर्तिर वरनम्॥ (P 444)

Oh beetle! go to distant place. Even when the ketaki flower is full of fragrance, you won’t get a single drop of honey from this because it is full of dust.

Here Pūrṇasarasvatī points out that the flower of kētakī also has
honey in it as it is a flower and that the poet does not want to negate the presence of honey but only the enjoyment of it because of the dust on it being an impediment for the experience.

**Explanation of apparent contradictions**

According to some there is incompatibility in the expression mākarandah parāgah in the verse:

\[
\text{दलयति परिशुष्यत्रोढतालोलिविपपण्डु-}
\text{स्तिमितिकरमुद्धे-नदवः प्राकः प्रकाशः}
\text{विययति पवनस्मुपरसावनुपुखः केतकीना-}
\text{मौभिनव इव सान्द्रो माकर-नदः परागः।। (VII - 1)}
\]

The rising early light of the moon, palish-white like the withering full-grown leaf of the palm tree, is chasing away the mass of darkness, as if the dense pollen of the ketaka flowers, rising upwards by the force of the wind, were gently moving in the sky.

One may doubt that the usage mākarandah parāgah is incorrect because the words mākarandah and parāgah denote one and the same thing. But Pūrṇasarasvatī explains it quoting the kōśa. mākarandah puṣparasāh parāgah sumanīrajaḥ and says that
is clear that mākarandaḥ and parīgaḥ are entirely different. In the word mākaranda the suffix an is given to denote redness and not just denoting the relation. The reading accepted by Jagaddhara is mandamandaḥ parīgaḥ instead of mākarandaḥ parīgaḥ. It can be seen that the reading taken by Pūrṇasarasvatī is charming.

He substantiated his view by stating that the word mākarandaḥ is used to indicate the redness of the pollen, otherwise it can not be compared to the twilight of the moon12.

Another point which deserves to be noticed is that his commentary reflects the then social problems also. This is evident from his comments on the words of Lavaṅgika in Act II (P.118) Though the textual context seems to be that of a gāndharva vivāha Pūrṇasarasvatī considers it a prājāpatya one. According to a popular code, gāndharva and rākṣasa types of marriages are acceptable among the kṣatriyās only. Here both the hero and the heroine are brahmins and therefore the indicated sense of gāndharva marriage cannot be correct. Besides bride’s father himself has the idea of giving her hands to Mādhava. Moreover the idea is blessed by their preceptor Kāmandakī. After discussing
the meaning of (VI-18) Kārrandakī’s advice to Mālatī and Mādhava prēyō mitraṇ bandhutā vā samagrāḥ; Pūrṇasarasvatī enters into an elaborate discussion on this problem, quotes from the smṛtis and then offers his conclusion that

अनया च बाधोपुक्तवा प्राणात्पत्तोऽध्यव विवाहों न तु गान्यं इति सुपितम्।।

Knowledge of various śāstrās

Pūrṇasarasvatī reveals his familiarity with the Sanskrit grammatical literature. He quotes the relevant rules of grammar while explaining the meaning in support of his view. He always quotes from other works which are well known and similar to the present usages. His profound knowledge in the Vyākaraṇa śāstra is evident when he finds out the grammatical defects occurred in the drama. But instead of correcting it, he just wants to substantiate it. In Act II P. 134, in the advice given by Kāmandakī to Mālatī there is a sentence, yat kila kauśikī śakuntaḷā duṣyantam apsaraḥ purūravasam cakamē ityākhyānavidaḥ ācakṣatē.

In ordinary case it is to be mentioned that the word apsara is incorrect as it is against Liṅgānuśāsana13. The word Apsaras
should be used in the plural number and in the feminine gender. But Bhavabhūti has used it in singular. He has supported the usage as it is used by a great poet. In support of this view he quotes: Sānumatī nāmāpsarāḥ from Śākuntālaṃ.

Pūrṇasarasvatī has acquired deep knowledge in the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga systems of philosophy. While commenting on the verse yadvedādhyanam, the doctrine of sāṅkhya and advaita are succinctly explained. His acquaintance with the principles of Tantrasāstra and Yogasāstra can also be seen in this commentary. While commenting upon the verse Ṣadadhikadaśanāḍī (Act V - I) this is very clear.

Another commendable feature of his commentary is the selection of genuine readings of the text.

अन्नयो जन्मतु च यस्तत्सारावशे
विश्वस्य थालित सम्म परमेश्वरंपि
तोड्यं प्रसिद्धविवधयः खलु विचजन्मा
मा लक्ष्यया तव कपालिकासहस्तमिभुवः

It is, indeed, he, the mind-born god, of well-known power, who affects equally the ordinary creatures
governed by the rajas and tamas qualities, the creator
of the universe and the supreme God; on no account,
therefore, should there be any concealment on your part
through bashfulness.

It is doubtful that the reading is antyēṣu jantuṣvapi. But actually
this is not possible because if the reading antyēṣu jantuṣvapi is
approved, the metre will be changed. The metre actually used is
vasantatiłaka. But the supposed reading makes it different. It
can be assumed that the indeclinable ca means api meaning a
difference. There is a possibility that the indeclinable api at the
end of the second line paramēśvarēpi is connected both to dhātari
and Paramēśvara by kākāśigjākanyāya or madhyamaṇīnyāya
The Commentator says api śabdāhyāṁ atyantaviruddhē köṭi
dvayē vṛttisāmāṇyasya vicitratvaṁ prakāśyatē.

Dhātṛ is the upādānakāraṇa of the world and creation takes
place by the desire of Parameśvara and so he is the nimittakāraṇa.
Actually the very same Brahman which is unique manifests as
light, darkness, wind, heat, coʻid etc. which we know are enemical
in their qualities. In the Nyāya system of philosophy they take
upādānakāraṇa and nimittakāraṇa as different ones. Something which turns to be another thing is the upādānakāraṇa and something which causes that change is to be taken as nimittakāraṇa. In the case of a pot mud or earth is the upādānakāraṇa and the process which turns it into the present form of a pot can be taken as nimittakāraṇa. This is a very good example for his deep scholarship in the Nyāya system of philosophy.

The allegorical interpretation given to the play at the end of the commentary reveals his religious and philosophical bent. He says here the hero's name is given as Mādhava to remind Nārāyaṇa, Lord of Lakṣmi. Also there is a saying 'Śrīgārō Viṣṇudaivatyam'. So it is meant to indicate that Lord Visnu himself is the hero here. The name Mālatī which denotes Jasmine is used to hint that the heroine herein is Lakṣmī herself. Devarāta can be taken to be Kāśyapa who has been sent by gods themselves to help the Lord who has taken birth on earth. The word Bhūrivasu means one who has much wealth. So is the sea having varieties of precious stones. So this name represents Milky Ocean. The word Makaranda stands for Paramēśvara himself who is the
Supreme unequalled bliss, vide, *raso vai saḥ*. The word Madayantika means one who makes fool of others by her charm. So it stands for Bhavānī who enraptures the world. Kāmandakī stands for bhakti or devotion with adequate power to grant wishes. Avalokitā stands for nīti which is always referred to by those who have descrimination. Buddhakasītā indicates *Sarasvatī* as she is protected by the enlightened. The name Lavaṅgikā stands for fame, *lavangi* is having much scent.

Kalahaṃsā stands for paramātmanantra which is sweet and uttered by murmurs which are not so clear. Aghorakahāṇḍa is adharma which is killing or hurting which is not ordered by the śrutiś and smṛtiś. Kapālakunḍala stands for *kapāla* i.e. human skull (destruction). And finally the name Saudāminī stands for knowledge which like the lightning flashes for a moment and dispels the darkness in the soul leads it onwards to the realization of the Lord.

**Śāstraic Principles**

The discussion regarding nāndī (beneficent verse) at the beginning of the commentary reveals his thorough knowledge in
dramaturgy. Pūrṇasarasvatī states that there are two types of Sūtradhāras.

i  nāndīsūtradhāra

ii  sthāpakasūtradhāra

The expression nāndyantē sūtradhāraḥ occurs after the verse sānandaṃ which according to the commentator is conducted by the nāndīsūtradhāra. The succeeding three verses are recited by another resembling him called sthāpakasūtradhāra. He carries on his discussions with quotations from Bharata, Kohala and Bādarāyaṇa.

Different sandhīs and their sandhyāṅgās, avasthās and arthapraśkritis are pointed out at the proper places. For e.g. in the first act Kāmandakī tells Avalokitā about the promise of Bhūrivasu and Devarāta regarding the marriage of their children. Pūrṇasarasvatī calls the mention of the promise the extension parikara limb of the opening. The promise is indicated as the bīja;

इत्य प्रतिज्ञा कार्यस्य मुख्यं वोजः,
कार्यस्य तत्कार्यविचारं पाणिग्रहस्य।(Page 40)
The analysis of the sandhi and sandhyāṅgās gives a wholesome view of the play.

**Aesthetic Approach**

As a commentator Pūrṇāsarasvatī takes care to point out dhvani at several places. He always uses the words iti dhvaniḥ, dhvanitam, dhvanyate, dyōtyate, vyajyate, pratiyate, vyanjayati, dhyotayati etc., while pointing out dhvani intended by the dramatist. While commenting on sarvaḥ hi saudāminyāḥ sambhāvyatē (P. 50) he observes that there is arthāntaraṣaṅkramitadhvani in the word Saudāminī which normally means the lightning which occurs in the atmosphere of the earth. In the other words divine. Here the word is used as a proper noun. The character Saudāminī is brough to the mind by the activities of Avalokitā. Saudāminī is said to have acquired divine powers doing penance. Saudāminī, lightning has divine powers by virtue of being strong electric current. As lightning can do so many miracles so has Avalokitā done things which were kept in the mind by Kāmandakī.

The commentary of the following verse proves that what
comes out of his pen are annotations:

कण्डूकुंभलिपिलेखणां सहचरां दत्तस्य कोटेऽ लिखन्।
पद्याय्यवृत्तकाणांचेव स्नेहाधिनिभृवः जयम्।
जागारेंवसल्लकीकिलिककरस्या स्वयम् कल्याणः।
धन्यो वन्यमल्लेन परिवंत्यारभवायमस्यति।। IX 32

Scratching with the point of his tusk his consort who has contracted her eyes on account of the scratching sensation, fanning her with the pleasing winds from the ears flapped in alternate succession, and feeding her with the half-chewed new sprouts of the sallaki, this happy wild elephant has been practising close familiarity.

The words, number and adjectives used in this verse are highly suggestive.

Each and every suggestion of the playwright is brought to light by Purṇārasavatī. Here by the expression kaṇḍū kuḍmaḷitēktionām the poet suggests that the sweet-heart is standing experiencing the bliss of the soft touch of the tusk. Again the word sahacarī suggests that she is always accompanying
him. This is meant to indicate that she can’t leave him even for a moment. Here the expression likhan suggest that the touch is as that of a nail and indicates the blissful experience. Here we can read as dantasya kōtyā ālikhan. If so we can say that the use of the indeclinable a indicates the softness of the touch.

The expression jagdhardhaiḥ indicates that the tusker gives to his mate the fresh sprouts which are tastiest after making them the quality test by consuming a part of them. Madhava, the hero, used the word dhanyah to indicate that the tusker is fortunate but he himself is unfortunate (because he has no such sweet experiences). The adjective vanya suggests that the tusker is free to wander anywhere he wants to. Here also we may see that this indicates that Madhava is having no such liberty as he is the son of a minister. The expression abhyasyati hints that the tusker is so young and he is experiencing conjugal happiness for the first time.

His ability to point out suggestive import is evident in the explanation of the verse:

व्यविष्णुपर्याप्तानात् कोशिपि हेतुः
ने खलु वर्धविश्राभासः प्रीतयः संशयनः।

210
Some internal cause binds together objects, affection does not, indeed, depend upon external causes; for the day-lotus blooms at the rise of the sun, and the moonstone becomes wet when the moon rises.

While commenting on the word Pataṅgasya, he says that the sun is neither touchable nor reachable. Even then the presence of the sun arouses the lotus which is considered as the sweet-heart of the sun. Likewise the love of Mālatī and Mādhava is not at all affected by the distance of the places where they live or the impediments to their union. The word Pataṅga gives up its normal sense and transits to the meaning of one which is hard to attain because of heat and distance. No commentator has given such an explanation as Pūrṇasarasvatī has.

Mammaṭa in his Kāvyaprakāśa has stated that the purpose of poetry is to achieve fame, wealth, pleasure etc.

The purpose of Kāvya is to achieve fame, wealth, pleasure, supreme bliss and to know customs and
practices, for the ruin of bad omen and advices as that
of a beloved (wife).

Pūrṇasarasvatī agrees to this but with a slight variation. In his opinion achieving wealth, fame, pleasure etc. are only incidental and the enjoyment of paramānanda (most intense happiness) is the ultimate aim. He adds that Mālatīmādhava is designed to achieve this purpose.

At the end of the commentary he makes a significant comment to emphasize his opinion. He says that those who read and practise his prakārana will attain what they wish because of the employment of the words sānandaḥ in the beginning, vidhātā bhadraḥ naḥ in the middle and śivamastu sarvajagatāṁ at the end.

Treatment of sentiments

Development of rasa is the most crucial factor to decide the quality of a drama. Bhavabhuti tells that his play, Mālatīmādhava is a remarkable composition on account of the skillful depiction of various rasas. The commentator points out the rasa and its various bhāvās almost everywhere and thus proves the claim of the
playwright true. While commenting on the verse नंतरविकसितामुल्लसवृक्षानां (1 - 30) he points out the anubhavās of vismaya, harṣa, adbhuta, raōha, vibōdha and lajja and states, अनुभवो रसां गहनाः: प्रयोगाः हति प्रतिशालयः योजनमनुसन्धेयम्.

The playwright depicts all rasās except hāṣya in Act V. Pūrṇasarasvatī has explained how each rasa is developed by the dramatist. The explanation of the following verse shows how the delineation of different moods helps to achieve portrayal of the principal sentiment.

तामिन्दुसुन्दरमुखी सुविंचरं विभाव्य
चेतः कर्त्यं कदमभि ह्यपचतं ते।
लल्लो विजित्य विनयं विनिवायं धर्मः-
मूनाथ्य मन्दरविवेककांक्षाण्ड एव।। (1 - 21)

Having long dwelt on her with a countenance lovely like the moon, my heart, which has suddenly overcome shame, set aside good manners, uprooted fortitude and has its power of discrimination blunted, returns to me but with difficulty.

The commentator points out the development of śṛṅgārarasa here
and each element which constitutes the rasa is also suggested. The love of Mādhava towards Mālatī develops into śṛṅgāra. Mālatī, breathing of Mādhava, thought are described as vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhicāribhāva. He further says that here the figure of speech is vyatirēka since Mālatī is distinguished from other women on account of her beauty which stirs the heart of everyone.

Pūrṇasarasvatī is unrivalled in the art of pinpointing suggested sense. He sees the suggestions of karuṇa rasa in the following verse.

असारं संसारं परिमुदितरं विभूवनम्
निरालोकं लोकं मरणशरणं बामभवनम्।
अद्यं कुदर्यं जननयनिर्माणपलः
जगजीवारणं कथासि विधातु व्यवसितं। (V - 30)

How art thou prepared to deprive life of its balmy essence, to rob the three worlds of their jewel, to deprive the people of their light, to make death the only resort of her relatives, to humble the pride of the God of love, and to make the creation of the eyes of men fruitless, and the world a dreary wilderness?
He points out that karuṇarasa is suggested here. After studying the emotions properly, the commentator points out that Mādhava has in him two emotions: love towards Mālatī and anger towards his enemy.

Some scholars are of opinion that Bhavabhūti could have omitted the fifth act. But it seems that he had included it in order to exhibit his remarkable mastery in delineating different rasas. Pūrṇasarasvatī is equally careful in showing these rasas at the proper places.

Pūrṇasarasvatī reveals his skill in depicting hāsyarasa. He makes certain humourous comments at times and thus fills the lacuna of absence of humour in the play he comments on. One such occasion is seen in the Xth Act of Mālatīmādhava where Kāmandakī expresses her desires and disappointments as:

अकारणस्तेहमतोहरास्म-
विशालालाटापितगी:सर्वप:।
तवादङ्कश्यो परिशुप्तभागवा
मया न दृष्टस्तनयः स्तनमयः।।
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I, whose fortune is reversed, did not see your suckling son, lying in your lap, with his face engaging by his cause-less smiles and with white mustard seeds placed on his crest and fore-head.

While commenting upon this he refers to manorathānāṃ bāhuvīdhyam which alludes to the vṛddhakumārīnyāya which indicates achievement of many things by a single way. The boon wanted by the old lady was pautrānāṃ suvarṇapātrē aṣanadarśanaṃ mē astu. With this one boon she obtained youthfulness, good marital relation, issues, grand-children, afluence, longevity and good health till the wanted sight (darśanam). Likewise Kāmandakī primarily wishes for the sight of Mālatī’s son. The adjectives there stanandhaya, etc. remind us of the old maiden referred to above.

Here also we can see the expertise of Pūrṇasarasvatī in commenting upon each sentence in an unprecedented way. He comments upon everywhere in a slightly twisted manner where he can use bāhuvīdhatvaṁ easily, he chooses the word bāhuvīdhyāṁ which attracts a second thought. Many a sentence of this kind can be seen throughout the commentary.
Figures of speech

Pūrṇasarasvatī bestows much care in pointing out various figures of speech in detail in practically every verse of the play. He quotes the relevant definitions every time and discusses them. He points out more than one alankāra in each verse. The discussion on alankāra in the following verse shows his erudition of Alaṅkāraśāstra.

\[\text{Verse: } 1-32\]

And then, while going, by her eyes with graceful eye-lashes, whose face with the neck repeatedly turned backwards resembled a lotus with its stem twisted, a side glance steeped in nectar and venom was planted deep in my heart.

Here he points out similarity with the lotus -

\[\text{Verse } 1-32\]

and virodha by the mention of nectar and poison planted in
Mādhava’s heart by the same glance-

अनुभवसमये सुखावहत्वात् विरहसमये दुःखावहत्वात्व

विरोधोऽभालकरः

He beautifully brings out the implied meaning. By poison it is implied that he has the least hope of attaining her and by nectar the favourable attitude of the heroine.

Vṛttis

The commentator points out different vṛttis like ārabhaṭī, kaiśiki in the context of raudra, bīhatsa and śṛṅgāra. Nāṭya is the imitation of action and each action has its characteristic mood with respect to the man in action as well as to the sahṛdaya who sees the nāṭya. This mood, atmosphere or disposition is vṛtti17. They are of four kinds.

bhāratī, sātvatī, kaiśiki and ārabhaṭī.

The foregoing discussion reveals Pūrṇasarasvatī’s erudition and his importance as a commentator. It will indeed be a blissful experience to read Mālatīmādhava along with Rasamañjarī.
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